Leo O'Neill
31/5/26

NFLD
J
125
N3
1925
dup

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

During the Second Session of the
Twenty-Sixth General Assembly
of Newfoundland

1925

The Evening Telegram, Ltd.

Proceedings of the House of Assembly of Newfoundland

Session 1925

Begun and holden at St. John's in the said Island on Wednesday, the eighteenth day of February, Anno Domini, Nineteen Hundred and Twenty-five, being in the Fifteenth year of the reign of His Majesty our Sovereign Lord George, by the Grace of God, of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and of the British Dominions beyond the Seas, King, Defender of the Faith, Emperor of India.

WEDNESDAY, Feb. 18th, 1925.

His Excellency having fixed the hour at which he proposed to open the present Session of the Legislative at three of the clock in the afternoon of this Wednesday, the eighteenth day of February inst., 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.

Hon. W. S. Monroe and Wm. C. Winsor, Esquire, duly elected Members for the Electoral District of Bonavista, having been sworn by the Commissioners of His Excellency the Governor, were introduced by the Honourables W. J. Higgins and Sir John Crosbie, and took their seats.

At Three of the clock a message from His Excellency, the Governor, was delivered by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, commanding the immediate attendance of Mr. Speaker and the House in the Council Chamber.

Whereupon, Mr. Speaker and the House attended His Excellency in the Council Chamber; and 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 make a gracious Speech to both Branches of the Legislature, a copy of which for greater accurcy he had obtained, and then read to the House as follows:

Mr. President and Honourable Gentlemen of the Legislative Council:

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

We meet under more prosperous and gratifying conditions than existed in this Colony when the Legislature was prorogued.

The Codfishery of last year was prosecuted successfully and the products disposed of at the best prices known in the history of the Colony (exclusive of the abnormal war years). Those who engaged in this staple industry of the country reaped a reward which renewed their faith and interest in it.

The construction of great works upon the Humber has proceeded with

remarkable speed and success, many men are now engaged in cutting wood for manufacture into pulp and paper, and it is confidently expected that early in the approaching Spring, manufacturing will begin. Negotiations are proceeding, it is understood, for the promotion of a pulp and paper industry on the Gander River, and hope is justly entertained, that construction will commence before we meet again in Session.

Conditions in the Mining industry at Bell Island have not been satisfactory. Disagreements have occurred between the Company and its workmen. Before they arose my Government had felt constrained to make concessions to the Company concerning its contractual obligations in order to procure increased employment for labourers. Arrangements have been made to proceed with work on former conditions, pending a conference between the Company, the miners, and the Government.

My Government recently sent a delegation to Canada to discuss suggestions regarding a settlement, by negotiation, of what is popularly known as the "Labrador Boundary Question." They met representatives of the Dominion of Canada and the Province of Quebec, and discussed with them the economic aspects of the matter, confidentially, frankly and fully, and without prejudice to either party, and the discussion has been continued by correspondence since the return of the delegates. No agreement has been completed, and none may be, but until a tentative arrangement has been made, or the possibility of making one abandoned, it is not deemed expedient to inform you more fully of the proceedings. It is hardly necessary to add, I hope, that the Colony will not be committed by my Government to any settlement of this matter without the prior consent of the Legislature. The gratifying warmth of the reception given to the delegates in Canada testified to the extreme friendliness of Canadians to the people of this Colony.

Following upon the Hague Award, defining the liberty of the inhabitants of the United States to take fish on the Treaty Coast, so called, of Newfoundland, an agreement was made in 1910 for the settlement by arbitration of claims by the United States, based on alleged wrongful acts of the authorities of this Colony in respect of American fishing vessels. Statement and Answer were filed in 1914, but proceedings were interrupted by the Great War. A revised claim was filed on the first of August last, and a final Answer on the 31st January last. It is expected that a hearing by Arbitrators will take place in Washington this year.

A contract has been made for the construction of a Steamer to ply on the Port aux Basques-North Sydney route. It was given to a Company incorporated in Holland, but partly owned and managed by British people. It would have been more agreeable if a contract could properly have been given for construction in a British Shipyard, but the price asked, and the impossibility of getting guarantees for early completion, practically compelled the acceptance of the Contract which has been made.

Unemployment in the Colony has greatly decreased by comparison with all the years since the Great War ceased, and it is not now abnormal. There are many persons who for one reason or another are out of work and it has been suggested that public money should be expended to provide employment. Experience has shown that work at public expense cannot be productively engaged in at this season and my Government has decided therefore not to authorise it at present.

Very disturbing discoveries have been made by a Commission engaged in an enquiry concerning expenditures for charitable institutions and services. Laxness of administration, and

imposition by the non-deserving, have been proven, and there is evidence that the homely virtues of self-reliance and self-respect have been diminishing. Public expenditure for the relief of the sick and afflicted is meant for the helpless poor, and the conduct of those who selfishly trade upon this charity is highly reprehensible. Stricter rules and closer observance must be insisted upon. Good results from the enquiry have already been observed.

The services of a Postal Service expert, with great experience in Canada, have been obtained, to aid in a reform in the Postal Service of the Colony, in which conditions have existed of a nature very injurious to public interests. The Service is over-manned and under-worked, and much greater efficiency must be obtained at less cost. It is not possible to reform a Service so demoralized in a short time, but drastic reforms have been proposed, and will be insisted on.

Agricultural interests are having the attention of my Government and it is hoped that a Committee of practical Farmers, now in conference with the Minister, may suggest some wise legislation for the promotion of this important industry.

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

The finances of the Colony are in a highly satisfactory condition. Revenue has increased, and expenditure has decreased, and there will be a surplus of ordinary Revenue over Expenditure on current account in the financial year, 1924-25. Tenders for a Loan of Four Million Dollars ($4,000,000), part of what was authorised last year, have recently been received, and the rates quoted have been most satisfactory. Part of this Loan will be expended in Great Britain for the purchase of rails, and the Imperial Trade Facilities Board has undertaken to pay part of the interest for five years on the amount so expended, with the stipulation that the Loan be raised in England.

The expenditure for many years past have so exceeded the votes made for them as to show that great carelessness, at least, has been displayed by those who prepared the Estimates. The provision you will be asked to make for the coming year will be calculated with great care, and will in the due course be laid before you.

Just prior to the coming into office of my present Government an irregular order was issued purporting to remove Customs duties from gasolene, flour, beef, pork and molasses. My present Government, prudently desiring to amply provide for the Colony's needs, did not feel able to legalize all the reductions which had been announced, but struck off the duty on gasolene and flour. It is pleasant, therefore, to be able now to announce that you will be asked to repeal the duties on beef and pork, and kerosene oil, a most timely reduction when the prices of these articles are increasing.

Owing to the increased cost of shipbuilding, the bounty offered by the Government has not induced the construction of many new vessels, and as a large proportion of our present fishing fleet are in need of repairs, a measure providing a bounty for the encouragement of such repairs will be submitted for your approval.

The taxation of Banks doing business in Newfoundland has been excessive and unfair. You will be asked to reduce it. The successful prosecution of the trade of the Colony depends very largely upon the continuance of adequate banking facilities and the splendid banking institutions in our midst must be fairly treated.

An examination of the Dry Dock in this port, made by an expert engineer, has revealed the need of extensive repairs, and of partial rebuilding, and the cost will be large. Proposals will be made for your consideration.

War time demands led to the enactment of the Business Profits Tax Act, 1917, and the Income Tax Act, 1918; the former has been repealed, the latter amended. Both laws worked great hardships, and have been unsatisfactory in practice. Income Tax returns have not been made by many, under pressure only by others, and payments of assessments have been evaded, delayed or refused in so many cases that unfairness has resulted to the honest observers of the law. It is a form of taxation unsuited to this country. It restrains investment of capital in business, and though apparently paid by the so-called well-to-do, it is passed on to the consumer, when paid by those successful in business, while hampering severely, and sometimes destructively, those who have not prospered. Profits on the business of last year often come to be added to the losses of this. Simplicity of taxation is much to be desired in this Colony, in order to get back, as far as posible, to the good old days of comfort for our people, and therefore a Bill to suspend Income Tax as and from the commencement of 1925 will be introduced. An endeavour will be made to meet the loss to the revenue by the practice of honesty and economy in public expenditure.

Mr. President and Honourable Gentlemen of the Legislative Council:

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

There has been no Redistribution of seats in the Assembly for many years. The constituencies marked out in 1832, upon the grant of representative institutions, have undergone minor changes only. The Census of 1921 revealed inequalities and unfairness, the population of some electoral districts being shown to be half as many for two members as others had for one. A Redistribution Bill has therefore been prepared for your consideration and will be introduced at an early date, so that a measure may be enacted at this Session to go into effect upon the dissolution of this Assembly. It has been vary carefully prepared and will, I believe, be generally acceptable. It divides the Island into thirty-four districts privileged to return one representative each, and three districts to return two men each, and so arranged as to maintain representation of the various interests as formerly. It would be difficult to exaggerate the good results which may be expected to flow from this measure.

You provided generously in your last Session for the construction of roads intended especially to promote tourist traffic and generally to develop the Colony, affording local accommodation incidentally. It was not possible to commence construction last year, but some surveying has been done, a plan for work this year has been made, and construction will be vigorously undertaken as soon as the weather will permit. A Bill will be introduced for the creation of a Highroads Commission, charged with the construction and maintenance of roads considered to be of first importance, designated from time to time for that purpose by the Government, and the Chairmanship of this Commission will be conferred on the Government Engineer, with the object that the methods adopted in roadbuilding will no longer be haphazard and inefficient.

It is obvious that if tourist traffic is to come to this country, revision in Motor Traffic laws is essential, bringing them into harmony with those of the United States and Canada, from which such traffic must come. The need of stricter and fuller laws in this relation has long been evident, and a Bill for this purpose, based upon the latest and completest laws of adjoining countries, will be introduced. It will confer authority over the Motor Traffic upon the Highroads Commission, upon the ground that as that Commission is to control the construc-

tion and maintenance of highroads, it must necessarily control motor traffic over them.

It has been usual in newly discovered countries for government to expand upwards, from Settlement, Village, and Town, to State and national organization, and for the practice of the control of local affairs to train the people for participation in the management of matters of concern. Here, it has been otherwise, participation in administration having been but slowly conceded by central authority, and a consequence has been that the general government of the Colony is expected to provide, control and pay for public services which should be instituted, managed and paid for locally. It is proposed, therefore, to ask your consideration of a wide general measure for the incorporation of municipalities, which can from time to time be made applicable to suitable areas by proclamation of the Governor in Council, and thus the feasibility of self-government in such areas will be given a trial under favourable conditions. The residents of the incorporated places will thereby be able to vie with others in making their home towns desirable and attractive.

I commend the duties of the Session to your assiduous care and pray that the guidance of Divine Providence may attend your deliberations.

Hon. the Minister of Finance gave notice that he would on to-morrow move the House nito Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolutions:—

RESOLVED,—That "The Revenue Act, 1905," and the amendments thereto, be further amended by transferring to the free list under Schedule B. the following items, viz:—

"Beef when salted in barrels, including duty on barrels."

"Pork in barrels or half barrels, viz: Mess, Family, Prime, Mess, Rump, Extra Prime, Bean Clear, Butt and Ham, including duty on packages—per brl., Belly, Back or Family Mess or Loin Pork, including duty on packages."

"Kerosene Oil, and the package in which it is imported."

RESOLVED FURTHER,—That the Act 15, Geo. V., Cap. XXI, be amended by adding to Schedule A. thereto the following words:

"Beef when salted in barrels, including duty on barrels."

"Pork in barrels or half barrels, viz: Mess, Family, Prime Mess, Rump, Extra Prime, Bean Clear, Butt and Ham, including duty on packages."

"Belly, Back or Family Mess or Loin Pork, including duty on packages."

"Kerosene Oil and the package in which it is imported."

MR. CAHILL—Mr. Speaker and Honourable Gentlemen of the House of Assembly, I rise for the purpose of proposing that a Committee of this House be appointed to draft an Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, but before formally putting this motion I would like to make a few brief comments on a number of important and far-reaching matters which are mentioned in that Speech.

It is a matter of interest to note that in having a winter session the Government are following the precedent and reviving the practice of earlier years when the House of Assembly was always convened in February month. Of late years expediency and opportunism have often dictated otherwise, but the present Government, realizing that a Session of this House in the month of February is in the best interest of the fisheries, of trade, and of the Country generally, have reverted to the old and proper custom.

A successful Codfishery with high prices realized for our staple product makes for the general prosperity of Neewfoundland perhaps more than

anything else, and it is a source of very great gratification to the Government, as it must be to those immediately concerned in this industry, and, as a matter of fact, to the Country generally, that last year's fishery was prosecuted so successfully.

Mr. Speaker, the public has recently been made aware that conditions in the mining industry on Bell Island have not been satisfactory. In fact there seems to have been trouble of various kinds between the Company and its workmen ever since the merger some years ago of the two former Companies into one large corporation known as The British Empire Steel Corporation, more familiarly known as "Besco." Newfoundland workmen are undoubtedly amongst the best in the world, competent, adaptable, dependable, not given as a rule to discontent, or strikes, or anything of that kind, and I think it can be depended upon that in any dispute with the Company the interests of the Bell Island miners and workmen will be most carefully guarded and looked after by the present Government. Of course, the legitimate rights of capital and the Company must also be protected, and fair and reasonable devices and regulations cannot be denied or prescribed, no more than excessive or unreasonable demands on the part of the men can be supported, or uncalled for strikes and the introduction of "Red" or Bolshevik methods condoned or allowed. It must simply be remembered that the miners and workmen on Bell Island are not mere slaves, nor can they be treated as such. They are our brother Newfoundlanders, entitled to fair wages for an honest day's work under proper conditions, and to that extent I think they can rest assured that they will be supported to the fullest possible measure by the Government.

Reference was made in the Speech from the Throne to the work of the Delegation sent to Canada in connection with the Labrador boundary. Whlist nothing definite has yet resulted from that mission I am confident that the visit of the Delegates produced many good results and that these results will be made apparent in the near future. Incidentally this visit gave the delegates the opportunity to meet the Prime Minister of Canada and many of his Cabinet Ministers and to take up and discuss with them various matters mutually affecting Canada and Newfoundland. The warmth of the reception tendered by the Canadian people to our Delegates was as much appreciated by them, I am sure, as it has been by those whom they represented on that occasion, namely, the people of Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker and Gentlemen of the Honourable House of Assembly, after the lapse of some eight months the slogan under which the present Government was elected to power has by no means become with them a dead letter. On the contrary, it is just as much an article of their creed and practice now as formerly. You will rememl er this slogan was "Clean up, keep clean, and a square deal to all," and so far the Government have not failed in one jot or tittle of that promise, nor do they intend to do so in the future. You have read in the daily press of the "clean up" in the Department of Finance and Customs, and of the reforms and improvements instituted by the present Minister, Hon. Sir John C. Crosbie. That these reforms, in conjunction with other things, have already resulted in the pleasing announcement in the Speech from the Throne of a surplus of revenue over expenditure for the present year must be as gratifying to the Minister as it is to the Government, and will be to the public generally. But a clean-up and reorganization was also found to be necessary in another Government department somewhat akin to the Customs, namely, the Postal Service. Many reforms have

already been introduced there by the Minister, my colleague for Harbour Main District, the Hon. William Woodford, and at the present time a Postal Service expert from Canada is engaged in a thorough examination of the whole service. His recommendations and suggestions will be faithfully carried out by the Government, and the general public, and the business public in particular, can count upon having within a reasonable time an up-to-date and efficient Postal Service.

Mr. Speaker, as an ordinary layman, unacquainted with farming, it has been a matter of wonder to me for many years why farming has not progressed more favourably and been taken up more extensively in this country. I could never understand, for instance, why it should be necessary for Newfoundland to import such very large stocks of potatoes, turnips and other vegetables from outside the country. I should have thought that this country could produce at least enough of these vegetables to meet the local consumption. The present energetic Minister of Agriculture, Mr. W. J. Walsh, the honourable member for Placentia and St. Mary's, has already outlined many plans for the improvement of Agriculture in Newfoundland, and he is at present in conference with a committee of practical farmers. That many valuable suggestions tending to the improvement of Agriculture in Newfoundland will result from that conference I am supremely confident.

The general public, and the fishermen particularly, will be deeply interested I am sure in the announcement that the Customs' Duties on Beef, Pork and Kerosene Oil are to be repealed during the present session. Last year, owing to the disturbed state of the finances of the country and the fact that every dollar of revenue was needed in order to cover expenditure, the Government, much as they would have liked to, found it impossible to remit the duties on these articles. Now, however, after some eight months of prudent economy and wise administration they happily find themselves able to remit the duties on these commodities. which they gladly do, hoping that this action will be of material help and benefit to the fishermen of the country particularly.

The splendid Banking institutions in our midst, which have proven themselves true friends of the country in times of stress, must be treated in a fair and equitable manner, so that the Banking facilities so necessary for the successful prosecution and development of the general trade of the country may be continued, and even enlarged and expanded. It has therefore been decided to slightly reduc the taxation on Banks doing business in Newfoundland, the Government being fully satisfied after careful inquiry that the taxes as levied at the present time are excessive and unfair.

Mr. Speaker and hon. gentlemen of the House of Assembly, it will be learned with general relief and satisfaction of the intention of the Government to repeal the Income Tax Act. There is no doubt that this tax, whilst apparently fair and just at first sight, was really and in actual fact not at all so. On the contrary, it was altogether unsuitable to Newfoundland. it hampered business and industry, and the peculiar circumstances and conditions are such in this country that of necessity the Act was unfair in its administration. Our friend and esteemed citizen, Capt. A. Kean, will now be able to prosecute this season's Sealfishery with a mind quite happy and contented. Might I here express the sincere hope that he and all the other gallant sealing Captains may return from this year's voyage with bumper trips. May I call attention to the closing sentence of the paragraph dealing with this matter of the Income Tax

in the Speech from the Throne, which reads: "An endeavour will be made to meet the loss to the Revenue by the practice of honesty and economy in the public expenditure." I feel that the people of Newfoundland will believe and realize that this is no mere clap-trap nor empty promise, but is an honest declaration of intention on the part of the Government, and one which will be sincerely and consistently carried out.

Mr. Speaker, the present system of distribution of seats in this House of Assembly is antiquated, unfair, cumbersome, and not at all in keeping with the developments and changes of recent years. The present Government, with characteristic courage and disregard of party or practical politics, having in mind only the general good of the whole country, have determined to bring in at this session of the House a Bill dealing with this important matter. It will divide the Island into thirty-four (34) districts returning one representative each and three districts returning two men each. This measure has been given deep attention, and has been very carefully thought out. It will maintain representation of the various interests as formerly, and will I feel sure appeal to the country as an eminently sane and long waited for improvement.

So much for my remarks on matters mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, but before closing I would like to make just one other brief reference. I feel sure that our Honourable friends of the Opposition have learned with interest of, and will properly appreciate, the many important measures, carefully conceived in the best interest of the coutnry, to be introduced by the Government during this Session, and that they, as true Newfoundlanders, genuinely interested in the welfare and prosperity of their native land, will recognize the sincerity of the Government and will give these various measures their hearty support. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition is a gentleman with large and varied interests in the country. I might be permitted to describe him, and it is intended to be complimentary, as a business man first and a poliitcian second. I fully anticipate that the various measures introduced by the Government will appeal to his keen business man's mind, and that they will have his hearty support and the support of the Honourable gentlemen comprising the Opposition party. Needless to say, any reasonable suggestions or constructive criticism from the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, or from any Honourable Member of his Party, will be heartily welcomed by the Government, and I feel confident that fair comment only, and constructive criticism only, without any reversion to mere party politics, or what may be termed "gallery play," will be furnished by the Honourable Members of the Opposition during the present Session. After all, we are all Newfoundlanders. who should be working and striving to one end, namely, the progress and happiness and prosperity of our native land.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of important matters referred to in the Speech from the Throne with which I have not dealt. This omission, however, is deliberate, as these particular matters will be referred to by the honourable gentleman who will follow me in seconding the motion I am about to make.

Mr. Speaker, I have very great pleasure in proposing that a Committee of this House be appointed to draft an address in reply to the Speech from the Throne.

MR. W. J. BROWNE—Mr. Speaker, it gives me much pleasure this afternoon to second the motion so ably put by my honourable and learned friend who has just sat down. I feel that I am expressing the thought of every

one here, when I compliment him on the able speech which he has given us, in proposing the motion you have heard. I feel Sir, that before I go on to refer to the various maters mentioned in the Gracious Speech with which His Excellency opened the House this afternoon, I should compliment the Hon. Prime Minister and his colleague the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries on their re-election for the District of Bonavista last October. I feel sure that to have been returned with an increased majority is not only an indication of the confidence the district places in these representatives, but is an indication of the feeling of encouragement and restored confidence of the country as a whole.

We are pleased to be able to observe that the country at this period of our time as a Government is very much better than it was when we first came into power. The general conditions of the country have been very much ameliorated. Not only have political conditions become stabilised but commercial conditions also seem to be going back to normal. And His Excellency was right in stating that we are now meeting under more prosperous circumstances than when we last prorogued. This prosperity is due to many things. I am not going to minimise the effect which that great industry recently established on the Humber has had on the general prosperity of the country. The Humber has given employment to several thousands of men and it would be absurd to attempt to take away from that industry the many benefits it has conferred. And not only have there been direct benefits to the workmen engaged but there were indirect benefits, because this money put into circulation made the wheels of industry and commerce move. It is likely that an industry of a similar kind on the Gander River may be organised during the coming year. It is a matter for profound hope. If we had industries of this kind, and the more the better, we should be able to provide against the bad years when the fishery fails. The West Coast is benefitting very largely from these industries and I trust that the hon. member for the district of St. George's is encouraging the people of that locality in the development of their agricultural possibilities.

Honourable members who are acquainted with the history of our country will remember how long and how troublesome the dispute regarding our fishery rights has been. It is now a relic of the past ages. But the award of the Hague Arbitration of 1910 ended it forever. But as most Hon. Members must remember there were some minor matters to be settled which were not settled due to the intervention of the war. For example one important matter was the fact that because of the interference of the American Senate in not passing the Bond-Hay Treaty of 1902 the Legislature of Newfoundland introduced a measure which took away from American fishing vessels certain privileges which they had enjoyed under the famous "modus vivendi." That measure was the Foreign Fishing Vessels Act of 1905. The enforcement against America's Bait Act took away many other privileges which they had previously enjoyed. As in both cases wrong was done and as the Hague award admitted certain rights which were taken away by this measure it was only fair and just that the Americans should receive some compensation for what they had lost in the interval from 1905 to the Hague award of 1910. It is very gratifying to know that this matter will be adjusted this year.

Our Government has recently closed an order for the building of a new steamer in Holland. The construction is well under way, and it will soon be in operation on the Port aux Basques-Sydney route. Some members of the Opposition may be surprised that this order was placed in Holland but I

may assure them that this was the only course open to the Government and as the Speech from the Throne points out, the prices in the Old Country were prohibitive. Besides, there was no sort of guarantee from firms in the Old Country as to what time the order would be completed, because of high wages and other industrial troubles. The people of Newfoundland must not feel that we are unpatriotic in doing that because a great deal of the capital and management of the company, which has the order, is British, and many British steamship firms operating in Britain have placed orders with the same company. This being so, it would be very unfair if anybody were to suggest that the Government has done wrong in giving consideration to these very important matters.

The matter of unemployment is one which is not unknown in this country. Fortunately, because of our small population, we are not called upon to face the tremendous difficulties which arise elsewhere. However, we, Hon. Members, who are representatives for the City, have some problems which are not experienced by Hon. Members for the outports and it has been a matter of great concern not only to my colleagues and myself but also to the Executive Government and we have given the matter a great deal of thought. After consultation with the representatives of the largest unions in this country we have come to the conclusion that the expenditure of large sums of monies on relief works of the same nature as have been in operation in previous years would be ill-advised and unsatisfactory. We have come to the conclusion that in case of necessity the Government will step in and see to it that nobody will be in danger of any hardship or privation. We feel that the results will justify what we have done and prove our decision to be in the best interests of the people. We feel, too, that in a short time work will be started in St. John's which will adequately provide employment for the workingmen and also put them in a position to obtain permanent employment and enable them to provide amply for the next winter. This is not the first year that there has been unemployment. Unemployment seems to be a matter of continual recurrence. It is apparently a permanent social problem defying solution and it is a surprise to me that in former years more thought was not given to preventative measures rather than relief.

The Government has appointed a committee to investigate the Charitable Institutions. And they have discovered many discrepancies. They have been veritable gentlemen with dusters. There have been many improper practices in these institutions and the department of the Government with which they are connected. These were largely due, I think, to the excess of human nature. Many of the hon. members of this House represent outport districts, and when their constituents come to them in times of stress the hon. members do most generously by them. The result is that people of all conditions are crowding the boarding houses of the city waiting to get into the hospital. This condition of affairs is intolerable, as it prevents any proper control or administration. By the appointment of this commission, and by the knowledge which they have received in their investigation we trust that this condition which has ben so much in evidence will be eliminated in the Public Charities Department and the various institutions connected with it.

The Government is deserving of congratulations for the raising of the recent loan which was authorised by this House last year. The Government did well in not rushing to raise this loan and waiting until six months when they were able to point to a good half years operation. It may not be uninteresting for hon. mem-

bers of this House to know a few figures in connection with the working of the Finance and Customs, for the six months ending Dec. 31st, 1924, and to take the revenue for this period in comparison with that of other similar periods. It exceeded the revenue of the year of 1922-23 by $363,735.00 whilst the decrease in expenditure for the same period as compared with the 1922-23 was $808,946 making a total savings on current account of $1,172,-682. And now we will take last year when perhaps the Government in power acted a little more wisely than the previous Government. The Revenue for the current year over 1923-24 shows an increase of $640,764.00 while the decrease in expenditure over the same period is $790,623.31, a total savings over 1923-24 of $1,431,388—a saving of almost one and a half millions of dollars. I think that the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs is justly deserving of the highest congratulations on the work which he has done in his present capacity.

Another item in the speech from the throne refers to still another practice of past Governments, that of exceeding the amounts voted in this House. That is a very incorrect procedure, Mr. Speaker. When this House votes a certain amount after careful consideration it is wrong that some official of the Government should take it upon himself, or even any committee of the Government, take it upon itself, to exceed votes of this nature by any large amount. Sometimes in an emergency it is impossible to avoid doing this entirely but there have been occasions when votes have been exceeded to the extent of one and a half million dollars! I am sure that this Government intends to abandon practices of that kind and to be able with careful estimation to have no necessity of exceeding the amount which will be voted by this House.

Another matter of importance to the people of this country and particularly to the fishermen is that referring to the granting of a bounty for repairs of ships. There has been for a number of years a bounty for shipbuilding in this country and it was granted at a time when the comparative cost of building a vessel was low. During the war prices increased and since then they have not gone down so very much that it is possible to pay owners for the great expense which it is necessary to undergo. However, the Hon. Members of the Opposition are well acquainted with this matter. To help out the fisheries and to help those engaged in the shipbuilding, this measure is to be introduced immediately and give the bounty for the repairs to vessels. It will also encourage a larger number of vessels to take part in the fisheries and will give employment to that large body of tradesmen known as shipwrights.

The Dry Dock is one of the public works on which employment will be given as soon as the weather conditions will warrent. There was a vote for this work in the loan resolutions of last year of fifty thousand dollars. I was not sanguine of the adequacy of that amount but one of the honourable and gallant members went even so far as to suggest that the amount was three times as great as necessary. I say, that living in St. John's West as I was, I had no illusions about the amount necessary to spend on this utility before it could be put in proper shape.

The Dock has been in need of repair for a considerable number of years, and if we are going to take any steps to furnish the Dry Dock to accommodate vessels that become disabled in mid-stream, we must be prepared to spend a large amount of money on repairs; and I consider it will be money well spent.

Another feature of the Government's programme, which has been forecasted at a previous session of the

House, is the policy of encouraging tourist traffic. A large amount of money was voted for the opening up of roads to encourage tourist traffic to come here. I consider that this is a policy which will soon justify itself, and assist very considerably in increasing our revenue. Honourable members who are familiar with conditions in the neighbouring provinces of Canada will know what a very large revenue can come from tourist traffic. Honourable members who are acquainted with the provinces of Canada, for example. the Province of British Columbia. know what an incredibly large amount of revenue comes into the province through the medium of tourist traffic. I consider that we are going the right way about carrying out that policy by the establishment of a Highroads Commission under the chairmanship of the Government Engineer. Under this system the hitherto sporadic methods of road building will cease, and we will now have a better system under which we will have good road building, and good road repairing. Under the old system, one part of the country did not know what the other part was doing, and there was not one person who had devised or planned any general scheme of connected construction or repair of our roads.

In connection with the road scheme propagated by the Government there will be a revision of the motor laws. That is a matter which I think required consideration long before this. Those who are familiar with the Courts of Justice in this country will know that in places outside St. John's there does not have to be any registration of motor cars, unless the owners brought those cars into St. John's. It was quite a common occurrence to see a motor car going around in the city without any registration number. It was an anomaly, too, that a man who wished to drive a motor car in Harbour Grace would have to come to St. John's and pass an examination before the Inspector General before he would be permitted to drive it. That is an anomaly which I trust will be cleared up by this legislation. I trust also that if we are going to bring our laws into conformity with the laws of Canada and the United States, we will make it the rule of the road to go to the right, and I am sure that those Honourable Members on the other side who are familiar with the workings of the Road Commission will recognize that that is an important introduction.

Another matter of local Government is contained in the second last paragraph of His Excellency's gracious Speech from the Throne in regard to the distribution of municipalities. This is a very interesting, if new, feature. I do not know if there has been any demand made for this, but it is quite easy to see the benefits that will flow from the incorporation of municipalities. and it is obvious that there are many peculiar conditions existing now as a result of the failure to do this in the past. The large towns of this country would have a greater civic pride if they had their own little organizations, and there would be a greater desire among the people to stay in their home town, instead of abandoning the homes of their fathers to come into the city. I am looking forward with hope to the development of this new institution in this country, and I trust that ere long Grand Falls, Carbonear. Harbour Grace, and other communities of similar size that would warrant the intrdouction of municipalities. will be incorporated, and I look forward to seeing them forming the proper community spirit, and vieing with St. John's in its many activities.

Mr. Speaker, before concluding I should like to remark what I think will be the opinion of many of the Honourable Members present, that the Speech from the Throne this year

is brighter than usual; and I think it will be admitted that it is very comprehensive, and has no frivolous matter introduced in it. I think I can say with confidence that this Session now opening will be one of the most important sessions of this Assembly. This session, I consier, with all its important legislation will be an historic session. The Legislation that is to be introducel appears to be of paramount importance. and it is a great honour to me to be here to-day to share in it, and I am grateful for the honour that I have to-day to be permitted to second this resolution that is now before the Chair—that a motion be passed for the formation of a Committee to draft a reply to the gracious speech which we have heard to-day from His Excellency the Governor at the opening of this session.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker, I desire to congratulate Mr. Cahill, the mover of the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, with which His Excellency the Governor has opened the present Session of the Legislature. Mr. Cahill is as yet but a political boy, but I have no doubt that he has a future before him in politics. I also congratulate Mr. Browne, the member for St. John's West, on his excellent address in seconding the motion in reference to the Speech from the Throne.

The Speech from the Throne contains a great many things. There is scarcely anything that it does not contain. The only thing that I am surprised to find is that it does not contain any reference to the recent eclipse of the sun.

For those who are not familiar with the proceedings of the House of Assembly, and are attending here now for the first time, I might say that such a speech as this is written by the Government to boost up their cause. It is not written by the Governor, but by the Government, and placed in the hands of His Excellency to read, and whatever they put in that speech His Excellency has to read. Therefore they try to bolster up their cause by the Speech from the Throne. You must not believe everything you hear, and not believe half you see. If you were to take seriously everything that is contained in that speech, I am sure that you would see a great deal of good in Newfoundland for the future. But this speech has yet to be pulled to pieces by the members of the Opposition.

The first opportunity the members of the Opposition have to see or hear that speech is when it is read by His Excellency in the Council. The Government members see it and hear it, but the members of the Opposition do not have that privilege. They have to wait until the speech has been read, and then they have to give their comments on it.

There are a great many subjects contained in this Speech which can be criticized, but taking this speech as it is before me now and going down through it, I will only be able to touch on certain matters, as I do not now want to delay the House. Later we will be able to discuss the Speech in full.

One matter here which has been very much stressed by the two gentlemen who spoke and is also very prominent in the Speech from the Throne is the contract for the new steamer which has been placed in Holland. Those who have listened to the speeches made have seen and heard how the speakers have stressed that point, and have sought to excuse the placing of that contract in Holland, where it will be carried out and constructed by probably half Germans. The excuse given is the saving. I doubt very much if there is any saving. We have been told to-day in the speech that the loan has been placed in England because the Trade Facilities Board will pay some of the interest on the loan. If the Trade Facili-

ties Board is prepared to pay the interest on the loan, that same Board would no doubt be prepared to pay the interest on the cost of constructing the ship in England, and that saving would be very much more than the saving we are now led to believe the Government has made on that contract.

In reference to the Profits Tax and Income Tax which the Government proposes removing—this no doubt is a good move on the part of the Government, and it is a department that should be abolished in the interests of trade. It is a pity that the Government thought fit to make an attack on Sir Edgar Bowring through the Courts, and took all sort of trouble to collect from him income tax on money on which he had already paid income tax in England. Sir Edgar Bowring is a philanthropist of great wealth, of which he has given to this country liberally, and he is now driven from his home, and forced to resign his seat in the Legislative Council. He is a man, as I say, of great wealth, and no doubt he intended in the future to leave large legacies to the country in which he was born. This man is paraded through the Courts in St. John's. He has been compelled to resign his seat in the Upper House, and he has given instructions to his agent to sell his house in Topsail. He kept his house at Topsail, and employed a few servants to take care of it for him, and that is why he is made subject to this income tax, and is compelled to pay it.

Therefore I say it is very regrettable that a man who is so important and has such extensive interests here should have been so badly treated in his own country. One of the speakers has stated that the Government proposes to reduce the taxes on the Banks. I do not know what these taxes are, but I know from the financial papers published in Montreal that all the Banks which have branches here pay 16 per cent. on the money invested. Therefore, I think they ought to be able to pay a little here. I am not able to give particulars of this matter just now, but hope to be able to do so later. The Honorable Member for St. John's West. Mr. Browne, has stressed the point of the Government having saved 1½ millions since they came into existence. If they have saved this sum, why are there so many hungry people walking the streets to-day? Why have they not found some means of employment for them? There are many things that might have been taken up to give these people help. Those who are getting the dole. are driven only by necessity, to accept it. The dole was never intended for any but the halt, the lame and the blind, and not those who are willing to work. If you boast of the saving of 1½ millions, why don't you help out those who do not wish to apply to the Charities Department for the dole. We have yet to find out where the saving of revenue comes in and to discover what the saving will be after the salaries of the increased number of officials appointed in the various departments since the Government got in have been paid. It is common knowledge that there have been many increases made and that departments are overmanned. It has also come before my notice during the last few months that many dismissals have been made of men who have given long years of service to the Government. I know of one man in Harbour Grace District with 15 years' service who has been dismissed, but I do not know what side he voted on. Last year shortly before the closing of the House the Hon. the Prime Minister promised that no man would be dismissed unless he took an active part on some particular side. Now, Mr. Speaker, in reference to the Tourist Traffic. I think the most important step is the building of an up-to-date hotel. No tourists will come to

Newfoundland unless they have some place to stop at. The provinces of British Columbia and Quebec, the revenues of which we have heard so much of this afternoon, are plentifully supplied with hotels. and that must be our beginning here. Before we waste any money on roads or regulations for auto traffic it is necessary to have accommodation for the people who will come here. I notice too, Mr. Speaker, that there is nothing in the Speech from the Throne in reference to the Railway. Last year we suggested that the estimates of the Railway be included with the others. In reply the Hon. the Prime Minister said it would be very difficult to do this as it would be hard to know what the profits of the Railway would be from one time to another. The same applies to some other departments. We must insist on having this information this year before the Estimates are passed. All the people engaged on the railway are civil servants and we must have these estimates to prevent the railway becoming a dumping ground and also to see what additions and changes to the staff are made. Our duty, as an Opposition, is to know exactly how the railway is conducted and to safeguard it for the people we represent. There are many other subjects, Mr. Speaker, I might dwell on now, but I do not wish to cause delay and will reserve comment till a later date when the House meets again.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Speaker, as a rule it is usual for the leader of each party to take part in the formal proceedings connected with the opening of the House, and, modest as I am, I cannot forget that I am the leader of a party. It is true the party is not so strong in numbers as those I see around me, but this I can congratulate myself on; my party went to the constituencies and came back 100 per cent. strong. I not only take it, Mr. Speaker, that I represent those who voted for me, but by the correspondence I have received, I take it I represent an independent body of opinion outside the House. The man who votes for a party is not always a hidebound politician and sometimes he has an independent mind and likes to have his opinions aired in the House, even if by a man not bound to either side. Therefore I speak for the man in the street who as he sees affairs move along finds there are certain questions he would like to ask. While I do not to-day wish to criticize I would like to point out that there are some reflections that have occurred to the "man in the street." I would like Mr. Speaker, to add my congratulations to those of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to the gentlemen who so ably moved and seconded the Reply to the Speech from the Throne. I thank goodness that I was saved the ordeal but the Hon. the Prime Minister made no mistake in leaving it in the hands of these gentlemen. Mr. Cahill—I was going to say is not young in years —is young in politics, and I hope he will long be spared to do honor to this House. Mr. Browne has already won a reputation as an orator and he well sustained it by his effort here this evening. I know the ordeal of speaking from a set text, as I have had the experience, but we on this side make our own text. I also join in congratulating the Hon. the Prime Minister and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries on their victory in the bye-election in Bonavista Bay. They found a doughty opponent, but defeated him, and are worthy of congratulation. Those who were present at the ceremonies in the Upper House must have noticed three new faces, and three newly filled chairs there. I saw Mr. Fred Alderdice, Dr. J. A. Robinson and Mr. C. P. Ayre in the seats of the mighty for the first time, and I want to congratulate the Government on the appointment of these gentlemen. Mr. Alderdice will prove a valuable addition to

the Upper House, he is very well known in the mercantile world, and I am especially interested in the other two members of the Legislative Council, as I offered them the seats, when I was Prime Minister but was not able to bring it to fruitition. I not only congratulate them but the Hon. the Prime Minister on their appointment to positions in our legislative halls. Now, Mr. Speaker, referring to the "man in the street" and thinking particularly of the "man in the street" on the West Coast, we must remember the disaster which recently overtook that West Coast and I am going to refer to it briefly, not so much as it affects my district as the one next it, but to point out that the appeal for assistance of the people affected has not met with the assistance that it should have. We have heard this afternoon a lot about unemployment and the Government devoting 1½ millions towards relief and I understand they are giving out a dole.

Now let me point out to this House that those men who lost their lives in that West Coast disaster a few weeks ago never looked for any dole. They did not want any portion of that million and a half dollars. They go out in their boats in all sorts of weather and at all times of the year. They go and pull fish from the sea when the spray freezes before it hits their faces, and, in pursuance of that, they carry on their work without asking the Government for a cent to go to the women and children who are left without husbands and fathers. A fund was started here by the "Evening Telegram," and I am sorry to say that if a man had his house burned down or had lost a horse he would get a better response than this appeal for these West Coast people has met with. I have no newspaper to advertise in, and, as this is the only place I can assert myself, I want those within sound of my voice to try and do something. To say that only four or five hundred dollars is all that is contributed for this deserving cause is a positive disgrace to us all. I do not appeal to the Government for help; but to private individuals, and I hope that the fund will be swelled by what I have said here this afternoon.

The gentleman who proposed the Motion for the Address in Reply, Mr. Cahill, stated that the present Government had not faltered in any shape or form in carrying out the policy for which it was elected, and he said that it had a slogan of "Clean up, keep clean, and a square deal to all." It will be within the recollection of everybody in this community that we have been for the past eighteen months indulging in some political fireworks and it cannot be denied that in these political fireworks I had a little to do It is, therefore, quite clear to you, Sir, that I must take some personal interest in the matter of that slogan of "Clean up, keep clean, and a square deal to all." I was rather amused I must admit when my learned friend picked out the three departments in which this slogan had been carried into effect and how strangely he took them in order from the left of the Prime Minister. I saw the modest blushes of the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs and the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, as the proposer referred to them. I am not in the same position as Mr. Cahill was and I do not know exactly what policy of "Clean up, keep clean, and a square deal to all" the Honourable Ministers have indulged in; but perhaps, now that the Minister of Finance has the assistance of Mr. James Gladney in his department, that I hope and trust things will go on alright. I do not say this in any disparaging spirit of Mr. Gladney. He is a personal friend of mine and I was delighted to know that his able assistance was at the beck and call of the Minister. The department of Posts and Telegraphs, I know from experience, is

one that calls for thorough investigation and if there is any department that needs a duster that is the department. I know of no better wielder of the duster than the Hon. Mr. Woodford. As a reformer he stands pre-eminent and I am glad to see that he is following in the steps of his predecessor. The late Government, of which, for a few months, I was the Leader, had already become aware of the fact that the Postal Department was not all that it should be and we had already instituted some reforms there. We had suspicions that things were not altogether right there and we had, as some members of the present Government know, put that department down as one to be investigated and enquired into by an independent outside Tribunal, and as far as I can see those steps taken by the late Government have been cancelled and the services of Colonel Ross have been invoked, but more with regard to the efficiency of the Posts and Telegraphs system rather than exposing to the public view and the public sight those who were not doing their work, as it was alleged to the Government at the time that matters were not going on as they might have and should have. I do not say that any officials were personally liable for the conduct of the department, but they were liable for some of their actions there.

The Department of Agriculture and Mines is taking steps to obtain from farmers some idea of a National Agricultural policy. In that my friend the Minister is following the footsteps of Mr. Baldwin and Mr. Wood in England; but I want to point out to the Minister that he must go farther than the farmers in and around St. John's to help him establish that policy. The farmers in St. John's have a limited market here. They have their own methods and, I am sure, they cannot advise men in their garden in the outports and I hope that the Minister will take into his confidence those outport folks who are trying to farm and trying to grow vegetables and other products referred to by the member for Hr. Main and obtain some advice from them.

The Leader of the Opposition stated that the Speech from the Throne contained pretty well everything except a reference to the eclipse of the sun. I might say that the Speech was remarkable for two reasons, firstly, for its great length and secondly because it was so radical, and, as far as I am concerned, the proposed legislation which is foreshadowed in the latter part of the Speech, I am sure, will meet with the approval of every man on the street.

I started to talk a few minutes ago about the slogan of the Government Party and I want to say that it is not in keeping with the slogan they went to the country on. I do not ask the Government to do anything. I only say this that the man on the street wants to know—and if he does not know now he wants to known later on—why the Commission of enquiry inaugurated by the late Government of which I happened to be Leader was cancelled and why investigations into various departments that were outlined in reports to the Governments have not been proceeded with. I do not say this personally; but I cannot help remembering what happened a little less than a year ago when Mr. Cramm, the honourable member for Bay de Verde, got up and proposed a vote of want of confidence. He said nothing against the then Government. What he said was against me. He said that I only carried on the investigations sufficiently to get my own leader. If that is true, what has been done by the present Government of which the same Mr. Cramm is an Executive member; if it was not true there was no justification for saying it and no justification for the Government joining him to carry out that vote of want of confidence. Now as

far as my connection with the Squires Government is concerned, I say this, that, at all events, whatever the shortcomings of that Government were, I do not think that any Government put their cards on the table and subjected themselves to exposure as that Government did. I say nothing of individual members of that Government, but I talk of that Government as a Government.

I am also reminded that during the Squires administration a Royal Commission was appointed to carry on what is known as the "Woodford Affidavit Enquiry." That enquiry was proceeded with without any undue delay. Later on Sir William Coaker was accused of something wrong about Government salt and a Royal Commission of Enquiry dealt with the matter. Subsequently charges were made against other members of that Government and proceeded with.

Take the Auditor General's Department. It is apparent to anybody and it is to the man on the street that thousands of dollars have disappeared from the public chest. I say nothing of the officials . The Auditor General is a perfectly capable man. But there is something wrong with the system by which thousands of dollars disappear, apparently without anybody knowing. I hope the Government will, at an early stage, engage the services of some expert chartered accountant ,to try and put our system right. Now the Leader of the Opposition has referred to the question of income tax, in which Sir Edgar Bowring was involved. I only refer to it casually for a particular reason. In a certain sense the late Government was responsible for the non-collection of that, and thus it has been made especially hard on Sir Edgar. I do not purpose to debate the case, but I want to say this, when I was Minister of Justice I did not think it was either legally or morally right to collect the income tax from a man whom the Government had appointed High Commissioner and who, by the terms of his commission, had to live in London. We did not collect the tax. The result was that it went on for a certain number of years, and in the end Sir Edgar was sued for quite a large amount. My point is this, that whether the Government was right or wrong in not collecting the tax, if Sir Edgar had known in the first place that he was liable for the tax, he would have rid himself of the liability then as now. I point that out to the Government for their consideration. I would like to refer to one other point, Sir, and that is raised by the learned member for St. John's West, Mr. Browne. He has referred to the large revenue which the Government has collected and to the fact that at the end of the present year we shall have a surplus of revenue over expenditure.

I would like to point out, Sir, that with the exception of the duties that are now to be taken off, the Revenue Act is the same as that proposed by the late Government. The present Government was appointed to office in June, 1924, and at least 80 per cent. of the estimates were those of the late Government. The present Government has been in office for 7 or 8 months and so has enjoyed the benefits of a policy which was pursued by its predecessor. They will have a chance this year to bring in their own estimates. I have a hazy idea that these estimates are not going to be as low as those passed last year. They are not going to do away with the extra amount being paid to officials by a Minute of Council; but they are going to provide for them by passing them formally through this House. I may say that I am amused at the few words in the Speech from the Throne, referring to the irregular order issued last year in taking off the duties now taken off. I have already spoken of it in the House. I desire to men-

tion it again. It will be recalled that last year there was some agitation to get the people to go to the fisheries during 1924. There were various articles signed by the constituents of the Prime Minister. Mr. Winsor asking for a bounty on fish or the reduction of duties on articles the fishermen were supplied with. I called the merchants together and asked their opinions, and upon consideration eventually it was decided not to collect the duties on pork, beef, kero, gasolene, etc. That was done purely because we wanted to get the fishermen fishing. The House did not open until April and we wanted it settled as quickly as possible, so an order was passed. It was not wrong; the Speech from the Throne contained a statement that we were going to take the duties off for that particular reason. The mere fact that it was irregular did not prevent the fishermen getting the benefit of it. One hears a lot of political rumours these days. The man in the street has had enough of elections and cabinet-making for some while. We want tranquility, we want political peace and we want to get down to business. A good stable Government has been put in office and the man in the street desires that Government to remain stable, to pay no attention to rumours but to carry on for the benefit of the people of the country who are first to be thought of.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—It has been a common practice in years gone by on this day of the opening of the House, when the proposer and seconder of the motion for the Address in Reply have spoken and when the leaders of the opposition parties have had something to say, it has been usual for the Prime Minister to rise to his feet and, metaphorically speaking, pat those budding statesmen on the back, tell them their speeches were excellent, and predict for them a very bright future. Mr. Speaker, it is not necessary for me to take any such course. In Mr. Cahill and in Mr. Browne, you have two men with experience of parliamentary practice as long and with a knowledge of constitutional law as profound as that of the very Prime Minister himself. I have not counted the number of years these gentlemen and myself have been in politics together. During twenty or twenty-five years of political turmoil with politicians shifting from one side to the other, Mr. Cahill, Mr. Browne and myself have never been in opposition to one another in politics. We entered the political arena together and we have been together ever since. I hope very sincerely that we remain together as long as I am in public life. I believe that these men to-day are in public life to try and benefit the country to which they belong. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to have with us a great number of the ladies. And I want to say that I am afraid some of them were disappointed when the Speech from the Throne made no reference to the subjeect that has concerned them for some years. I was not more than three weeks in office when a deputation of the ladies called on me and asked me to introduce a Bill giving votes to women. I want to say here that I did not for one moment imagine that they had come to me because they thought I could put their case before the House more forcibly than any other member. They came to me because I was the leader of the Government party and I explained that if I brought in a measure it must be a private one. I would not expect a member of our party to vote for it because I introduced it, and I would not expect the Opposition to vote against it because I had brought it in. I do not propose to make a long speech on the subject of Woman Suffrage just now but I want to say that Newfoundland and South Africa are the only two English speaking countries which have not given women

the vote. And when it is considered that South Africa is largely Dutch, Newfoundland stands alone, I am convinced that the women of Newfoundland are as deserving as the women in any part of the world to get the privileges they ask. There are three points which I would like you to turn over in your minds before the Bill comes before the House The three questions to ask yourselves are: Should a woman have a vote at all. What age should she have it at. What are the privileges it carries with it? I am inclined to think that women should have a vote. As far as the age is concerned I have a very open mind In England the vote is given to women of 30 years of age, and I think that was done because, after the war they were afraid that the large number of women would swamp the votes of the men. I understand that a law to amend this is to be brought in at this session of the House of Parliament. In Canada votes are given to women at 21. I fancy in this country it would be as well to give franchise to women at the age of twenty-five.

I say that not because I think that a woman of twenty-one has a mentality less developed than a man of twenty-one, but because I think it possible that it was a questionable policy to allow the men to vote at the early age of 21. There may be a difference of opinion about that and I am open to conviction. The next question, gentlemen, is as to what privileges we are to give with the vote. A couple of years ago my wife wanted to join the Historical Society. She had heard that some papers were to be read in which she was interested and she wished to become a member. She made application and found that because she was a woman she was not allowed to join. On account of her sex she could not become a member of the Historical Society. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would allow every woman of Newfoundland to become a member of the Historical Society. I go further, I would allow every woman to sit on a jury. If the juries which we have had during the last six months had been entirely composed of women I firmly believe they would have done just as well as the men. I still go further, I would allow every woman who can get there a seat in the House of Assembly. Some ladies came to see me a few weeks after I became Prime Minister and I told them a story. I will tell it again. It was told by Lady Astor when she was first elected to the House of Commons. A day or two after she had taken her seat in the House, Sir Edward Carson, now Lord Carson, went up to her and shook hands. Lady Astor said to Sir Edward "Is this a shake hands of welcome or just an ordinary shake hands " Sir Edward, who speaks very slowly and with a broad Dublin accent, replied, "It's a very ordinary shake hands. I hate to see you here." I just mention this to show that a woman trying to get elected to the House of Parliament has to face very great disadvantages; but if a woman of outstanding character should offer herself for election she should not be debarred from the House of Assembly on account of her sex. That is all I wish to say on this subject this afternoon.

Now I wish to make a reply to a few matters brought up by the Leader of the Opposition. In the first place I wish to speak about the contract which we have given for the building of the ship referred to. I want to say that we have made a saving of ten thousand pounds by giving the contract to the Holland firm. We could not very well sacrifice ten thousand pounds simply for the pleasure of giving the order to an English firm. The Furness and other British steamship companies are building their ships in Holland, and if in

this manner we can save money for the country we are going to do it. As regards assistance procurable for work of this kind, the Government communicated with the High Commissioner and he wired that the Trade Facilities Board considered that vessels of this type were not a public utility, and they would not give the same assistance they would on rails. The Leader of the Opposition made some reference to Eir Edgar Bowring's income tax. I think that there should be some little explanation in connection with that, because what we want clearly understood is, that we did not make the income tax law. The very fact that we abolish it, or are about to abolish it, shows that we disapprove of it. The law is wrong, but since it is there it must be obeyed, and we cannot make the effect any different for Sir Edgar Bowring than for any other person. As a matter of fact Mr. Warren will remember, as he was acting for Sir Edgar Bowring, that I suggested a compromise, but Sir Edgar preferred to have the case tested in court. We are certainly not to blame for the result of a bad law which we are proposing to abolish. Mr. Hickman also referred to the matter of a hotel. He says that the first thing that we have to do is to build a hotel and the roads will come after. I do not quite agree with Mr. Hickman. I agree that the hotel is an essential and we have been trying to get somebody to build a hotel. We have offered every kind of enticement to get an American or Canadian company to build a hotel. We have even offered to subsidise them or guarantee their bonds to some extent. But in spite of this nobody has come forward yet. It may yet be necessary to build the hotel ourselves and then sell it afterwards at cost price. Anyhow, we want the hotel and we are going to have it. The building of the hotel and the roads go hand in hand, and as it is going to take longer to build the roads than it is to build the hotetl, we need not worry ourselves about the objection raised by Mr. Hickman. As regards the income tax, we felt some diffidence in taking it off because the people might be of the opinion that we were doing it because some of the rich people might be affected favourably by it. Now, Mr. Speaker, nothing was farther from our minds in that respect. There are a small number of people who are paying the income tax and there are many people who should be paying the tax and are not paying it. The people who are paying it are regularly salaried clerks. It has become a disgrace. This class of man cannot escape paying the income tax because his employer gives a statement showing his exact salary, so that he cannot escape. But there are fishermen who have paid for new schooners this year and never paid an income tax, and would be deeply surprised if they were asked to do so. The whole principle of the income tax is wrong and indirect taxation is what we want in this country. There is Captain Kean, and he will think that he was the man who got that off, but I want to tell Captain Kean that this matter was discussed before ever his letters came out in the papers. Now, Mr. Warren refers to the fact that our policy was "Clean up and keep clean, and a square deal to all." I can tell Mr. Warren that we are cleaning up and have been cleaning up with very startling results. It is a very difficult business. And I want to tell Mr. Warren that we have not yet finished paying the bills of the late Government. We got a bill the other day for sixteen thousand pounds for repairs to the Lobelia. The late Government apparently bought only the shells of these ships. No doubt they thought that they bought fully equipped vessels, but this bill charges us with everything that went in-

to them. We also got a bill the other day for two aeroplanes which were supposed to have been given to the Government. I think that it was the Squires Government. I do not know whether they thought that they were getting aeroplanes. If they did, they did not get them. They got balloons —dirigible balloons. They came out to Botwood, were unpacked there and sold to some garage firm. The material was cut up and made into waterproof coverings, and when you see a horse going through Water Street with a silver covering on him you will know where it came from. If it happens, Mr. Speaker, that you are driving home some evening in a sleigh and an attentive cabman wraps one of these silver robes about your knees, you can feel you are as near to driving in a Government aeroplane as you are ever likely to be.

Now I do not want to delay the House this afternoon, but there is just one thing which I wish to say before we close and that is, that we have a great deal of very important legislation to lay before the House and we want the criticism of the Opposition. We want to hear what they have to say and any honest criticism that they give we are prepared to take sitting down. I believe that honest criticism is the best thing that we can get. I do not think they should try to make political capital out of it. I cannot help feeling that last session some of the gentlemen in opposition were obsessed with the coming election in Bonavista Bay and that they could not think of anything else but how they could embarrass us politically. I do not blame them for that. These gentlemen have, I hope, now settled down resignedly and contentedly to enjoy all the home comforts that can be found on the opposition side of the House and do all they can to further the interests of the country, which is what I hope we are all here to do.

On the motion of Mr. Cahill, and seconded by Mr. Browne, that an Address of Thanks be presented to His Excellency the Governor in reply to the Gracious Speech with which he had been pleased to open the present Session of the Legislature, and that a Select Committee be appointed to draft such Address in Reply, it was accordingly done and that the Committee consist of Mr. Cahill, Mr. Browne, Mr. Chambers, Mr. Duff, Mr. Ashbourne.

Hon. the Colonial Secretary tabled the following reports:

The Report of the Board of Governors of the St. John's General Hospital for the year ended June 30th, 1924.

The Report of the Tuberculosis Public Service for year ended December 31st, 1924.

Annual Financial Statements of the St. John's Municipal Council.

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce the following Bills:

"An Act Respecting the Seal Fishery during the present year."

"An Act Respecting the Lobster Fishery."

"An Act to Amend Chapter 25 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Light Dues.'"

Hon. the Minister of Justice gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce the following Bills:

"An Act to Amend 11 George V. Cap. 45, entitled 'An Act to Incorporate the Women's Patriotic Trust Fund, and for other purposes.'"

"An Act further to Amend the Act 61, Victoria, Cap. 47, entitled 'An Act relating to the constitution of the Supreme Court and the Acts in Amendment thereof.'"

"An Act respecting Companies."

Hon. the Minister of Agriculture gave notice that he would on to-

morrow ask leave to introduce the following Bills:

"An Act to Amend Cap. 24 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series), entitled 'Of payment of certain fees and charges by Stamps."

"An Act to Amend Chapter 134 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series), entitled 'Of the Operation of Saw Mills.'"

"An Act further to Amend Chapter 129 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series), entitled 'Of Crown Lands, Timber Mines and Minerals.'"

Mr. Scammell gave notice of question.

Mr. Brown gave notice of question.

Mr. Halfyard gave notice of question.

Mr. Hickman gave notice of question.

Mr. Ashbourne gave notice of question.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I move that the House on its rising do adjourn until to-morrow.

MR. HICKMAN—Does the Hon. the Prime Minister mean to-morrow, Thursday?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Yes.

MR. HICKMAN—The members of the Opposition would like to have the usual course adopted of having the House meet again on Monday, which is the usual course followed. This would give the members of the Opposition an opportunity to consider the Speech from the Throne.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—What is the particular reason? The idea of the Government is to try and get through the sessional work as quickly as we can. We do not wish to embarass the members of the Opposition in any way, but I do not believe the Opposition will read more of the Speech from now and next Monday, than they will from now until to-morrow. They can read the Speech from the Throne ten times through between now and to-morrow. If the Leader of the Opposition makes a point of it we will adjourn until Monday, but we would rather go through a little work, and make the Session as short as we can. Our idea in getting Bills ready is to have things a little different from other Sessions of the House, which were adjourned almost immediately after opening, because nothing was prepared.

MR. HICKMAN—It is the wish of the Opposition that the House adjourn until Monday. It is the pleasure of the Prime Minister whether he moves that or not. There is nothing whatever to be gained by departing from the usual custom.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I will accede to the request of the Opposition that the House adjourn until Monday.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until Monday next, 23rd inst., at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, Feb. 23rd, 1925.

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

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the residents of the Groais Islands, District of St. Barbe, and I notice among the signatures the names of some who are directly connected with trading there during the summer. The request is that the Government see its way clear to make the Islands a schedule port of call during the Summer for the Prospero. This petition has my heartiest support and I would like to take the opportunity to point out that every year since I have represented St. Barbe, I have presented a similar position or plea in this connection. I urged the Government of which I was a supporter to make it a regular port, and they

did so as circumstances directed, but this did not satisfy the people; and is not satisfying them to-day. I ask the Government to give every consideration to the request I am now urging. The Groais Islands is not only a fishing centre and concerns only men from St. Barbe district, but fishermen from all the East Coast as far south as Conception Bay, have occasion to visit there in connection with their operations. I do not see why the petition should be denied. In view of the importance of the place and the large number of fishermen interested, it is only right to make it a port of call. The matter affects Twillingate, Bonavista, Trinity and Conception Bays, as the Islands have a large floating, as well as a resident population. I would urge the Government and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to give their earnest support to the petition.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petition. I have received letters from Bonavista, Twillingate and Trinity Bays on the subject of this petition, and would ask the Government to give every consideration to seeing that the Prospero calls at the Islands both going and returning.

MR. WALSH—Mr. Speaker, The presenter of the petition has rightly said that the matter is of interest to the people of the north, and though my constituents are not directly concerned, I am, and have great pleasure in supporting the petition. It may not be known generally in the House or outside, but I spent two years of my short career as a fisherman at the Groais Islands, and I know what the people there labor under through lack of steamer accommodation. The harbor is not what we would wish, but there is no reason why the ship could not call there in summer with little disadvantage to either captain or the crew. I therefore heartily endorse the petition.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker, I wish to endorse the petition asking that the steamer call at the Groais Islands. I may say that when I first assumed office I was asked to send the steamer there a couple of times and did so, and also in the Fall. I have no doubt the Government will see that the Islands are made a port of call during the coming Summer. The fishermen now are inconvenienced by having to go to Conche and other places for freight, etc., and the petition therefore has my heartiest support.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the residents of Glovertown in the District of Bonavista Bay, asking for the erection of a public wharf during the coming summer. As outlined in the petition, many men come there from outlying settlements to join the train and are inconvenienced by having no proper landing place. It is true there are some private wharves but there is no public wharf and landing is very difficult. This wharf would not cost much—say $200, and there should also be a room for the storage of luggage, costing say a total of $500. I hope this petition will receive the hearty support of the Government.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from the electors of Witless Bay in reference to a breakwater at Lower Pond Gut. I think if the matter were referred to the Government Engineer, who did some work there a few years ago, he would be able to throw some light on the matter. I also beg to present a petition from the same place for the erection of a public wharf. Witless Bay Harbor is very exposed to the sea and the Gut is the only refuge of the fishermen. I would suggest that the Government Engineer be sent to inspect the place. A breakwater was built up a few years ago

but the sea has carried it away, and it is absolutely necessary in the interests of the fishermen that the work of reconstruction should be commenced at once.

HON MR. BRADLEY—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Otterbury, North River and Hallstown, praying for a public wharf in that vicinity. Formerly there was a public wharf at North River and it was of great benefit to the people of that place and adjoining centres, but of recent years it has been allowed to fall into bad condition and is now practically non-existent. There is very considerable traffic at this point from Bell Island and other places and in the interests of the people the wharf should be again erected. I know myself of the existing conditions as I visited the place last summer and I know of the great difficulties experienced in landing—in some cases, even women have to come ashore on a plank. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I give this petition my heartiest support and hope that it will receive the consideration it deserves.

MR. CAHILL, 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:

To His Excellency Sir William Lamond Allardyce, 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.

(Sgd.) CYRIL CAHILL,
W. J. BROWNE,
W. McK. CHAMBERS,
R. DUFF,
T. G. W. ASHBOURNE.

Assembly Room, Feb. 23rd, 1925.

On motion the reception and adoption of this Report was deferred until later in the sitting.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Speaker, before the adoption of the Report I would like to ask leave to introduce a Bill. I crave the indulgence of the House but as it refers to the Loan I would ask that the Bill be allowed to go through in all its sections, as its passage is most important. The Loan is being raised in England and therefore it is necessary to have the word "bonds" inserted afther the words "the said Loan shall be raised less the issue of." I have just received the following message from the Trade Facilities Board bearing on the matter.

(reads telegram)

I feel confident that the House will have no objection to the passage of this Bill as it is important to get it through and only the slight change mentioned is being made in it.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, might I be permitted to explain for the information of honourable members opposite. As regards the legal aspect of the situation, I may say that the reason the indulgence of the House is asked for this afternoon is for the insertion of a word only. Section 7 of the Loan Act last year reads that in the event of the Loan been raised in England the Loan shall be raised by the issue of "stock." The request now is to insert the words "bonds or." I merely want to explain to the Leaders of both parties on the opposite side of the House that the change of the wording has no effect whatever, except, apparently, that it is necessary to have these words inserted in order to float the Loan over in England. I take the liberty to say this so that there will be no misunderstanding as to the legal position.

MR. SCAMMELL—Do I understand that the Dominion Securities Company floated this Loan?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Yest, but it is essential in England to have the words "bonds or" added. It is essential to have it under the English Acts. I think you will find that all our other Acts read in the same way.

Hon. the Minister of Finance, with the unanimous consent of the House, asked leave to introduce the Bill entitled:

> "An Act to Amend the Act 15 George V., Chapter XX., entitled 'An Act for the raising of a sum of Money on the credit of the Colony for centain public purposes,'"

which was, on motion, introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time presently.

Whereupon, on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, and with unanimous consent, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 15 George V. Chapter XX, entitled 'An Act for the Raising of a Sum of Money on the credit of the Colony for certain Public purposes,'" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon, on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 15 George V. Chapter XX, entitled 'An Act for the Raising of a Sum of Money on the Credit of the Colony for Certain Public Purposes.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester 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 said Bill without amendment.

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a third time presently.

Whereupon, on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, and with unanimous consent, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 15 George V. Chapter XX, entitled 'An Act for the Raising of a Sum of Money on the credit of the Colony for Certain Public Purposes,'" was read a third time, and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Leader of the Opposition, who is not acquainted with the procedure, I would respectfully suggest that the rest of the Order Paper be gone on with before we take up the motion for the adoption of the Report of the Committee appointed to draft an Address in Reply.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Is there any partciular reason for that?

MR. HALFYARD—There is no particular reason, but there is a lot of questions to be answered and we could proceed a step or two by going on with the Order Paper.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—We have no objections.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, it will be remembered during the last session of this House that a Bill was introduced by Mr. Brown, member for Twillingate, in respect to Logging. Nothing was done in connection with this Bill outside of the Government promising to appoint a Commission to enquire into its merits and into logging operations generally, and, accordingly, Mr. Warren, member for Fortune Bay, was appointed a Commissioner, and I have much pleasure in tabling his report.

Mr. Scammel gave notice of questions.

Mr. Brown gave notice of questions.

Mr. Warren gave notice of questions.

Mr. Ashbourne gave notice of questions.

Mr. Halfyard gave notice of questions.

Mr. Hickman gave notice of questions.

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries tabled the Report of his Department for the year 1924.

Hon. the Minister of Justice gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act Relating to Firearms."

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 11 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the House of Assembly.'"

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitlel "An Act to provide for the Construction, Reconstruction and Maintenance of Highroads."

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Regulate Travel on Highroads and the Speed, Operation and Load of Vehicles Thereon."

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, "An Act respecting the Seal Fishery during the Present Year" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

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

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, "An Act to Amend Chapter 25 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series), entitled "Of Light Dues" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, "An Act to Amend 11 George V., Cap. 45, entitled 'An Act to Incorporate the Women's Patriotic Trust Fund and for other Purposes,'" was read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, "An Act Further to Amend the Act 61 Victoria, Cap. 47, entitled 'An Act relating to the Constitution of the Supreme Court and the Acts in amendment thereof,'" was read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion Hon. the Minister of Justice, "An Act respecting Companies" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, "An Act to Amend Cap. 24 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series), entitled 'Of Payment of Certain Fees and Charges by Stamps,'" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, "An Act to Amend Chapter 134 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series), entitled 'Of the Operation of Saw Mills,'" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, "An Act Further to Amend Chapter 129 of the

Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series), entitled 'Of Crown Lands, Timber, Mines and Minerals,'" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Answers to the questions Nos. 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 12 were tabled.

(10) MR. HALFYARD—To ask Hon. the Prime Minister if it is the intention of the Government to have the allocations for Public Works under the direction of the Public Works Department and the Marine and Fisheries Department made upon the recommendations of the elected representatives of the various districts.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—In reply to question No. 10 in relation to the Departments of Public Works and Marine and Fisheries, that is a matter for the Heads of those Departments. They will use their own judgment in expenditure and in accepting the recommendations of the elected representatives.

(13) MR. HICKMAN—To ask Hon. the Minister of Justice for list of all convictions under the Prohibition Act and Alcoholic Liquor Act from 15th June, 1924, to 15th February, 1925. The fines imposed and the amounts collected and what portion of each fine went to the informer.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—In connection with the answer to question 13, I may say that this is a question which involves the decisions of about thirty magistrates and all the details in connection with them, but if the Hon. member will tell just what he desires, I will get it for him in half an hour; otherwise it will take a considerable time.

(14) MR. HICKMAN—To ask the Hon. the Prime Minister to lay upon the Table of the House statement of all moneys paid out on Executive authority from 10th day of June, 1924, to 15th day of February, 1925.

HON THE PRIME MINISTER—In answer to question No. 14, I may say that a statement of the expenditure made by the Executive Government is a matter for the Finance Minister. The Supplementary Supply, asked for in the Estimates, will in a full measure account for such expenditure.

(15) MR. HICKMAN—To ask the Prime Minister to lay upon the Table of the House all correspondence in reference to the building of a Hotel; also what guarantee the Government is prepared to give to holders of Bonds in proposed hotels.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I beg to lay on the Table of the House the reply to question No. 15, which is the correspondence in connection with a hotel, showing the guarantee which the Government might be prepared to give.

(16) MR. ASHBOURNE—To ask Hon. the Minister of Justice when the appointment of a Magistrate for Twillingate will be made.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I might say in answer to question No. 16, that the choice of a magistrate for Twillingate is a matter having the consideration of the Justice Department just now. I have no doubt that an appointment will soon be made.

ADDRESS IN REPLY:

MR. SCAMMELL, Mr. Speaker, on the motion before the chair, that the House draft an Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. I want first of all to say that it is my humble opinion, whether I am constitutionally correct or incorrect as regards proper procedure, that the House ought not at this time to be called upon to draft such Address. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the elected Representatives of the people of this country ought not be requested to draft any reply to the Governor's Speech until such time as they have had full opportunity of acquainting themselves fully as to all the facts in

relation to our public affairs since the present Government took office.

On Wednesday last we heard the Speech for the first time. It was a lengthy document and, in view of that, the Leader of the Opposition very wisely asked for an adjournment till to-day, in order that Opposition Members should have ample opportunity to acquaint themselves with its contents. As the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, it referred to practically every subject under the sun except the Eclipse of the Sun, and I will go further and say that, to my mind if it did not refer to the Eclipse of the Sun, it, at least, portrays the Eclipse of the Government. The Speech is wordy, exuberant in verbosity, and having looked all around it I am reminded, Sir, of the Parable of the Fig Tree. It will be remembered in relation thereto that the foliage was copious, but no fruit was found thereon.

The Speech from the Throne, Sir, at first sight conveys the impression that it contains a great deal, but on closer examination we find practically nothing in it that gives any food for satisfaction or hope. Like the Tree of old, to which I have just referred, it may be that the time of figs is not yet.

The Leader of the Independent Party the other day said the Speech contained no reference to matters which the man on the street were interested in, and I entirely agree with the position he took, and will go further and say that it gives no reference to, and seeks only to blind public interest and public attention to the graver matters that are really confronting the country to-day. Again, Sir, let me say that were I in order I would like to move that this Address ought to be the last thing considered by this House at the present time. We ought, Sir, in this matter to be able to intelligently discuss the affairs of the Country. As an Opposition Party we are responsible to the Country for having full light thrown upon the events of the past eight months. Opposition Members have already placed certain question before the Government, and until these questions are answered, I fail to see how we can intelligently dilate upon the events to which I have just made reference. But, since the Motion for the Address is the Order of the Day, we must proceed, in spite of protest, with our manifest duty.

First of all, I would congratulate the Mover and Seconder of this Motion, and I congratulate them, Sir, only in so far as they acquitted themselves creditably on that day from the standpoint of eloquence, and from the fact that they made a good case out of a bad one. Every one of us who listened to them on Opening Day realized that they had a difficult problem before them in presenting a case for the Government at the present time. I feel sure that no one less than two legal luminaries such as the Honourable gentlemen could have put forward such a case for the Government as they, and they were evidently picked for the job.

Their remarks lacked the force of conviction, they did not appear to be heart and soul with the task they were confronted with, and I feel sure that the Honourable Member for Hr. Main, Mr. Cahill, in particular, put a great deal more vim in his election speeches in that constituency last Spring than he did in his efforts on behalf of the Government last Wednesday. In fact, the old saying seemed to have been reversed and in their case it appeared that "while the flesh was willing, the spirit was weak." They felt of course that they did not have a very good case but that it was their bounden duty to make the best of matters as they were. The Government seems, it appears to me, to have so many irons in the fire that when it comes to writing a speech for His

Excellency the Governor to deliver, they scarcely know where to begin and where to end. The most remarkable thing about the speech is its great length, but I fail to see how the average taxpayer throughout the length and breadth of this Country is going to get any consolation as a result of a perusal of this document.

Before passing on to discuss the Speech, I would like to refer to the matter of the West Coast Disaster Fund. I feel sure that there is no honorable member in this House who does not agree with what the Honorable Member for Fortune Bay said on this point the other day. The West Coast Disaster Fund has not received that measure of support from the public which such a tragedy ought to induce. These men went under at Duty's post. They ventured out that morning as only fishermen can venture, and only those who are most intimately connected with it, can have any adequate idea of what West Coast fishermen are called upon to endure in the prosecution of the Winter fishery. Amid frost, snow and ice they venture all to provide for themselves and their families. On this particular day the fishing fleet put to sea, the storm broke, and we know the result. The wives and families of seventeen men are left the Country to-day as a legacy of that spirit of adventure, and the tragedy which follows in its wake. It was ever thus.

"Not once, nor twice, in our rough Island's story,
The path to duty was the road to glory."

An appeal is now being made on behalf of those who suffered as a result of that day's storm. The fund is not being patronized, Sir, as well as it should, and without stigmatizing the City of St. John's at all, I should like to say now that, in my opinion a first-class lottery would have been better subscribed to than the appeal which has been made in this connection. I feel that the member for Burgeo has done all he possibly could, and I now offer him my hearty support in any further effort that he makes in this direction, and also beg to inform him I hope to be able to do something in a tangible way to express my sympathy on this occasion. I shall be only too pleased to help in any way possible.

Now, Sir, there is another remark made by Mr. Warren the other day with which I do not find myself in absolute accord. He congratulated the Government on the appointments they had made to the Upper House, and felt that they had done well in their selections of men to fill the vacancies in that Chamber. I cannot congratulate the Government for the appointments, although the three gentlemen they have appointed may be very estimable gentlemen in many respects. The Government of course has acted true to Tory traditions and have placed in these vacancies men who are representative of Tory traditions and the die-hard merchant element. Apparently, the Government could not find it convenient to place in the Upper House any representative of our Fishing Industry or any representative of the large industrial activities in the Country. It would appear moreover that despite the large number of prominent Outport gentlemen who are supporting them, they cannot find among such gentlemen a fit and proper person to grace the Upper Chamber. So much for what they think of their Outport supporters.

The first of the Appointees, the Hon. Dr. Robinson, may be a gentleman and a scholar. He is of course a Tory of Tories, in fact, he is a traditional Tory. He was an opponent of Whiteway, an opponent of Bond and an opponent of Squires.

Mr. Alderdice, as Manager of the Ropewalk, also represents the mercantile element, and the same applies

to Mr. Ayre. The public can very well know, sir, from these appointments just where the present Government stands in its relation to Water Street, and despite the large number of supporters they had among leading men in the Outports, they apparently did not think it worth while to appoint any of these gentlemen to the Upper House. I am an Outport man myself. The city and the city interests are well and ably represented in the Upper House and I fail to see why the Outports have been so ignored by the Government when appointments of this nature was being considered. There are plenty of splendid men in the Outports who could grace the Upper Chamber equally as well as some of those there at present.

The Speech from the Throne opens by a reference to the general prosperity and gratifying conditions existing in the country at the present time. These conditions may be a matter of consolation to the Government, but they certainly cannot be a matter of congratulation to them. The people of this country, sir, know that the real foundations of the prosperity which the country is enjoying to-day was laid by the late Liberal Administration. The people of this country need no history books or text books written to inform them as to the history of the Humber Deal.

I recently returned from the Humber Valley and I want to tell you, sir, that the Deer Lake I saw the other day and the Deer Lake that I went through in 1923, when I went down to the District of St. Barbe with the Humber deal as my platform, were entirely two different Deer Lakes. When we were preaching from that platform, who were our opponents? They were, in the main, the gentlemen who are sitting on the other side of the House of Assembly to-day. I doubt very much if one man who sits on that side of the House to-day can take to himself one single iota of credit for anything that has helped to make the prosperous conditions we have in the country to-day. Yet the Speech from the Throne takes care to stress that the prosperity which exists to-day is largely due to the conditions in the Humber Valley.

And I want, in this connection, to refer to a man who was for many years a member of this Chamber; a man who was as big and broad a man as ever held a seat in this House of Assembly. I refer to Sir William Coaker. When the Humber Deal was mooted. Sir William Coaker asked the Union Councils to pass resolutions favouring the Humber Deal; he asked the men to talk night after night and develop public opinion in favour of the project. He was then characterized as a fool and a madman. Bu he was right, and those who opposed him have lived to see that he was right, and that he had hold of the right end of the stick. Sir William Coaker is out of this House to-day, and there are men in this House to-day who will say things behind his back who would not dare to say the same things to him face to face. I take this opportunity of paying a tribute to my leader, the President of the Fishermen's Union, and I say that this country can ill afford to have men of the stamp of Sir William Coaker outside of the four walls of this House to-day, and I say further that it will not be long before Sir William Coaker will find his way back to the House of Assembly again, and that is the wish of thousands.

The history of the Humber Proposition, the whole Humber story, and the ultimate prosperity to the country which resulted from the Humber Industry in no measure gives the present Government any room for congratulations, and they can no longer fool the people with such talk as they have got off in the Speech from the Throne.

The general prosperity of the coun-

try is also due to the fact that last year we had a short catch of codfish. I understand that the catch last year was three hundred thousand quintals short of a normal catch. The extra prices given for the fish last year have had something to do with the present prosperity in this country. But the Government of Newfoundland has had no more to do with the prices paid for the fish last year than the man in the moon had to do with it.

There was competition, there was a short catch of fish, there was a good market, and that, more than anything else, was responsible for the high price paid for codfish.

"The codfishery last year was prosecuted successfully," says the Speech but the Government can take no credit to itself for any of the resultant prosperity.

Now, what is going to be the position in the future. It would have been more to the point if the Speech from the Throne had been more devoted to discussion of the problems which will arise during the coming year What is going to be the position this spring? There will not be anything like the same number of men employed in the Humber Valley this spring as there was last year. There will be a surplus of two, or three, or four thousand men released for the fishery this spring. Where are these men going to find their supplies and outfits? Are they going to find boats and schooners to take them to the fishery? And if not, what does the Government propose to do with them? The Government must concern itself with this problem. A similar situation developed during the regime of the Squires Government in 1922. The Government found itself up against a similar situation. Men were coming in and asking for supplies for the fishery. They met the situation of that day, and grappled with the situation by what then for the first time became known as the Guarantee Fishery Supply Account. We have been hounded and vilified by the opposite side for what was done at that time. But we are now and always have been satisfied that that step was necessary, and we have absolutely nothing to be ashamed of in connection with that account. The present Government will have much more to be ashamed of if they do not adopt some similar measure to meet the situation that will surely arise in the spring. I need not recite the details in connection with that matter. The hon. member for Placentia and St. Mary, Mr. Sullivan, and his colleague, Mr. Walsh, know that he and his colleague were members of the Select Committee that heard and advised the bringing in of that project. They will know that we had our backs against the wall then, so to speak, and that we did the very best we could under the circumstances. I was replying to Sir Michael Cashin in the House the following year, and I think Hansard will bear me out when I say that I remarked that it would be much better for the country if we had spent one million dollars that year on supplies, and left certain construction works alone. And I think Sir Michael Cashin agreed with me. The Government need not rest easy, and think they will have any sinecure this spring. There are going to be thousands of men without employment, and there are going to be thousands of men who will find it very difficult to get supplies and outfits to enable them to prosecute the fishery.

But even if we do have a large fishery this year, does the Prime Minister as a business man—does the Minister of Finance and Customs as a business man, anticipate that a larger fishery this year is going to find the country in a more fortunate position. I say no. If we have a larger catch of fish this year it will not leave us in any more fortunate a position than we are now. Can we anticipate as

good prices next year even if we only have a normal catch. I am afraid present indications are not encouraging.

You say that you have reduced taxation. Your action is tardy, and so tardy that you will get no thanks for it. You have reduced taxation on beef and kerosene and pork because the public and your conscience has compelled you to. You have reduced taxation on beef, pork and molasses because you have had, so to speak, to cut off your noses to spite your faces, because you were going to reduce the Income Tax, which is paid by the monied classes, and you had to reduce the taxation on the fishermen and the working classes of this country. You have reduced taxation. Again, I say, your action is tardy. You have taken upwards of three thousand dollars from the fishermen during the last six months that need never have been taken from them. Last session you film-flammed, saying that the reduction on taxation on these articles which had been made by the preceding administration was illegal and irregular. But none of the legal luminaries on your side of the House attempted to tell us wherein it was illegal, and you did not tell us where you got your legal advice from, but we suspect that we know. You know that you got your advice from outside sources, and no efforts was made to satisfy honest opinion that the course taken by the late administration was wrong or illegal. You know that you have reduced taxation, but you also know that the dollar to-day is not the dollar that it was six months ago, and you know that the dollar is going to be worth considerably less this spring. You know that it is going to be less in value this spring. What are the fishermen going to pay for flour this spring? What are they going to pay for their outfits? They are going to cost prices which I tell you frankly will stagger you. I met a man the other day, a man who takes ten men to the fishery in a large schooner, he asked me what I thought of prices the coming spring.

I told him he would likely pay $15. a barrel for flour this spring. The consequence was that he went down town and bought his supplies at the present prices. But what about the man who cannot do that, and has to get his supplies on credit? The latter, I fear, has an eye-opener in store for him and will find to his grief that he is not living in the paradise that the Speech from the Throne would lead him to believe in to-day. The Hon. the Prime Minister told us the other day that he felt the Government would be likely to build a hotel. That, of course, will be a great consolation to his constituents to whom he promised last year a bonus on fish.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I did not.

MR. SCAMMELL—There are two ways of doing a thing—you can do it in a way so that you can say you did it; or you can do it in a way that you can say you didn't do it. I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, to submit a questionnaire to the constituents of the Hon. the Prime Minister asking them, did he, or did he not, lead them to believe that he was going to pay a bonus on fish. I am not afraid to say that fully 75 per cent. of the people would say that he did. But, be that as it may. the fact remains that it must be a matter of the greatest concern to those interested in the fisheries to see the Government, as shown by the Speech from the Throne, are so little interested in this direction. The Speech contains only a passing reference to the stable industry of the Country which shows how much they are really concerned about it. The Hon. the Prime Minister as a business man must know that the great question today is the improving of the quality of our fish. He knows the history of what transpired during the past Sum-

mer, the history of our competitors and their efforts to place a better article on the markets, and also their strenuous endeavours to undermine us. I would like to think it would be wise on the part of the Government which pledged itself to advance the interests of all the people, to give earnest consideration to legislation which will benefit our largest class of earners, and see to the improvement of our fish. I do not think we will have a better cure till legislation is passed to encourage the fishermen in this direction, to abolish the tal-qual system and to regulate the cull, etc. I regret that when the Fish Regulations were abolished they were removed in toto. I regret that the Acts dealing with Standardization and statistical information were not retained and the Government would not be far wrong if they replaced them on the Statute Book. I saw by a recent report of the Board of Trade that no statistical information was available. Sir William Coaker when he introduced the Regulations made an effort to have statistics available as to the catch of fish. But now there are no reliable figures as even the Board of Trade states they can only estimate the catch as at or about. If the Board has reliable information they would not have to produce their report by the words at or about. It is very regrettable that the Act providing for these statistics was abandoned. However, that is now a matter of past history and we can only hope that efforts will be made to obtain reliable figures in the future. Now nothing has been said in the Speech from the Throne of the bonus on fish. The Hon. the Prime Minister has said that the Government may build a hotel but makes no mention of the far more important matter. Again, we expect to see a stop put to the export of our manufactured pit props and pulpwood. The Government must have considered this problem and must know that there is a constantly growing feeling against this export. At the last meeting of the Fishermen's Union Convention, resolutions were passed against this export and it is also condenmed in their annual report by the Board of Trade. I therefore, cannot see how the Government can still permit this export in view of the objections of two such different and important bodies functioning in such different atmospheres and directions. The Government should get down to work and stop it. see that no licenses are granted for next Summer and that there is no further export as far as this season is concerned. I would also, Mr. Speaker, wish to refer to another matter which is perhaps of more interest to the people of St. Barbe District than to those of the other Districts. I am informed that the Government has promulgated a law calling for a close season for lobsters for a period of three years. This is of particular interest to the people of St. Barbe as that is the largest lobster fishing section in the Country. I cannot understand or find where the Government got their cue for the introduction of this close season. I have gone to considerable trouble and expense to sound the opinion of the people of St. Barbe on the matter and I find that while a majority of the merchants approve of it, the fishermen themselves are totally opposed to it. I have telegraphed some 20 men between Trout River and Flower's Cove, among the number being 6 or 7 business men. A few of the latter agree to the measure but the fishermen on the whole are opposed to it. I think this matter was too much rushed and I feel it my duty to ask for a reprieve. The fishermen should have been given time to dispose of their gear—as far as such gear can be disposed of—and given time to make arrangements for earning a living elsewhere. The ordinary lobster fishermen has no nets, twines, traps, etc., such as the cod

fisherman, but only such gear as appertains to the catching of lobsters. Usually in the Fall he spends considerable time and money in repairing this. and the position in the District of St. Barbe to-day is that scores of men have gone to that expense and made provision for next year's work without making provision for engaging at anything else. Those prevented from engaging at the lobster fishery can not now get work elsewhere. The Humber has absorbed all that it can and not 25 per cent. of those formerly employed there will go back again next year. As these men will not be able to get work at the Humber next year and as they are not fitted out for the prosecution of the cod fishery, it is apparent that they will be in a very bad position. I would. therefore, Mr. Speaker, ask that the Government grant a year's reprieve before putting the regulations mentioned into effect. I understand there is to be a bill introduced to give effect to the proposal and I sincerely trust that a year's reprieve will be granted. St. Barbe. it seems, Mr. Speaker, has been coming in for a lot of the hard knocks of late. Besides the lobster regulations, there is also a law as to the killing of caribou. I know where the idea originated. I know that in the Humber vicinity there has been a demand for a larger game reserve. By all means give them the larger reserve, but do not apply these iniquitous regulations to the places in the Straits of Belle Isle. A few years ago there was a serious outbreak of a disease called beri-beri at several places along the Straits, and Dr. Grenfell in his report stated that it was largely due to the use of white flour and not a sufficient supply of fresh meat. Now, deer meat was a valuable addition to the food of these people but the small number of deer killed by the people of St. Barbe District for food purposes would not appreciably affect the growth of the caribou herd or interfere with the ideas of those who want a larger reserve around the interior. The people of the Straits of Belle Isle are going to find this a very imposing and a very iniquitous regulation, and they are going to use every means in their power to protest against it. I must protest against these actions of the Government in inflicting these hardships on the people of St. Barbe District, and the Government have shown that they have not taken the trouble to consult the public. They have merely acted on suggestions from one or two who profess to know all and be all, and then they made up their minds to put the drastic regulations that I have referred to in force. Now, I hope the Prime Minister will be as square as he claims himself to be, and be consistent as regards the lobster fishery and as regards the caribou. The district of St. Barbe does not want those regulations and the people propose to use every means at their disposal to show their resentment just as soon as occasion occurs.

Now, to get back to the Speech from the Throne. It says: "Very disturbing discoveries have been made by a Commission engaged in an enquiry concerning expenditures for charitable institutions and services. Laxness of administration, and imposition by the non-deserving, have been proved, and there is evidence that the homely virtues of self-reliance and self respect have been diminishing. Public expenditure for the relief of the sick and afflicted is meant for the helpless poor, and the conduct of those who selfishly prey upon this charity is highly reprehensible. Stricter rules and closer observance must be insisted upon. Good results from the enquiry have already been observed." I cannot go on and discuss this matter intelligently until somebody on the other side of the House informs us what the real conditions are to-day with regard to poor relief. It appears that the Gov-

ernment began its practice of economy by getting after poor people first. The people in my District are very outspoken against the new poor relief regulations in force at the present time, and I think we should have a word from the Colonial Secretary on the subject. Why begin your economies by using the pruning knife on crippled and infirm people first.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—We are not doing it.

MR. SCAMMELL—Now, it is said that the Government are taking great pains in cleaning up but it appears in a different way than what they proclaimed they were going to clean up. The Speech from the Throne states that some people were trading upon the charity that should go to the helpless poor. I would like to know from some one in the Government ranks who these people are.

Another paragraph states that "The services of a Postal Service Expert, with great experience in Canada, have been obtained, to aid in a reform in the Postal Service of the Colony, in which conditions have existed of a nature very injurious to public interests. The service is over-manned and underworked, and much greater efficiency must be attainted at less cost. It is not possible to reform a service so demoralized in a short time, but drastic reforms have been proposed, and will be insisted on." We have on this side of the House an ex-Minister of Posts and Telegraphs who is better able to deal with this matter than I am; but I was rather amused the other day to read this extract from the Speech of Hon. Dr. Robinson in the Upper House. He is an ex-Postmaster General and one who ought to know what he is talking about. He says: "The real trouble (he is referring to the Post Office) is there is no esprit de corps, no discipline and no ambition. Governments appoint men without training or capacity, whose sole qualifications is partisanship. This causes the lower ranks to lose ambition. They lose the hope of promotion and become indifferent and careless. Partisanship becomes rife. Factions are formed, etc., etc., etc."

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a rumor current to-day to the effect that the Government proposes to appoint a man, who as far as my knowledge is concerned, never was in a Post Office in his life, to the position of Deputy Minister of Posts and Telegraphs. In view of the statement of one of the Government sponsors where does the Government expect to land itself or where does it expect to land the country if matters and appointments of this sort are to be the order of the day. If you put Mr. Hodder, to be frank, in the position of Deputy Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, according to Hon. Dr. Robinson, there will be no discipline and no ambition in the lower ranks. Surely a Government pledged to reforms and pledged to clean up is not the Government that is going to take a rank outsider and place him in the Department of Posts and Telegraphs as Deputy Minister, in view of Dr. Robinson's laudable sentiments. I do not think—that the Government has any reason to congratulate itself on the way the Department of Posts and Telegraphs stands to-day, although it may be that we are in the unfortunate position that we do not know anything about it. So far we have had no opportunity of getting inside information, but when the facts are revealed—and we do not propose to let up until we get the information we require—all the facts will be made plain to the public.

Then, there is the visit of the Labrador Delegation. They did nothing. Of course, we all expected that; and I doubt very much if the man who wrote that Speech from the Throne didn't use the newspaper to assist him in drafting that paragraph in the Speech. Nothing was done with the Labrador Boundary question; but we

expect the Minister of Justice or the Prime Minister or the Colonial Secretary to tell us something of the nice time they had while in Montreal.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—You do not expect us to tell you all the fine times we had.

MR. SCAMMELL—Another paragraph in the Speech from the Throne says: "Owing to the increased cost of shipbuilding the bounty offered by the Government has not induced the construction of many new vessels, and as a large proportion of our present fishing fleet are in need of repairs, a measure providing a bounty for the encouragement of such repairs will be submitted for your approval. I hope that the bounty to be offered by the Government in this connection will be sufficient inducement for the undertaking of the repairing of vessels on a large scale, and I am glad to see that the Government have adopted the proposals which we advocated from this side of the House last year, namely, the inauguration of a bounty for repairs to vessels. I feel sure that if the Government will go the right way in applying the bounty for repairs and see that no discrimination is practiced that good results will come therefrom.

As to the paragraph relating to "Banks," I might say that I am not sufficiently wealthy to be interested much in banks and will have nothing to say on that topic.

The Speech goes on to say that "An examination of the Dry Dock in this port made by an expert engineer, has revealed the need of extensive repairs, and of partial rebuilding, and the cost will be large. Proposals will be made for your consideration." In my opinion the cost will be about eight times as large as the Government in their wisdom estimated last spring. By the time the Government gets down to a final esimate for the performance of all the work outlined in that loan act of last spring they will find that instead of six millions they will have to borrow fifty millions of dollars, that is if we are to take this Dry Dock transaction as an index of their accuracy in estimating costs.

Then again we are told in the Speech from the Throne that the Income Tax is to be abolished. Well, we all know the history of the Income Tax. War times led to the enactment of it and it was imposed when the financial conditions of the Colony were stringent. At the time it was put in force very few people objected to it, we should not carry it on any further. We should abolish it now and not have false and misleading statements go abroad in the press. Consequently, I urge upon the Government to remove it as from December 31st, and I think that such an action would be more in keeping with what the public construes from the reference of this subject in the Speech.

The Prime Minister chose to be very witty and very happy the other day. He told us all about votes for women and it looks now as if they are going to get the vote. Now everything is not exactly as the Prime Minister would have us believe. I have no doubt he got a shock when he got some bills for the "Lobelia" and the "Daisy", but the Prime Mnister—professing to be a square man as he does—did not do the square thing in connection with this incident and tell the country the other side of the story as regards these steamers. It was not a dead loss as the Government would have us believe. The "Lobelia" was sold and the Government received $30,000 for her; the "Daisy" has been continually engaged in the Revenue Service and the "Watchful" has on various occasions been employed by the Government in useful work when other steamers might have been needed to do the work. It is just as well for the Prime Minister to be square and let the country know the truth.

The story of the late Government is not as black as the Prime Minister would have us believe. It is all very well for the Prime Minister to point to the past. It was a great occasion to get the smart stuff off. The Prime Minister is fast becoming adept at getting off the smart stuff occasionally. Now, Mr. Speaker, despite all the smart stuff got off in the House, I want to make this point that the people are not going to be bluffed. They want facts and they are going to get facts. They want both sides of the story and not one side only, as the Prime Minister gave in connection with these steamers on Wednesday.

The Government is not very happy to-day, they did not look very happy on Wednesday afternoon, they will look less happy as the session proceeds. It is true that they won the bye-election in Bonavista and from that point of view they can feel secure in possession. Of course they know that a hard battle was fought. I trust that while they are there representing the District of Bonavista they will see that their policy of the square deal to all is put into effect without fear or favour. We do not feel down north that we are getting a square deal from this Government. Where was the square deal in removing the "Malakoff" from Trinity Bay? That will be a matter no doubt which the members for Trinity Bay will forcibly deal with. The people feel that there is a great deal of personal vindictiveness dictating Government policy North. We don't feel that a square deal is being practised in parts of Bonavista and Trinity Bays. No, sir, the Government cannot console themselves with the thought that they actually practised that square deal during the past six months. I would warn the Government that they need not feel too secure in their position in the country to-day. There are no indications of better conditions in the country. If they congratulate themselves in that respect they are living in a fool's paradise. They have set for themselves a high ideal. Like the Knights of Arthur's Round Table of old they have constituted themselves "A glorious company, the flower of men to serve as model for the mighty world." They have set for themselves a high standard and place themselves on a high pedestal and consequently when they fall, their fall will be all the greater. It will be the duty of the Opposition during the present Session to see how far the Government is living up to the high ideal it has set for itself. There has to be some plain talking and a great many more matters to be dealt with and discussed in the public interest than those to which the Speech from the Throne makes reference.

MR. GODDEN—Mr. Speaker. As everything points to this session of the House being a busy one, it behooves us, therefore, to come to the point as quickly as possible in our remarks. To Mr. Cahill and Mr. Browne, the mover and seconder of the Motion in reply to the Speech from the Throne, I would add my congratulations to those already extended. Their profession of course calls for eloquence, and they sustained the reputation of their profession by their performance Wednesday last.

The Speech from the Throne contains a good deal of superfluous matter. It is a matter of common knowledge that operations at the Humber are fast approaching a manufacturing stage. It is also common knowledge that negotiations have been under way for a considerable time regarding a pulp and paper mill in the Gander Valley. In reference to the Humber activities I have been wondering whether the workingman's interests have been adequately looked after. I say that because we have reports from men that have been engaged there, that men are brought in from the outside and are being dealt

with more generously than our own. I understand that the outside man is being paid a higher wage than the Newfoundland workman, which is not fair, and a matter for the Government to look into without delay.

It was quite a pleasure to hear that the action of the late Liberal Government is now about to be endorsed by the present Government by removing the duties on beef, pork and kerosene oil. That is welcome, and I would now put in a plea for the importers of the commodities. I submit that in all fairness to them when it is proposed to alter the tariff value of any article notice should be given of not less than four weeks. The Prime Minister and other business men sitting in this House will, I am sure. see the reason and justice of this.

That there is less unemployment in our midst than formerly I quite believe; but we all know that there are a great many men with families to support who are anxious to find employment and cannot. And I do not think that adequate attention is being given the matter as regards these men. I trust there will be done more than has been done under the dole system in this connection.

Whether the encouragement of tourist traffic will be successful is a matter for conjecture only; but, if a sum of money is devoted for road construction, by all means let us get down to that part of the business with all despatch; put good and trustworthy men in charge of the work, and, if possible, connect each district by a good main road. It is only necessary to travel some parts of Trinity District to know the necessity of road construction.

The suggestion of Municipal Corporation is a step in the right direction and, should suggestions develop, it will prove a solution to many of the difficulties and problems faced by the people of the outports for a considerable time. It is quite easy to arrange a programme, but the carrying out of that programme is a horse of another colour.

Some seven months ago when the present Government assumed office we were led to expect a big improvement in the functioning of different departments, and also to expect Legislation that would be to the betterment of Newfoundland, and to the encouragement of our people; such. I am sure. were the motives which actuated the Hon. the Prime Minister, and that gentleman, I believe, has earnestly striven towards that end; but his efforts have had no apparent success so far, and it would seem that he has been playing a lone hand, and has not had the wholehearted support of the Members of his Government; and what can even a Prime Minister accomplish when his subordinates, instead of standing shoulder to shoulder with him, persist in going their own way, seeking self-advancement and gain. At this juncture I would say that I have no personal ill-feeling against any member of the Government, but I shall deem it my duty, when necessary, not only to Trinity District but to myself, to speak out against any unfair discrimination practiced by Heads of Departments, or to anything that does not portend to the betterment of conditions generally I mentioned unfairness and discrimination, and I would caution all Ministers of Departments, as Heads thereof, that before they apend their signatures to any document to be sure that the document contains nothing of an unfair nature. A short while ago I received letters from two civil servants who had received notice of dismissal from their respective departments, and who had been given no reason why they had been dismissed, and they asked me to look into the matter on their behalf; and when I approached the Ministers for particulars of these dismissals, expecting to hear that it was for political purposes, I was surprised

to be told that they knew nothing about the matter. Why then were these men dismissed if no fault was known of them? Is it true, as has been suggested, that there is some Big Boss in the Government ranks, whom even Ministers of the Crown must obey? I hope that is not true, but it looks very much like it. The junior Member for Harbor Main in his able speech on Wednesday last mentioned that the Government slogan is the same to-day as it was when they sought election "Clean up, keep clean, and a square deal to all". I say that this banner has not been lived up to, and the last part, namely, "a square deal to all," particularly is not being upheld; and how can a square deal be given when political spite enters into the Government's scheme of action.

A few days ago the Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines held a meeting of farmers to discuss with them ways and means whereby the interests of agriculture could be encouraged. This is a very laudable thing to do, and I trust that the Honourable Minister is really sincere in his desire to co-operate with the farmers; but I hope he will make it his business to prevent any unfairness such as occurred some time ago when contracts were being allocated for the supply of Pure Fresh Milk to our public institutions. One of our young farmers was supplying the Fever Hospital with fresh milk and giving all the satisfaction possible. This farmer is one of the best and most progressive farmers that we have, and is noted for his success in the raising of dairy cattle, and has done more than anyone else to raise the standard of dairy produce in this country. I say that he had been delivering milk to the Fever Hospital and had been giving every satisfaction possible; this contract was taken away from him in favour of a man who was only a part-time farmer, who, besides, had not sufficient cattle to obtain the necessary quantities of milk desired by the Hospital and had, therefore, to go to other milk vendors and get sufficient milk to supply the order; thereby not only rendering the deliveries of the milk, but also the quality, very doubtful. If the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines wishes to co-operate with the farmers, I suggest that he should keep in close touch with those gentlemen who comprise the Board of Works Committee; and I still further suggest that he should endeavor to see that contracts be given to applicants who are doing their utmost to make farming successful, and a thing worth while, and whom it is the intention of the Hon. Minister to encourage. I make these suggestions to the Hon. Minister of Agriculture with every good intention.

I wish to congratulate the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs on the great energy which he has displayed in the interests of his department. His activities have been apparent to all, and they have extended in a great many directions, and have been felt by some. I hope his further efforts in checking up delinquents who owe money will not be guided or affected by personal or political spite; and trust that he will continue to show those returns which are an evidence of our prosperity, not forgetting that one of the most important reasons to take into consideration in the present increase in revenue is due to the activities at Corner Brook, an industry which was fostered and made possible by the late Liberal Government. Reference was made the other day to what the man on the street was saying, and it is a fact that these results which have come to light as a consequence of the recent investigations into public affairs have caused the man on the street to say, "Why is it possible that these irregularities can go on when we have an auditors' department such as we have?" Our audi-

tors have come in for a great deal of criticism, whether fair to them or not I am not in a position to say; but I do say this, that if our audit system is ineffective, then immediate steps should be taken to install a system so that this department will be able to meet the necessary requirements. I believe that the Auditor General is quite capable of carrying out the duties of his office, and it has been suggested to me that in the past the Auditor General has, when submitting his audits, made reports of the irregularities that have come under his notice, and when he has done this I take it that his duties as an auditor have been accomplished; it is the duty of those in authority to whom the reports have been submitted to take the action necessary under the circumstances. This suggests that, in the past, those guilty of misdeeds have been able to hide themselves behind the skirts of politicians. It must no longer be possible for parties to be able to help themselves to a loan from public monies for private business or any other purposes. I submit that the hands of the Auditor General would be considerably strengthened if he were allowed to bring his reports in future to a committee composed of members of the Government and of the Opopsition side of the House of Assembly. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the gentlemen sitting on the other side of the House work together if possible in harmony under the leadership of their Prime Minister for the best interest of Newfoundland, until the termination of their term of office, and I bespeak for them from this side of the House such criticism and suggestions as I hope will be helpful to them in their efforts.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne contains very little of importance. The first thing that we have before us is that the fishery of last year was very successful and that the products were disposed of at the most profitable prices in the history of the Colony. Now, Mr. Speaker, what led to their being successful? First let us turn to the policy of the late Liberal Government. That Government brought the Humber into being which took men from the fishery, which left so few engaged in fishing that the catch in consequence is so short that the price of codfish went up and the returns were proportionally great. Next, let us come to consider the Humber. That is very interesting when we come to look at it. "The construction of the great works on the Humber has proceeded with marked speed and success and many are now engaged in cutting wood for the manufacture of pulp and paper." There is a question to be asked and that is a question in which members not only on the Opposition side of the House but also members on the Government side should be interested. To-day we have between five and eight hundred French-Canadians logging on the Humber. I ask the question here and now, and I don't care who smiles or who does not smile. I ask the question: Why are these French-Canadians brought into this country when there are men just as capable and able to do the work as well as French-Canadians and they are not allowed to work? We see daily in the papers that so many French-Canadians crossed the Gulf on the Kyle bound for Deer Lake for the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company. Another paper says that there are no more men needed. And still another says that only those men are wanted who are qualified loggers and must have obtained labour before he starts to come out there. Why should Newfoundlanders be discriminated against in favour of French-Canadians brought here to take their places? It is said on the Humber that Newfoundlanders are no good. I say here without fear of successful contradiction that you cannot get a better man

than the Newfoundlander in this world to-day. Whenever he has been given a good showing he has proved himself equal to any man of any other nationality with whom he has come into contact. Why is he not given a square deal, a good opportunity in his own country? This country may be called upon to pay five per cent. of the cost of that Humber, and if we are possibly going to be called to pay this interest why are we not going to be given the benefit which can be derived from it at least in the way of employment? Why cannot we get fair play? Foreigners come over on the Humber and they get the pay for doing the work and the Newfoundlanders do the work. Over there the Newfoundlander is getting twenty-five cents an hour while the man from Montreal or New York or some other American or Canadian city is getting from 45c. to 85c. and a dollar an hour, in some cases for doing the same work Why is this being allowed? I would say the same if I sat on the Government side of the House and I would voice the same sentiments in the same manner as I do now. I claim that every man who works in the country should get fair play, and I say here and now, without fear of contradiction, that the Newfoundlanders are not getting fair play. And the time is fast approaching when the Newfoundlanders are not going to stand for such treatment. I myself have seen the Newfoundlanders come out of the woods after working for days or months, as the case might be, to get paid. They come to a wicket about 15 by 24 inches in size and there they are made to line up one after another to the number of perhaps two or three hundred. The temperature is perhaps fifteen or twenty degrees below zero and every man has to wait his turn to get paid. There is no shelter. And after the men get their cheques they are not allowed to cash them until somebody has gone around to all the shops in Corner Brook or Deer Lake to find out if the man owes anything there. And when these cheques have been cashed they have to wait two or three hours for a train. There is no place to go. There is a sort of a hen house there for a station. And when finally the train does come it is filled up and these men have to get on the brakes and ride across country to their destination. Imagine, Mr. Speaker, on the brakes of the train. I am informed that this man Stadler over there does not think very highly of Newfoundlanders either. We may not be completely up to the scratch but we do not like to have foreigners come out here and tell us so. It was only the other day, Mr. Speaker, that I heard one of the men from the Cabot Strait steamer tell about a man named Fraser, he may be the head of the Fraser Brace Co. for what I know, who was crossing the Gulf to Canada, and he was in a hurry for some important meeting or other which was to take place in the very near future. The Kyle got an S. O. S. call for assistance from the steamship Dunstan, I think it was. After the captain had changed the course of the steamer this fellow came upon the bridge and started to argue with Captain Cross as to why he had changed his course, and Captain Cross after fully explaining his position and telling him that he as chief magistrate and captain of the ship was supposed to respond to an S. O. S., was insulted by this fellow, who started to get nasty over the affair and wanted the ship to go back towards Montreal or wherever he was going. Captain Cross then told him to go to his room, or whatever place he belonged, or he would have to put him in his place.

This is the kind of thing that we have to contend with, although we are —or the country is financing this Humber industry to the sum of ten million dollars. We can't seem to get much fair play out of it. I would like to ask now if the Newfounlland di-

rector has handed in his report to the Government yet this year. If not, he should have handed it in.

I hear that there are to be two boats operated from Corner Brook to New York, and instead of these boats being managed by concerns in Newfoundland as they ought to be, they are being managed in New York. Outrageous! Ridiculous! The idea! And when the manager was asked if Newfoundlanders would command these steamers, he said "as far as possible," but the Executive would not be Newfoundlanders. In other words the Commander and Officers and the Engineers, who would also be Officers, would not be Newfoundlanders, but a Newfoundlander might get a job as a fireman or a deck hand. I am not blaming the present Government any more than any one else, but somebody should look into the affair, and see that this thing is handled in a different way.

I would like to speak of the question of the French Canadians coming here. What are these French Canadians getting? It is reported that for logging these men are getting seventy dollars a month in the woods, while the Newfoundlander in the same place have to work on the subcontract system, and earn what he can. That is the state of affairs that is existing now, and what is more, the French Canadians are sent into places where the wood is thick, and all they have to do is just cut ahead. But it is different with the Newfoundlanders. I have received letters to that effect from various places. These fellows get a show because they come from across the water, and our own men who have to leave their own homes in this country are almost looked upon as serfs in certain places, and have to take the dirty end of it.

The day is coming when this thing will be no longer tolerated. I understand that a report has been tabled to-day in this House of the result of the Logging Commission. I have not yet seen it, but I am anxious to get hold of that report, and see what is in it, and I will not be satisfied until something is done to better the conditions of these men. If this Government does not do it, then some other Government will have to look after the workmen and labourers of this country.

I am not speaking this afternoon to get clapped or stamped from the Gallery, or anything of that kind. But I am speaking for my fellow countryman, and my fellow workman, the men who have to go and work for their living. It is alright for men to sit down to their tables or in their offices, after a decent meal, and then come out and look down on the man who has to do the laborious work of the country. They have got to get consideration, and I am here now to see that the labourer and the fishermen and the logger gets the consideration that he properly deserves.

I heard of one instance to-day of two brothers who are to-day working on the Humber; one of them coming from St. John's, the other from Montreal. The two men are working at the same job exactly. One man, the man who came from Montreal, gets forty-five cents an hour, the man who came from St. John's gets twenty-five cents an hour. They are both working at the same job.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—If you can get the names give them to us and we will see that the men get fair play.

MR. BROWN—I have not the names here now.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Well get them, and we will see that the matter is settled. We want to see that everyone gets fair play, and we will have the matter looked into and settled. You know there is no use in making an accusation unless you can substantiate it.

MR. BROWN—Even if it is substantiated, I doubt if anything will be done.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Why do you say that?

MR. BROWN—I will come back to what I was speaking of. What I am saying applies also to those who earn their living by the sea. I am going back to the incidents of the Prospero and the Malakoff and the Wren. Here is a case where last Spring a capable man was taken off the Labrador route, and a man put on who apparently was incapable. He took the steamer down there and battered her brains out. There was a case where everybody would have admired the Government if they had let the officers continue in their job until the end of the year. Instead of that they gave it to a new officer. I am not going to deny that the men were good men, on a schooner or at the fishery, but not officers of a steamer. They were men without experience. The result was that the captain was unfortunate enough to have an accident, because he had been twelve days without sleep, and with his clothes on, and there is no doubt that he was asleep on the bridge.

You all know about the Malakoff, and there is no need for me to deal any further with the subject.

One other subject is the matter of the conditions in Bell Island. I read in the Evening Telegram some time ago that the Government was likely to deal with the situation. I congratulate the Government on the action that they have taken over the conditions on Bell Island. Conditions at Bell Island have never been satisfactory, and the men never get fair play from the Company. I think it is about time that the Company was brought to its senses in one way or another. If they will not improve conditions put the export tax on them, and make them pay it. That will bring the Company to their senses.

I do not propose to hold up the House any longer this afternoon, but I hope to be able to speak about this matter at a later date, and I hope that the Government will see its way clear to deal with the Humber matter, and the Bell Island matter, and that they will make some satisfactory arrangement between the workmen and the employers.

MR. DUFF—I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply. They have a great deal of material to work on, and they made the most of it. I must say that personally I thought that Speech from the Throne was good looking stuff. But then I am no politician, and I have not a great deal of experience in this House. Also at this time I would like to congratulate the Hon. Prime Minister and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries on their return for the district of Bonavista. I understand that Mr. Ashbourne and myself took a prominent part in having these two gentlemen returned. I have been informed that our names were used a lot down there. Nevertheless I am glad to see them here.

To begin at the end of this Speech of the Governor's I would like to refer to the incorporation of towns. I am just wondering if the Government has a change of heart since last year. It is a well known fact that the members on this side of the house had nothing whatever to do with the affairs of their districts last year, although they were the elected representatives, and why the Government should not want to incorporate the towns is just what I should like to know.

To mention one or two facts. Last year the first thing I found was that the Government had appointed two fire wardens for the district of Carbonear. I have no doubt that there are

fire wardens over a good deal of Conception Bay, but there is no work for them to do. It is really a gift, and the men have nothing to do. I am rather surprised that the Government made these appointments, because I thought it was against the policy of the Government. But why they should dismiss one fire warden and appoint two. It was not necessary and was unkind.

Anoher matter I want to speak of is the matter of the Post Office at Bristol's Hope, which is in my district. The people desired to have the post office put in the middle of the settlement, for their convenience. The place chosen was probably the most unsuitable and inconvenient place in the settlement. I must say that the lady in charge has been very good, and carried out her duties very well. But the Government should not have placed the office where it is and in doing this the Government has acted unfairly to the people of this village.

In regard to Victoria Village. It seems strange that the Government would want to incorporate towns, when they will not let the elected representatives of the districts have anything to say in the affairs of their districts. I have a reply here from the Board of Works, whch says that the Department considers it advisable that the money should be expended by the commissioners appointed by the Department. That was not fair or square to the people who were appointed and elected as the Road Board. If that is what they are doing, I cannot see why the Government suddenly wants to incorporate the towns.

Then again I find that there is to be a redistribution of seats. I have only one thing to say about that. I find that there are to be forty members. In my opinion the number of members should be reduced instead of increased. There should be a reduction to at least thirty. At present too many are being kept by the people of the country and I suggest that the number be reduced. As a matter of fact the country is being run by nine men in the Executive Council. There are many men in this House who have nothing to say in the country's affairs. I refer to the Opposition, and it would be just as well if they were not here at all although in some cases they have been returned by very big majorities. There is one thing about the Opposition—they can see what is going on and are able to criticize the doings of the Government. I would like to remark to the members for Bay de Verde that last year there were some repairs supposed to be made to the public wharf at Freshwater. But what happened? The timber was used for the repairing of a private store and not the public wharf. Possibly Mr. Puddester who was down there knows something of this and I think he or Mr. Cramm should look into it. I understand that the Government is also considering the building of a public wharf at Brigus. Now this is unnecessary as there is one there already and the building of another would be too much expense. Sometimes I am inclined to think there are altogether too many public wharves and public buildings. Now, Mr. Speaker, when the Government came into power we were lead to believe hat they were going to do great things on their slogan of Clean Up. Perhaps though we are too hasty in judging them already and should give them a little more time. And perhaps some of those in the Council are not to blame for the slowness in introducing the reforms. We have heard a lot of the Clean Up in the Customs Department and maybe something has been done there but I think that many other departments are in need of reorganization and it should be undertaken at once. I agree with the Hon. Dr. Robinson who in dealing with the Speech from the Throne said the Post Office Department should be taken out of politics entirely. As far as I can see last year

there were numerous appointments made of assistant postmasters on trains, etc., appointments of men who had nothing whatever to do only draw their pay. There is something radically wrong in this and it should be remedied at once. Now as to the plan of tourist traffic and road building, I would like to agree with the Government but cannot, as I think it is a wildcat scheme of the worst kind. If we could get people to come here and spend their money it would be alright, and I notice that all the men who own motor cars approve of the plan as to roads, but as far as I can see we only get an occasional tourist here and he never seems to return. As to the building of a hotel for the accommodation of visitors, it would mean a very big outlay and we would never see our money back again. The main thing for us to attend to is the fisheries which are the mainstay and principal industry of the country. Is there no way in which we can spend our money and get returns in this connection. I agree with the reference in the Speech from the Throne that last year the returns were very good but this season a much larger number of men will probably prosecute the voyage and there is a possibility that the markets will be overstocked. In view of all the conditions we should be able here to produce the cheapest fish in the world and the Government should be able to aid in this direction by taking cff the duties on the various supplies. When I see the reference to this tourist traffic, Mr. Speaker, I must say I think it is a very ill-considered measure but if I could see any prospect of returns from it I would agree with it. Now every day we see hundreds of our young fishermen leaving the country by every boat, and they will be going constantly from now on. This loss to the country is inestimable and still we talk of tourists and spending 2 million dollars for roads to bring at best a few dozen or score of visitors here. We all know that these tourists can easily go to Quebec or even down to the eastern provinces but I do not think there will be many cross the Straits, or if they do risk the long and tiresome journey across country to see the roads. A certain few men come here each year to catch salmon or shoot caribou but you can count them on your finger tips. Again Mr. Speaker, there are few representatives in this House who live in the ouports—perhaps one or two on either side—but I would like to bring to their notices that at present there is a fight cn in Conception Bay in connecton with electrc light. Probably the members for Port de Grave, Harbor Grace and Bay de Verde know of it and I would like to ask them what they are going to do about it. Some 20 years ago this House gave certain parties exclusive rights as to lighting and electrical power in Conception Bay which was a crime and I hope we have learned the lesson now in this House and will not do the same again. These powers have been repeated several times since the first grant. To-day the people are fighting for light in Conception Bay and perhaps in a few days will be in darkness. This company which has the exclusive right of house and street lightng paid 10 and 12 per cent. to their shareholders as well as stock bonus of 33% and on the low rate of a minimum of 50 cents per month at first charged. All their machinery is brought in duty free and they are paid by the Government for the street lighting all over Conception Bay. I think, Mr. Speaker, there should be a commission appointed to look into the affairs of this company with their customers and they may find out even a more serious state of affairs. At one time the electrical rights were given to certain business men in Hr. Grace, Heart's Content and Carbonear, but now they are in the hands of the one family who are living in St. John's and

are now looking for hundreds of thousands of dollars from the investors. If this matter is investigated the Government might see why they should take a hand in. As to the new industry to be established on the Gander River, Mr. Speaker, I would like to hear an expression from this House as to whether it is going ahead as many men would be able to get work there this summer which will be badly needed. I have heard repeatedly that the men employed on the Humber proposition were not getting a square deal and I do not blame the Government as they had very little to do with it, but I hope if the Gander deal goes through we will see a different condition of affairs. In regard to the case of Bell Island and Besco it has struck me that in this connecion the Government has acted wisely. Besco has appeared a shoddy outfit, and the revelations not pleasing the people have a very poor opinion of them and in the past the Governments have been too lenient altogether with them. It is a very common thing to see the people of Bell Island out of employment and we ought to find out if the Besco concern wants the ore from the mines there so badly. There should be no more remitting of royalty with them as there has been formerly. Now, Mr. Speaker, as to the railway question. The Carbonear branch has been the best paying one and we had one or two trains a day for a time. We have the train crews under pay and perhaps it would not be too much to ask to have the two trans daily. The winter is apparently passed and snow shovelling unnecessary, and nothing to prevent us having two trains. As to the matter of the vote for women, a bill dealing with which is to be introduced this session, I quite agree with the granting of the franchise to them, and I believe that if the women had the vote the liquor question would be speedily disposed of. I am disappointed in the liquor bill to see that the prices have not been reduced. I do not know if the quality has been improved but as the prices for liquors have been kept up the present Government has been profiteering somewhat.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my congratulations to those already offered to Mr. Cahill and Mr. Browne for the able manner in which they proposed and seconded, respectively, the motion for the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. I want to be brief and to the point and I hope I am not speaking to the galleries. (I don't think I am, as the people have nearly all gone home to tea). The first thing I notice in the Speech from the Throne is a reference to the codfishery. To my mind the codfishery is of prime importance to this country. It is the backbone of this country and has been so for centuries past and will always be in my opinion. We should treasure always the fisheries and we should do everything in our power to foster and develop the Labrador, French Shore and West Coast fisheries, hence it is a good thing that the first mention in the Speech from the Throne is with regard to the codfishery. It seems that the Government, though, are taking the credit for the high prices that obtained last year; but, as previous speakers pointed out, the credit is not due to the Government. Last year there was a shortage in the catch of codfish to the extent of over three hundred thousand quintals, and according to the law of supply and demand when the catch is short the price goes up correspondingly. The history of Newfoundland has proved that the prosperity of the country is in the same proportion as our fisheries are profitably engaged in. In fact, as has been already said, more attention should be given to this important industry, because, after all, Newfoundland depends to such a large extent upon it. We have a good supply of

timber and we have considerable mineral resources; but the codfishery is the most important asset we have and there should be a bounty paid for the improved cure of fish or something done to encourage and give heart to the fishermen to pursue his hazardous calling. I think that the whole matter should be gone into thoroughly by the Government, seeing that the fisherman is the bone and sinew of our land.

The next reference in the Speech from the Throne is to the Humber industry. According to the last message I had from that territory, the staff is still considerably reduced over there. I would like to know from the Government why it is that foreigners are receiving more pay than Newfoundlanders for doing the same work. There are instances of this spoken of in this House this afternoon which are outrageous, and, I contend, that the matter should be gone into carefully and found out how it is that people from Montreal get higher rates of pay than people from St. John's for doing the same class of work.

In relation to the Bell Island proposition, I have no hesitation in saying that a strong hand is necessary. As we have the third largest hematite ore deposit in the world on Bell Island, I think that we are in a position to see that, if Besco do not operate the mines, the Government could. I think that a strong hand should be applied in order that we might protect not only the workmen at Bell Island, but also the country at large. If the Besco people do not meet their contractual obligations, they should be forced to do so.

The next paragraph dealt with in the Speech from the Throne goes on to say "My Government recently sent a delegation to Canada to discuss suggestions regarding a settlement, by negotiations, of what is popularly known as the "Labrador Boundary Question." I should like to know who suggested the sending of this delegation to Canada and whether it came from the Newfoundland side or from the Canadian side. To my mind this is a very important question. No doubt Canada is after the timber rights and the timber rights are equal to the fishery rights there. A few years ago if a man wanted to build a house in the outports he could build it out of pine. To-day he cannot get any pine at all in our section of the coast and he is compelled to use fir and spruce. Therefore, I think we shall need that timber on the Labrador in years to come, and we want to be sure that we are not giving away something that may be utilized, if not in a few short years to come, by generations yet unborn; so we should safeguard their interests and act for them as an industrious factor. I should not like for the Government of the present day to make any compromise, if they are sure we have a good right to that part of the Labrador in question. There is also to be found on the Labrador considerable mineral property from Nain to Mugford, and I think about three years ago Canada had a surveying steamer down there with about eighty men. They are naturally as much interested in this question as we are. We, as an Opposition, want to see that Newfoundland gets the best portion of the bargain. There is also a great deal of timber and mineral lands at Hamilton Inlet. I think that no compromise or sacrifice should be made in connection with this Labrador question without prior consent of the Legislature.

I would also like to see the correspondence in relation to the purchase of this steamer which is being built in Holland for the Government. To my mind it seems rather strange that that there should be such a difference in the contract price of ten thousand pounds for the construction of this steamer, and I back up the statement of Mr. Hickman that it was ill-advised to place this contract in Holland,

without being positively sure and without making full enquiries that the contract could not be just as well placed with a British firm. We are all Britishers and proud to be such, and I think that if we go to the Old Country we shall always get a square deal. and when it comes to a few dollars here or there that it does not pay to quibble over a small amount. We should see that the country that does most to protect our shores and who are ready to serve in our defence, if occasion should ever arise, should be given the preference for all work that Newfoundland has to give. We go to England to raise a loan of four million dollars, and, as the railroad was considered a public utility, they are going to pay a certain interest on the amount spent on the purchase of rails. Now I want to be convinced as to whether or not that aspect of the matter was gone into thoroughly before the order for the construction of this steamer was placed in Holland.

With regard to the matter of unemployment, it seems, according to the Government, that public money spent for work done at this time will not give commensurate returns. I understand that a certain form of relief is being given out in St. John's. Now what about the people of the Outports? Are the outports getting their share and the same square deal as St. John's. Well we have men from Green Bay in the woods cutting wood and we have lots of men from Green Bay who are anxious to go in the woods but who cannot get there. A short time ago I sent a message to try and get some of my constituents work in the woods, but was unsuccessful. Now we are here to see that outport men get as good a deal as St. John's men.

We are also told in the Speech from the Throne that the Department of Posts and Telegraphs is "overmanned and under-worked." It would be interesting to know what appointments were made there within the past few months and whether this statement in the Speech is correct or not.

I notice that the Minister of Agriculture and Mines had interviews with farmers, and I hope that much good will accrue from those interviews. No doubt Newfoundland suffers considerably by her climate, and it is a question, in my mind, whether or not agriculture can be profitably carried on with success in this country, owing to the rigorous climate. At all events I hope that some successful scheme will be worked out whereby the farmers will be able to grow more crops in this country and have to import less from other countries. If we could produce more hay, turnips, potatoes, etc., we would have a much better chance to survive, especially when the world markets get bad

According to the Speech from the Throne, it seems forecasted that a larger amount will be asked for in the Estimates. This, to my mind, is regrettable, although I may be mistaken. I hope that the expenditure will be less. With regard to the taking off of duties. We are all aware that the price of Pork, Beef and Kerosene have advanced and we all know that these commodities are of paramount importance, as is also Molasses, but I notice that the Government has not seen fit to remove the duty from molasses. I do not know why, but I would very much like to know. As I understand it, the matter rests with nine or ten members of the Executive to say when they see fit to remove the duty from molasses.

I do not think this should be given to any body of men outside of this House. I am glad the Government has seen fit to remove the duties off these because juggling with the tariff does not assure the best interests in the trade of the country. And it is very difficult for the busi-

ness man to know to-day where he stands. If to-day the duty is taken off and to-morrow put on and the next week removed again, there is no stability—the one thing wanted to-day in the country. We want to get down to rock bottom, bed rock. And seeing that they had the power to remove the duties from these commodities they might have included molasses. If they cannot take it off at this session of the House reserve it for the next session. I understand at this moment a law was passed as to the time the duty was to be taken off molasses. I do not think it right that we should be bound down to any body of men outside of this House. I am very glad to know that that is not so, because in my opinion this House should have absolute right to remove the duties at any time. The Bounty for shipbuilding is a great thing. I hope that the amount they get per ton will be sufficient to allow people to go ahead and repair their schooners. A person interested in fishing and looking around cannot see what is going to happen now that the schooner fleet is fast being depleted, and he wonders where they are going to get schooners to carry on the fishery in a few years. The work on the Humber will engage less men than last year. The majority will find their way to the fishery, in order to secure employment there, and the outport man perfers during the summer months to go to the fisheries rather than to go to the woods, that is if some encouragement is given by this Governemnt. I think they will be backed by the Opposition Party in order that everything that can be done by the fishermen to repair their schooners and get new ones will be done. We are told that the taxes on banks has been excessive and unfair, and we are asked to reduce it. I understand that some banks are paying dividends of from 15 to 20 per cent. I know that bank stock carried double liability and that the stocks are greatly at a premium. They are charging 6 and in the outports 7 per cent. interest, it is a question whether or not they can afford to pay the half of one per cent. which is to be collected from them. I shall want certain information from the Prime Minister or the Finance Minister as to how he arrived at this statement that this tax was unfair and excessive. To-day in the outports we are asked 7. In St. John's perhaps it is 6. I know as far as Twillingate is concerned the rate is 7. If the tax is remitted or even a reduction made are we confident that they will get a lower rate of interest charged in the outports. The successful prosecution of trade depends very largely upon the continuance of the banking facilities. Banks play an important part in the commerce of the country. And we want in our banks large men, broad-minded men because we know that the banks may be sometime or other called upon to carry the load as it were. Whether or not the policy of the banks will be changed by the removal of this tax or this reduction remains to be seen. I believe the policy of the banks is generally dictated from abroad. I don't owe the banks any money.

These are points I would like to bring up before the House. I believe that anything that I say will be construed as constructive criticism and I want to bring those matters before you. I question whether this remission of reduction will have any effect upon the banking facilities which will be afforded our men in this country. I think the Government should go into this matter carefully in order that they might not err. An examination of the Dry Dock made by an expert shows that it has need of extensive repairs. I would like to ask whether it was necessary to bring an engineer here to report on the dry dock. Have we no Government Engineer, and is

he not capable of reporting on the dry dock. Even a school boy could see that it needs extensive repairs. I don't know what an expensive engineer was required for. The income tax is to be abolished as it was found to be most unsuitable for Newfoundland, and no doubt this change will be a welcome one. Another Bill that is to be brought before the House is the Redistribution Bill. We have in this country to-day a population of about half the size of a modern town About a quarter of a million people, and we have here an island one-sixth larger than Ireland.

As has been pointed out by one of the former speakers, the policy depends upon the 10 men of the Executive. We may increase the districts from 36 to 40. It may be a good thing. I have an open mind about it. The idea of redistributing or splitting up the districts is a good one. It will be an incentive to the districts to return local men. And I believe since the outports get a better share, that perhaps they will do more in the building up of their island home. There is no mention in the Speech from the Throne of the Liquor Bill or how it is working. We are told there has been nothing done as yet in regard to the building of a hotel. Nothing has come of that up to the present. The question of spending two million on roads I think is a debatable one. In my opinion the money would be better spent, if spent on the fisheries. I think the idea of tourist traffic is a visionary one as I said at the last session of the House. That the motor traffic law needs to be changed is apparent. To-day persons who have motor cars in the outports have to pay six dollars to the Municipal Council. They do not even have to have a number plate on their automobiles. The question seems an open one and ready for discussion at any moment especially if it is the intention of the Governemnt as it evidently is in this Speech to create a new Department. With regard to incorporating municipalities, I think we should have more team play. I think, as it is mentioned here in this Speech that we should try to bring our towns up to the State and not retrograde. We have heard nothing about the railway. This is a very important branch of the public service. It is a public utility and the fact that nothing is said in the Speech about it indicates that it is not getting the attention and consideration which it requires. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Goverunemnt will see its way to go through the business of the House with the greatest despatch, and I would like also to ask that they let us as representatives of districts know about and be consulted in any matters pertaining to the districts which we have the honor to represent.

I have already been consulted with regard to two or three things about the District of Twillingate, but I would like to be consulted still more fully about these matters of vital interest to my district. I feel sure that every member on this side of the House feels as I do, and would like to be consulted as I would. Our advice may not be taken, but we would like to be given the chance. I notice that the time for adjournment is now come, so I beg to move that the House adjourn.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, before the adjournment there is one little explanation which I would like to make, in connecton with what Mr. Ashbourne has just said. He was right and we were wrong. He said just now that we had not the right to remove the duties off molasses. It appears according to the last clause that we have.

The clause reads as follows:—

Reads the Clause.

I just want to make the statement because the Government has no in-

tention to interfere with the tariff, and will not exercise their rights under that clause. We have decided not to take the duty off molasses because we have done as much as we can well afford, and also because the price of molasses is very much less in Barbados this year than it was last, and therefore the duty being left on will not be felt so much as it would be if left on the other articles in question.

On motion it was ordered that the debate on the Address in Reply be deferred until to-morrow.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, Feb. 24th, 1925.

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

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from a number of the residents of Portugal Cove. The people on the West side of the Cove request that a connecting road be put in from the main road to their farms. Very many people are interested in the petition and I would strongly recommend it for the consideration of the Public Works Department and ask the attention of the Minister to it when the allocations are being made in the early part of the year.

Mr. Hickman gave notice of question.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker, I would like to make reference to two questions which I asked on yesterday's Order Paper. One was "to ask the Hon. Minister of Justice for list of all convictions under the Prohibition Act and Alcoholic Liquor Act from June 15th, 1924 to February 15th, 1925. The fines imposed and the amounts collected and what portion of each fine went to the informer."

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I gave the reply to it yesterday.

MR. HICKMAN—How long will it take to get all the particulars.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—You will have to wait some time to get them. It will probably take about a month.

MR. HICKMAN—You told me yesterday it would take two weeks.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—If you are in a hurry and name the specific cases, I can get the information for you in a quarter of an hour. You name the Magistrate or the particular convictions and I will give you the particulars very quickly.

MR. HICKMAN—I want the whole particulars.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I know what you want.

MR. HICKMAN—I want the information too before the House closes. I also put a question on yesterday's Order Paper to the Prime Minister asking him to lay upon the table of the House a statement of all moneys paid out on Executive authority from 10th day of June 1924 to 15th day of February 1925. Now the Prime Minister's reply, I consider, is very unsatisfactory. The members on this side of the House have the right to know what moneys are paid out on Executive authority.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I do not pay out money on Executive authority.

MR. HICKMAN—But you are the Prime Minister and you are the man from whom we expect to get the information we want, and if the information is not forthcomng this way we shall have to ask for the Minutes or the Warrants of the Executive Council. During the last session of this House members on the other side had a great deal to say about the Executive Government paying out moneys on their own account, without referring the same to this House of Assembly. I understood that the

present Government would not pay out any moneys unless what is absolutely necessary. In that event, I see no reason why the information that I have asked for should not be forthcoming. If certain things have been done that should not be done there is no reason why the information should not be given to this House.

Mr. Randell gave notice of question

Mr. Scammell gave notice of question.

Mr. Brown gave notice of question.

Mr. Duff gave notice of question.

Mr. Godden gave notice of question.

Mr. Hibbs gave notice of questions.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions respecting the Revenue Acts.

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

HON MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, these resolutions are what I spoke of the other day. They are just to amend the Act in relation to the duty on beef, etc. They are for the purpose of putting on the free list "beef when salted in barrels, including duty on barrels; pork in barrels or half barels, viz: Mess, Family, Prime Mess, Rump, Extra Prime, Bean Clear, Butt and Ham, including duty on packages per barrel, Belly, Back or Family Mess or Loin Pork including duty on packages; kerosene Oil and the package in which it is imported, and also beef when salted in barrels—and so on according to the resolutions.

You already know by the Speech from the Throne that the duty was going to be removed off these articles, and the intention is to enable the people giving those artcles in supplies to get articles in duty free, so that the supplies will not cost the fishermen anything extra.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, in reference to these Resolutions I would like to say that in removing the duty on pork, beef and kerosene oil the Government is only removing duty that they themselves put on these articles last year—at the last session of the House. At the opening of the last session of the House these articles were duty free, but the Government placed duty on those articles and also on molasses. These commodities have advanced in value, and I suppose the Government feels that by taking the duty off they will be relieving the burden of the fishermen in their outfits for the coming year. If that is the idea it is a very good one. It was not the idea when they put these duties on at the last seession.

A great deal has been said and particularly in the Speech from the Throne about the good results of last year's fishery. I intend to deal with that matter later on, but the result of last year's fishery is not so good as the Government would make us believe. The price of fish was not so high in the early part of the season as it was in the latter part, and therefore the fishermen did not get very good results from the fishery. It was only the men who had very good success at the fishery who were able to carry this burden and pay their accounts at the extremely high prices which were charged for these commodities on which the duty is now being removed. After these duties were placed upon beef, pork and molasses last year, the prices of these commodities went up three or four dollars a barrel, and then the duty of three dollars a barrel increased the burden which was placed on the backs of the fishermen by six or seven dollars a barrel at least on pork and beef more than it was before the meeting of the last session of the House of Assembly.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—You do not blame us for the advance, do you?

MR. HICKMAN—I blame you for putting on the duty on these commodi-

ties. The Prime Minister as a merchant knew the prices of these commodities, and I blame him because he, knowing the prices of these articles, put the duty on them, and so increased the burden on the backs of the fishermen.

I notice that molasses is left out of this bill. Evidently it is not the intention of the Government to take the duty off molasses. The Prime Minister makes the explanation that molasses this year is at a low price in Barbados. I do not know that the price of molasses is going to be very much lower this year in Barbados. Some time ago it was quoted at thirty-three cents per gallon there, but there were no purchases made at that price, and at the present time it is quoted at thirty-eight cents a gallon, and the planters do not care to sell even at that price. So you can see that by the time the purchases are made for Newfoundland, molasses might be as high as it was last year, particularly if there is an advance in sugar, which there is likely to be, because sugar has been at a fairly low price for some time, and it is not likely to go lower.

However, Mr. Chairman, it is my intention to move an amendment to these Resolutions that molasses be added to the free list. I do not know if any other members wish to discuss this matter before I go further.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman. The resolutions which are now before the House merely confirm what was planned by the recent Government, and of course must have the support of every member of this House. I would now like to ask that another article be added to the free list, and that is an article which will not cost the Colony very much. I refer to the duty on dories. The electors of the district that I represent have asked me to do this. I understand that the duty collected on these articles last year was not more than fifteen or sixteen hundred dollars.

At the present time no dories are being made in this country, but whether they can be made or not is a matter for those who know more about the matter than I do. What brings the thing home to my constituents, I think, and also to the constituents of other representatives of South Coast districts where dories are very much used, is the fact that other fishermen—Lunenburg and others—come down there and fish with their dories, but do not have to pay duty on them because they do not land them. My constituents say that this duty might easily be left off.

I do not ask that the duty on dories be taken off by these resolutions, but I do ask the Hon. Minister of Finance to give this matter his consideration, and, if possible, when he brings in his budget speech, to look into the matter and see if the duty can be taken off dories. I have been given to understand that it is very hard to make these dories in this country. I n any case, so far as the amendment proposed by the Leader of the Opposition is concerned, I have no other course than to vote for it. A year ago, the Government with which I was associated took the duty off molasses, because they thought they could afford to do it, and that it was a duty that ought to be taken off; and unless the Government shows some reason why the duty should remain on, I have no other alternative but to vote for the amendment proposed by the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman. In connection with the resolutions now before the chair, I would corroborate all that has already been said by the Leader of the Opposition and by Mr. Warren, the Hon. member for Fortune Bay. It was, in the opinion of ninety-five per cent. of the electors of Newfoundland, a wrong move on the part

of the Government last year to put the duties back on these articles now mentioned in these resolutions. It was a great surprise, and disappointment. Those who supported the Monroe Party, and voted them to the seats which they now hold in the House of Assembly felt that they had been given a slap in the face. The Government which had promised to make living conditions easier, particularly for the fishermen, put the duty on these articles, and when that was done it was evident that the promise of the Government had simply been forgotten as soon as the votes were counted. The first move of the Governemnt as soon as they had a chance in the House of Assembly, was to add insult to injury by placing back the burden of taxation on pork, beef, molasses and kerosene oil. However, apparently the pressure brought to bear on them, was so great that they were ashamed to allow the duty to remain on flour and gasolene. That was taken off last year.

Now the action of the Government is not expected in removing these duties at this time, as one of the speakers yesterday pointed out, in view of their intention to remove the Income Tax. Certainly they could not remove the Income Tax which is paid by the well-to-do, and leave the duties on the necessaries of life which are largely consumed by the fishermen and labouring classes. Every concession which the Government have made in any respect to the labouring classes seem to have been made under pressure and not with any free will. Why molasses is not now included amongst the articles put on the free list I cannot understand. We do not know what the price of molasses will be when importations will be made within a few months' time. Prices fluctuate, and we do not know what those prices will be when importations are made.

And although the price may be a little low to-day we cannot tell what the price will be in the future as pointed out by Mr. Hickman. And this is something that the fishermen and the labouring class of the country use more so than anything else, and why it is excluded from these resolutions I cannot for the life of me understand. I heartily support the amendment proposed by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that molasses be adedd to the free list.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed the said Resolutions without amendment and recommended that Bills be introduced to give effect to the same.

On motion for the adoption of the Report Mr. Hickman moved and Mr. Halfyard seconded, in amendment, that "Molasses including the duty on packages be included."

Whereupon the House divided, and there appeared in favor of the amendment:

Mr. Hickman
Mr. Halfyard
Mr. Hibbs
Mr. Scammell
Mr. Brown
Mr. Randall
Mr. Duff
Mr. Godden
Mr. Ashbourne
Mr. Warren—(10)

and against it:

Hon. the Prime Minister
Hon. the Colonial Secretary
Hon. the Minister of Justice
Hon. the Minister of Finance
Hon. Mr. Sullivan
Hon. Mr. Long
Hon. Mr. Cramm
Hon. Mr. Bradley
The Minister of Agriculture
The Minister of Marine & Fisheries
The Minister of Public Works
Mr. Cashin
Mr. Moore

Mr. Lake
Mr. Sinnott
Mr.Chambers
Mr. Power
Mr. Little
Mr. Puddister
Mr. Cahill
Mr. Linegar
Mr. Browne—(22)

so it passed in the negative.

The original motion for adoption of the Report was then put, when there appeared in its favor:

Hon. the Prime Minister
Hon. the Colonial Secretary
Hon. the Minister of Justice
Hon. the Minister of Finance
Hon. Mr. Sullivan
Hon. Mr. Long
Hon. Mr. Cramm
Hon. Mr. Bradley
The Minister of Agriculture
The Minister of Marine & Fisheries
The Minister of Public Works
Mr. Cashin
Mr. Moore
Mr. Lake
Mr. Sinnott
Mr.Chambers
Mr. Power
Mr. Little
Mr. Puddister
Mr. Cahill
Mr. Linegar
Mr. Browne—(22)

and against it:

Mr. Hickman
Mr. Halfyard
Mr. Hibbs
Mr. Scammell
Mr. Brown
Mr. Randall
Mr. Duff
Mr. Godden
Mr. Ashbourne
Mr. Warren—(10)

so it passed in the affirmative and was ordered accordingly.

Whereupon the Bills entitled respectively "An Act to Amend the Revenue Act 1905, and the Acts in amendment thereof;" and "An Act to Amend the Act 15 Geo. V. Cap. XXI, entitled "An Act respecting a Tax on Goods Imported into Newfoundland" were introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bills be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to Firearms" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled 'An Act to Amend Chapter 11 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the House of Assembly'" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to provide for the Construction, Reconstruction and maintenance of Highroads" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to Regulate Travel on Highways and the Speed, Operation and Load of Vehicles thereon" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

QUESTIONS.

(1) MR. SCAMMELL—To ask the Minister of Public Works what Ferry Services were in operation in the District of St. Barbe the past season, who were the ferrymen in each case, and what salaries were paid them.

THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Speaker, that answer is in course of preparation.

(2) MR. BROWN—To ask the Min-

ister of Public Works to lay on the Table of the House a list of all allocations of Public moneys, main line and special, sent out to the district of Twillingate since April 30th last, showing in each case to whom grants were sent.

THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Speaker, the same answer applies to that.

(3) MR. WARREN—To ask Hon. the Colonial Secretary: (1) How many families in St. John's are being relieved at public expense per week; (2) What amount is being paid to individuals and families; (3) What is the total amount paid from January 1st, 1925, to February 14th, 1925; (4) If any investigation of the circumstances of applicants is made before they receive relief; (5) If so, what is the nature of such investigation; (6) What steps are being taken to relieve destitution in other districts; (7) What is the total amount spent in able-bodied poor relief by districts from January 1st, 1925, to February 14th, 1925.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, that question is being prepared by Captain Byrne, and will be ready in a short time.

(4) MR. ASHBOURNE—To ask the Minister of Public Works to lay on the Table of the House an itemized account of the expenditure in connection with repairs to the Court House at Twillingate during 1923 and 1924, showing names of parties supplying material, names of labourers and how much each was paid; bills of all material, etc., and if any Commissions were paid on purchase of material.

THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—That answer is being prepared.

The answer to Question No. 5 was tabled.

The answer to Question No. 6 was tabled.

(7) MR. HALFYARD—To ask Hon. the Colonial Secretary to lay on the Table of the House a statement of claims received by the claims agent of the Railway for compensation for animals killed on the Railway from September 1st, 1923, to February 1st, 1925. The statement to show, in detail, the following: date of claim, name and address of claimant, value and description of animals, date killed, amount of award, if any. If claim disallowed, state reasons.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—That answer will be tabled to-morrow.

(9) HR. HICKMAN—To ask the Hon. the Prime Minister to lay upon the table of the House all correspondence with the Quebec Government in reference to the Labrador Boundary Quebec.

HON THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay on the table of the House a copy of all correspondence prior to our taking leave for Montreal. The correspondence which has taken place since our return has been of such a confidential nature that unless authorised by the Government of Quebec we would not be justified in tabling it.

(12) MR. SCAMMELL—To ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing: (a) what kerosene oil has been purchased by his Department for light houses since April 30th last (1924); (b) parties from whom such kerosene was purchased; (c) price paid in each case.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—In reply to the Hon. Member for St. Barbe I may say that 1,120 gallons of kerosene were bought at 22½ cents per gallon. 2,920 gallons at 25 cents per gallon these were all purchased from the Imperial Oil Company.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Speaker, there are a few points I would like to speak briefly upon. I was glad that the

Prime Minister drew the attention of the House to the fact that I was correct in my statement yesterday as regards the right of the Governor-in-Council to abrogate the duty on pork, beef, molasses and kerosene oil. I would also say that I am not very pleased that the Governor-in-Council did not exercise the right to remove the duty from molasses. I feel sure that it could be taken off, and I think it would be wise to have the Act rescinded and I would suggest that the Government would bring in a bill to rescind that Act and if they cannot place it on a free list, place it so that the Members of the Executive Government will no longer have it under their control. As I said yesterday changes in the tariff tend to demoralization in trade and if it is the hope of the country to get back stability in trade we must finish once and for all with tinkering with the tariff. Referring to bank interest, it is a fact that 7% is being charged by some banks. I have been informed recently that in St. John's as well 7% has been charged. The managing director of a large concern told me that a few days ago he was asked for his signature to a document bearing interest at 7%. He said that if his signature was not good enough to get the 6% rate he would not sign the note. The result was that the interest rate was changed. I think that we should have an understanding with the banks in this regard. If it is the intention of the Government to reduce the rate of one half per cent. there should be some understanding so that the outports would not be unjustly dealt with in this regard. The absence in the Speech from the Throne to the granting of the franchise for women seems perhaps rather worthy of mention. The Prime Minister said on the opening day it was his intention to bring in a private bill to this effect. I think that as we are living in the twentieth century and not in the dark ages that it is a wise move on the part of the Prime Minister to bring in this bill in order that we may extend the right of the franchise to women. Nobody who has looked at the work of women in times of peril and national calamity and particularly in the Great War in muniton factories and in other ways providing for the comforts of the men can deny that they helped in no small way to bring about victory and bring the war to a successful issue and so I feel that I can heartily support this bill when it is brought in. There is mention made in the Speech from the Throne with regard to tourist traffic. Now if I may be permitted I would like to read from the Hansard. At the last session the Prime Minister stated "we can interest hotel companies to build a chain of hotels through the country." We find now that the Government has not been successful in inducing anybody to come into Newfoundland to build an hotel. It seems now the Government is entertaining the idea of building hotels themselves. I consider that the Government has enough irons in the fire and I would like to know what the Government has to do with building hotels in Newfoundland. I think the allocation of two millions to be spent on the roads had far better be spent on the fisheries to encourage the fishermen of this country. I would like to comment on what was said by the Hon. Member for St. Barbe in relation to the Pit Props. We have great reserves of timber and we know that they are fast being depleted, that by and by they will be gone unless something is done in the matter of reafforestation. It would be well for the Government to go into the matter to try and conserve our forests by preventing the exportation of pulp-wood. We may some day be in need of timber and the use of this wood for the manufacture of pulp. There are one or two other matters that I intend to speak on but when the different bills are coming up I shall keep my re-

marks until that time. The Speech from the Throne contains quite a lot and perhaps some might call it radical I would call it perhaps conservation. I am a Liberal and glad to be a member of the Liberal party. Liberalism has stood for progress. It stands for progress to-day and it will stand for it in the future.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a few remarks on the subjects referred to in the Sueech from the Throne, but before doing so I wish to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Address in Reply. Both Mr. Cahill and Mr. Browne made very excellent speeches on that occasion; they played their part well, and like loyal and staunch supporters, they, of course, did their best to boost the administration of which they are members. To those of us who have had the pleasure of listening to those gentlemen on former occasions their eloquence was not surprising. I sincerely congratulate them.

Now, sir, I would like to review the Speech from the Throne for a few moments. The very opening paragraph deals with the fisheries, and it is very disappointing indeed, because I find there are only four brief lines devoted to the greatest industry in Newfoundland. Now of course I am not accepting that as an index of what the Government intends doing. We have at the moment as the Leader of the Government a man directly interested in the fisheries of the Colony. He is one of the biggest exporting merchants in the country and I cannot believe that he has not some policy in view. If I may be permitted to make a few comments on what I think the Government should do with regard to the fisheries the coming summer, I would say, first of all, we must make up our minds that we are going to be faced this Spring with a much greater number of men endeavouring to engage in the fisheries than last season. Last year the Humber employed seven or eight thousand men, most of whom would otherwise be engaged at the codfishery. The Humber construction work is practically completed now. There will be nothing like that number employed this year, and as there is little hope of the Gander operating in the Spring or during the year, for that matter, there is no other recourse than the fisheries. What are you preparing to do to assist those men to engage in this industry? Most of them will have no supplies, and it is well for you to have that in mind right now. Many people will be looking for some means of encouragement to engage in the season's voyage. To quote the Speech:—"The codfishery last year was prosecuted successfully, and the products disposed of at the best prices known in the history of the Colony (exclusive of the abnormal war years)." It is not correct to say that last year's fishery was successful, as a matter of fact the shore fishery was the smallest for a number of years. However, the prices obtained were very good, particularly in the latter part of the season. There is no doubt but that because of the good prices last year it is generally thought that there are going to be high prices next year. I don't believe the Prime Minister or any member of the Government is sanguine of the high prices continuing if we have four or five thousand more men engaged in the catching of fish, and particularly if our competitors—France and Norway —continue to increase their activities in this direction. I would like to see something being done to increase the value of the fisheries, in the way of a better cure and in regard to its sale in the foreign markets. Some years ago we had trade commissioners, but because of party politics the plan was knocked from its very inception. It is very apparent that any country that exports to foreign markets twelve million dollars' worth of pro-

duce should have representatives to look after its interests there.

Mr. Speaker, it is a poor argument that because the late Government introduced the idea of trade commissioners, with the abnormal conditions existing at the time militating against its success, that this Government should not take the suggestion seriously. The Government should not hesitate. Get good live commissioners, the best men obtainable, men who know the business down to the ground, and send them to the markets to boost and sell our products. If you think the idea is not a sound one, then we should advise such countries as Great Britain and the United States that they are wrong in sending men abroad to sell their goods. I hope the Government is seriously considering the matter, but the subject is of such vial importance that I want to further impress it upon them.

The next paragraph in the Speech deals with the Humber construction and says that the work proceeded there with remarkable speed and success. The speed side of the operation is something we all know of already. As to the matter of success, I am not so sure; I would like to put a question mark after that. If we judge by the complaints of the workers who were engaged there, it was not such a success for them, and, sir, if we take into consideration the matter of discrimination between Newfoundland and foreign workmen, the proposition has fallen far short of expectations. I do not directly blame the Government for this state of affairs, and perhaps they were not altogether responsible, but surely it was their duty to investigate and discover what has been going on there. If I remember rightly this matter was brought to the attention of the Government, even debated on the floors of this House, and the facts disputed by some members, who claimed that Newfoundland workmen received the same fair treatment as foreign labourers. I am prepared to challenge that statement, as several cases of gross discrimination has been practised against our workmen, and, Mr. Speaker, this kind of thing should not have been allowed, and the Government long ago should have taken steps to prevent it. To cite one case, out of many, as an example: Painters from this city were engaged by the N. P. & P. Company last Spring, they arrived simultaneously with a number of Canadian painters. I know two of these men and they are first class tradesmen. They worked in the same room painting and varnishing with two Canadians. One of them received forty cents per hour and the other fifty cents. The Canadians who were doing exactly the same work were paid sixty-five cents per hour. Besides this the Canadians came in with their passages paid, while our men were obliged to pay railway fares by having it deducted from their wages. The Canadians were rated sixty-five cents per hour and found, while our men received forty and fifty cents per hour and had to pay one dollar a day for their board. The Newfoundlanders paid for their bedding while the Canadians enjoyed theirs free.

HON. MR. BENNETT—You should have provided for that when you were putting the contract through.

MR. HIBBS—We did not think we should be succeeded by a Government so absolutely indifferent to the interests of our people, as you have proven yourself to be. It is all very fine for the Colonial Secretary to interject that kind of talk, but we cannot all be prophets. These are unforseen circumstances that should be dealt with as they arose by the Government of to-day.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—The people who made the contract have the sin on their soul, if sin there

be, and you will have to do the confessing, not us.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Speaker, I recollect that certain men who are now enjoying seats on the Government side of the House were on this side at the time when that contract was debated, but I have no recollection that they ever offered a helpful suggestion with respect to this question.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Do you remember the history of the affair? And that we had to pass that contract, and also give the Reids two million dollars. We had to take both parts of the bargain and smile.

MR. HIBBS—The railway settlement in no way affected the question under discussion, and that kind of camouflage will never remedy the evils complained of, and which I am placing before the House. At a matter of fact I think the two men I refer to are constituents of the Hon. the Minister of Justice, and I would expect him to be alive to their interests in this particular.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I wish I could do something for them.

MR. HIBBS—The next question in this lengthy document is the trouble at Bell Island. In referring to this the Speech from the Throne is telling us something else that we know all about. However I have to congratula'e the Government on their attitude in this matter, which shows that after all they have decided to take our advice. Last session, it will be remembered, there was similar trouble on the Humber, which resulted in a strike like that at Bell Island; it will also be remembered that messages were coming in here pleading for intervention but the Government were quite indifferent to the plea of the workmen, and took the stand that it was none of their business. It was a matter for settlement between the employers and employees. The Government regarded the dispute as a domestic difference between the Company and its workmen that did not justify Government interference. But why the change of policy now? I congratulate the Honourable the Premier on the stand he has taken in connection with the Bell Island trouble, and only regret that the same action was not taken in the case of the Humber, which fact perhaps explains why such regrettable discrimination followed.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—In the one case we were bound by a contract but in the other we were not. We can talk to Besco but we could not to the Humber people.

MR. HIBBS—You were not bound to allow the rights of our own people to be infringed upon either at the Humber or at Bell Island.

Another matter referred to in the Speech, and one we hear a lot about recently is the Labrador Boundary Question. I can appreciate the Government's position as to saying very little about this matter, as they are in the throes of negotiations with the Government of Quebec at the present time, and obviously it would be injudicious to disclose anything of a confidential nature. I think I speak for the gentlemen on this side of the House when I say, we hope the Government will make the best possible bargain for the country in the settlement of this vexatious question. We on this side of the House have no desire to embarrass the Government in this connection, but personally I have a few ideas to which I would like to give expression. I think I know the sentiment of the people in Newfoundland, and believe I am justified in saying if you can get decent terms from Quebec, sell the Labrador hinterland. The general desire of the people throughout the country is to get rid of this question, because they are tired of listening to stories of the dispute, and reading the lists of big fees that political lawyers and others have raked in while engaged in real or imaginary

work in this connection. I could regale the House for an hour or more with references to these fees, which ran anywhere from ten thousand dollars down. After all to be practical in discussing the matter of the disputed area, we have held this claim for over three hundred years and it will remain for three hundred years more without the slightest returns to Newfoundland. If there are valuable timber and water power there, by what means are we going to develop it; I advise you to get down to practical business and dispose of it, but, by all means protect the fishing rights of our people. It is, I feel superfilous to suggest that, as I have no doubt the Government are fully alive to that phase of the question. Mr. Speaker, I repeat, we should make the best terms available and get the most money possible, but hesitate seriously before you let the matter go to the Privy Council. We must remember that Canada is a big and prosperous country, having lots of money, prestige and high standing in the Empire. Canada, because of her geographical position can develop the Labrador, while we cannot. We are living in a country that needs development badly, and we require money to carry out that development. I firmly believe that Newfound land has a perfect right to the Labrador territory affected by this dispute, but it requires diplomatic skill on the part of our negotiators to drive a bargain with the Canadian authorities, and I sincerely hope the Government will prove equal to the test.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—What price would you suggest for it?

MR. HIBBS—To mention any price here, would I fear, embarrass you and your Government. I hold certain ideas with regard to what the terms should be. Among other things, I believe that not only should Newfoundland fishing rights be preserved, but a right to erect fishing rooms, stages and other intercourse with the land should be reserved, including the cutting of necessary timber for boni fide fishing purposes. I cannot think, however, that any good purpose would be served, at this juncture, at least, by shouting the price which you are negotiating for from the house tops.

Mr. Speaker, before closing my remarks on this subject, I would say once more, get the best price you can for the hinterland of the Labrador, but sell it if you can and use the money in reducing the taxation which our people are suffering under, and in developing and opening up the resources of our own country. Let us do this while we are alive. We shall all be dead bye and bye and receive no more benefit from the lands of Labrador than did our forefathers. When this question is settled by negotiation there will be less inducement perhaps in the legal profession, but what is better for Newfoundland, there will be greater room and inducement for farmers.

Now sir, the Speech also refers to the fact that the United States is making a claim against us, with respect to that old fishery squabble of long ago. It is one of the greatest mistakes in the world to advertise yourself as having too much money. During the last three or four months we have been reading in the Government newspapers glowing accounts of the flowing revenues the Government were receiving.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—It pays to advertise don't you know.

MR. HIBBS—It pays to advertise in the right way, but you people went at it in the wrong way. The trouble with you, was, that you were so surprised and delighted upon getting in power, that you did not know what struck you. It was like getting money from home, you did not have to work for it, your predecessors in office had done all the work for you. During 1924 money was flowing in from the Humber like water, it was a veritable gold mine for the Government—and

then you began to advertise your good fortune, with the result that the Americans came along, and dug up an old claim against us. I am not a bit surprised to find even the old mother Country making up her mind to relieve us of some of our surplus cash while the going is good, and she politely presents a bill for several thousand dollars on account of airships and warships, equipments, etc. It is a wonder that such bills were not sent in when we were in office seeing that we were blamed for being so liberal over money. The late Government were obliged to spend money to help those who were in need, there is no such problem as that to-day.

And now, sir, speaking of the fisheries again, the only redeeming feature that I can see, is that there is going to be a bounty given for the repairing of vessels, and I give the credit for this to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. This policy was adopted by the late Government, and will go a long way toward reclassing vessels, with bottoms sufficiently good to warrant repairing.

With reference to the question of unemployment, Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne says, "Unemployment in the country has greatly decreased, by comparison with all the years since the Great War ceased, and it is now normal." Well that is what we naturally would expect. During the past two years inland industries have engaged so many of our people as to greatly reduce the number of unemployed, but there are still unfortunately a large number out of work. However I do not advise the Government to enter upon non-productive employment. I can never understand why there are such a large number of able-bodied young men in St. John's, unemployed. Now I do not want to be considered unkind or too critical, nor do I want to pander to anybody, but I know that if the majority of the young men in this city were in the outports they would be working in the lumberwoods.

To-day in the city of St. John's you have twelve hundred able-bodied men receiving a dole of from $6.50 to $10.00 per week and doing absolutely nothing for it, and you are the gentlemen who have talked so much about the late Government demoralizing the people. You are doing worse than any former administration did, and if you are honest men you must admit it. How can the Government justify the giving away of $50,000.00 per month for nothing to men whose only job is to sit back and smoke their pipes while this generous Government provides the tobacco. There is no justification for it. Talk about demoralization. Why that is the worst form of demoralization.

Mr. Speaker, I would sooner see those men digging holes and filling them up again, than have them taking a dole and giving no returns. Our city to-day is not in such an up-to-date condition, that there is no room for improvement; as a matter of fact the streets and sidewalks are in a dangerous, filthy and disgraceful condition. The Council have not sufficient money to clean up. Could you not manage to meet them and collaborate by putting these twelve hundred men to work cleaning up the city during the fine weather at present prevailing?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—They will not collaborate or will not come together at all to discuss the matter with the Government.

MR. HIBBS—Well, then, I will vote against every member of that Council at the next Municipal election. At any rate there are lots of work to be done in the city, as can be seen everywhere one goes, even if it is only cleaning the sidewalks.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—For your information and for the purpose of helping your argument, the

Council takes the position that, firstly, they are not able to do any relief works, and secondly, they will not accept any money from the Government by way of loan, and the Government has no right to give them money.

MR. HIBBS—That is a very unfortunate state of affairs to say the least of it.

Why the Government is giving out thousands every day, but the Council won't accept work for it.

Coming now to the Department of Posts and Telegraphs. I am glad that postal matters are engaging the attention of the present as well as the late administration. There is no department in the whole public service so complicated, and requires so strict a supervision. Mr. Speaker, I often question the sincerity of the Government in matters of public policy and this case is no exception. The Government says that this departemnt is overmanned and underworked. Of course it is overmanned, and who is responsible for the overmanning? Is it not a fact that twenty-six men have been placed in jobs in this department, in addition to those already there, since the present Government took office, and the same story can be told of other departments and offices all over the country, but particularly in St. John's. Imagine twenty-six men being pitch-forked into nicely made jobs in the Post Office and then you talk of the service being underworked and overmanned. Now I am going to watch that department very closely, because frankly I have not much faith in what you are doing there, and the service is worse to-day than ever it was. I am glad that you have engaged the services of a reputable and competent man who will, I hope, remain incorruptible. He undoubtedly will, if you don't interfere with him, I refer now to Colonel Ross. The Speech from the Throne states that the Government is going to maintain efficiency in the public service. You state that every person should have some training for the particular job he is about to fill. That is merely your propaganda. But what have you done in practice. A new Deputy Minister of Posts and Telegraphs was appointed yesterday, who has absolutely no experience. The gentleman has never been in a post office unless it was to buy a stamp, but he was one of the team I helped to defeat in Trinity District, and that was, I suppose, his qualification for the position. Now I want to be correctly understood. I have nothing against the man personally. He is a fine character, a friend of mine and as a man I respect him. He was an excellent schoolmaster, and has managed an orphanage very well, but it is palpably unfair to put this new man over the heads of men who have spent the best years of their life in the service. I claim the principle is wrong, and every member of the Government knows it is wrong. When the late administration was in office certain gentlemen now in the Government ranks were wont to expound the many qualifications of Mr. LeMessurier, who had put in over thirty years of service. Well then do you think it is fair to the service now to put a schoolmaster in his place?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. LeMessurier voluntarily resigned.

MR. HIBBS—Yes, but why has not some official of the department better qualified and experienced than the new appointee peen promoted to the job? Is it possible that no such official could be found in the Department?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I am sorry to say it is.

MR. HIBBS—Well I am sorry, too. Not because Mr. Hodder got a position, but because I think that his present appointment is not in the best interests of the public service

The next subject I wish to deal with is the question of agriculture,

which to my mind, is second only in importance to the codfishery, and yet there are only three brief lines devoted to it in the Speech, and it reads as follows:—"Agricultural interests are having the attention of my Government, and it is hoped that a committee of practical farmers, now in conference with the Minister, may suggest some wise legislation for the promotion of this important industry." Does not that show a most unfortunate state of affairs? You have no policy and must therefore call in a few farmers to institute one for you. I am not opposed to the idea of consulting farmers, because, after all, it is a practical way for the Minister to get information which he may not personally possess. And now, Mr. Speaker, I would crave the indulgence of the House while I review the history of agriculture in this country for the past twenty-five years.

Agriculture in Newfoundland has been made a political football of. Sir Robert Bond, in 1906 made what I always considered the first serious and honest effort to try and place agriculture upon something like a sound scientific basis, which aimed to give our people a training in at least the rudiments of agriculture. But what happened? Sir, I fear it is not much to our credit, but instead of receiving the indorsation of the country, Sir Robert's Government was defeated on that very issue. Most of us can still remember with regret the effect of that cheap and senseless catch cry "Bond's model farm," you would think he had committed one of the worse crimes in history so cleverly did the professional politician disguise the real merits of his work. Mr. Murray, a successful and highly reputable agriculturist, who was recommended by high Canadian authorities including Professor Zafitz, had just started work here, when the Government changed in 1909, and he was sent home after being the subject of abuse and misrepresentation by people who knew more about playing dirty politics than improving agriculture in this sadly abused country.

The Morris administration that succeeded Bond made up their minds to do something entirely novel. They had condemned and abused the Bond policy, and must needs inaugurate something different to that which they had succeeded in destroying. Sir Edward with a great blowing of trumpets started in to "Whiten the South Side Hills with sheep." His policy included the formation of a large number of agricultural societies in Newfoundland. They found no trouble to get men to join, large numbers, whether interested in farming or not, flocked in, because they hoped to get something for nothing. They wanted to take part in the free givings out. One of the most ridiculous features of this scheme, was the so-called agricultural reports, sent in by the Chairman or Secretary of those societies and purporting to give statistics of all crops and cattle over a radius, sometimes of twenty miles, the real facts of which they knew no more about than the man in the moon. And Mr. Speaker, the saddest part of the matter was, that this stuff was incorporated in the regular agricultural report, and tabled in this House, and regarded as reliable and official figures. I am however prepared to admit that the giving out of farm implements, had the effect of increasing rotation of the land. But, Sir, with no means of imparting the scientific knowledge so essential to success, our people were no more advanced in 1919 than they were in 1909. The Morris effort had proven a blank failure. The societies died a natural death, and practically none were in existence in 1919. During the Squires regime, the energetic Minister, Hon. Dr. Campbell, brought a stock farm into existence. General conditions existing throughout the country however, greatly militated against engaging in any ex-

tended scheme. Some of the best stock available was secured but a serious mistake was made in not having first provided modern housing facilities. When the Warren Government took over control they were stampeded into sacrificing these splendid animals, and many of the choicest 'pedigree stock went to the block. I personally protested as I considered it a crime, and an outrage on the farming interests of the country. They merely pandered to opposition clamor to destroy. True to the disgraceful agricultural tradition of the country, anything a former Government had built up must be torn down, and we find ourselves in this day of grace 1925 no further advanced than our great grandfathers were one hundred years ago. The advice of the Secretary of the Board, Mr. Bayly, the only practical man on the Board, has seldom if ever been followed. Mr. Speaker, I fear that this Assembly has not yet awakened to treat agriculture as more than a political joke. When I referred to the matter in this House in 1920 Honourable Gentlemen began to smile, it was such a ridiculous subject, they had to laugh at it, they now appear to be becoming disillusioned. When I advocated the building of roads, one gentleman said I was mad. He drew the line between giving out relief and building roads, but you are going to build roads now, are you not? I would now ask the Minister Mr. Walsh what he intends doing for the encouragement of agriculture. I believe he is in earnest. Mr. Walsh has said that he intends cutting politics out of this question. I am glad to hear it and sincerely trust he keeps his promise. Why not follow the example of other countries. Go to Nova Scotia if you will, and see what they are doing there for agriculture. Their conditions may be more favorable than ours, but they are steadily building up, not tearing down. What our people require are object lessons. Lectures and literature may help, but you must give them practical demonstrations of what can be done in the way of improving their farming and gardening methods if you want to interest them. Those demonstrations must be given by practical men, but where are you going to get them here. No trouble to get merchants, lawyers and doctors, very indispensable gentlemen in their own line, but you can't get an agriculturist in Newfoundland to-day. If you import a stranger can he be expected to have the interests of Newfoundland at heart? Now let me tell the House where a good man can be found, and if the Minister will take my advice, he will secure his services at once. If we are ever going to get out of the old time worn rut, we must have a professional man in charge of the practical side of our agricultural activities. The Government would not think of appointing an ordinary layman, as Medical Superintendent of the General Hospital, unless they wished to increase the number of funerals. If we did not have a legal gentleman in the whole of Newfoundland, and Mr. Higgins was in Canada, you would try to get him down here at once would you not, because you must have a lawyer to fill the office of Minister of Justice, but Sir, what about the greatest of all sciences, the science of Agriculture. Are you still going to fill that department with useless political office seekers? This gentleman to whom I refer is a graduate of McDonald College, and is an Agriculturist and Biologist, both.

I understand that he would like to give his services to his Homeland, the country that he offered his life for in the Great War. This young man went to Truro Agricultural College in 1912, and after two years came home and joined the "Blue Puttees," and went overseas, where, without "pull" he won his commission. He was among the first to go and one of the last to return, having served in Gallipoli,

France, India, and finally as an officer in Ireland. After returning home he proceeded to McDonald College, and there graduated and received his B.S. A. degree. He comes of a family of practical farmers, a splendid fellow, and one to whom work is a pleasure. His name is Mr. H. A. Butler, B.S.A., and he is now in charge of a large live stock yard near Toronto. (I am glad the Minister is taking his name). The President of McDonald College, or Professor Cummings, will no doubt, recommend him. Secure this young man's services if possible, give him charge of the practical end of the business in co-operation with Mr. Bayley, who, has the interest of agriculture at heart, and see if you can't reduce the importation of $3,500,000.00 worth of farm produce which this country is annually purchasing from abroad.

The next paragraph says, that you have reduced the taxes on the Canadian Banks doing business here. That is a matter to be hailed with delight by the poor struggling fisherman or labourer, who is beginning to see the bottom of the last barrel, to know that these banking concerns will now be enabled to get over the trying month of March more safely with their taxes reduced. Mr. Speaker, will this reduction of taxes on the Banks, that according to reports have cleaned up millions here during the last few years, mean better financial accommondation to our people. I consider those bankers as people well able to look after themselves, and unless they loosen up a bit, and help the fishery supplying trade better than they have in the past, I fail to see the purpose of your reducing their taxes. There are lots of room if you feel like reducing taxation, besides beginning with the millionaries behind the Banks.

Now Mr. Speaker, we come to the redistribution of seats. This is a big question and will mean a radical change in the whole electoral district system, as we have it to-day. Of course I am not worrying about it personally, as I happen to be the sort of a person who can get elected in any district in the country.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—It's good to have a high opinion of one's self.

MR. HIBBS—Certainly, everybody who knows me will vote for me anyway. But speaking seriously, Mr. Speaker, I am interested in this question because I agree with the principle of it. I believe that one man districts will give better service, than the present system which has outgrown itself. Mr. Monroe has taken the leaf from the F.P.U. book in this respect. The Prime Minister has been closely in touch with that organization recently in more ways than one.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—We get all our good ideas from others.

MR. HIBBS—We are only doing our duty in offering you advice. While the principle of one man constituencies is a sound one, I feel that the Government has made a big mistake in increasing the number of seats from thirty-six to forty. Now it is a well known fact that the machinery of Government in Newfoundland is out of proportion to the population and resources of the country. It has been likened to the "trappings of an elephant on the back of a mouse," and the Government is certainly not justified in increasing the number by four more seats. Every hon. gentleman who represents a district knows, that so far as the interests of their constituents are concerned there is no necessity for forty members. I am inclined to think that there is some kind of political expendiency at the back of all this. I would ask the Government to forget the political party game, and instead of increasing the number to forty, reduce it to thirty. The denominational aspect can still be taken care of, by distributing the seats proportionately as you are doing now.

What advantage can be expected from the increased number of seats? Take the District of Fogo for example, I have represented that district for a number of years, and managed it, I hope, fairly well. On some occasions I have been accused of running the District of Hr. Main in addition to Fogo, this of course is not quite correct, but anyway I did not find any great overstrain in doing what I did. It must be remembered that the more constituencies there are, the greater will be the cost of representation and general elections. I ask the Prime Minister to reconsider this decision, and reduce the number of members of the House of Assembly to thirty instead of forty, even though the suggestion does come from this side of the House. Then the country will believe that you are really trying to practice economy.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I wish you would tell us how it can be done.

MR. HIBBS—How are we going to get the chance to tell you if you will not consult us.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I can assure the hon. member, that ample time will be given for helpful suggestions, as to how the matter can best be arranged.

MR. HIBBS—Thank you! I believe if we got together on this old map we can cut off six members instead of increasing by four.

Mr. Speaker, this is a national question, and when the bill is brought up, we will be in a better position to deal with it.

The Speech next refers to a tourist trade policy. This is a venture that I have personally advocated for a number of years. For a long time mine has been a voice crying in the wilderness. I have advocated and worked for such a policy under the Squires and Warren Ministry's and I shall gladly support the same policy if inaugurated by the Monroe administration. I sincerely believe if properly handled, there is an opportunity for us to utilize our natural attractions for tourists, and now I would like to place my position clearly before the House This sir, is one of the things in which we require a little faith. It must be somewhat of a venture. We will all be very much wiser in four years from now than we are to-day. While believing in a tourist trade policy, I do not want to be classed in the category of an extremist. I would advise a safe, sane middle course. We should not imagine that this tourist business will cause the country to flow with milk and honey, or that it will be a panacea for all our ills. The first thing the Prime Minister and colleagues will have to do is to work out the matter as free from politics as possible. We cannot afford to play politics in this case, and there has been nothing done by the Government during the last six or eight months to give us any assurance they are not going to play politics.

Bermuda's success is due to the application of business to their scheme. Members of Government, Opposition, transportation, general trade and hotel interests, comprised an active board, and their success has been marvellous. To-day practically the whole of their revenue is derived from tourists. The same is true of the Bahamas. To the success of the tourist trade in the latter country. His Excellency Sir William Allardyce contributed a valuable quota. I have often recommended this idea, both by writings and on the floor of this House.

Mr. Speaker, after you have built your roads and your hotels, if you do build them, after the transportation interests have placed adequate shipping on the routes, your work will not be complete, for to insure success you will have to do lots of advertising, and you will require live people to do it. There is one thing that I want to refer to in this connection, which I miss-

ed in reviewing other portions of the Speech. I was speaking just now about Trade Commissioners. I would like to call the attention of the House to the fact that Mr. J. M. Devine was appointed by the late Government in 1920 as a Trade Commissioner in New York. I think he is well known to everybody here, and those who know him I am sure will agree with me that he is as good a man as one could get to fill that position. Mr. Devine is a good type of Newfoundlander. He sacrificed a good business here at that time, and accepted the position imbued, I believe, with the hope of doing something in that great Metropolis to advertise the attractions, and introduce the products of this country. A live energetic hard worker with the accomplishments and qualifications to represent Newfoundland creditably in such a field as the United States. But this gentleman's services were dispensed with, simply because the policy of the Government in appointing Trade Commissioners, generally at the time was criticized by the Opposition. Trade Commissioners were recalled, and Mr. Devine's services to the Colony, which had just begun to bear fruit, were lost. Apart from the gross injustice and hardship to himself and family, the act was an absurd one. Mr. Speaker, when Trade Commissioners are appointed as they certainly will be, in order to sell our products and advertise this tourist programme, I think you should right the injury which has been done Mr. Devine, and reappoint him, if he will accept the position.

HON. MR. LONG—What good did the Trade Commissioners ever do?

MR. HIBBS—That is a very broad question to ask. In the first place, why does Great Britain, the United States and Canada and all other countries which are abreast of the times, send out their commercial travellers and trade agents to every corner of the globe, to advertise and sell their products. I wonder has not some smart foreign commercial traveller sold you something that you didn't think you wanted, by virtue of his superior persuasive power.

HON. MR. LONG—But I am asking you now what good have the Commissioners done?

MR. HIBBS—That is not a fair or logical question to ask. I am referring to the principle. I say that the principle of having Trade Commissioners is a sound one, and I will go further than that, and say that before four years will have passed, if this Government remains in office for that period, you will have Trade Commissioners.

HON. MR. LONG—Doing what—selling fish?

MR. HIBBS—Certainly, selling fish, and everything else that we have to dispose of, and boosting Newfoundland. Do you mean to tell me that if we had the right kind of trade agent in New York, such a man for instance as Mr. Devine, that a market for a great deal of our fish could not be found in America. We can do it if we have proper representations. I do not believe in this idea of sticking forever in the same old rut, and never making an effort to improve our foreign connections. Does the hon. member arrogate to himself the right to dictate to the commercial world, and tell them their policy of appointing Trade Commissioners is all wrong? I say, sir, that in connection with tourist traffic programme, we will want a good man in New York and one in Canada. We will have to give these men advertising facilities if you are to induce the right people to come here. That is when we prepare ourselves for the traffic. We are not ready yet, and will not be for some time to come.

With respect to the establishment of the Highroad Commission, it is gratifying to me to learn that the

Government is about to act on my advice in this connection.

I am very glad indeed to know that Mr. Hall is to be the Chairman of the Commission. I hold a high opinion of the Government Engineer in that capacity. Mr. Hall is a man who has done a great deal of good work since coming to this country. Of course he has not had very wide avenues in which to practice his profession. The many splendid concrete bridges around Newfoundland testify to his undoubted skill, as well as his able assistants. But Mr. Hall will not be able to be on the job all the time, and you will require other skilled help. I would recommend Mr. Cochius who built Bowring Park as a first class man. I also know of a Newfoundlander who is at present in the Province of Ontario, working with the Highway Commission. He has a practical knowledge of road work, from the building of a good gravel road to the making of a paved highway. I think that his services would be available, he will naturally be glad to get a job nearer home, and I think he is desirous of giving his services to his own country.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—What is his name?

MR. HIBBS—His name is George H. Dawe, I am not sure of his address just now, but he is engaged in the construction of roads just outside Toronto. When the bill comes up I will have something more to say with regard to this Commission. In the meantime I would strongly urge that, all other things being equal, by all means, give this work to Newfoundlanders.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Hear, hear.

And now, Mr. Speaker, the Speech refers to the incorporating of municipalities in outport towns. This idea looks very nice on paper. The principle of municipalities is of course a very sound one, but you must remember you have a form of municipalities now in Newfoundland. The Local Affairs Act of 1915 gave us something similar in principle and practice to municipalities. It gave to every settlement in Newfoundland the right to elect their own Road Boards, which not only had the sole right to look after roads, bridges and wharves, but everything else of a local public nature. While those Road Boards were allowed to function everything was alright—but what do we find now? The present Government during the last eight months have demoralized the whole system of outport expenditure. This Act, as binding as either one on the Statue Book, has been wilfully violated and trampled on. This outrage has been committed by the Government to serve a petty cheap code of Party Politics. And, Mr. Speaker, these are the same gentlemen who come in here now and talk about incorporating muncipalities in the outports. What faith or confidence can the people place in you anyhow; you ignored the lawfully constituted Boards and gave their grants to your political supporters to expend as they wish. If on a Board of six, two are political friends of Government members, you retain these two and ignore the other four because you say they were not legally elected. Was there ever anything more dishonest? That is not the kind of thing I would expect from the Prime Minister. Mr. Monroe has not been a professional politician, and I had hoped he never would become one. I am, frankly, astonished that he stood for such a demoralizing practice. That sort of thing has destroyed the confidence that the people had in you, sir. After treating the country like that, you come in and tell us that you are going to incorporate municipalities. I ask you, would it not be following in your own footsteps if, when we get back into power, we were to ignore

those muncipalities that you propose incorporating?

I remember when Mr. Jennings held the office of Minister of Public Works, if I went into him and told him that the Chairman of a Road Board was dead, he would almost want a doctor's certificate, before he would allow the money to go to anybody else. He respected the law, but you appear to think that because a fellow voted for you he is qualified to handle public monies. Mr. Speaker, allow me to cite an example of how this form of outlawry works out in practice. Every hon. gentleman from the Premier down, are acquainted with the main road from St. John's to Holyrood, and remembers the pleasure it was to drive over the section prior to last summer. A board of men elected by the people greatly asissted the Road Commission to keep that road up against the wear and tear of fast motor traffic, particularly the chairman, Mr. Dawe, whose record as a road man is so well known. You ignored these men and gave their money to a few fellows who you think voted for you. Is that what you mean by a square deal? The result of your illegal interference was that, if the squadron of warships had not visited Topsail last summer, you would have to fence off the Topsail road. In order to make the road passable for the heavy traffic during that week fifteen hundred dollars was allocated at that time and the most of it wasted between St. John's and Topsail, and the road is still in a frightful condition. These men have no interest in the roads. We are gone back again to the days of sops for votes. I am tempted to tell the House the record, as road builders, of some of those who have now usurped the office of the lawful and official boards in this section. And this is not the only case in which this has been done, it is the same practice all over the country, more or less. I can not believe the Prime Minister has been aware of that sort of public outrage, or he would never have allowed it.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say before I take my seat, that I am not talking politics for the sake of politics. After all we are all Newfoundlanders; we have to live in this country and support our families here; and I, for one, will give the Government my support in all that I believe aims for the best interest of Newfoundland.

This Speech from the Throne contains twenty paragraphs, but can only be classed as a document containing a fine array of words, most of which I fear contribute very little toward the advancement of this country.

I have heard a lot about reforms in the Post Offiec, and I may have more to say in this connection before the House closes. I know of some reforms and doings in that department that are not entirely creditable to the Government. Some of your objects may be well meant, but the country wants you to show that you mean to do something more for the country than playing cheap party politics and practising discrimination against your political opponents.

CAPTAIN RANDELL—Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my congratulations to the gentlemen who so eloquently moved and seconded the motion for the appointment of the Committee to draft the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. It is according to custom to do that, but in this case I believe I am right in saying that we listened to an unusually able discourses, and congratulations are rightly due. Perhaps we heard some of the matter contained in the speeches before, though now we have heard it expressed in particularly striking language, and I am proud to see we have among us two such able coming politicians. Most of the subjects referred to in the Speech from the Throne have already

been ably dealt with, and perhaps it is little I can do to add to what has been said, but there are one or two subjects that perhaps I may be able to throw little light on. I have had connection with some of these subjects. I refer to the Labrador Boundary, the Corner Brook Industry, the proposed repairs to the Dry Dock, and one or two others. I might say that I am just back from Canada, and after spending a day or two at Corner Brook I gathered some little information as to how affairs are progressing there which perhaps will interest the House and the public generally. There is no doubt of there being a great industry there, but whether it will be a great success is another question. What I heard and saw—and perhaps such cannot always be depended on—was such that I must say I cannot congratulate myself on being one of the party which was instrumental in bringing that industry about, because I believe we will have to find the money in a very few years to pay the interest on the ten million dollars. I understood the industry would be moving and making paper in a couple of years at a cost of about twenty millions, but I am told that to date the expenditure is in excess of twenty millions. I have heard the figures expressed in various numbers, and I believe I am safe in saying that the amount will run to about thirty-five million dollars. I do not know if this is correct but I have my information from a very reliable source. If that be so, where will the dividend be found when the interest on the loan by the Trade Faciliities Board has to be covered first. I am no financier and do not understand much about finance, but I think the small dividend on thirty-five millions, and this will likely happen, will be a much smaller dividend on ten millions when the interest is asked to be paid. The industry may pan out alright for this country, but I must say it looks very doubtful. I have it on very good authority that there will be no money in it for two or three years, and I am not versed sufficiently in the matter to say if it should pay a dividend. We have to leave that for the future, as we are in for it anyhow. I would like to draw the attention of the House, and the country generally, to the employment of so many foreigners in connection with the industry referred to. As far as I could learn you will generally find a Newfoundlander sixth or seventh from the top in any job, and not only that, but some five or six hundred French-Canadians were brought into the country to engage at logging during the winter. I do not know much about logging or about construction work, but I have been told that the Company are having two ships specially built to carry their paper to whereever they intend shipping it—New York, I think. These ships are being specially built for the trade, but as we all know, we have conditions around this country for which we must have special men to do the navigation around the coast and in the waters adjacent to the Island. I was told that these ships would be manned as far as possible by Newfoundlanders, but when I said this would mean all Newfoundlanders, I was told the executive on the ships would very likely be foreigners. I hold that all our history shows that there is not in any country men so good in any other part of the world as right here in Newfoundland to handle shipping or navigation especially around our coast. And I am prepared to pick them if needed. There are many within sound of my voice who have often heard the quotation "If blood be the price of Admiralty, we have paid in full."

Many of us have lost sons, brothers or fathers in the waters surrounding our shores or following their calling in the foreign trade of this country,

and seeing that we, the people of this country, are guaranteeing the interest on the bonds whereby this industry was accomplished, I think it only right and just that we should have a say as to how this money is to be spent, particularly in regard to these steamers. If that be so and they will probably employ foreigners to man and go in charge of those ships, I again affirm they are not treating our people right or just. I could say more about the shipping end of the business as far as Corner Brook is concerned but I do not propose to deal much with that at present as it is not my business. I do state, however, that I think the management of the Company have made a mistake as regards the shipping end of their business. When I was at Corner Brook I asked the question why were foreigners being put into this department and I was told the Newfoundlanders had no idea of time and they could not be found to fill the positions. If they could not get Newfoundlanders to handle shipping better than it was done last year for them, then it is high time that this island of ours was sunk.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Did they not have any Newfoundlanders in charge of shipping at Corner Brook?

MR. RANDELL—They had one man somewhat recently there.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—I understand they had a man named Bartlett, of Brigus, there all the time.

MR. RANDELL—Of course, when I referred to the shipping end of it, I meant the chartering of ships and everything in connection with the water line. I will give one instance, but I could give many more, wherein there was a certain amount of mismanagement. They have a pier right in front of their mills and that pier has eighteen feet of water alongside at low water so that they could not load or could not discharge a five or six thousand ton cargo boat. And they cannot do it now; they either got to dredge the place or else build out. But what I want to emphasize is the fact that Newfoundlanders are overlooked and not given a chance. I do know that Newfoundlanders can handle those ships from mess room boy up to captain. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to keep this House listening to any unnecessary remarks I may have to make. I just want to bring before the Government certain matters that might be remedied, that is if the Government thing there is any need or occasion of a remedy or not. In the meantime I should like to refer to one or two other subjects. With reference to the paragraph in the Speech from the Throne as to the need of repairs to the Dry Dock. I can assure the Government and the people of St. John's that repairs to the Dry Dock are very badly needed. I will go further than that and say that I think that the Dock has been in grave need of repairs for some time past. I want to throw out a warning to those in authority that there is likely to be a serious accident at that Dry Dock in time. Four years ago on the south side of the Dock inside the gate I saw the ground moving up and down in the harbor when there was a slight swell. Three years ago I saw the same thing, due to the sea outside. Now that is a state of affairs that should not exist, and, I presume, things are getting worse there. Sir Michael Cashin quoted me as knowing that things were serious there. Well he was quite right. I did not voice these sentiments myself what I did know. Perhaps I was not inclined to speak then as I am now; but, at the same time, I thought it my duty to speak to people in authority about it. That Dry Dock is in need of urgent repairs and in order to prevent a serious accident from occurring the Government should take steps towards effecting immediate repairs, whatever

the cost financially. Personally, I am of the opinion that the Dry Dock should never have been put where it is and endorsing this opinion there is a letter in to-day's Telegram with reference to the Dry Dock. Nearly every place in the world that I visited where there is a small harbor their sole aim and object was to make accommodation for shipping and make the harbor large because as trade increases of course more harbor accommodation is needed; but here we fill up our harbor and make it smaller. If all that space above the Long Bridge had not been filled in, there would be an area about one-fifth the size of St. John's harbor available. I just cite this to show that we have been adopting a very peculiar policy regarding our harbor facilities. In my opinion, I repeat, the Dry Dock should never have been where it is. At any rate, I would like to put myself on record as saying that if something is not done very soon as regards repairs to the Dry Dock, the results might be more serious than can be imagined.

Another subject I would like to refer to is what is known as the Labrador Boundary. This has, perhaps, been ably debated by former speakers; but I want to say that I do not agree with the member for Fogo when he advises getting rid of the Labrador at a price, because, in my opinion, we do not know what we have there, and, not only that, but you do not know the coastline. There is not a man alive who knows the coast line exactly. There has never been a proper survey made, not a regular survey. There may have been something done by the Canadian Government in the way of sending a party of men down there off and on; but there has never been any geological survey or any marine survery made by any living man. Even the headlands are not properly charted. Hamilton Inlet is not properly charted. Take a map of the Labrador and take a position north of Blanc Sablon. It is said we own the land east of a line drawn from that to Cape Chidley, but if we do not know the coastline we do not know whether the territory is on water or on land. A line drawn to Cape Chidley bisects the coast and what is not generally known Cape Chidley is on an island. And not only that, but Port Burwell is also on an Island and there are two Straits inside of it. Now I take it that there is little known by the ordinary Newfoundlander here about these Straits. But if these outlying Islands are belonging to Newfoundland, the Canadian Government has been making a mistake in collecting revenues at Port Burwell. I cannot see how we can discuss something we know nothing about. How can we discuss a subject we have no data upon? We might say that we own the hinterland, or water shed, but we even do not know where that is when we have never had a survey made. This I do know, because I have seen it myself, that we have a valuable possession there and I do not think it should be sold for any small amount of money. I know that there is considerable mineral land along the coast and the most of us know that there is a vast quantity of timber lands on the Southern part of the coast, but neither this Government or any former Government of Newfoundland can give scarcely an approximate estimate of how much of these resources we have there, because, as I have already pointed out, it has never been properly surveyed. Whatever information has been obtained was probably got from people who were there on private expeditions, but there has never been any one sent there by the Newfoundland Government as far as I know.

I would next like to refer briefly to the Redistribution Bill about to be introduced in the House.

As most of the Government members know, there is quite a population on Labrador. I believe they claim allegi-

ance to the British Crown and are supposed to be under the Newfoundland Government. They have never been represented in the House of Assembly or in the making of laws pertaining to their own welfare. As to the matter of population they have from four thousand to five thousand people at least, and they should have representation. They have never had it, and as this Redistribution Bill is about to be brought before the House, I think that some regard, in the ways of discussing it anyway, should be given to the welfare of these people to see that they are properly represented. I think that it would be a step in the right direction. In the Speech from the Throne it is stated that the finances of the Colony are in a highly satisfactory condition. There is a surplus of revenue over expenditure. It is well known that I am not a financier. I know very little about finance. But I hold that no matter whether it is a colony or a country or an individual, the finance of that colony, country or individual is not in a wholly satisfactory condition when they have to borrow money. Mr. Hibbs, the hon. member for Fogo, in speaking on the Labrador question made reference to the conditions that existed there one hundred years ago. And as they will exist in a hundred years' time, I think that we should be concerned not only with the immediate present but we should be concerned with what is going to happen in the future not only to ourselves while we are alive, but as to what kind of legacy we are handing down to our children. That's what we have to consider here. We have to find interest on a public debt amounting from three to four million dollars. We are still increasing it. I don't say that the finances of the country are in a very highly satisfactory condition while that state of affairs exists. Every man, woman and child in this country has to find thirteen or fourteen dollars a year to pay the interest on the public debt. I question whether it is right, legally or morally, to hand down to our children in the future a big debt that they have to liquidate. If we don't want to bring about insolvency, what is going to happen? What is going to be the result? Where is it to end? And it is going to end somewhere, even though we may not be here. But some day we will have to foot the bill. I would like to say a word or two about the present. I asked a question here during the Summer session, in July, about coal bought for the Newfoundland Railway. After receiving a reply to my question I had no time to speak on the subject in the House. I would like to say a word in regard to that now, if I will be given permission to refer to this for a little while. I heard the Hon. Minister of Justice make a speech in which he said that in 1923 the Government could have saved 70,000 dollars on coal bought for the railway. Well, now, that may be right. Somewhat of a reflection on the management of the railway at that time perhaps. It is a reflection on how the corporation known as the Besco has exploited this country. Now I question whether the saving could be as great as 70,000 dollars, but possibly it could. I know that that year the people of Corner Brook bought coal much cheaper than the Newfoundland Railway bought it. But in connection with the Besco Company I would like to make a suggestion. As a matter of fact, talking over some subjects, no longer ago than this forenoon, in connection with the affairs on Bell Island, I think that a good scheme would be to have an investigation and find out what capital has been invested on Bell Island. Find out what is the cost to operate. Find out what is the interest on their money and find out how the industry on Bell Island stands as a going concern aside from anything else. Then

we would see if we could not demand a decent wage for the men. The Besco Company has, I believe, not only exploited this country in the matter of coal in the interests of Bell Island but also have been trying it with their own mines at Cape Breton. But as far as the Bell Island industry is concerned we should take stock of what is being done there and I believe that the result would be very apparent if there was an investigation with regard to the Bell Island industry and our mining interest there. We could then know very well if they could afford to pay a decent wage to the miners, or if they had been exploiting the miners, or if the miners had not been treated fair.

In the matter of the redistribution to be introduced I would like to add a word. I think it is not what was expected from the Government, it is not in accordance with their professions to increase the membership of the House of Assembly to 40 members. I understand that there will be some districts that will have two members each. And now the question arises, and of course it has arisen, I understand, with regard to the denominational side of it. Personally I have not much use for denominationalism, but it has to be taken into consideration perhaps. But why not have all the districts represented by a single individual? Why have some districts with two men? In other parts of the world, I understand in Great Britain, they have four or five men representing as many people as the whole population of this country. Could not one man represent a district if you are going to consider the cost? It does not speak for economy when they purpose to increase the membership of the House. There are also one or two other subjects in the Speech from the Throne that I would like to refer to, but perhaps before the session closes I may have a chance to debate on some of the subjects in connection with the billls to be brought before the House. I trust anyway that, as forecasted, the coming session will be one that willl be beneficial to the country at large and the fishermen in particular. I am not much in accord with this idea of encouraging tourist traffic. I fail to see it, as a matter of fact. It may be that it is all right, but I can't say. I think that a portion of the money that it is proposed to spend in connection with the tourist traffic would be much better spent if spent on the fishermen. The fisheries is, of course, the principal industry, and it is going to remain that for a long time. I don't see that there is any chance of any big development that is going to oust it out of its premier place, and I think that it should be given the first consideration, and that you should do something towards its encouragement. I think that our men should be more encouraged to go to the fisheries. I think that the coming season is going to be a very busy one, but similar to the wheat situation in Canada, the beginning of the season opens when you don't know your harvest, we don't know our catch. As far as the fishery is concerned it is going to be a very difficult year. Anyway I trust, sir, that what has been prophesied with regard to the tourist policy will come true. Before I close I would like to say that, in my opinion, the clean up, keep clean, and a square deal for all policy has not been adhered to by the Government—not as much as we were led to expect. Still there is some cleaning up to be done. I think there is some cleaning up being left over. We have a case where it is reported by the Auditor General that from one to two hundred thousand dollars had been misused and misappropriated in the course of a couple of years. So far we have not heard where that money went. Now I think that if the Government wanted to follow out their slogan with which they went before the country last year, it is

about time that they made some move in the matter of the Controller's Department. There are a lot of people in this country looking and wondering why. In conclusion, anyway, I want to say that the coming season will be one that we will be able to congratulate ourselves on and that the good times forecasted in the Speech from the Throne will become an accomplished fact.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, as it is about quarter past six, and as I would like to have an opportunity to speak to the Address in Reply before the adoption, I would suggest that we discontinue the Address in Reply and go on with the Orders of the Day.

It was ordered accordingly.

Second reading of the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the Seal Fishery during the present year."

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES:—Mr. Speaker, this Bill is in reference to the Seal Fishery of the country. During the last four or five years under executive authority the law has been laid aside, and it is the intention of the Government, this year, to allow the sealing ships to sail on the fifth of March and this is the matter which is contained in this Bill. According to the law on the Statute Book the ships cannot sail until the thirteenth of March and it is not allowed to kill seals after the twentieth of April. During the last few years we have been allowed to kill any time and as long as we wish, and it is the intention of the Government, this year, to make the law so that the killing of the seals can go on as long as the provisions last or longer if anybody wants to. It is intended to make it lawful for the ships to sail on the fifth of March and also to make it lawful for ships to kill after the twentieth of April. I have very much pleasure in introducing this Bill.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the Seal Fishery during the Present Year" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Second reading of the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the Lobster Fishery."

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker, it is the intention of this Bill that the Lobster Fishery should be closed for the next three years. During the debate on the Speech from the Throne some of the members on the opposite side of the House made reference to the fact that it was the intention of the Government to make a close season for the Lobster fishing for the next three years. One gentleman, in his speech, I think that it was the member for St. Barbe, said that the people of his district were very much against having this close season imposed. He said that it was not from the merchants of the district that the complaints were coming but from the fishermen themselves. Now it is a strange incident that the Fishery Board has not received one solitary word from any person in the district of St. Barbe with the exception of the firm of Abbott and Haliburton. These are the only people with whom the Fishery Board has had any communication whatever in connection with the Lobster Fishery. As a member of the Fishery Board I may say that during the last four months we have had hundreds of applications from all over the country crying to us that we close down the lobstering for at least three years and in many instances they ask for the period to be made five years. After taking the facts into consideration the Fishery Board has decided to ask the Legislature of the Colony to close the Lobster Fishery the next three years. As far as the district which I represent is concerned

the Lobster Fishery is a thing of the past, and has been for the last five or six years. I can remember when I have seen from seven to eight thousand cases of lobsters packed right before my own two eyes. Now there are two or three so called fishermen who stayed home from the Labrador and they started to pack lobsters and I may say that they never packed enough lobsters to pay for their molasses bill. The same thing has occurred practically all over the Island. I have been told and the Fishery Board has been told that when some of the merchants of the West Coast have supplied for the Lobster Fishery they do not get enough to pay for the cases. We have also had letters from foreign countries complaining against the way the lobsters have been packed; not so much about the way the lobsters have been packed as about the small lobsters which the cases contain. The lobsters are very scarce and those that are caught are very small. Therefore from the correspondence that the Fishery Board has received during the past five months from the men interested in the Lobster Fishery of this Colony, I as Minister of Marine and Fisheries and also as a member of the Fisheries Board, think it my duty and the duty of this House to see to it that this one time great industry should be protected. We have been told that this step would cause undue harm and hardship to the fishermen of this country because they have made preparation for the next years fishing. For the information of this House I may say that I, myself, as early as the month of July notified the men of this country engaged in the Lobster fishery that there would probable be a close season for three years. I do not believe for a moment that in the month of July men were making preparation for the Lobster Fishery for the coming year. If they were they are very few Any how, the action which we are about to take and which should have been taken before, must be taken now or otherwise the industry will be destroyed and the Lobster become extinct altogether. That is the only hope for it. If it is the case that some on the West Coast will suffer I may say that the Government of the Country has something else in mind at the present time which I believe will be a help to them. We have on this side of the House a member representing a portion of the West Coast and I feel sure that his district will come in for as much hardship under the enactment of this Bill as any other part of the country, but if the Government is to listen to every thing that is said, or objected to, then nothing will be done. But I claim, Mr. Speaker, that this Lobster Bill has not been brought into this House a bit too early. Surely, at this time when they are clamoring for more men to go to the fishery and it has been proven this year that we have not got fish enough to supply the markets; surely it is a good time to close down the Lobster Fishery and give it a chance to build up again. We have heard in this House what is going to happen to the fishery for next year. We heard what was going to happen in the spring of the year. We heard last year. We heard the statement in the spring of the year that it was not possible for shore fish to go more than $7.50 What did happen? It went as high as ten dollars and I have no doubt that in some cases it went to fourteen. The same thing happens now. They paint everything as black as possible. We are printing in our newspapers to-day, and we will print to-morrow as the case may be that there is going to be a large catch of fish this year, and that the price will be low. And those newspapers are broadcasted all over the world, and therefore they get to the markets where we sell our fish. I think that that sort of thing should cease. There

is nothing more detrimental to the fishery in this colony than the newspapers. They all come out and say that we are going to have a big fishery and that the price will be low.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that this Bill got a great deal of concentration and consideration by the Fishery Board before it was brought here. I may say that the Fishery Board to-day consists of what it has never consisted of before. Ninety per cent. of that Board consists of outharbourmen and fishermen of this Colony. I have been charged as Chairman of the Fishery Board that all the members of the Board are Merchants. I am proud to say to-day that it has a majority of outharbourmen, and therefore it will interest itself in the fishery of this country. And it will interest itself in the codfishery, and it has interested itself in it, and I hope and pray that this Bill will go through during this session of the Legislature, because I feel sure that we can take care of the few men that have been lobster fishing during the season; and I have no doubt that next fall these very few men that are making an outcry about the closing down of the Lobster Fishery will only be too glad to acknowledge that it was the best possible thing to do under the circumstances.

Further debate on this Bill was postponed until to-morrow.

Mr. Ashbourne gave notice of question.

Mr. Scammell 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 at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, Feb. 25, 1925.

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

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Dodd Cove, St. Brendan's and other places in that locality asking that a public wharf be built in that place. I may say that the petition has my hearty support.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from certain electors of Winterton, Trinity District, asking for a grant of two thousand dollars to build or start to build a public wharf. This petition or letter that I have here was sent to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who courteously passed it along to me for presentation. The necessity for a public wharf at Winterton is pressing, otherwise the petitioners would not have taken the trouble to ask for an allocation of two thousand dollars. I may say in presenting this petition that the people of Winterton are very industrious and from my own knowledge of that district I know that the inhabitants of Winterton are as independent and as trustworthy as are to be found in any part of the Island, and that is one of the reasons why I heartily support the prayer of the petition. I now ask that the petition be referred back to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for his consideration.

MR. GODDEN—Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the prayer of the petition. Public facilities are entirely inadequate at Winterton in the best interests of the fishing industry. I know that because I was there last Spring. I give my wholehearted support to the petition.

MR. RANDELL—Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my support to the petition just presented by my colleague. I think Winterton deserves as much or more recognition than any other place in Trinity district, and I think the Government would do well to give the petition their sympathetic

consideration. I beg to support the prayer of the petition.

MR. POWER—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the people of Codroy asking for a breakwater there. I ask that the petition be referred to the Engineer's Department, as this work was undertaken by that Department some two years ago.

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 15, George V. Chapter XX, entitled 'An Act for the Raising of a Sum of Money on the Credit of the Colony for Certain Public Purposes,'" without amendment.

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES presented the Reports of his Department 1923-24.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY —Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay upon the table of the House a reply to question of Mr. Warren No. 3 on Order Paper of February 24th:

1. Number of families in St. John's who are being relieved at public expense per week.

1274.

2. Amount being paid to individuals and families.

Individuals, $5.00 per week. Families first relief order, $10.00. Following orders, $10.00, $8.00 and $6.00 according to size of family.

3. Total amount paid from January 1st, 1925, to February 14, 1925.

$7,178.67.

4. If any investigation of the circumstances of applicants is made before they receive relief.

Yes.

5. What is the nature of such investigation.

Upon the registration of the applicant for relief, an Investigating Officer is sent to the address given, for the purpose of making enquiry into the condition of the family. It is upon the report of such Officer that relief is either granted or refused.

6. What steps are being taken to relieve destitution in other Districts.

Outside of the regular plan which consists of each Relieving Officer in his particular section investigating, and reporting any application to the Commissioner of Public Charities, who instructs him what to do, no general plan has been inaugurated to assist Outport cases of destitution.

7. Respecting total amount spent in Abe-bodied poor relief by Districts from January 1st, 1925, to February 14th, 1925.

Up to date no statements have been received for relief issued in the Outports during the said period.

Mr. Warren, Mr. Brown, Mr. Hickman, Mr. Scammell, Mr. Duff and Mr. Hibbs gave notice of questions.

MR. HICKMAN—To ask the Hon. the Prime Minister to lay upon the table of the House all correspondence between the Government and the Imperial Government in reference to the construction of the new steamer in Holland.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Question one and the second question asked by Mr. Randell appear to be more or less on the same lines, and there is a tremendous lot of correspondence to be copied before we can answer the questions thoroughly, so I propose, with the permission of the Leader of the Opposition, to let the two questions stand over until tomorrow when we hope to have all the correspondence copied.

MR. HICKMAN—That is quite satisfactory.

MR. SCAMMELL—To ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing all marine grants sent out to the District of St. Barbe since

April 30th last (1924) and parties to whom such grants were sent in each case.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I beg to table the information.

MR. DUFF—To ask Hon. Colonial Secretary the reason for the dismissal of Mr. William Guy from the management of Carbonear Water Company, and submit all correspondence relative to same.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Reply to Question of Mr. Duff, No. 5, on Order Paper of date February 25th, 1925.

In 1920, after the Squires Government returned to power, they retired the Manager and Secretary of the Carbonear Water Company, and appointed Mr. W. T. Guy to the said position. When the present Government came into power, they received a requisition (copy of which is attached), asking that Mr. G. H. Soper be appointed as Manager and Secretary of the said Company in place of Mr. Guy. This requisition was acted upon, and the appointment of Mr. Soper was made in due course.

Carbonear, July 4th, 1924.

Hon. J. R. Bennett,
Colonial Secretary,
St. John's.

Dear Sir,—I hereby make application to be appointed "Superintendent of the Carbonear Water Co."

With the approval of the undersigned members of Mr. John Rorke's Committee.

With the confidence that my request will be granted.

I remain, yours truly,
(Sgd.) G. H. SOPER,

Signed: Messrs W. & J. Moores, per S. W. Moores, Edward P. Goff, James Moore.

The reply to the questions No. 5 was tabled.

MR. HIBBS—To ask Hon. the Colonial Secretary to lay on the Table of the House: (1) the total cost of rails and plates, etc., recently purchased for the Newfoundland Government Railway; (2) the price paid per ton; (3) the name of the firm from which the rails and plates, etc., were purchased.

THE HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY replied as follows:

(1) Total cost of rails and plates, etc., recently purchased for the Newfoundland Govt. Railway; approximately $670,000.00.

(2) Prices paid per ton:

Rails and angle bars	8 guineas
Nuts and bolts	£20. 11. 6d.
Track spikes	20. 1. 6d.

All C.I.F. St. John's.

(3) Name of firm from which rails, plates, etc., were purchased—Barrow Mematite Co., London.

MR. HICKMAN—To ask the Hon. the Prime Minister to lay upon the Table of the House the report of the Government Director of the Newfoundland Power and Paper Co., Ltd.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—In reply to that question, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Foote is the Director of the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company. He was appointed by a past Government. He did not make any report before and did not know that he was called upon to make any report. He suggests that if there is any particular information that is required he will have it prepared and give it. But he has not prepared any general report.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Has he made any verbal reports to the Government?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Occasionally, on certain points.

THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Speaker, I beg to table the following replies, answer to question No. 13 of the Order Paper of Feb. 25th, answer to question No. 1 of the Order Paper of Feb. 24th, also answer to question No. 2 of the Order Paper of Feb. 24th.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, with

your permission I would like to refer to the questions No. 10 and 11 of the Order Paper of Feb. 24. One of these questions refers to the District of Trinity and I cannot see the reason why that should not be forthcoming as the amounts of the monies have not been so very great. Another is in connection with the district of Bonavista. I would think that these two questions would take precedence to any others as they are the first on the Order Paper.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—In reply I may say that all these answers are ready but for the fact that we have to wait for some returns from these two districts. I have sent letters asking that these returns be sent on, and as soon as these have arrived I will table the answers.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, after the very many excellent speeches that have been delivered by the members of the Opopsition who have been speaking to the Address in Reply, it will be conceded by all who have had an opportunity to hear those speeches that there is little left for me to say on the question which is now before the House. But as a member of His Majesty's Loyal Opposition, it devolves upon me to make a few remarks in connection with the Speech delivered by His Excellency on the opening day.

It may be in order for me to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Address in Reply. We have already heard some very congratulatory remarks from the previous speakers and it is not more than we should expect from two such learned and honourable gentlemen. In the course of my remarks this afternoon I have only one or two things to say to the hon. gentlemen in connection with the Speech, on the policy of the Government. It may not be ungracious on my part to congratulate the Prime Minister and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, on the confirmation of their election in the District of Bonavista. In the game of politics, as on the field of sport, it is only in order to congratulate the winners. But I am reminded of a remark that the Prime Minister made very wittingly, at the opening of the session. It was about the occasion of Lady Astor's first appearance in the British House of Commons; when she was shaking hands with Mr. Carson she asked him if this was an ordinary shake hands or a shake hands of welcome. He replied, "It is an ordinary shake hands for I hate to see you here." And like Mr. Carson, I say that my congratulations are very ordinary congratulations. I would not follow up and say that I hate to see you here, but I would very much like to see some person else in your place; that is, of course, if I were with him on the other side of the House.

To refer to the Speech, I may say that it is a very lengthy document, with very little substance. It consists of words and verbiage, and I do not know that we can compliment the composer on its phrasing. When the Speaker was reading the Speech to the House, he very aptly put in some words and deleted others, to make it more intelligible.

We are to-day living under better conditions than existed eighteen months ago. In nearly all other parts of the civilized world conditions were not very good as a result of the Great War. But to-day, fortunately, Newfoundland in common with other parts of the world, is in a better condition. The employment situation in the country as a whole, for the last six months is better than it has been for some years. The fishery gave very good results for those who were fortunate enough to have caught a fair, or large quantity of fish. There is one part of the Speech from the

Throne which requires an explanation; it is as follows: "Those engaged in the staple industry of the country reaped a reward which renewed their faith and interest in it." Now that is a statement that needs explanation or modification. Those who were fortunate enough to get a catch of fish did fairly well during the year, but not all those who engaged in the fishery. The unsuccessful fisherman reaped no reward.

If the people of the District of Trinity were depending solely on the codfishery last year for their support, the conditions there would be much worse than they were in the years 1922-1923. Strange to say, the fishery in Trinity District during the last three or four years has been practically a blank, with the exception of Heart's Delight, Whiteway, Dildo, New Harbor, and one or two other places in the bottom of the Bay, where there was more fish caught last year than has been caught for some time previous.

In practically the whole of the rest of the District, the fishery was a blank. But the people in that district are better off this year than they have been for the last two or three years, and the reason for that is, they were not dependent on the fishery. Seventy-five per cent. of the men in that district had employment other than the fishery. They were at Deer Lake, Corner Brook, or some other place in connection with the Humber industry; some were at Grand Falls, others in Canada or the United States.

We all know that the reason for the better times is because of the inland industries which were instituted and brought into being by the outgoing Government. The present Government, I hope, are honest enough to say that they did not take any part in making the conditions that obtain to-day, better than those that obtained two or three years ago. They did not do anything. They did not start anything. They simply sat tight and collected the taxes, and therefore they have to give the credit to the Squires and Warren administrations for the prosperity that now exists in this country. I know they will all admit that. Possibly there is an excuse for the Government's inactivities in this respect, but for the idea to be broadcasted throughout the country that a change of Government brought about better conditions is dishonest, when we know that they had nothing more to do with it than the inhabitants of the planet Mars.

The people of this country—the thinking people of this country, the politicians, especially those who had anything to do with the administration of affairs during the last three or four years, knew that as soon as the tide turned there would be an increase of revenue; that there would be a greater revenue, and, therefore, a larger amount of money to spend. I know the matter was spoken of in Council many times. We knew that if we could get over that bad period, and keep our independence as a self-governing Dominion, we would have much greater revenues when times got better. That would as surely follow as darkness follows light. People were living on their earnings and savings, and nearly all their savings were exhausted. But people had to eat to live, and according to climatic conditions and the laws of society people have to wear clothes, and have to keep themselves and those dependent on them warm during the cold and rigorous winter months. The earnings of the people increased, as a result of new industries and a better price for fish, and the people had to spend their earnings in dutiable goods. At least seventy-five per cent. of our requirements must be imported, and increased importations mean increased revenue. If there was a surplus of revenue over expenditure.

last year the country is to be congratulated. But referring to the policy of the Government again, it would be dishonest for them to use any propaganda to cause the people to think that any action of the Government brought about any better conditions in this country.

If the party that opposed you at the Polls, in June, 1924, had been elected, conditions would be just the same, and that party could justifiably point to the results of the policy inaugurated by them. The seeds of industrial progress were sown by the outgoing Government, and you and the country are reaping the fruits thereof now. I hope conditions will continue to improve.

To repeat myself—the price for codfish was remunerative to the fishermen during the season that is past, and I do not suppose that there is very much left to be sold by those who catch the fish. What the result will be for the exporter, I do not know, but I hope that it will give him all the returns he expected. But the marketing of codfish is surrounded with a lot of uncertainty, and what the final result will be for the exporter, I do not know.

I am surprised, Mr. Speaker, that there is no more in this Speech from the Throne about the codfishery. The codfishery is our staple industry, and will be, no doubt, for a very long time. It is the industry that our people are accustomed to, and it will be a long time before they will be happy at any other employment, even if it does give them the same returns. They are accustomed to the sea. There is a certain element of adventure about it, that appeals to them. They can work as hard as they like, or if they are inclined, they can loaf as much as they like. There is not the same discipline about it that there is about any other enterprise. The fishermen, to a certain extent, are as free as air. He can go out to the grounds when he like, and he can stay out there as long as he like, and when a fisherman is fortunate in loading his boat from day to day, he does not mind staying up two or three nights at a time, to get his fish under salt, whereas, if he was under a master, who would say, "You have got to do this, you have got to stay up to-night, you have got to work longer hours," he would rebel against it. But being his own master, it is only a pleasure to him, just as a sportsman would go out hunting and tramp all day, and get home to his home to his camp, after night, fatigued. But the sportsman does not mind that —it is pleasure. The same thing applies in the prosecution of the codfishery to some extent. The hardship is when the fishermen does not get any fish. He works just as hard, perhaps harder, looking for fish and getting nothing. Therefore the fishery appeals to our people, and they will be coming back from the woods just as soon as they think there is a chance of earning enough to provide for themselves and their families, and they will be back next Spring in their hundreds, if not in their thousands. It has been remarked that, it is a question as to who is going to look after the thousands of men that will be anxious to prosecute the fishery this year. That is a question that perhaps the Government will be asked to settle.

But outside the ordinary prosecution of the fishery, there is one thing that the fishermen have no control over, and that is the marketing of the fish. They are the producers, they catch the fish and prepare it, then it is somebody else's business to market the fish. Under the system in this country, the exporter arranges for marketing and values, but there is room for improvement in the manner in which the markets are looked after. The producer does not always get satisfactory returns for his labour, and becomes discouraged. If the fishermen see no way of disposing of the fish at

remunerative prices, hundreds of them will leave the fishery, indeed many have already abandoned it because of inadequate returns in the past. The fishermen need encouragement, and the exporting system needs attention, and what are we doing as a Government, a people, or a Board of Trade, to bring about any improvement in the conditions of marketing our staple product? Have we forgotten this all important subject because we have had some differences on the matter, tinged by politics, or because those who were in Opposition a few years ago, have since come into power and are no longer interested. It is indeed a strange view to take, that because during the last season we marketed our catch at a fairly good price, we must now lie on our oars and forget that we ever sold fish at $4.00. It is **not** because we had one fairly good year that we should remain idle. Now is the time when things are prosperous, to make our plans for the future, and not wait till the people are coming up and presenting memorials to the Government. It is admitted by all that our system of marketing is anything but right. And now, Mr. Speaker, cannot we try to remedy this state of affairs, forget our politics and do something to improve the marketing of the catch on which the welfare of the country so largely depends. The Government is in a strong position to-day, and in a sense can ignore the pleas of the Opposition. As a matter of fact it is said, so strong is the Government along Water Street, that you cannot get a merchant to give financial support to a newspaper, unless its policy is to back up the Government or at least remain neutral. You are a merchant's Government and have their support—and why should you not, considering that you have granted them practically everything they asked.

If things go well, as it is true they did to a certain extent last season, we will be able to market our fish at a fairly good price again this year, but the question is, will these favourable conditions last? We have no guarantee whatever that they will. According to all indications we will have a much larger number of men fishing this year than last; with the result that there will be a larger catch, and with the keen competition of our opponents in the markets the question arises, will the prices be maintained? It has been said that because the catch was short last year the price was high; but is it reasonable to suppose that that condition will apply again this season. I am sure that the Hon. the Prime Minister must be thinking of this matter. He is one of our largest exporters, and his interests are in the fisheries. It is true he may have other interests in other industries, but his principal interests are in the fisheries, and it is needless for me to question his anxiety as to the success of the fisheries.

The fisheries are, and will ever remain, the principal industry of our people, and every effort should be made to improve the marketing conditions of the catch.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot about tourist traffic and the building of roads, which matters are all right in their way, but we can never get anything to replace the fisheries in this country. We are now dealing with the staple industry of the colony and I have in my possession certain resolutions which were presented, in 1922, to the Government of that day, by a Society known as the United Fishermen. The representatives of that body I remember, asked for a conference with the Government, which was gladly given them, and it is no secret that the honourable gentleman who advised them on that occasion, was the Hon. Mr. Morine, who attended the conference with them, presented their case, and drew up the resolutions. But nothing whatever has been done since to improve the

marketing conditions of our fish.

The reason why I refer to the Hon. Mr. Morine is because he is a member of the Legislative Council and prominent in all the affairs of the Government, and the Hon. the Prime Minister is credited with saying during the bye-election in Bonavista Bay that he took him into his Government because he was a man of brains. I am sure that nobody will question that he is a man of brains; but rightly or wrongly, it has been said that the result of this brainy man's activities have not always been in the best interests of this country, and that is the reason why fault is found with him. I am not referring to Hon. Mr. Morine in a personal way, Mr. Speaker, but considering that he is the brains of the Government, is it possible that he has undergone a change of heart, or is it that the difference in his position, he now being a member of the Executive Government, while in 1922 he was on the outside, has caused him to alter his opinion on fishery matters. Perhaps he is too busy wielding the poliitcal axe, dismissing honest, efficient civil servants to find positions for political heelers, especially the leaders of the United Fishermen movement, that the fishery policy of 1922 is forgotten. Times are better just now and we will bring in something else to take the attention of the people and they will forget that we ever had anything to do with the United Fishermen, or any movement to bring about a better marketing of our fish. Mr. Speaker, it would be worth while for this House to spend many hours in the consideration of this question. There are many things in the Speech that are put there merely to camouflage, and perhaps the Speech is not entirely indicative of the Government's attitude towards the matter of the fisheries. There are certainly other important matters not referred to, which, I presume, they will deal with later, and one of these must surely be the fisheries. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I take the liberty to refer to the Hon. Mr. Morine's activities on the fisheries in 1922, and repeat that since then nothing whatever has been done to improve the marketing. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will quote from the petition referred to, and presented by the United Fishermen, Nov., 1922, and the House I submit could not do better than consider it. The United Fishermen were apparently sincere in applying to the Government of that day and the Hon. Mr. Morine might have been the same. But recent happenings may cause one to doubt the sincerity of the United Fishermen, as well as the motives of the man, or men, who took a leading part in that movement.

Quotes petition.

Mr. Speaker, I shall be only too glad to pass that petition over to the Prime Minister, it contains some good points while others may be discarded. Now is the time for something to be done while you are in a strong position. The man who drew up this petition is now at your service; get busy and do something before the House closes. This is an outstanding question which should not be considered from a political standpoint, and you should be broadminded enough to take advice from the excellent speeches made on this question from this side of the House. We should forget the past and be willing to consider, not only consider, but accept, any proposals put forward which would bring about the conditions desired by every person of mature age with regard to our national industry. I offer no apology for taking up the time I have on this question. We were told by some of the best fishermen of this country, those living on the north side of Bonavista Bay, men who prosecuted the fisheries on the Labrador, that unless taxa-

tion was lightened, unless expenditure was reduced, they would not be able to prosecute the fishery. They returned during that season with comparatively large voyages but they could not make two ends meet, and they were considering leaving the country if the Government did not do something to lighten the burden of taxation. They admitted that taxation could not be reduced unless expenditure was reduced correspondingly. During the Squires and Warren administrations, the estimates showed a reduced expenditure of two million dollars. The United Fishermen told us that expenditure should be cut in half, and referred to useless and overpaid officials, there were too many steamers, receiving large subsidies. The steamer should be taken off Bonavista Bay; there was no need of a steamer on northern Labrador. They were speaking of expenditure on current account, not on relief. What has the Government they helped to elect done to cut ordinary expenditure in half? Absolutely nothing. There is no protest from the leaders of the United Fishermen now. Seventy-five per cent. of them are stowed away in Government jobs. Now I do not intend to speak on finance this evening, there will be time enough for that when we get to the Budget, but I may be excused for offering a remark on the expenditure of this year. I am told that there is going to be a surplus revenue over expenditure, there will be reduction of expenditure of three quarters of a million dollars. I am anxious to get the public accounts to find out in what way the lessening of expenditure has taken place. The votes for public institutions, I presume, are about the same as last year. The repairs for public institutions, I presume, are about the same. With regard to the administration of Government departments I cannot see how it is possible to have less expenditure, when we consider the number of officials and the salaries paid the officials this year compared with last year. As regards expenditure, I venture to say that when the accounts are tabled, the only saving will be in the amount spent for relief. It is unreasonable to suppose that the Government would be called upon to spend as much money on relief as last year when we had seven thousand people, the most of whom were out of employment the year previous, earning on a low average two dollars a day at the Humber. That would be about fourteen thousand dollars a day multiplied by the number of working days in a year, say three hundred, gives in wages alone five million two hundred thousand dollars. Without this industry conditions in this country would be far worse than during the year 1923. This applies particularly to Trinity District, where the fishery was the worst on record. Still the people are better off than they have been since 1921. The conditions that obtain in St. John's where you have over twelve hundred families kept alive on the dole system on an average of ten dollars each per week, or about $50,000 per month. Where would your saving in expenditure come in if the people of the outports had to be helped at the same rate per capita, which condition would certainly exist if we had no Humber Industry. You have adopted the dole system, which is demoralizing, but it is the easiest way to give out money, and get no returns. There are people in Trinity District who could not go to the Humber, some of them were at the fishery, others through age and sickness had to remain at home, these people in some cases have to beg from door to door for a bit to eat. Your Relieving Officers can do nothing for them, while here in St. John's you are spending at the rate of half a million dollars per year. You have a Commission of Enquiry on Hospitals and Public

Charities, consisting of the Prime Minister, the Colonial Secretary and Hon. A. B. Morine, with two secretaries and a typist, which is a pure waste of money. The Prime Minister said in reply to a question as to when this Commission will report, that they may not be in a position to report for six months. Then I presume the Commission will present their bills for payment, and two respectable but needy men and a typist will have a job for 8 or 10 months. People had to be kept alive during the years 1922 and 1923. No person would give credit. All avenues of employment were closed. Some people got money who could get along without it, you are sure to have impositions. You have them now in connection with your dole system in the city. The applicants are right under your eyes and an army of officials and policemen to enquire into the circumstances of each individual. Do not waste any more money on Enquiries, you will never collect money that has been improperly spent. See that these Intittutions are properly managed now. Institute a better system, if you can, and enforce your rules and regulations; but do not waste time and money over what cannot be remedied. How have you kept your pre-election promises, re a square deal to all? I will mention one or two instances out of the many to show that your activities are anything but square. Why did you dismiss honest, efficient officials and put in their places many unfitted in every way for the positions. Take the change of crews on the Malakoff, why was the mate of the Malakoff put on the street the first of September? I refer to Mr. George Howell of Catalina, a man who had been in the service on Trinity and Bonavista Bays for 16 or 17 years, and had been from before the mast to Captain on the bridge for some time when Capt. Day was sick. Even poor old Capt. Day had to walk the plank.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Howell was a political partizan.

MR. HALFYARD:—I do not believe that Mr. Howell took any part in politics I do not know whether he voted for me or not. But the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has given the reason why Mr. Howell was dismissed. Some person told the Minister, or the Prime Minister, that Howell voted for Halfyard, and without taking the trouble to find out whether it was true or not, this man was penalized, because the majority of the electors in Trinity District voted for me and my colleagues. This is what we get from the Square Deal Party.

You are making every steamer in the Costal Service under Government Control a dumping ground for political heelers; suitability or efficiency does not count. The Wren was lost. The Malakoff was put on the rocks. The Prospero just escaped being a total wreck, and the whole chapter of accidents might possibly not have happened, if the captains and crews of these steamers had not been interfered with. I would be shirking my duty as a representative of Trinity District, if I did not speak of the injustice to Mr. Howell. It is a crying shame, and a disgrace to any Government. The people of Trinity District individually and collectively, were penalized for political reasons. It was bad enough to dismiss the crew because they belonged to Trinity District, but to take the Malakoff off Trinity Bay without giving any substitute service, was most outrageous treatment. Bonavista and Trinity Bays were being served by the Malakoff by a weekly trip, which was as much as the finances of the country could afford, and the people were satisfied. Bonavista Bay on the north side was being well served by every steamer sailing north from St. John's.

Splendid Motor ferry services linked up the other parts of the Bay with the Railway and the Malakoff. By having one boat do both Bays we saved thirty or thirty-five thousand dollars, and both districts received similar treatment. Trinity District during the past few months with regard to transportation services and money to meet pressing requirements, has been completely ignored, while steamers are chasing each other around in Bona vista District, and money in galore for Marine Works and Roads and Bridges have been distributed in every nook and corner of the District. And this is a Square Deal. Before this House closes we shall find out what the Malakoff cost this country last year, compared with the year previous. The Minister of Posts and Telegraphs came in here last year and told us all that was being saved on steam subsidies. The steamers would be taken off Bay of Islands, the Wren off Fortune Bay, and there would be no steamer on Northern Labrador, and there would be a saving of about $125,000. What happened? Ten days after the Minister made that statement, the Wren was sent to Labrador, and a little later Bay of Islands and Fortune District had steam services, and we shall find when the accounts are tabled, if I am not much mistaken, that steam subsidies this year are just as great as last year.

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries had visions of great numbers of schooners on Northern Labrador, and he decided to send the Wren, and of course they had to get a good captain, Captain George Barbour, for political reasons was put in the discard, his experience did not count, and when it came to choosing a captain, blood was thicker than water, and he got a captain to go down. That captain, like many other good men, had an accident, and then another steamer had to go down. I cannot see where there was any saving to the revenue. All that the Government has done, has been done under pressure. Did the Government think that the honourable member for Fortune was going to tolerate your proposition, or your actions, wtihout protest? You had to fall in line with his propositions, because you saw the wisdom of them.

(MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES:—We did not fall in line with his propositions.)

MR. HALFYARD:—The Minister of Marine and Fisheries just bears out what we all know and you would not take a proposition coming from this side of the House, because you are afflicted with the germ of partisanship. I thought that the Prime Minister was going to inject something into the political systems of his followers that would kill that germ; but instead of that he is encouraging its propagation, and it is increasing. It has taken full control of every action of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and of the Government, and almost every utterance of every responsible Minister of the Crown. Where are we and whither tending?

I was speaking of expenditure, and I was dealing wth the policy of the Government. It is a very important question. It vitally effects every man, woman and child in this country, because if we cannot reduce expenditure, if we cannot carry on the public service at less cost, the burden of taxation will bear just as heavily during the coming year on the shoulders of the taxpayers as it has borne in the past. It is a regrettable condition of affairs, but as the honourable member for Fortune District pointed out in the House last year, there are certain services that we are under an obligation to have performed, and Fortune Bay must have some kind of transportation services. Fortune Bay has been shown up in the public press as an example of the little amount of money that has been spent for medical services during the past year. Why?

Are the people of Fortune District not subject to the same ills that the people of other parts of the country are subject to? Are there any ills that affect the people near St. John's that do not affect the people of Fortune Bay? No! The difference is that these people are out of communication with doctors and nurses, and they live and suffer and die And that is the reason that the expenditure has been so small. It is unnecessary on my part to refer to Fortune District so much, when the people in that constituency are so well represented by the able exponent of their cause, the honourable Mr. Warren. I apologize to Mr. Warren for referring to the matter at all. But the conditions have shown that the Government made a mistake in taking the Wren off Fortune Bay. Your action was inexcusable. Transportation services in certain sections of this country must be maintained, just as you maintain lighthouses. You say you have to maintain the railway. You must, but you must also maintain certain steamer services in some places in this country. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take advantage of this opportunity to tell something else to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I tell it to him in his public capacity, and not at all in his personal capacity. It affects the District of Trinity to such an extent that it must appeal to the Hon. the Prime Minister at this time, and I am sure that what I say will be readily accepted by the Ministers of the Crown, including the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. What I have to say is this,—that you made a mistake last year in connection with the arrangements about transportation services in Fortune Bay, and a similar mistake was made in Trinity District.

You must admit that it was a mistake, from every point of view. The Malakoff, I hope, will be put back on Trinity and Bonavista Bays, and thus a lot of money will be saved. Get that done as quickly as possible. Get down to a Square Deal, and see that the members are consulted. I hope that all the members on the other side of the House had the privilege of listening to the speeches of my colleagues Mr. Godden and Capt. Randell. I am proud to have these men as my colleagues. Just for the minute leave Halfyard out of it altogether. He is an old politican. But why have you not consulted my colleagues, Capt. Randell and Mr. Godden? If it has not been necessary to consult these members, why has it been necessary to consult Mr. Mitchell, Mr. King and Dr. Tait? Why have these men been consulted?

Certainly Captain Randell knows something about the district. I do not know that Dr. Tait has interferred in any way with Trinity District, but I know that Mr. Mitchell has, I have been told that the Hon. the Prime Minister persuaded him to manage the affairs of the District. It was forced upon him, I believe. It seems that Halfyard who has the good-will of the majority of the electors and knows the requirements of every part of the District, must be ignored; if anything is to be done let it be through Mr. Mitchell. This is Premier Monroe's idea of a Square Deal. The majority of the people say it is an outrageous deal. From some sections of the district people write to say—the Tories got a few votes down here last spring, but if they came here now they would not get one quarter of the number.

MR. P. H. MOORE—Would you believe that, Mr. Halfyard?

MR. HALFYARD—In the natural order of things, could you believe anything else? You took the steamer off the Bay, turned out competent officials, sent no money to the District to rebuild bridges, and did nothing for friend or foe.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Didn't we put a road down there?

MR. HALFYARD—Yes, Mr. Prime

Minister, we heard something of a road, and this gives me an opportunity to speak of it. It is a sorry story, but true. It was broadcasted last year that a scheme of roadbuilding was to be undertaken, and the people of Trinity Bay South were told that the first work started would be in connection with the road begun by the outgoing Government in their District the previous year. This road began at Old Perlican and went right through to Lead Cove. It was partly built and a large sum of money had been expended as the hon. member for Bay-de-Verde is well aware. The money was voted by the outgoing Government, and the Hon. Mr. Cramm with Mr. Hibbs, who was my colleague at the time, had the allocating of the money. It had been built to within two and three-quarters of a mile of Lead Cove, and the policy was to have a splendid motor road through Sibley's Cove, Whale's Brook, New Chelsea, New Melbourne, Winterton and other points to Heart's Content. The plan as outlined by the Government Engineer, showed that the contour was not exactly what it should be, and that the road should go around certain hills and build a good road to connect with the railway at Heart's Content. That was the compensation for taking the steamer off the Bay. I certainly cannot see how a road would be a substitute for transportation service in that section of the District. The people were told in August you would give them a road, and men from Lead Cove to Green's Harbor were writing me for a job on the road. It is said that some men who were working up country gave up their jobs and came home, thinking that if they were near their property they would have a chance to improve it in the evenings. Men at New Chelsea even hauled up their boats and dug their potatoes two weeks earlier than usual to be prepared for the work on the road for the rest of the Fall. A Government Contractor, who was used to building the Badger, Botwood, and other roads was engaged, and I do not know how much it cost to transport his machinery, horses, drays, tractors, etc., from Grand Falls to the South Side of Trinity Bay. Anyhow the work was started, and about two miles of road built when work ceased a day or two before the bye-election in Bonavista Bay. The men only got about seven or eight days' work, and those who did not stop up country or hauled up their fishing boats were not only sadder but wiser men. That is exactly what happened. To quote Scripture, they asked for bread and you gave them a stone, and metaphorically speaking if they were to exist on what they got they might just as well have had the stone because they did not earn enough on the road to buy the bread let alone the butter to put on it. We are reviewing the history of what you have done during your six months in power. A few days ago I saw a book giving the reasons why the women should not get the vote. When I opened it I discovered all the pages were blank, which was just what they should be—there were no reasons. The Government's record is just the same—it is worse than a blank. Now the Speech from the Throne takes four pages to tell what they will do in the future, and I hope, Mr. Speaker, they will do something.

Fearing that I may not have occasion before the time arirves for the closing of the session to refer to the matters that I would like to touch on this evening in a casual way, I shall take this opportunity to refer to the Income Tax. The Speech from the Throne has this to say about it:

This is rather amusing. Repeal the Income Tax and it is a panacea for all our ills and we will get back to the good old days of comfort. "The good old days of comfort." I do not

know what that means. From remarks in the public press and in this House the repealing of the income tax is regarded as a most popular thing. Well, why is it popular? And with whom is it popular? It is popular with the wealthy and well-to-do classes. Certainly it is, and will be popular no doubt with parties who have shirked their responsibilities, and have not conformed with the Laws of this Colony, and who have evaded the payment of the income tax. But why should the law be repealed because it is difficult to enforce? Evidently the Government is following the line of least resistance. The Leader of the Government in the Upper House is credited with having said a year or two since that the Prohibition Act was a good thing for the country, and to make it effective it required to have some teeth put in it and cause it to function properly. As soon as that hon. gentleman had the opportunity to put his statement into effect, he was one of the first to repeal the Act. We presume this was much easier and apparently much more popular, than to get the machinery installed to put some teeth in the Act. Now we are to have the Income Tax repealed. This is no doubt very popular also, with the well-to-do section of the community, whose annual incomes cause them to pay certain moneys into the treasury. Political economists say, while revenues must be collected by taxation, the income tax is an ideal tax, but deplores the fact that it is very difficult to make collections, or it is too much trouble to bring defaulters to realize that they must obey the stautory laws of the land, and render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's. This Government will therefore give another instance of repealing what is regarded as a just system of taxation. It is too much trouble to put the law into effect. It is unnecessary to elaborate on the justness of the tax, so long as we must have taxation. Under our indirect system of taxation, every person who lives in the country pays into the Treasury, upon the necessaries of life, viz., food and clothing, proportionate taxation on the food consumed and the clothing used, whether the income of that person is much or little. Of course the easiest way to get revenue is to collect the taxes on the imported article before a release is given by the Customs. The merchant, business man, or trader sets the price accordingly for the rich and poor alike. One must eat to live, and according to the rules of society and climatic conditions, one must wear clothes; all members of the community are therefore taxed alike in proportion to the quantities consumed by the individual. Will any person argue that this is a just system of taxation? It is an iniquitious system, when the labourer owing to the increased cost of life's necessities as a result of taxation, not only himself, but the wife and children dependent upon the result of his toil, eke out a miserable existence, badly housed, poorly fed, and half clothed. Then the Government that removes the Income Tax, which applies only to the wealthy and fairly well-to-do, are greeted by the press with laudatory statements. From whom? From men who should be thankful that their earnings are such that they came under the provisions of the Income Tax. I give no credit to the individual who has tried to evade this form of taxation. I happened to get a copy of a weekly city journal last Saturday, and was surprised that there was one paper, at least that had the courage of its convictions and was bold and daring enough to give its opinion on the repeal of the Income Tax. I cannot do better than quote the editor's remarks. I agree with the writer in every particular.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Your own Leader said he thought this Income Tax should have been repealed long ago.

MR. HALFYARD—I am not speaking for my Leader, I am speaking for the man on the street.

MR. BROWNE—I thought Mr. Warren spoke for them.

MR. HALFYARD—Yes, Mr. Warren spoke from one angle a few days ago, I am speaking from another. I have not consulted any one in this House or outside the House on this question. I am dealing with it as it appeals to me; and I cannot see how the Government can take off all forms of taxation that may appear embarrassing to the wealthy and well-to-do, and cannot reduce taxation on those who earn their bread by the sweat of their brows in the fishing boats, in the mines and in the lumber woods.

The Hon. member for Harbour Main, Mr. Cahill, when proposing the motion for an Address in Reply to his Excellency's Speech, said that the Government had kept its promise, for a "Clean up keep clean and a square deal to all" to the very jot and tittle. That is the spirit and letter of the slogan had been rigidly adhered to. In the face of what the Government has actually practised, it is difficult to perceive how the honourable member could be guilty of making such a statement, so contrary to what has really taken place. It was understood by the electorate that the cleaning up meant, the pushing of the inquiry to a conclusion in connection with alleged misdemeanors in the Controller's Department. The Prime Minister now says they are cleaning up because they have to find money to pay outstanding bills due the British Government, and completely satisfies himself that he is doing all the people expected of him. If he is satisfied, the people are not, unless they are disgusted with all inquiries. What about the Square Deal? Is it a square deal for the elected representatives of Trinity District and other Representatives of Opposition Districts to be absolutely ignored in all matters affecting the interests of their constituents?

I beg to differ from the hon. proposer of the Address in Reply to the Speech of His Excellency. If he being a resident of the city is not acquainted with the Government's policy, I excuse him for that statement.

Mr. Speaker, I would again ask the Hon. the Prime Minister, if it is the intention of the Government to ignore elected representatives?

Question—To ask Hon. the Prime Minister if it is the intention of the Government to have allocations for Public Works under the direction of the Dept. of Public Works and the Dept. of Marine and Fisheries made upon the recommendations of the elected representatives of the different districts?

Answer—All allocations for Public Works are under the jurisdiction of the Ministers of these Departments, and they will use their judgment, in accepting or otherwise, the recommendations of the elected representatives.

There was a similar reply given last year. We on this side of the House are to get the same treatment as last year, judging from the reply given by the Prime Minister. I would ask the Prime Minister for his idea of an honest or square deal. Does he really and sincerely believe that it is the right thing, to ignore the elected representatives of the Districts? Evidently my colleagues, Capt. Randell, Mr. Godden and myself are not worthy to represent the District of Trinity or hold seats in this House of Assembly, according to the ruling given by the Hon. the Prime Minister.

THE PRIME MINISTER—It depends upon the person who asks for allocations to be sent.

MR. HALFYARD—Are there words in the English language sufficiently

strong to repudiate and to condemn the motive and the idea behind the reply which has been given this afternoon by the Prime Minister in connection with this matter. It is reprehensible; it is discreditable. Can you have an honest Government? Can you have co-operation? When you treat the members of this House in such a disgraceful manner,, and discriminate to such a contemptible degree. The districts expect to deal with the elected member or members, you insult them when you say it depends on the man who asks for the allocation to be made. Quite true, it depended on the man who asked for the allocation of moneys for the roads last year. As far as the people are concerned they are ignored, absolutely ignored. Elected Road Boards are ignored in connection with the spending of local and main line moneys. No Government ever interfered with elected or appointed Road Boards before in the spending of Local and Main Line Grants, which are annually voted by this House. At Blaketown you took these grants out of the hands of the duly constituted Road Boards, and appointed Mr. Arch Brown as a Commissioner, an insult to 75 per cent. of the voters of that place. There is a duly elected Road Board at Dildo, you appointed three men in place of that Board. Two of the three men told me that they would prefer not to be on the new Board, they were appointed without consultation. Of course one of the men was appointed to the job because he was a political partisan, and received the chairmanship of the Board. That man attempted to break up our meeting at New Harbor, he made himself most objectionable to the majority of the electors at Dildo, and it is another case of putting a premium on rowdyism.

I wish, Mr. Speaker that the Hon. Minister of Justice was in his place at this time, for when he occupied a seat on this side of the House, as Leader of the Opposition, in 1923, he asked the same question then, that I am asking now. This is what Mr. Higgins said at the time:—

MR. HIGGINS—"Mr. Chairman, before the Committee rises there is a matter which I should like to refer to arising out of the voting of public moneys. As I intimated to the Hon. Prime Minister in a private interview, I think the experiences of the past few months should have taught us something from which we might now benefit. It seems to have become an established thing for people who are in no way responsible to this House to have control of the expenditure of public monies with power to fling it around where and how they please. If the present Administration are sincere in their desire to have a general clean up, this is one of the first abuses that should be put a stop to. In my opinion, and I think all Hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House will agree with me, only elected representatives of constituents should recommend expenditure for district needs to the heads of departments. This practice of irresponsible people going around the country spending large sums of public moneys is an outrage. In many cases the money is not spent at all, but nothing can be done about it because those to whom it is given do not have to account for it. It is the duty of the Hon. Leader of the Government to see to it in future that such expenditures are directed or recommended by the men who will be responsible to this House. If there was an understanding that districts that happen to be in Opposition were to be treated the same as the Government districts, many of the abuses that have existed of late would be quickly done away with. Now, Mr. Chairman, might I, through you, ask the Hon. Leader of the House to lose no time in having this matter set right. I may say that this request is made without any consultation on the point with my colleagues on this side,

but I feel that in making it I am voicing the wish of every Hon. member of the Opposition. Those who should alone have a say in the spending of public monies are the elected representatives of the people. The pople themselves sent us here and they must therefore take the responsibility for our acts."

How more applicable can anything be to the matter which is before the House at the present moment. The Hon. Mr. Higgins was at that time Leader of the Opposition. He knew whereof he spoke. He certainly cannot agree with the Prime Minister, who said "it all depends upon the person who asks for the allocation." The Hon Minister of Justice, Mr. Higgins, talks about abuses and said this is the first that should be cleaned up by the Warren Government. Perhaps it will be considered now that it has been brought to the attention of the Minister of Justice, surely it cannot be that he is uninformed as to what is being done. In fact the Warren Government was not guilty of the abuse at all; the elected representatives under that Administration had the absolute and full control of all moneys spent in their Districts, irrespective of Government or Opposition. The Monroe Government and the Minister of Justice, Mr. Higgins, are guilty of introducing the abuse. This is an example of the Clean Up policy. But I have not finished about those good old times; this clause in the Speech from the Throne says, "repeal the Income Tax and get back to the good old days of comfort." The first thing you did was to repeal the Prohibition Act, and that is the first step back. Now you propose to repeal the Income Tax, another step back. Possibly "the good old days of comfort" refers to the conditions that obtained in the eighteenth century, and to illustrate the relations that existed between the merchant and the fishermen of that time. I take the liberty to read the items that appeared on an account between a fisherman and his employer:—

Thomas Leaman Debtor to William Collins.

			£	s.	d.
1787.					
Oct.	15—	To 1 qt. rum	0	1	3
		" 10 lbs. tobacco..	1	0	0
	17—	" 2 cotton shirts..	0	18	0
		" 1 qt. rum	0	1	3
	30—	" 1 qt. brandy	0	1	3
Nov.	12—	" 1 qt. rum	0	1	3
		" 1 pair shoes	0	9	0
		" ½ gall. rum	0	2	6
		" 1 qt. rum	0	1	3
	20—	" 1 qt. rum	0	1	3
	25—	" 1 qt. rum	0	1	3
		" 1 lb. soap	0	1	0
	29—	" 1 qt. rum	0	1	3
Dec.	2—	" 1 qt. rum	0	1	3
	7—	" 1 qt. rum	0	1	3
	8—	" 1 qt. rum	0	1	3
	9—	" 1 qt. rum	0	1	3
	17—	" 1 lb. tea..	0	5	0
		" 1 qt. rum	0	1	3
	18—	" 1 qt. rum	0	1	3
	21—	" 1 qt. rum	0	1	3
	24—	" 2 qts. rum	0	2	6
	26—	" 1 lb. sugar	0	1	0
1788.					
Jan.	4—	" 1 qt. rum	0	1	3
		" 1 qt. rum	0	1	3
	7—	" 1 qt. rum	0	1	3
		" 1 lb. pepper	0	5	0
May	8—	" 1 yd. half ribbon	0	1	0
	10—	" 1 qt. molasses ..	0	1	0
	11—	" 1 qt. brandy	0	1	3
	18—	" 1 qt. molasses ..	0	1	0
	24—	" 1 qt. brandy	0	1	3
June	2—	" ½ gall. gin	0	2	6
		" 1 qt. molasess ..	0	1	0
	10—	" 2 qts. brandy ..	0	2	6
	16—	" 1 qt. brandy	0	1	3
		" 1 qt. molasses ..	0	1	0

30—	" 1 qt. molasses ..	0	1	0
	" your washing ..	1	0	0
	" your doctoring..	0	8	0
	" your hospital ..	0	2	6
	" neglect of duty and upholding and encouraging of 2 men who r a n away in my debt.	20	8	0
		27	0	3

Contra. Cr.	£	s.	d.
By his summer's wages	26	0	0
Balance due William Collins ..	1	0	3
	27	0	3

Were those "the good old days of comfort" when the duty on rum was only three pence a gallon, and everybody could get all the rum they wanted? Methinks those good old days did not bring much comfort to the fishermen who were treated as serfs. If any one had comfort it must have been the merchants. The merchants are getting every consideration by the present Government in the removal of the Income Tax, which affects them and the well-to-do; but you will not take the duty off molasses for the fisherman and the labourer. Perhaps the "good old days of comfort" are not meant for them.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words in reference to the Speech from the Throne. In making reference to the Speech from the Throne, I wish to congratulate the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply on their splendid speeches made on the opening day, and before I go any further I would like to say that when I came down here to-day I had no intention whatever of making any speech in reference to the Speech from the Throne, but during the remarks made by Mr. Halfyard, my attention was drawn to several different things, and I think in fairness to all concerned I should say something. I do not think it is right for any member of the House of Assembly to come in here and make charges against a man who is not here, and cannot be heard to defend himself. Why cannot he tell this to the man's face. I am speaking with regard to a charge made against me of having my brother put in charge of the Wren. In the first place, I have been charged with putting him there. That is a lie. The boat was chartered by the Government, and the Government made the appointments of the master, and the officers, and the crew and all the rest of them. I had nothing to do with having my brother put there. In reference to the running ashore of the Wren, I may say that Capt Randell, the honourable member for Trinity, made a speech yesterday, in which he referred to the dangerous, and uncharted coast line of Labrador. I did not pay very much attention to Mr. Halfyard talking about the Wren being lost on the Northern Labrador, because Mr. Halfyard does not know what he is talking about. Capt. Randell knows a lot about these things, and he will know very well that any man who takes a boat up on Northern Labrador is up against a hard proposition running along that coast, especially when she is out of her regular route. I want to tell Mr. Halfyard another thing; at the time that the Wren was lost, there was a pilot aboard. My brother did not lose her at all.

MR. HALFYARD—A pilot on board? More extravagance.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—It is the extravagance of the Government that you were in some time ago that left us as we are. We are living to-day suffering from the bad management of the Government that Mr. Halfyard was a member of.

He brought up the question of the

United Fishermen, too, some time ago. He made the remark that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries made a promise to the fishermen of Bonavista Bay that he would give them a bonus on their catch of fish. The Prime Minister and myself did, but on what conditions? One was that if the revenue of the country would stand it, and the other was that it would be given if it was needed. The statement that Mr. Halfyard made that seventy-five per cent. of the men in Bonavista Bay wanted the bonus on fish last year is not right.

MR. HALFYARD—That is a personal matter which I want to answer. The honourable member has misunderstod what I said. I was referring to a remark made by Mr. Scammell, the hon. member for St. Barbe, when he was talking a few days ago. He said that seventy-five per cent. of the fishermen in Bonavista Bay last year were led to believe that they were going to get a bonus on fish.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES — Perhaps seventy-five per cent. of the electors of Bonavista told you last Fall that what Monroe and Winsor told them in June last they believed and still believe in. You charged me with pitchforking my brother into a position. I would like to ask Mr. Halfyard if he ever pitchforked any blood relation of his into a position?

MR. HALFYARD—That is a personal matter. I do not see why you should say anything like that. It is small and despicable.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—I say that it is small and dirty for any member to make a statement against a man that is not in the House of Assembly. You took good care to say that the boat was lost, but not to say who lost her. You did not accuse my brother of any bad management—you did not say that it was because of bad management that she was lost. You were not man enough.

About the Malakoff. We did take the Malakoff off, but who took her off Bonavista Bay in the first place. You took her off Bonavista to satisfy some of your supporters at Port Union, who were anxious that she should come off Bonavista Bay. You did not bring her back for the benefit of the public of Trinity Bay, but for the benefit of a private concern. I had scores of letters from the residents of Bonavista Bay, and even Captain Day told me that she was only a nuisance running on Trinity Bay.

Mr. Speaker, in reference to a charge made while discussing the Speech from the Throne about turning certain individuals off boats, I may say that it is a fact, and I make the statement without fear of contradiction, that there was one solitary Government man on the Malakoff in Bonavista last Fall during the elections, and he was not allowed to go ashore by the captain, because they feared that he might do some benefit for the Government. I say that it is time that the Government put a stop to these kind of things, and see that they are not allowed to go on.

Mr. Monroe made a statement that any public servants taking active part in politics would be dismissed. But who started that in the first place? Mr. Halfyard said that the members elected for the districts cannot get the money to spend. I make a challenge to Mr. Halfyard, and to Capt. Randell, and to Mr. Godden to name anything that any one of them has come and asked me to do for their district which I have not done. I sent for you three or four times to come to me, but you would not come.

MR. HALFYARD—It would be useless, we would not get the money.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—You never asked me for it. You asked for money to be sent out to Elliston to build a bridge, and the

money was sent out. And I sent money to everyone you asked me to, didn't I Capt. Randell?

CAPT. RANDELL—Yes.

MR. HALFYARD—What was the good of that; did you want us to get down on our knees and crawl to you.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I never asked you to crawl to me and if it was humiliating to come down to my office, I will tell you now the reason why I would not do it for some of you. For the last years before 1923 the members who were sent money for Bonavista Bay should not have had the handling of the money of any district. Every dollar of it was sent to the Union Councils and they gave it only to those who supported their own side. A case was stated last year where $1000 was sent to my own home town and because certain men were not on the side of the Union they could not get one red cent of it. Is that fair, Sir. I ask Mr. Halfyard if there is any difference made now as to the giving of a day's work, and I challenge him to state if any Union man asked me for anything that I did not try to get him a job and in nine cases out of ten succeeded. As far as the fishery is concerned we did not give a bonus because with fish at from $8 to $12 a qtl. we did not consider it fair to tax the other people of the country to give it. I may say for the benefit of the public generally that the fishermen of Bonavista and Notre Dame Bays were told it would not be fair to the other taxpayers of the colony to give a bonus and they did not want it. I consider that if any squandering was done the gentleman opposite is one of those who did it.

On motion the debate on the Address in Reply was deferred until to-morrow.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, Feb. 26, 1925.

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

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, before proceeding with the Order of the Day, I am going to ask the concurrence of the Opposition for the purpose of proceeding immediately with the Sealing Bill. His Excellency is coming to the Legislative Council this afternoon to consent to the Finance Bill which we passed the other day, and to avoid giving him the trouble of another trip down to consent to the Sealing Bill I thought it possible that we might put it through this afternoon, have it sent to the Legislative Council, and after it was passed there to have it assented to by His Excellency the Governor at half past four.

THE HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—We are glad to conform with anything of that nature which arises, now or any other time during the session.

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 during the present Year."

MR. SPEAKER left the Chair.

MR. PUDDISTER took the Chair of Committee.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to make any reference to the bill before the chair. I would just like to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries whether all the steamers going to the ice are fitted with wireless outfits, and if so whether they are obliged by law to be so fitted.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISH-

ERIES—Yes they all are outfitted with the wireless. That is the law.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for a little information. He is a sealing captain and I think that he should be able to tell me what I would like to know. There was a law put in force some years ago and I suppose that the captains who were sealing masters at that time were consulted about the matter, I would like him to give me a little information as to why the change is being made at the present time.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the Leader of the Opposition, I may say that for the past few years there has been a great agitation that the law be changed as perhaps the Hon. members opposite are aware. At one time you were not allowed to carry guns to the fishery. You were not allowed to kill hoods. Since 1921 there have been a great number of the clauses of the act which have been amended by Executive authority and the ships have been allowed to sail on the fifth of March. This is a matter which should be in my opinion left to the captain. As a master of many years experience there have been some springs when I would have liked to sail on the thirteen of March and on other years I would like to sail on the fifth of March. Sometimes the seals are thirty or forty miles north of Belle Isle and the coast is blocked with ice. Consequently, it takes a long time to get to the seals and if you do not leave till the 10th or 12th of March, it will take a long time to cut through this ice and when you arrive where the seals are you are too late. It is, the opinion of the owners of the ships, as well as the captains, that the ships should be allowed to sail on the 5th of March if they wish. I have been practically always under the impression that the 10th of March is the proper time to set out for the seals.. I remember a few years ago that the captains, who, at that time nearly all came from the Northern side of Bonavista Bay, were asked their opinion about making the date of sailing later. I wrote my owners, who were Baine Johnson's at that time, to that effect, and I am of the same opinion now. Others thought different. Some thought that as late as the thirteenth of March was best.

But with the vessels which we have at the present time, I think that the captains should be allowed to sail as early as the fifth of March. Perhaps we may have steel ships and it may be necessary to change the law—this law-again. This law was enforced last year by Executive authority. It never came before the House. So as to make it lawful and not have the captain, or somebody else getting into trouble when he comes back from the fishery, I brought in this bill. Next year we may have different conditions. Then it may be necessary to change this law again.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, for myself I may say that I am in accord with many of the things that Capt. Winsor has said. I think with him that the captains interested should have some say about the date on which the ships should be permitted to sail. I know the captains are very watchful for some months before the fishery time comes around in making observations as to the direction of the winds and other conditions which might effect the locations of the seals. But there is another point about this bill which is before us on which I would like to hear Captain Winsor give some explanation. That is the point about the steamers staying out for an unlimited time. I am but a young man,

and not very experienced in affairs as regards the sealfishery. I was under the impression that the law now was on the Statute Book, provided for a certain length of time, beyond which the ships could not stay out. I would like to know whether it is the intention of this bill to arrange matters so that the captains will now be able to stay at the fishery as long as they choose. I think that the majority of the men who go to the sealfishery would like to have some definite knowledge as to the time when the voyage might be expected to conclude. Only this morning a couple of men came to see me and talking about various matters they made reference to this bill. Are we to understand that the captains alone are to decide as to when they shall give up the voyage or is it possible to get some definite knowledge as to when the voyage will be over. I hope that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will give us some explanation on that matter. I would like to be informed.

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—In reply to the hon. member for St. Barbe, the captain is to decide when he is to come home from the fishery. If I go to the sealing fishery with a hundred and twenty men I should be in a pretty condition if every man had to give his opinion as to when we were to come home. Of course it can be very clearly seen that there will be few ships that can stay out until the twenty-fifth of April because they cannot carry enough coal. There are the Terra Nova and one or two others which can stay out until this time but that is all. The most that some of them can do is to stay out as long as the fifteenth or twentieth of April. I have never been able to stay out longer than the tenth of April. That is the only suggestion that I can make as to the time that the ships might be expected to come home. That is when all their coals are burned. The owners have to go to a great expense in the fitting up of the ships to-day, and as these are ships that cannot make any money during other times of the year, all that I can say is that any man who wants to go to the sealfishery ought to be prepared to stay out until the captain has decided to come in. If he is not prepared to do this then it is better for him to stay down in his own outport where he belongs. It has often happened to me that I have not come in from the fishery until every ton of coal has been burned. So that is the only thing that I can see which will be able to give a person some idea as to what time the voyage might be expected to finish, and that is when the coal or provisions have given out.

CAPTAIN RANDELL—In reference to this amendment now before the House I would like to add a few words. I think that it is immaterial when the ships sail for the fishery. I think that the ships should be given a chance to get to the seals. It does not matter whether they go on the fifth of March, but whenever they are ready, so long as they get the seals. Of course as to the length of time which the ships are to stay I agree with Captain Winsor that it depends on how long the provisions and coal last. I think that is a matter that might be very well left to the masters discrimination as to when he shall give up the voyage. Now there are very few ships which can stay out longer than the twenty-fifth of April. There are times when some men would like to stay out longer but usually it is not the case. I think that it is a matter which might be left to adjust itself.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, there is a little explanation which I would like to have made in the interest of the sealfishery. Perhaps Captain

Winsor will give us some explanation about the birth of seals. The seals have young some time every year and I would like to know what time. The Government has found it necessary to bring a bill before the House at the present session of the Legislature for a close season for the lobster fishery for three years, because the fishery was becoming depleted. Now this action may possibly make it necessary for some future Government to bring in a bill making a close season for the sealing fishery also. I am satisfied with the explanations given by Captain Randell and Captain Winsor. That is all I wanted to know. I only wanted to suggest to Captain Winsor that he sees that everything is in order before he asks us to put through this bill. As to the time that the ships should come back from the ice, I quite agree with him that that should be left to the captains themselves.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES:—Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Leader of the Opposition, I think you have asked me a question this evening that it is rather unfair to ask me, but nevertheless I am quite prepared to part with any knowledge that I have to anybody that wants it. I cannot say that I have ever been there when the seals had their young, but I have been twenty-six years as a sealing captain, and as far as my knowledge goes, and the knowledge of the people who live around the places where the seals have their young, the time the seals have their young is about from February 27th. to March 1st. or second. That is in the majority of cases. Of course there will be exceptions to that, and I have heard of cases of the seals having their young about February 22nd.

I was told the other day by a man coming across the Gulf, that there was a whitecoat caught on the 18th. February, weighing fifty pounds. But everything that is white is not a whitecoat. The seal that that man was referring to I think must have been what is called a "pot-head". I have been told that there are two thousand and more of those caught every year in the gulf. It is not those seals that I am speaking of now, but the seals which are caught on the Northern section of this Island. From the 26th. February to the 1st. or 2nd. of March the old seals are seen along the French shore.

Yesterday, I had a message from Magistrate Alcock at Griguet, in which he says that there were millions of old seals all along the coast. That goes to prove that they have not had their young yet. But I think that the people who will follow the reports from around there for the next few days will find that about the 1st. March it will be reported that there are no old seals on the French shore. Consequently they will have gone to look for some place to the Eastward where they can have their young.

This year I may say will be the first for eighty-two years that there will not have been a Winsor to the ice. My grandfather was a sealing captain, and my father was also. This year I thought I might be able to go, because while I never thought that I was much service on land, still I did think that I would be some good to the country, on the water. But I will not be able to go this year.

MR. HICKMAN:—Why don't you put a Winsor on the "Prospero"?

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES:—No, I would not do that. But for the information of the Leader of the Opposition I may say that so far as my knowledge goes, the seals have their young any time from February 27th. to March 1st. or 2nd.

There is one thing that I would like to say, and that is if I had it in my power, I would have a man stationed down on the Eastern end of Belle Isle, to report the weather conditions, the seal conditions and ice

conditions. It is all very well to have the shoremen say that the fish are running here or there, but you really want a man down there, who can report these things day by day.

There was many a year that it used to be a cant in the city that "you would have to go to the eastward to find the seals" I remember a year a long time ago when I had Mr. Walter Baine Grieve out to the seal fishery with me. The day that we were going out of the Narrows he said to the second hand on board "the captain is going North—if I had charge of the ship I would have her go East." Sometime after that, the second hand told me, as perhaps he thought he should have told me, what the other man had said to him. I went North, however, and held fast to the Wadhams for a few days, and waited till we got a south west wind, and then we got our load of seals, twenty thousand of them or more. Captain Barbour of the Neptune had got his load before us, and Mr. Grieve wanted to get back to St. John's as soon as possible, so he was moving his things to the Neptune. He said to me that there were some bottles of whiskey and port wine up in his cabin. He said he knew I would not take any whiskey, but I might like the port wine. I said —"do you think we should have gone East, Mr. Grieve". Oh he said, "he told you what I said, did he."

I am glad to hear that Captain Randell is of the same opinion that I am, that any master who goes out to the seal fishery has a very difficult proposition ahead of him. And any merchant in this city who makes up his mind to make any individual master of his sealer should be prepared to let the master decide what time he ought to sail.

There is another thing that I had hoped would come up in this House, and I did not intend to bring it up now, because I intended to bring in a Bill at the next session of the House in relation to this matter. I intend to bring in a Bill next session to provide that all sealing masters be allowed to take their own crews, and have no interference in regard to them however. I have seen quite a bit of the seal fishery during the years that I have been master, and I think that the master of a sealing ship has to take a big lot of responsibility on him. He has quite enough responsibility on him without having men put in on him that have never been to the seal fishery before, and does not know the first thing about the ice, and do not know how to protect themselves even a few yards away from the ship. There are very stringent laws to-day on the statute book in reference to the captains of sealing vessels. About six or seven years ago the laws were very stringent for the captains, and now when a captain does not know who he is bringing out with him to the ice, it it a wonder that the captains are not down with Mr. Parsons in the Penitentiary for the rest of their lives.

A yew years ago a gentleman in this town had arranged to have two men go to the ice in the Viking. These men were delayed coming to St. John's, and consequently when they arrived here, the Viking had gone to the Gulf. He then asked me to take the men out with me. I asked him what kind of men they were, and he said they were all right—good men, so I took them out with me. What happened? I was very nearly losing my Spring's voyage because of those men. I got out to the ice, and one of those men had never been on the ice before, and as soon as he got clear of the ship, he went down between two pans of ice, and nearly had his leg broken. I might have had to start out and come back to St. John's with that man and so lose my voyage, but luckily I had a man on board who knew how to treat a case like that, and he fixed him up alright.

Therefore, I hope I will be able to

bring in this Bill next session allowing every captain to pick his own men. I know now what a lot of the honourable members have said in their own minds—that it will be all Bonavista Bay men go to the ice. I want to abuse your minds of that idea. Only the other day a man came to me, and wanted me to get berths to the ice for fifty or sixty men. I said I have not got one to give you—the Government has not given me one berth out of their ships.

I was looking up the papers of the boat I had to the ice last year, and I found that out of one hundred and sixty-three men that were at the ice with me, there were only thirty-eight Bonavista Bay men, and the same thing applies to every boat that went to the ice with a Bonavista Bay captain in her. This year I understand that Bowring's have given their captains the whole responsibility of choosing their men. I myself am prepared to go to Conception Bay or any other place in the country outside of Bonavista Bay, and get just as good a crew for a sealing ship as in Bonavista Bay, that is, if I am allowed to pick them myself. It is not the fault of certain men that they did not get good men, but the reason is that the captains are not allowed to pick their own men, and pick men that have been to th seal fishery before.

MR. HICKMAN:—There is just one more question that I want to ask the hon. Minister. Are there not some regulations in reference to taking charge of a sealer? Does not the captain have to have certain requirements under the law.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES:—No. A few years ago there was a board appointed to examine the masters, the watch masters, and the bridge masters of the different ships. The law called for a board of three masters of ten years standing as masters, to examine the captains, watch masters and sealers officers. The Board has certain rules laid down, but I do not think myself that there is any advantage in having any rules laid down, because any man who has been master to the seal fishery for ten years will know all there is to be known about it.

MR. SCAMMELL:—Who are the examining Board this year?

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES:—They are not appointed yet. I am going to ask for their appointment to-morrow, because I understand that the Viking is going to sail in two or three days' time. I was on the Board one year myself, and I suppose being on the wrong side last Spring, they turned me out. But I never kicked, and never accused anybody of it. I was quite satisfied with the three men that were there last year. In fact, when a man came to me and made a complaint that one of the members of the Board was not master for ten years, I did not make any fuss about it. I said, perhaps he knows as much in eight years as you and I do in ten.

CAPT RANDELL—Mr. Chairman, there is one question I would like to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and that is, does he not think that the 13th is too early a date at which to kill. I believe this country has lost hundreds of thousands of dollars since we have been engaging in this fishery by the date to kill being set too early—that is, that the ships have been allowed to kill before the seals are matured. I ask the Hon. Minister if he ever saw the main body of the seals matured before the 13th of March. The old idea was that they were matured by the 17th, but in my few years experience I have not seen it, and I think the date, 13th should be carefully considered before the amendment is passed.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHTRIES—I may say in reference to Capt. Randell's question that I wish we had more time to talk this matter

over, as I have an argument to put up in connection with it. When Mr. W. C. Job asked me if it was good to put off the killing date to the fifteenth, I expressed the opinion that the later the seals were killed one year, the later would they be in coming to killing weight next year. As I said before, and as I think Capt. Randell agrees after the time of whelping, if the seals are prevented from mating in one year they will be later the next year in having young. Unless the seals are caught up in the bays and manage to take to the water by the twentieth, it is generally considered that the voyage is practically hopeless. I agree it is immaterial as to when the ships sail, and as I said before, I would like to discuss the matter further, but I am satisfied that the thirteenth is early enough, and I don't think that the fourteenth or fifteenth would be too late. The main think is to go and get the seals. Some people think to get the seals is just like crossing the floor of the House, all you got to do is to go down to Belle Isle, cut around a bit, and pick up all you want of them. I admit we sometimes do not know exactly where the seals are, but last year we knew they were almost up in the woods, but still could not get to them. If we extended killing to a later date, I do not think it would do any harm.

MR. SCAMMELL—I would like to ask the Minister of Marine if he thinks Mr. Little would have any difficulty in passing the necessary examination.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I do not think he will have any difficulty. He will answer the questions of the Board. Nobody can take a position from a man if he passes the examination, and answers the questions just like anybody sitting for a master's certificate. If he answers the questions you can't take the position from him.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to take any part in the debate on this subject only for the statement made by Captain Winsor himself. I think this is the first year in very many that he is not going to the Sealfishery as Master. I understand that he has some Qualms of conscience as to prosecuting the voyage, while he still holds the position of Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I know that he is trying to be honest with himself, but personally I think, and I firmly believe many others will agree with me, that in view of the importance of the fishery to the country, and the knowing ability and experience of Captain Winsor, we are not justified in keeping him back. Now then take the Government's own position. They are sending out the "Sagona" and the "Prospero," and for a time thought of sending the "Glencoe" also. These ships are not being sent out on pleasure trips, but to secure catches of seals. We certainly need a good sealfishery, and I ask is this the time to keep a man like Captain Winsor back when everything is dull, and he cannot do much in his office? I think the Government is very ill-advised in keeping him from going to the sealfishery. Here we are trying to get all the seals we can, and the Government itself sending out ships, so I cannot see any justification for the action in connection with Captain Winsor. We are sending others in his place, while he could easily go himself.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, I beg to differ with the opinion expressed by Mr. Warren, and I think that Captain Winsor is well advised in staying home, in view of all the conditions. I agree that his valuable experience and ability are a loss to the fishery, but I believe Capt. Winsor has acted wisely in refraining from going out this spring. He is a public servant and a Minister of the Crown. Not so many years ago a certain Minister was slammed right and left for drawing a salary and accused of not

being inside the door of his office for twelve months. Surely Captain Winsor is not going to lay himself open to attack in a similar way. He has done wisely in staying home, as he will be needed before this House closes to explain many matters, and I believe that when all the facts are laid before the country and his constituents, it will be generally agreed that he did right. It will be shown that he was prepared to make a great personal sacrifice. He has an able second-hand to succeed him, and consequently I am entirely at variance with the view expressed by Mr. Warren, and again affirm that Captain Winsor was right in staying in port.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, I thought I had made myself quite clear in my remarks. I put the matter on national grounds, rather than in comparison to what have been done by a previous Minister of Fisheries. I said that this is a time when the Government is sending steamers to the ice, that a good sealfishery is badly needed, and that it is a pity to have left behind men of the ability and experience of Capt. Winsor, particularly at a period when he can be of little use in his office. That is the ground on which I have based my argument, and to which I still adhere. It is not because Mr. Coaker did not attend to his office and was subjected to severe criticism, that, therefore, Capt. Winsor must not follow the same course. That is not in the matter at all, either the previous Minister was right, or he was wrong. If he left his office and did right, then Capt. Winsor can go to the ice, but if Mr. Coaker was not right in attending to his duties as Mr. Scammell intimated, then there is no reason why Capt. Winsor should not stay home. But as far as the present situation is concerned, I put it on the grounds as a national question, and I do not propose to argue the matter. Does anybody think for a moment that Ministers in the past devoted their whole energies and time to their office, and did not attend to their private business? Not at all—and there is nothing to justify Capt. Winsor stopipng ashore.

CAPT. WINSOR—Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few more remarks, and draw attention to the fact that now no steamer is to sail for the sealfishery before 8 a.m. on the fifth of March in any year.

MR. SCAMMELL—The hon. the Prime Minister asked us to assist in getting through this Bill in a hurry, but now these changes are introduced.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I might say, if I am not interrupting, that the amendment was made after consulting the Minister of Justice, and at the suggestion of the Minister of Fisheries, and in view of the fact that unless this was legalized now, we would have to be going through the same rigmarole next year, as to the date of sailing. It is possible we may have better steamers going to the ice next year, though it does not seem likely at present, and we do not know what might be asked for then. The only reason why the changes made now is, that we may not have to pass the same legislation next year.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, I thank the hon. the Prime Minister for his information, and I want to say that any criticism I have made on this Bill was not from the viewpoint of political acrimony or any desire to hold up the debate. Consequently, in view of the explanation of the Prime Minister, probably it would be just as well if the Bill went through with the amendment.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, I would like to explain that the intention of this Legislature is to remedy what has been the practice in the past. The law calls for this year only; but if we find ourselves in this position twelve

months from now and the House not in session, then we would have to do it again on Executive responsibility, a situation we want to avoid even if done with good intent.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, if the amendment is not put in now, next year we will likely have another Sealing Bill here. If Capt. Winsor is satisfied that this Bill is a correct Bill, I think it could apply to any year as well as this year.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in the debate on this Bill and everything seemed to have gone on nicely from my point of view. The Bill has been lucidly explained by Captain Winsor, but, in my opinion, it should not extend beyond the present year because next year there may be steel steamers prosecuting the sealfishery, and the amending of this Act would have to be done by Minute-of-Council, that is, if it is thought in the interests of the country that steamers cannot sail before a certain date. Other amendments have had to be made on Executive responsibility during the past few years. I would prefer, personally, for the Bill to remain as it is and let next year provide for itself.

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 amendment.

On motion this Report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a third time presently.

Whereupon, with unanimous consent, the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the Sealfishery During the Present Year" was read a third time, and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from a number of residents on the front section of Bell Island requesting an allocation for the extension of the public wharf there. In connection with the extension of this wharf the position is at the moment, that the water is too shoal and an extension of some thirty feet is requested. The petition is signed by practically all the people on the front of the Island, and I commend it to the Department of Marine and Fisheries for consideration and ask that, when allocations are being made out of a public character, this petition be borne in mind. The sum asked for by the petitioners is $1500.00.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the residents of the several harbours in St. Mary's Bay. The petition emanated in St. Mary's and is signed by Rev. Frs. O'Driscoll and Enright, William Hogan, M.D., Stipendiary Magitrate, St. Mary's, and about five hundred residents of St. Mary's Bay. The petitioners ask that a Fog Alarm be erected at Point LaHaye. I think that past hon. members of this House, a large number of whom are here today, will remember that on several occasions during the past four or five years petitions were presented by my colleagues and myself with reference to this fog alarm. In the years 1921-1922 when Sir William Coaker was Minister of Marine and Fisheries he took occasion to pledge to my colleagues and myself here in open House that the Government and his Department would have two fog alarms erected in the district of Placentia and St. Mary's. He not alone undertook to guarantee to put up those two very necessary public utilities and aids to fishing boats

and coasters, but he went so far as to send Captain English, the present Harbor Master, and, I think, Captain Couch, to locate a site for them. They came back and reported that Point LaHaye was a most suitable place for the erection of a fog alarm and my colleagues and myself were given the assurance that work on them would start immediately. It is unnecessary to go into the details of what happened afterwards, sufficient to say that no fog alarm was erected at Point LaHaye, neither was there one erected on the West side of Placentia Bay. Now I hope and trust that, with such an important man as Captain Winsor in charge of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, the request of the petitioners this afternoon will be acceded to and acceded to at the present session of the House. I trust that the Minister will be able to make provision in his estimates to have sufficient money allocated to go ahead with these very necessary aids to navigation in this important section. During the past few years a large amount of money has been spent on fog alarms and lighthouses that were erected in various parts of the country; but within the twelve years that I have been a member of this House not twelve dollars have been spent on such utilities in my disrict, though there might have been improvements made to lighthouses, but I contend that lighthouses are not as important as fog alarms because a man trying to make the land in thick fog or stormy weather can see the light from the lighthouse but cannot see the land, whereas if he could hear the fog alarm he would know whereabout he was. At Point LaHaye numerous wrecks and considerable loss of life have occurred. There is no question that, if the fishermen of St. Mary's Bay were not hampered in pursuing their avocation and if they had this necessary aid to navigation erected, the country as well as themselves would share in the result of their toil. I have very much pleasure in presenting this petition and with the hope that this will be the last time—even if I represent the district for the next twenty years—I will present a petition from the inhabitants of St. Mary's Bay on this subject. I give the petition my hearty support and I ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to do all that is humanly possible to have the request of the petitioners acceded to.

MR. SINNOTT—Mr. Speaker, I have very much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition presented by my colleague, Mr. Walsh.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Mr. Speaker, like my colleagues I give the petition my unqualified support. We have been promised this fog alarm at Point LaHaye for a long time, and as Mr. Walsh has explained, Sir William Coaker saw the necessity for its erection just as much as we did, realising that every fog alarm is in the interest of the fishermen of Newfoundland and as a guidance to strangers coming in here. Near Point LaHaye there is a dangerous rock known as Nancy Cann and if that fog alarm had to be erected a few years ago, two shipwrecks would have been averted.

Last October, I wrote a letter to the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries asking him if he would include in his estimates provision for two fog alarms which are so badly needed by the people in both Placentia and St. Mary's Bays. I am glad to say that the Minister, with characteristic promptness, has placed the matter before the Government I have no doubt but that when this matter comes up before the Executive Government again that it will receive the same hearty support as it does from the three members for

the district of Placentia and St. Mary's.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the residents of Glovertown, Bonavista Bay, asking for a Government building to be used as a Post Office, Custom House and a Magistrate's Office. As far as a Post Office is concerned at Glovertown, it is badly needed and has my hearty support. I ask that the petition be referred to the Department to which it relates.

MR. CHAMBERS—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from Cape LaHune on the subject of wireless telegraphy. This Cape is a great place on that Coast for bankers seeking bait, and it is most convenient to be able to communicate with other harbors. It would serve a population of six hundred people in an area of sixty miles. It would be a great convenience to the fishermen and business men there. I strongly recommend that a wireless station be established there to make up for this great want. I hope it will receive the proper attention.

MR. LAKE—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting this petition. Probably I know more about that coast than any other member in this House, having travelled over it many times. As mentioned by Mr. Chambers, it has absolutely no roads whatever. It has a coast line of sixty miles. It is a great place for bait. They go there on the chance of getting bait. The only connection is by the Portia once a fortnight or three weeks. The Glencoe does not call there. Therefore, I have much pleasure in supporting this petition.

HON. MR. LONG—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting the petition presented by the hon. member for Burgeo & LaPoile.

MR. POWER—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Codroy. This is in connection with the dumping from fishing vessels going to and from the fishing grounds. This matter has been brought before the Fishery Board some time ago. I refer to it again and ask that the Department have the matter attended to.

Hon. the Minister of Justice tabled the Memorial of American Fishery Claims, and the British Answer.

MR. HALFYARD—While these are being tabled I am reminded that last year we got no report from the Postal and Telegraph Department. I beg to draw the atetntion of the Prime Minister to this matter. I do not know whether the reports were printed. There were no reports tabled. I am referring to the reports of July, 1923.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—I will look them up.

Mr. Ashbourne gave notice of question.

Mr. Warren gave notice of question.

Mr. Scammell gave notice of question.

Mr. Hickman gave notice of question.

MR. HICKMAN—While I am on my feet I would like to ask the Minister of Finance and Customs when he expects to table the Public Accounts. It is necessary this year to have the public accounts before the estimates are brought in.

MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Mr. Speaker, the Public Accounts are not quite ready. As soon as they are they will be tabled.

MR. DUFF—I beg to ask permission to refer to the question I asked yesterday. It was answered by the Colonial Secretary. It refers to the dismissal of Mr. Guy. I must say for the information of the House that Mr. Guy was a very competent man. He took no part in politics. He had three sons to the War. One was killed, an-

other was decorated, another one fortunately returned. I would like to call the attention of the House to this I brought the matter before several members of the Government but received no satisfaction.

I notice the Hon. Prime Minister said in reference to a question asked him by a member of the Opposition as regards the privilege of having a say in the spending of local monies, "It all depends upon the representative." To that I will quote the words of Bobby Burns: "A man's a man for a that."

The Minister of Public Works last session stated that I had not advanced any concrete suggestions, when criticizing local affairs. So that the Government may not again repeat this, I will state that I am willing to make a suggestion that I believe would be acceptable to the Government, and at the same time do justice to all concerned without any great cost, and I ask the Government to reconsider this matter.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

(1) MR. WARREN—To ask Hon. the Prime Minister if advice was taken by the Government from any lawyer or lawyers upon the question of a settlement of the Labrador Boundary Question at any time between the receip' of the invitation to discuss the matter up to the present time. If so, what lawyer or lawyers were consulted; (2) if any advice was given was it in writing and, if so, either by cablegram or letter to lay upon the Table of the House a copy of such advice.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—In reply to that question, no lawyer has been consulted on the Labrador Boundary Question. The matter stands just as Mr. Warren left it.

(3) MR. HICKMAN—To ask Hon. the Prime Minister to lay upon the Table of the House a report from Mr. Ross on the Post Office.

HON THE PRIME MINISTER—In reply I beg to say that no report has been received from Mr. Ross. He has given a certain number of recommendations which the Government are considering, but there is not likely to be any regular report until he is about ready to leave the country.

(6) MR. HICKMAN—To ask Hon. the Prime Minister to lay upon the Table of the House a report of the Commission engaged in the enquiry concerning expenditures for Charitable Institutions and services.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I beg to say that the answer to this question is in course of preparation. I would like to remind the Opposition that they are not giving us much time to get a lot of correspondence together and get the copies. At least it would be expected that we be given 48 hours to furnish this correspondence. The Commission engaged to enquire into the Charitable Institutions have not done as much work as they would like to have done. They have been so much taken up with other meetings. We have not had time to do very much more than the immediate work on hand. The Report is not nearly ready yet. It will be six months before we are in a position to give reports on these institutions.

(7) MR. HICKMAN—To ask hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to lay upon the Table of the House a list of new Customs appointments made in Harbour Grace District since 10th day of June 1924.

Tabled.

(8) MR. HICKMAN—To ask hon. the Prime Minister to lay upon the Table of the House all correspondence between the Government and the hon. M. S. Sullivan in reference to the raising of the Loan.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Speaker, in reply to that question I may say that there has not been any correspondence between the Government and Hon M. S. Sulliv-

an in connection with the raising of the Loan.

(9) MR. HICKMAN—To ask hon. the Prime Minister to lay upon the Table of the House statement of claim by the United States for alleged wrongful act of the Newfoundland Government in respect to American fishing vessels.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, In reply to that question, the statement of the claim of the United States has been tabled by the Attorney General and the British responce to it also. I might say that I would like to table also the reply to the question asked by the Hon. Member for Harbour Grace on yesterday's order paper. That is the correspondence in connection with the building of the new steamer. That replies to the question asked by Mr. Hickman and also that asked by Mr. Randell.

(11) MR. HICKMAN—To ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay upon the Table of the House of new appointments in his department made in Harbour Grace District since the 10th day of June 1924.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. Leader of the Opposition, I may say that there have been no appointments made in my department in the District of Harbour Grace.

(12) MR. SCAMMELL—To ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries what amount of money, if any, was paid Mr. J. Allan Taylor in respect to his visit to this country some time ago in connection with an investigation into our fishery resources.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker, one half of that amount was paid by the Board of Trade and the other part was paid by the department according to an agreement made. I beg to taole the reply.

(13) MR. DUFF—To ask Hon. the Colonial Secretary, the names of the Directors of the Carbonear Water Company appointed; also if it is the intention of the Government to appoint other Directors to constitute a full Board, their names, and when?

(Tabled).

(14) MR. HIBBS—To ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the Table of the House the following information: (a) A statement showing what allocations of Public Monies for Marine Works have been made in the District of Fogo from the first day of June, 1924, to date; (b) to show the names of the parties to whom grants were sent in each case; (c) to state on whose authority the allocations, if any, were mode.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—I may say right here and now that they were made on the authority of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and that nobody else has any right or authority to do it. I beg to table the answer as follows:

(Answer to Question 14).

'24-'25.

Aug. 8, '24—B. P. Bowrings ..	$ 34.83
Sept. 26—B. P. Blocks, Hampstons	6.00
Nov. 21—B. P. Arthur Guy ..	90.00
Dec. 1—Change Islands Wharf, Walter Watton	200.00
Dec. 15—Fogo, Hire, A. Payn ..	20.00
Sept. 23, '24—Musgrave Hr. Wharf, Arthur Guy	150.00
Oct. 6—Lumsden S. Wharf, Gideon Gibbons	230.00

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to delay the House for any length of time this afternoon by discoursing on the Speech from the Throne. In fact I did not intend to say very much at all, but for the fact that we have had so much rain to-day that it gave me a chance to get a drink from Windsor Lake as it has been replenished since Mr. Halfyard drank it dry yesterday and carry on a little longer.

There were a few items in the Speech to which I intended to refer, but as they have to come up later, I think that I may as well let them go for the time being. One thing that drew my attention as I sat in my place listening to the various speakers in the criticism on the Speech from the Throne, was that they were very hard on the Government in reference to the "Clean Up and a Square Deal to All." And there have been some questions asked from my department in connection with things that have to do with the past. There have been some questions from my department about the sums of money that have been paid from my department to Bonavista Bay and other settlements around the country, and there are some no doubt that claim that this has been done as a political sop. But, I can show you, Mr. Speaker, that in every instance this is not the case. But you expect a Government to take control of a condtion of affairs and to go right away and complete the clean up. But I am afraid that this is not going to be done. All that I have done practically, since I went into the department was to pay bills of late administrations some of them dating as far back as 1921. During the last week I had made up my mind that all the bills were in because I wanted to have some of the monies voted for the current expenses of the department left for that purpose and we are getting very short. But just before coming down here I got another bill to the extent of five thousand three hundred dollars, from the Imperial Oil Company. This was an expense incurred in buying oil from a gentleman named Cheeseman from the West Coast in 1923. The bill is made out $2250.00 for one amount and another amount for 1923-24 is $3200.00, and that makes up a total of more than five thousand dollars. We have got to clean this up and as soon as I have cleaned this up and they have got their cheques there will be something else to fix up. How can we clean up under conditions like that. How can you hope that we could be able to clean up a condition of affairs like that in six months. It may possibly be that we will have it all cleaned up at the end of the four years, but I am afraid that it is going to take longer than that. There was another instance about which I intended to speak, but I think that I will leave it over as I will have another chance to throw back some of the dirty insinuations that have been made against the Government.

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 Sealfishery during the Present Year," without amendment.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Speaker, on the opening day I offered a few remarks on the Speech from the Throne but I had not time to go into the matter very fully so I must crave the indulgence of the House this afternoon while I make some more extended references to the various points raised in the speech. I propose, Sir, to be critical but I hope that what I say will be accepted in the same spirit in which it is meant. I have had during the past five years some experience in trying to carry on the affairs of the country and I shall, then in the course of what I have to say, make my criticism as far as I possible can, constructive and not destructive. First of all, I would like to thank the member for Trinity Bay, Mr. Halfyard, for taking up the cudgels on behalf of Fortune Bay in his speech of yesterday. He was so much in earnest about it that I thought that he must have had some aspirations to that district. But I want to tell him that he consumed about fourteen

glasses of water and thereby proved himself more than a bottle-a-day man and therefore will not commend himself to the people of that district. First of all, Sir I want to say that there are some things which are not mentioned at all in the speech. We have all heard the saying that "It is more remarkable for what it does not contain that for what it does contain." Of course the speech refers to the proposed legislation. There will be other things to come before the House during the session. Ministers or members may want to bring in some matters which are not mentioned in the speech from the Throne. Therefore members in speaking to the address in reply are entitled to speak on matters which will come before the House during the session. Perhaps, while I am speaking about this I may make reference to the Coastal Service on Fortune Bay and I want to say this that I think that the South Coast and Fortune Bay has got the best Coastal Service that it has had for many years.

It took time. I had to do some fighting for it, but I must say now that I am expressing the sentiments of everybody in that constituency when I say that the services given by the Glencoe were as near to perfect as they could possibly be; and I was only sorry one day when I read in the papers that the Glencoe was going to be taken off the route and sent to the sealfishery. Fortunately, however, the Government countermanded that order. Now, I would like to convey to the Government the amount of work that is done there by that steamer. On the trip before last, from Port aux Basques to Argentia, the Glencoe passed through four hundred passengers; and when she left Belleoram to come to Argentia she had one hundred and thirty-five passengers on board—so much, indeed, that there was not enough accommodation for them, and one passenger and his wfie, whose names I need not mention, could not find any accommodation and had to go into one of the engineer's rooms.

In addition to that, at this time of the year the industries are beginning to open on the West Coast, and it would have been fatal to take the Glencoe off and put a smaller vessel on. There are about two or three hundred people up there who go to Lunenburg to fish at this time of the year and who come back in the winter. Some may say that these are people leaving the country. They are nothing of the sort. They are doing exactly the same thing as the Northern men who go down to Labrador. These men go to Lunenburg and fish and bring back their money in the fall. Exactly the same as the Northern man who fishes on Labrador and brings his money back. There will be at least two or three hundred men going to Lunenburg, besides those who will be coming back from the Humber, and the Home could never have been able to look after them.

Last Session we heard a great deal about the Prohibition Act, and though we have had a good many speeches in the House on the matter now before the chair, no reference has been made to the Prohibition Act, the working of the Act, or the Controller's Department. I therefore am, perhaps, making a new point when I refer to it. The Act was intended to provide that a man would be able to get a bottle a day. But I think, sir, that some amendment will have to be made either to the Act itself or the Commissioners will have to amend their Rules and Regulations to carry out that object.

I do not know whether a bottle a day was too much or too little for the ordinary man. I know my own requirements, and I do not propose to state them to the House. But I do know this, that at present a man who lives in the outports has either to accept a bottle per trip of the steam-

er or to pay a very enhanced price for what he orders.

I have taken the matter up with the Commissioners because of representations made to me. The people who require a bottle a day say that they are not able to get it. They may not want it, but they are not able to get even a half bottle a day. The position is this, and I think it has already been referred to in the newspapers: The man in St. John's can go to the Controller's Department and his bottle. It may not be a bottle a day. But on the South Coast, where the Glencoe leaves Argentia once in three weeks, and the Portia once a fortnight, it means that a person who wants to abide by the law and carry out the Prohibition Act, and obtain whatever he is allowed to obtain, can only get one bottle per trip of the Portia or the Glencoe. That means a bottle every fortnight or a bottle every three weeks, or else he has to pay very considerably more for anything he gets in addition to that. I understand that the Commissioners have taken this view of the Act, that a man who has not ordered anything from the Controller's Department for a fortnight, and who write to the Department and says "I have not ordered anything from your Department for ten days. I, therefore, would like you to sell me five bottles of"—his particular fancy—"and enclose the money for it." He is told that all he can get is one bottle, but that if he writes a letter on the 1st of March, ordering a bottle, and another on the 2nd of March, ordering a bottle, and others on the 3rd, 4th and 5th March, ordering a bottle each day, unless the 5th happens to be Sunday—then the Controller's Department will send him one bottle per day at the usual price plus expressage for every single parcel they send.

I desire to draw this to the attention of the Government so that some arrangements may be made whereby, as far as possible, the man in the outports may be put on a par with the man in St. John's, who are more fortunate or more unfortunate.

Now, sir, there is one more matter which has been brought up here to which I want to refer. That matter is this, that last session I was asked by the Government to undertake an enquiry into the system of wages paid loggers in this country, and to the best of my ability I did it. I filed my report and the members can read it for themselves.

It will be remembered that a Bill was introduced into this House last session to provide for a minimum wage of forty-five dollars per month and found be paid to those engaged in the logging industry. I proceeded in November to the various headquarters of the loggers, and I understand I was not in the House at the time—but I understand that the member for Twillingate, Mr. Brown, who introduced that Bill, in criticizing the Logging Report, said that he could have written a better report sitting in his arm chair. I am not sure if that was what the member said, but he can correct me if I am wrong.

MR. BROWN—That is not what I said. I said that I heard somebody else say that he could have written a better report sitting in his arm chair.

MR. WARREN—The hon. member said that he heard somebody else say that he could have written a better report sitting in his arm chair. I do not know whether in making that statement to the House the honourable member takes the responsibility for it or not, but whether he does or not I am just going to tell him that he may take what I am saying back to the gentleman who told him that he could write a better report sitting in his arm chair. I am at a loss to understand what he means. If he means that the literary style, diction or the language of the report is not

all that it might be, then I cannot say whether he is right or wrong, because I do not know the literary abilities of the gentleman who gave the honourable member his information. But if he means that the facts are wrong in that report, I think that the gentleman who gave him his information will find that he is mistaken, as every fact in that report is verified on oath. As a matter of fact the report is merely a resume of what was taken on oath. Of course anybody, as a matter of fact, could have written that report sitting in an arm chair. I did it in mine, after I had been out to the West Coast and interviewed the various people who gave evidence, which evidence is set forth in that report. It is only natural that any man could write it sitting in an arm chair.

I found, sir, that as far as the logging industry is concerned that the men wanted to get as much as they could, and that, far from asking for a minimum wage of forty-five dollars a month and found, they wanted sixty-five dollars a month and found; and the Companies—I will say this for them—are prepared to give them that, and are giving it to some, provided they get returns for it. Of course every man, whether he is a logger, or a fisherman, or whatever else he is, wants to get for his labiur as much as he possibly can get, and nobody will refuse to give him that. But the logging industry, as every man or practically every man that came before me swore, is a skilled or semi-skilled work. The trouble is this, that those who make a business of going into the logging woods each winter work in their own gangs. It will be found in that respect that nearly every man whose evidence is with the report has sworn that a bad man in a gang will spoil the work of the rest of the gang. Therefore the men make up their gangs before they leave their homes, or when they get to the place where they have to work, they pick out the four best men they can get and they work in the same gang.

The trouble I found was this. That there were a lot of men who had been fishing during the summer and did badly, and then came back and looked around for some enterprise in which they could engage to tide them over during the winter. They went into the logging woods, and found that they were not earning the same large amounts that other people were. At the end of two or three months they expected to come out with a hundred dollars or more, but instead of that they found that they had little or nothing.

After all, the logging industry is like all others. The men must know something about it, and it can be readily seen that those who have to get the wood, the paper companies cannot afford, nor indeed can the country afford, because the country is behind one of these companies to the extent of ten million dollars, to treat the industry in that manner; but the time will come when there will be no need for Mr. Brown's Bill, when the men will realize that logging is a skilled industry. They will devote their whole attention to it, instead of . . .

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 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:

In the name of the House of Assembly I present the following Bills for Your Excellency's assent:

"An Act to Amend the Act 15

George V., Chapter XX, entitled 'An Act for the Raising of a Sum of Money on the Credit of the Colony for Certain Public Purposes,' and

"An Act Respecting the Seal Fishery During the Present Year."

To these Bills His Excellency assented.

The members of the House of Assembly then returned to their own chamber.

MR. WARREN—When interrupted by His Excellency's command, I was concluding my remarks with regard to the wages paid the loggers. I was saying that the time will arrive, and perhaps in the not distant future, when the loggers realizing that theirs is skilled labor, will be able to force their own rates of pay and be able to look out for themselves instead of having an Act of this sort put through the House. Now turning to another point, there was something in the remarks of the hon. member for Carbonear a short time ago when referring to dismissals such as that by which Mr. Guy—I do not know the man—lost his position though he had three sons who gave service to the country during the war, which leads me to say that I think the time has arrived when the Civil Service should be placed under a Commission and we should follow the system in vogue in other countries that are further ahead than we are. At present investigations are being conducted by experts into the different Departments of the Civil Service and we are told that every branch has something wrong, that they are not functioning properly, and as we have seen lately civil servants are being haled before the Courts. To a certain extent this is the fault of the Government—not the present one—but those which have gone before. Since the days of Responsible Government we have been appointing to civil service positions those who we think have done the most for us on the political platform or in the political campaign irrespective of his ability to perform the work for which he was appointed. It is all very well for those of us who are in the Government at the time to do it for the one who gets the position, but speaking for the man in the street who has to pay the salaries it is not good enough. He is entitled to the value of what he pays and unless we run our civil service as other countries do, or like the ordinary business man conducts his business we can expect nothing but the disclosures such as we have witnessed the last few years. Civil service positions should be given to the men best qualified to fill them irrespective of his political views, and wherever possible, to the ex-service men. We have been told that conditions in the Post Office Department are bad, and we have heard an ex-Postmaster General state one of the reasons for the disintegration and poor condition of the department is because men are put in the positions who have not gone through the system, have no knowledge of the work and are practically useless as far as properly filling the jobs is concerned. In spite of the appeals to previous governments to appoint ex-service men to civil service positions, we find Mr. Hodder to-day appointed to the position of Deputy Minister of Posts. I have nothing against Mr. Hodder, and as far as I know he is a good citizen, but I have yet to learn the reasons why he was appointed to the position of practically permanent head of the department. He has no service in the department to recommend him, but while ex-service men, many with the same abilities and out of work, are passed over, Mr. Hodder is appointed. I would like to hear the reasons why these men were passed over and the position given to a man with no experience in the department, which admittedly is not functioning and which is in such

a condition that strong hands are needed to pull it together. I have now come to some things mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, and to which I would like to refer. The first paragraph relates to codfish and that subject I will deal with last.

The next point in the Speech from the Throne to which I wish to refer is, that dealing with the conditions at Bell Island. The relations of the Government with the corporation generally known as Besco have been strained for some years. It will be remembered that the contract made by the Government, I think in 1905, and to last fifteen years, expired in 1920. By this contract the Company was to pay a tax on all iron ore mined at Bell Island. In 1920 another agreement was made, and since then various troubles have arisen. I consider that the miners are being exploited by the corporation, and the situation will have to be taken hold of with a strong hand if we are to arrive at a basis, where work at the Island will be carried on satisfactorily, and with profit to the country, the miner and the company alike. Perhaps a review of the situation since 1920 will help honourable members to obtain a view of matters in connection with the deal. In 1920 the contract expired, and it was the duty of the Government of the day to make another agreement with them. This agreement was a little different from the other, and obligations were put on them to carry out—in some cases the tax was increased—and in others a tax was abrogated. Further we must remember that that agreement was a mutual one, not between the Government and Besco, but rather between Besco and this House. As a matter of fact it was accepted first outside this House, then submitted here, and a joint committee appointed to take it up with Besco. That committee consisted of members of both sides of the House, and further, that committee took the agreement up with representatives of the corporation, and agreed to amend it so that peace might reign, and all would be satisfied. The Hon. Minister of Justice, I think will bear me out that the Committee offered various alternatives, but the Company would not agree—we offered a sliding scale and a tax, but the contract was fastened on the Government, and no sooner was it ratified than the Company began trying to avoid it. The very year after, having found, to use a colloqualism, that they had bitten off more than they could chew, that they had entered into a contract with the Government which they could not fulfil, they started to try and evade it.

MR. BROWNE—Why did they enter into the contract?

MR. WARREN—I do not know what was in their minds at the time, but I remember we met outside in the Speaker's room, and they would not agree to our proposal.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—President Wolvin, of Besco, says that they never intended to carry out the contract as far as certain sections were concerned ,that clauses such as that dealing with the promise of an erection of a smelter, were never intended to be lived up to, and when asked as to why an alteration in the contract, as suggested by the Committee, could not be made, he stated the Company would not consider any alteration at all, because having had a signed contract with the Government they were afraid, in view of the talk of the famous dollar a ton, export duty, it might possibly lead them into a worse state of affairs. I had intended, Mr. Speaker, when the opportunity offered, to bring this matter to the atetntion of the House.

MR. WARREN—I do say this that so far as I was concerned in that Government and so far as the present Minister of Justice was concern-

ed there was no question of $1 per ton when they came in to make that contract.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—In fact the proposal of the Select Committee was to make a lighter tax.

MR. WARREN—But, having made the contract, they have tried to evade it, hence it is that a strong hand must be taken with them. When I was in the Government year after year, it was in December month when everything else was dead and there was not a stroke of work doing for laborers, that was the time that Besco always stepped in. I think that the Prime Minister will find in his fyles a copy of a letter from me to Mr. Wolvin dealing strongly with this annual lockout on the part of his Company and I hope that the Prime Minister will see that it must stop and that there are no more of these annual lockouts from the Besco people. And this is not the only country that has experienced trouble with Besco. They are up to their necks in it in Nova Scotia where Besco is having a fight with the coal miners. When it came to the end of 1924 in Nova Scotia Besco said to the miners "your wages must be reduced by ten per cent." The miners, through their Union, said "No, our wages must be increased by ten per cent." No arrangement or agreement could be arrived at and eventually the Dominion Government stepped in and a conciliation Board was appointed. The miners refused to appoint representatives on it. Although such a board was illegal by a judgment of the Privy Council, representatives for the miners were put on that board by the Government with the result that, after hearing various evidence at what was known as the Winfield Commission, it was decided that the whole matter should be thoroughly explored and that there should be an investigation and both sides to the dispute were willing. Both the Company and the miners said "Yes, we are satisfied to have the investigation." But what happened. They immediately fell out as to the scope of the investigation. The miners wanted a full investigation regarding the Company, internally and externally, as to whether their side of the case was right or wrong and as to whether their wages should be increased or not. The Company wanted to limit the scope of the investigation and have it determined as to whether "we can this year afford to pay an increase of ten per cent." There the matter stopped and there it rested, except that the Prime Minister of Nova Scotia has now offered a Royal Commission to enquire into the whole matter. It is not my desire to offer destructive criticism, but constructive criticism, and, I have made up my mind that the one course for our Government to pursue is to have a Commission of Enquiry and investigate the whole matter thoroughly and see if the contractors cannot pay those workmen on Bell Island or see if the men are overworked or are producing too much for what they are being paid. We want the industry here to go on and we want the men to get work, but I consider that there is only one course for the Government to take and that is a complete investigation and not take the ipse dixit of Mr. Wolvin, who, frequently says that Besco cannot do this, that or the other thing. Let the Company come before the Government and substantiate on oath what they are doing and then the Government, the miners and the people of the country will know for certain what the position is, and until that is known we will be constantly in a state of turmoil over these annual lockouts and with a spirit of antagonism prevailing between the miners and the Company. And I

want to say this, that there are some parts of that contract that Besco would like to have carried out and there are other parts of it that they do not want to have carried out. There is in that contract a proposal to give the Company the use of the waters of the river known as Rocky River in the district of Placentia and St. Mary's for power purposes. When I was in the Government I was approached by various people both on behalf of themselves and on behalf of Besco asking that that power on Rocky River should be given to Besco, but while I was Leader of the Government I always refused and I would like to point out to the Government of the day that efforts are likely to be made still on behalf of that corporation to obtain the use of the waters of Rocky River and pitch the rest of the contract overboard. I hope that the Government will take into their consideration the waters of Rocky River when they make a new contract, if they ever do with that corporation. So much for Besco.

The next paragraph in the Speech from the Throne is one that I have a great deal of interest in. I refer to the Labrador Boundary Question. The Labrador Boundary Question has been a more or less unfortunate thing for any lawyers who happened to be mixed up in it. It has been treated as a joke somewhat ever since it started in 1909 and has been looked upon as a lucrative source of revenue to any lawyer who has been engaged on that question. Any lawyer, whether he has been an Attorney General or not, has had to stand a certain amount of witticisms and criticisms because of his connection with that Labrador Boundary Question. I need only refer to the speech made by the hon. member for Fogo a few days ago in which he thought, according to the papers, that the Labrador ought to be sold because of the large amount of lawyers' fees that had been paid. Last session I had to stick out for my constituents in Fortune Bay when they were deprived of their steamer. As soon as I did, I was told by the Hon. Minister of Finance that the Government was cutting out the steamer in Fortune Bay for reasons of economy, and that one of the reasons for the economy was the large expenditure over the Labrador Boundary Question. I did not argue over it with him at the time. It was much more important to me getting the steamer in Fortune Bay than it was to know whether or not I robbed the Government over the Labrador Boundary. So that the House will appreciate and see for themselves I must quote the words from the Hansard that the Hon. Minister of Finance used in dealing with the matter in which he rounded on me the squanderings of the past few years. Here is what he said: (Quotes from Hansard).

Well I did not anticipate then that the Labrador Boundary was going to play such a prominent part in the doings of members of the Executive Council, as I have learned since, but I hope that the Minister who talked about those payments being squandered and described them as shocking and unfortunate has now come to see that, perhaps, there is something more in the Labrador Boundary than the mere payments of fees to lawyers. I need not go into the history of the matter nor do I propose to go into the details, but I would like to point out to those who think that the money has been squandered and the expenditure has been unfortunate that it has suddenly dawned upon some good people in the community, at all events, that there is something of value on the Labrador and something worth fighting for. The Labrador Boundary Question was not started by the late Government. It was started long before that period.

It was commenced in the time that Sir Robert Bond was Prime Minister. The dispute arose really between the Province of Quebec and a private individual. I am going into this history so that people can understand a little about what is known as the Labrador Boundary Question. It was found that in pursuit of that action a judgment between the Province of Quebec and a man named Dickie would not settle the Boundary of the Labrador, and Dickie who had got a lease from the Newfoundland Government, appealed to the Newfoundland Government to stand behind him. The Government of Newfoundland said "Yes, as we have given you a lease, we will stand behind you."

I want to assure the House that in my opinion and in the opinion of the then Prime Minister and of the Solicitors and Counsel on the other side, that we could do no harm by trying out the Quebec and Dominion Governments with a view to a settlement rather than pursuing the bitter fight in the Privy Council. As I said, I came out from England by way of Canada. It was done after consultation, and I am safe in telling now the reason that the delegation that went to Quebec and Montreal, did little more than I did at that time. I am going to tell you exactly what I did, and some of the propositions I made in order to rush the question to a conclusion. Between 1909 and 1915, there was nothing done in the matter at all events, and I do not say this with any amount of pride. It is only my duty to do it, but when I happened to be Attorney General our case was settled complete and ready for exchange with the Province of Quebec. I spent three and a half years on it. I was always twitted about taking trips across to England, but if nobody else brought it to a head, I did, and now the country reaps the benefit of what I did, in spite of the shocking expense referred to by the Minister of Finance last year. In 1922 we had our case very far advanced. I was in England at the time, and I went over the matter with the lawyers on the other side, particularly with Sir Thos. Berridge, who was our Solicitor. He died a few months ago. I am going to mention one reason, I am not going to give the other. It would not be right or fair, although I am no longer associated with any counsel on the Labrador Boundary Question. But Sir Richard Squires, who was in London at the time, in consultation with him it was decided that it would be just as well to see if steps could not be arrived at instead of going to the Privy Council with it. I am not going to submit it to the House. I am prepared to tell the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice why we could not come to a decision.

Now, if we could settle the Labrador Boundary Question by the Dominion Government taking over the National Debt, we must do it. I accordingly made that proposition to the Prime Minister of Quebec. I may say he did not know whether to believe I was in my right senses or not. However, I did not leave it at that. I took up the question of fishing rights and of vested interests down there, and we were practically agreed on every point. The Prime Minister—Sir Richard Squires, followed me, and we had a further interview with the authorities as to the settlement of the question. The next year was 1923, and I attended the Imperial Conference. At the Conference there were the Prime Minister of Canada and the Minister of Justice of the Dominion Government. I again took up the matter with them with regard to a settlement. I did not go into details but I had an assurance from him that a reasonable settlement was what he preferred. Mr.

Lancelot was one of the delegation which met the Newfoundland delegation in Quebec. He was in London, too, and looked into the matter. I want to say that I had an interview with him, and in spite of any assertion made to the contrary, the lowest figure we were prepared to entertain for any transference of our rights on Labrador to Quebec or Canada, was twenty-five million dollars. I did not offer or consider any figure less than that—whatever I was prepared to do later on. I was prepared to consider 25 millions and nothing else until they gave me an indication of what they were prepared to give. Nothing was done until the present Prime Minister received an invitation to discuss the matter with the authorities. I am going to say this, and I have gone into the matter, I don't think there is a lawyer in Newfoundland who has a better knowledge of the details of the Boundary Question than I have. I asked the Prime Minister if he had taken any legal advice before he had proceeded to Quebec or Montreal, and I was rather surprised to find that he had not. I don't think if I had a case in court with another man that I would try to settle it without taking some advice from the lawyers I had retained. Of course I don't mean that he should have consulted me, but he was most unwise to proceed further without legal advice.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—We had a lawyer with us.

MR. WARREN—But I don't think he had a knowledge of the details that the lawyers prominent in the case for the last four years had. There was no reason why he should not acquire it. There are enough documents on this subject to acquire the knowledge that has been acquired by those delving into the matter for the past four years. But, Sir, I will say this, looking at the whole matter, and without giving any legal reason why I think so—this matter can be settled without going into the Privy Council. Some agreement has to be arrived at. Although the case has already been printed, we can't hand it over to Quebec nor get their case. So eventually, whether there is a settlement or not, we must come to some agreement before going to the Privy Council at all. Ask them are they going to let us have their case, if they want to string the matter out or if they want the matter tied up for the next three years. There is no machinery to compel action within the next five years, and evt:ything will be tied up. There is another reason I might tell, but I am not going to give it in the House because I might be prejudicing our case. I might give the reason privately to the Prime Minister or the Minister of Justice.

The next point to which I wish to refer is the matter of the construction of the new steamer. Some reference has been made to the fact that the Governemnt has raised a loan to pay for the steamer and for the rails purchased in England, and that the Trade Facilities Committee over there has undertaken to pay a portion of the interest on the part of the loan which is expended on the purchase of the rails. I had something to do with that, Sir, and I want to make myself perfectly clear with regard to it. Last year when I attended the Imperial Conference and the Economic Conference, there was a select committee of the Economic Conference consisting of the Prime Ministers only, and it was held with a view to increasing employment in England. At the Economic Conference were Sir Marmaduke Winter, a member of the Executive Board of Newfoundland and Sir Patrick McGrath. They did not attend the meeting that drew up regulations regarding the Trade Facilities Committee providing for payment of a

certain portion of interest on the loans raised in England. No fault can be found with the other gentlemen for not knowing very much about what took place, but I know after these discussions with the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the other Prime Minister, no arrangements had been come to, by which fair work that was necessary, would be subsidized, whether it was public or private, so long as it provided employment for the unemployed in England, and whatever it was, the Government was prepared to pay up to 75 p.c. on loans raised in England for the period of five years, if the money was utilized on making materials that would give employment in England.

Because it was not a public necessity is perhaps more fully understood, because under the rules, and if you will look up the minutes of the conference, you will find that it does not matter whether it is a public concern or a private individual or anybody else so long as they would speed up any work that they had and would probably leave for a year or so otherwise, and they would pay seventy-five per cent. of the interest on the money spent so that it was spent in the Old Country and thereby lessening the condition of unemployment which existed there. As I said, any private individual could take advantage of that offer but it had to be under the auspices of the Dominion or Colony in which the work was done. Now, sir, with regard to the order for rails and with regard to the order for the machinery, which they must of necessity have a considerable amount; you must have roadmaking machinery for the proper building of the roads; I hope that you will bring the matter up with the Trade Facilities Committee. As one of the Committee, any help of any form that I can give, or any assistance which I may be able to offer from my knowledge of the rules and regulations in connection with the working of the Committee, I shall be glad to give it. Now, there is another matter to which I have to refer, unemployment. I propose to leave this with the fishery until the end. Now, sir, the next matter to which I have to refer in the Speech from the Throne is this: "Very disturbing discoveries have been made by a commission engaged in an enquiry concerning expenditures for charitable institutions and services. Laxness of administration, imposition by the non-deserving have been proved, and there is evidence that the homely virtues of self-reliance and self-respect have been diminishing. Public expenditure for the relief of the sick and afflicted is meant for the helpless poor, and those who selfishly trade upon this charity are very reprehensible." That is the only reference to any commission of enquiry in the speech. I do not think that in view of what has recently taken place that the man in th street thinks that enquiry sufficient. In the first place, compared to the other enquiries which have taken place in this Colony, you have a private investigation. It is not a commission of enquiry. It is a private investigation undertaken by members of the Government, and however much they would like to do, you cannot separate them in the minds of the man on the street from some idea of partisan politics, and any member of the Government or of the Opposition or any one sitting in this House would have the same thing thought of him. This investigation cannot bring in a conviction of any guilty persons. This committee is able to restrain any information which the man on the street is entitled to know and allow the press to print just what it likes to divulge. We have been told that there have been discriminations practised. We have been told that there were doctors

who have made thousands of dollars out of it and that there were others who have made none. Some districts have taken advantage of the Commission of Public Charities and that others have not done so. There is only one district, and that happens to be the district which I represent, which has not taken advantage of this condition of affairs which existed. And I think that I saw in one of the papers the other day that the hospital was crowded with people taking advantage of the Commission of Charities. And as I stated, the people of Fortune Bay are the only people who did not do so. That must be very gratifying to them to be aware of this. I am sure that it gives them much pleasure to know that they are the only district who did not avail of the Commission of Charities or whatever official was looking after thees affairs. They may be very pleased, but this is not sufficient. They want to know who are the others. If the money has been voted by this House for Public Charities and is to be publicly spent, and is not publicly spent, it is right that the person or persons guilty should be made known and an enquiry made, not a partisan enquiry by the members of the Government, who give out what information they like and cannot make any convictions on what they find. You are not going to stop it by this means. Let the names of those guilty persons be given the publicity which they deserve. It does not matter who it is. Let us see the names of those doctors who got the thousands. If they did wrong in getting it their names should be published. If the members of this House obtained for their districts what they should not have gotten, I say, sir, that their actions should be made public. You are not going to stop a repetition of these wrongs with a private enquiry that can give out that information only which it likes to give. I am reminded of one other thing. It was on the opening day of the House. I had just congratulated the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply. The Prime Minister spoke after me and therefore I did not have an opportunity on congratulating him publicly on his speech, although I did do it afterwards privately. I had heard the Prime Minister eulogised as not being a professional politician. It was said to his credit that he was not a professional politician, and I agreed with it, but on the opening day there was no politician that ever sat in this House that could handle the situation that was presented that day as well as he did. Now I made reference upon the opening day to the policy referred to by Mr. Cahill as "Clean up, keep clean and a square deal to all." I do not want to go into the details of Mr. Cahill's and Mr. Monroe's speeches now, but what I want to say is, that Mr. Monroe got up and gave this House and everybody who sat in it the idea that he was presenting the policy of cleaning up and paying the bills that were left over. "We are paying for two balloons and the shell of the Lobelia and that is the cleaning up that I am doing"; and I say that the Prime Minister made a perfectly satisfactory explanation that he was paying the bills for the balloons and the Lobelia and that would be the clean up policy, and everybody went away perfectly satisfied. Now I say, sir, God help the rest of us the day that the Prime Minister starts in to be a professional politician. He knows that he satisfied the crowd that day; but he knows that if he had gone to the country with that sort of a clean up policy and tell the people that he was going to pay the bills for a couple of balloons and perhaps clean up the question of the Lobelia, if, I say, that he had gone to the country with that sort of a policy, I think that there would not have been so many of the members on the other

side of the House who are there now.

My friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries did the same thing this afternoon. He said that he was cleaning up a bill due the Imperial Oil since 1921. If that is what the Prime Minister means by saying that he is cleaning up, I am prepared to accept his assertion.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—The trouble is that we have struck so much new stuff that we have been delayed. You know what was in those pigeon holes.

MR. WARREN—I am glad to hear from the Hon. Minister of Justice that the cleaning up has only been delayed.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Do you mean to tell us that you did not know that there was anything due on the Lobelia and the Wren and the Daisy?

MR. WARREN—Not until I was informed that that was the case by the Prime Minister a few months ago. I did know something about the money that was tried to be collected on the two balloons, and I refused to pay that money. There was no demand made upon us by the Government except for a small amount, but there was a demand made by a Major —I cannot think of his name just now. . . .

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Major Kennedy?

MR. WARREN—Yes, Major Kennedy, which demand we refused to entertain. As far as we were concerned these presents—these Greek presents, I may call them—were made to the Government through the High Commissioner's office in London, and as far as I am concerned, I understand that they really were presents. I did not understand that we were buying them, nor so far as I know was any demand made for payment upon the Government, except as I have outlined. As a matter of fact, I was away when the Lobelia arrived.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I do not think anyone blames you for these presents.

MR. WARREN—If we had understood at all that we were buying these things, they would never have been accepted. There is only one oher matter that I wish to speak of before I resume my seat, the Government's proposal to incorporate towns and villages and settlements for the management of their concerns. That is a matter that will require a good deal of thought and consideration; but I think it is a move in the right direction. I think that the time is arriving when those settlements or towns, which are capable of being incorporated, should have the control of their own affairs, and in this connection I would ask the Government to consider the advisability of the appointment of a Public Commission to deal with all public utilities.

Here in St. John's we have a town which is run by a municipality. The town has its charter, but it is not fully incorporated. The town cannot borrow money itself. It has to rely upon the Government for its finances. It has to come to the Government before it can borrow money for any improvements or public utilities whatever.

We have recently had an experience which shows us the need of a Public Utilities Commission to look after the interests of the ordinary man on the street. We need some Commission of that sort. I am speaking now of the time when we were promised a new telephone service in St. John's, and a bill was being put through for the new Company. We were told that the old system was inadequate, antiquated and antedeluvian, but the new system was to remedy all the old defects, but now after some years of it I defy anyone

who uses the telephone under the new system to-day to say that the system is an up to date one, or at all commensurate with the promises that were made at the time that it was being started, and when the Act was going through the House, and I think that that is one Public Utility that might have borne the Inspection of a Public Utilities Commission.

Since last year we have a new owner of the Electric Lighting and the Street Cars. The other day I was coming from the West End in a street car, and I saw a man sitting in the car with his umbrella up. That is just typical of the condition that these things are in. Then there has been a lot of trouble about the electric light. The price went up, and then it came down again; the light is not good enough, there is not enough power, on all sides there are complaints to be heard about this Company.

I would suggest that the Government in connection with the Bill that they now propose to bring before the House for the Incorporation of townships, they will take into consideration the advisability of providing for the appointment of a Public Utilities Commission, who will have power to speak for the man in the street, who cannot speak for himself in regard to matters of that sort.

Mr. Speaker, finally I want to refer to two more matters which I have left over—the question of unemployment and the question of our fisheries. These two things are absolutely intertwined. I asked yesterday for a list of the number of families that are being relieved at the Government's expense in St. John's. I did not ask that question for the purpose of advertisement. I asked the question so that I could have accurate figures to compare with the figures of previous years. I see that the Daily News this morning in giving the figures was inaccurate. The number of families being relieved by the Government per week is one thousand and two hundred and seventy-four, and they are paying to individuals five dollars per week, to families for the first relief order ten dollars, and following orders ten, eight and six dollars according to the size of the families; and an investigation is held into each case before the relief is given.

What I want to get at is this—it is not so much an investigation into the actual circumstances of each family that is needed; but what we have to do, what the Government have to do, and what the Opposition has to do, and what the man on the street and everybody else has to do is to find out the reason why twelve hundred families are receiving relief in the city to-day, and when they have found that reason they have to remove it.

It is not so much the number that is alarming; that is practically the same number that was being relieved last year and the year before, but what I am worried about and alarmed at is this—how long is that state of affairs going to last? When is it going to stop? What are we going to do to stop it? What can be done to stop it? That is the problem that is facing us.

With about thirteen hundred families being relieved, at the rate of five to ten dollars for individuals, the total comes to about fifty thousand dollars each month, and for three months it would come to about one hundred and fifty thousand dollars. How long is that drag on the community going to continue. The man who is receiving relief, wants work, and he wants to know what is going to be done for him.

Undoubtedly many side industries have been started in this country, and while they have helped a lot in reducing unemployment, they are not able to take up all the unemployed

of this country. There can be no doubt that we have to get back to the fishery, which is the mainstay of this country. I am not criticizing the Government now; I am merely trying to give them some suggestions. I am alarmed to know that thirteen hundred families are receiving relief from the Government in St. John's, and everyone must do what he possibly can to stop that.

I think that the institution of industries like the Humber and the Gander and Grand Falls have helped a lot, but eventually we have got to get down to the basic industry of this country—the fishery. It was the fishery that made this colony, to begin with, and we really have to have a good fishery to carry on.

I have talked about the settlement of the Labrador Boundary Question. I say now, yes, sell the inside of the Labrador so long as you have your fisheries left. Suppose you get ten millions for it. With five per cent. on that you will have five hundred thousand dollars a year. Spend that money, or whatever you get for the inside of Labrador, on doing something to improve the fishery. Here we are a fishing country, and we are making, and catching, and shipping our fish exactly as we did a hundred, or a hundred and fifty years ago. Can that be said of any other country? Has any money ever been spent on any scientific investigation of the fishery? In a small way, members of the community have tried to do something to obtain a scientific insight into our fishery, and private efforts are made from time to time to dispose of the fish in some other way than the time honored one of salting it down, and sending it across to the markets—the same old markets that have been buying our fish for years. The hon. member for Burin yesterday asked what good Trade Commissioners were. I do not know that Trade Commisisoners such as we have had them have been very much good; but is there any man in business who does not try to boost his wares. You do not see the Royal Stores or Ayre & Sons, or any other merchant on Water Street sitting down and expecting somebody to come in and buy his goods from him. They send out men to sell their goods, and it does not matter whether you call them Trade Commissioners or Commercial Travellers—they try their best to boost their goods wherever they go.

Take the case of the hon. member for Burin—Mr. Lake. He is going to commence to make profitable a new method of disposing of fish and selling it. But who knew of that. Not a soul—but if we had some trade commissioners or commercial travellers around, even though we could have only one or two to start with, then at all events we would be able to dispose of our fish in new markets, and not in the old time honored way. But as long as we sit down and consider ourselves a sound, tight little Island bounded by the sea, then we can expect nothing but to go on shouldering our burden of taxation—the higher burden of taxation upon the same quantity of fish that we had about a hundred years ago, when the public debt of the Colony was only a fifth or a quarter of what it is now, and when our expenditure was only one-fifth of what it is to-day. We are still practically depending upon the same amount of fish, caught in the same old way, handled in the same way and sold in the same way. There are individuals and bodies who have tried to do something about it, and I suggest to the Government that they co-operate with these people who are trying to do something. Take our Board of Trade. With very little money at their disposal they have done a lot of work. They have realized that if we are going to get out of the rut, and if we are going

to improve our fishery, we have got to introduce some scientific knowledge into it. We want to find out if we can handle the fish better, if we can cure the fish better—and we are told that we can't.

The Board of Trade in its annual report has 1½ pages devoted to scientific research in connection with the fisheries. It is not put there to fill up but to give information and with the object of improving the fisheries. But what notice has been taken of it. None as far as I can discover. I have in my hand now a pamphlet dealing with biology and the waters around Newfoundland by Mr. Huntsman a member of the Biological Board of Canada. In that Dominion they have tried many means of improving their fish catch and of disposing of it. But we have no Biological Board and have done practically nothing as to improving the fisheries and making them such as to support the heavy taxation which we have to bear to-day. I have also another pamphlet on the fisheries of Newfoundland by Mr. Taylor. He was brought out here by the Governor and I think the late Government. He is a fellow the Royal Statistical and other such Societies of England and bears a very high reputation. He gave an address here before the Board of Trade and it was put in pamphlet form but I do not believe a single fisherman ever saw it. The one by Mr. Huntsman who was sent here from Canada dealt with practically everything from the taking of the temperature of the water to the catching of the fish but what fishermen takes the temperature or does anything else in a scientific way. During election times he has political propaganda, circulars, manifestoes, etc. poked under his door but none of them ever see one of these pamphlets. I had to ask for one at the Board of Trade and I trust the present energetic Minister of Fisheries will see that these matters which were given to the Board by these men who are among the highest in their profession are distributed among those who catch and sell the fish. It may be said that if we caught more fish we would not be able to sell it. Well then, let us find more ways of disposing of it. A larger catch means more employment in St. John's and a catch of 100,000 qtls. at $10 a qtl. will not give as much labor as 200,000 qtls. at $5 a qtl. If we get more fish we have to find more ways of marketing it. When I was in London I was speaking to Premier Massey of New Zealand and I asked him how it was that his country could sell butter in Newfoundland in competition with the product of Prince Edward Island which is just next door. He replied that it was because of the system of manufacture by which they use nothing but machinery and by selling the product under Government regulations. Their dairy products are sold under control of act of Parliament and that is why they can sell their butter in Newfoundland. Now if this can be be done in one Colony—and mentioning regulations, I do not think anyone wants to return to fish regulations—steps should be taken here in regard to the marketing of our fish which result in the giving of labor and the stopping of the present unemployment conditions.

As I said before I do not wish to delay the business of the House, and referring to the matters in the Speech is one of the formalities, but if I can do anything to help in bettering the conditions of the fisheries and the fishermen I will gladly do so, as I believe my constituents sent me here for that purpose. Whatever I can do I am prepared to do. I would like to add that since I referred to the distribution of the pamphlets dealing with fishery matters I have learned that the Minister of Marine has dis-

tributed 3,000 of them, which only bears out what I said before as to his energy in office. I hope when such people as the scientists referred to come here again to help us, their views will again be put in pamphlet form, and I know the Minister of Marine will have them distributed. Today I have confined myself to dealing with codfish, but I would like to add that there is a great market for our herring which has not yet been touched, and that is Russia. When I was Prime Minister I was one day approached by a Water Street firm on this matter as a trade agreement between England and Russia was then on the tapis. I do not know if the contract is in effect yet, but I do know that besides Russia there are great markets for herring in Lehvia and Esthonia. The Newfoundland representative in London could easily get in touch with the British Overseas Department and obtain all the information needed on this matter of herring for Russia. There is no doubt whatever as to the market being there, and I hope the Government will pursue the subject by every means in their power.

On motion the debate on the Address in Reply was adjourned.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, Feb. 27th, 1925.

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

PRESENTING PTTITIONS.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of St. Vincent's Parish and St. Mary's Parish, and the inhabitants of Riverhead, St. Mary's. This petition is mainly in connection with a road from St. Vincent's to St. Mary's. This road would be about eighteen miles long, and would be an excellent addition to our tourist roads. For many years we have been spending small amounts of money to try to complete that road from St. Vincent's to St. Mary's, but unfortunately we have never been in a position to get a sufficient amount of money. I certainly think the road should be completed. The main road now runs just along by the sea coast, over barren country, and it is impossible to travel over it in the winter season. I, therefore, have very much pleasure in recommending this petition to the attention of the department to which it relates, and in asking that when the Government is pursuing its new road policy, that this will be one of the first roads completed.

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES—I have much pleasure in supporting that petition.

MR. SINNOTT—I also have much pleasure in supporting that petition.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the electors of Brigus South and Admiral's Cove, in the vicinity of Cape Broyle, asking that a telephone line be erected between Brigus, Admiral's Cove and Cape Broyle. In giving this petition my support, I would like to impress upon this House that both these settlements have a population of about fifty families. Through the winter season these people are practically cut off from communication with civilization, I may say, because there is no telephone in Brigus, nor in Admiral's Cove, and they are three miles from Cape Broyle. I feel sure that I will only have to refer this petition to the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs to have it receive all the attention possible.

MR. MOORE—I give the petition that has just been presented by my

colleague my heartiest support. I know the needs of these people, and what hardships they have, and I hope the Government will see its way clear to accede to this petition and have the telephone line erected.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I beg to lay on the table of the House the answer to the question of Mr. Halfyard on the order paper of February 24th.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I wish to lay on the Table of the House a copy of the correspondence between the Government and the British Empire Steel Corporation, which was asked for by Mr. Hickman yesterday. It was question number 5 on yesterday's order paper.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—I beg to lay on the Table of the House the following answer to Question No. II of the Order Paper of Feb. 23rd in relation to Trinity District:—

Date	Name	Place	Purpose	Amount		Voucher No.
			Bridge N.W. River & Station Road	247.00		536
Aug.	22—W. J. Frost	Hillview	Bridge	82.08	R	622
	28—Thos. Sparkes,	Sibley's Cove	Bridge	150.00	R	34
Sept.	1—Wm. Goobie	Queen Cove	Roads	200.00	R	9
	Nath. Toope,	Ireland's Eye	Dildo to Chance Cove	250.00		43
	Jas. Smith	Old Shop	Washout	68.67	R	751
Sept.	11—T. St. George..	H'ts Desire	Road to School	25.00	R	2
	Leander Drover,	Whiteway	Road from Britannia to Foster's Point..	250.00		8
	12—Rev. R. H. Mercer,	Britannia	Bridge	150.00		68
			Repairs to Peckham Road	100.00	R	1091
	27—D. W. Tilley	Shoal Hr.	For work effected ..	23.95	R	1103
Oct.	2—Wm. Bannister,	Trinity E.	Roads and Bridges ..	89.33		4
	John Porter	Elliston	Timber for Bridge ..	30.00		1797
	G. Ploughman,	Port Rexton	Roads	300.00	R	1323
Feb.	2—Thos. Sparks,	Silby's Cove	Main Road	100.00	R	1475
Oct.	14—T. Fleming,	Spillar's Cove	Road leading to Carbonear	300.00		7
	21—HubertJ. Vey..	Long Beach	Road to H'way House	500.00	R	8
	Jas. Wiseman,	H'ts Delight	Bridge	50.00	R	9
	Wm. Day	Champneys	Main Road	100.00		6
	Herbt. Sceviour,	British Hr.	Road	50.00		91
	W. T. Gooby..	Queen's Cove	Retaining Wall	100.00	R	7
	24—Norman Smith,	Elliot's Cove	Roads	20.00	R	1501
	F. J. Brady	Trinity	Roads	50.00	R	2
	J. Stringer,	Little H'ts Ease	Completion of Bridge	40.00		12
	Robt. Smith,	Norman's Cove	Hodgewater Road ..	50.00		13
	28—W. D. Tilley	Shoal Hr.	Repairs to Bridge ..	50.00		14
	Arch Brown	Blaketown	St. Jones' W'out to Heart's Ease	100.00	R	15
	Arthur Moore	Dildo	Monroe to Clifton ..	100.00		16
	J. Hiscock,	St. Jones' W'out	Local Bridge	40.00		17
	Henry W. Thistle,	Monroe	Public Well	30.00		1617
	R. Seward	Southport				
Nov.	17—J. Ploughman,	Port Rexton				

	20—Levi Button ....Lead Cove	Public Well	25.00		37
	D. McCarthy .. ..Bellview	Public Well	25.00	R	8
	24—John Vivian .. ..Cat Cove	Repairs Bridge	30.00		51
Dec.	1—N. Piercey .. ..Winterton	Planking Bridge	20.00		84
	Rev. R. H. Mercer, Britannia	Britannia to Deer Hr.	100.00		5
	Geo. Simmonds, Witbourne	Bridge	50.00		6
	9—Saunders & Howell, Carb'r	Repairs to Halfway House	85.60		1704
	R. Burrough, H'way House	Repairs to Halfway (Labor)	14.40	R	5
	16—I. J. Smith ..Hodge's Cove	Repairs to Bridge ..	25.00		26
Jan.	29—Theo. Hart .. ..Lady Cove	Roada	100.00		91
Feb.	19—S. Rowe .. ..Chance Cove	Repairs to Bridge damaged by ice ..	80.00		1814

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay on the Table of the House answer to the following question of Mr. Hibbs on Order Paper of Feb. 26th, 1925.

(15) MR. HIBBS—To ask the Minister of Public Works to lay on the Table of the House: (a) A statement showing what allocations of Public Monies, either main line, Local or Special, have been made in the District of Fogo, since the first day of June, 1924 to date; (b) To show the names of parties to whom Grants were sent in each case; (c) To state on whose authority the allocations, if any, were made.

QUESTION NO. 15—ORDER PAPER OF FEBRUARY 26th, 1925.

Fogo District—Local Roads, 1923-1924 (Balances)

Date	Names	Places	Amount	Voucher No.
Aug. 12—	Willis Abbott	Doting Cove	46.50	3181
	Arthur C. Goodyear	Musgrave Hr.	39.50	2
	Elimore Howell	Lumsden	40.50	3
	Bert Tulk	Ladle Cove	25.00	4
	Jesse Chaulk	Apsey Cove	9.50	5
	Enos Hicks	Carmanville North ..	82.50	6
	Willis Tulk	Carmanville South ..	18.00	7
	Chas. Wheaton, Sr.	Noggin Cove	14.50	8
	Chas. Wheaton, Sr.	Frederickton	15.00	9
	Harry French	Gander Bay South..	20.50	90
	Edw. Torraville	Victoria Cove	25.50	1
	John Blakey	Horwood	23.50	2
	Ezekial Ludlow	Fogo	80.00	3
	Wm. Butt	Island Hr.	33.00	4
	Alex. Coffin	Joe Batt's Arm	130.00	5
	Adam Hewett	Baird Island	30.00	6
	Herbert Bryan	Tilting	47.00	7
	F. D. Scott	Seldom-Come-By ...	113.50	8
	Andrew Blunden	Stagg Hr.	9.50	9
	Walter Collins	Indian Isld.	3.50	3200
	Walter Walton	Change Islds.	191.55	1

Fogo District—Local Roads, 1924-1925.

Sept. 15—	Willis Abbott	Doting Cove	100.00		764
	Arthur C. Goodyear	Musgrave Hr.	120.00		5
	Elmore Howell	Lumsden	88.00		6
	Bert Tulk	Ladle Cove	30.00		7
	Jesse Chaulk	Apsey's Cove	20.00		8
	Enos Hicks	Carmanville North	60.00		9
	Willis Tulk	Carmanville South	35.00		70
	Chas. Wheaton, Sr.	Noggin Cove	24.00		1
	Chas. Wheaton, Sr.	Frederickton	26.00		2
	Harry French	Gander Bay South	25.00		3
	Thos. Gillingham	Gander Bay North	66.00		5
	Edw. Torraville	Victoria Cove	36.00		6
	John Blakey	Horwood	45.00		7
	Ezekial Ludlow	Fogo	250.00		8
	Harry French	Man Point	25.00		4
	Wm. Butt	Island Hr.	37.00		9
	Alex. Coffin	Joe Batt's Arm	160.00		80
	Adam Hewett	Baird Isld.	117.50		1
	Herbert Bryan	Tilting	95.00		2
	F. D. Scott	Seldom-Come-By	90.00		3
	Andrew Blunden	Stagg Hr.	25.00		4
	Walter Collins	Indian Isld.	88.00		5
	Walter Walton	Change Isld.	200.00		6

QUESTION NO. 15—ORDER PAPER FEBRUARY 26th, 1925.

Fogo District—Main Lines, 1923-1924.

Date	Name	Place	Section	Amt.	Voucher No.
Aug. 14—	H. Water man	Hare Bay	Fogo to Hare Bay	30.00	3204
	W. Newman	Baird Isld.	Fogo to Baird Isld	63.60	5
	Ezekial Ludlow	Fogo	Fogo to Shoal Bay	30.00	6
	Levi Perry	Joe Batt's Arm	Tilting to Joe Batt's Arm	48.00	7
	Ezekial Ludlow	Fogo	Fogo to Seldom-Come-By	128.40	8
	Enos Hicks	Carmanville	North-Rocky Bay to Gander Bay	28.80	9
	Elinor Howell	Lumsden	Cat Hr. to Musgrave Harbor	78.00	10

Fogo District—Main Lines, 1924-1925.

Oct. 21—	Harry Farwell	Fogo	Fogo to Hare Bay	60.00	1423
	Alex Wheaton,	Frederickton	Fogo to Shoal Bay	60.00	4
	J. Newman,	Joe Batt's Arm	Fogo to Shoal Bay	48.00	5
	Leonard Green	Tilting	Tilting to Joe Batt's Arm	48.00	6
	Henry Farwell	Fogo	Fogo to Seldom-Come-By	132.00	7
	H. Anthony,	Seldom-Come-By	Fogo to Seldom-Come-By	132.00	8

Arch Squires .. ..Victoria	Rock Bay to Gander Bay	60.00	9
Aubrey Wellton, Ladle Cove	N.S. Ragged to N.S. Aspey Cove	78.00	30
Luke Abbott ..Doting Cove	Cat Hr. to Musgrave Hr.	42.00	2
A.C.Goodyear, Musgrave Hr.	Cat Hr. to Musgrave Hr.	42.00	1

QUESTION PAPER NO. 15—ORDER PAPER OF FEBRUARY 26th, 1925.

Fogo District—Special 1923-1924.

Date	Name	Place	Section	Amt.	Voucher No.
Aug. 14—	A. C. Goodyear		Musgrave Hr.	70.00	3214
	Ezekial Ludlow		Fogo	338.42	15

Fogo District—Special 1924-1925.

Aug. 13—	Andrew Blunden		Slagg Hr.	100.00	351
	Ezekial Ludlow		Fogo	100.00	1
	Willis Tulk		Carmanville South ...	140.00	3
Sept. 19—	Geo. Parsons		Lumsden	100.00	791
	Dorman Finnimore)				
	Wm. Newman)		Baird Island	250.00	2

QUESTION PAPER NO. 15—ORDER PAPER OF FEBRUARY 26th, 1925.

Fogo District—Loan 22—1923-1924.

Date	Name	Place	Section	Amt.	Voucher No.
Aug. 14—	Mark Mouland		Wadham	50.00	3211
	Enos Hicks		Carmanville North ..	60.00	12
	Bernard Sandy		Cape Cove	97.60	13
	Henry French		Gander Bay South ..	15.00	17

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—

Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay on the Table of the House the answer of the following Question (No. 4) asked by Mr. Ashbourne on Feb. 24th, 1925.

(4) MR. ASHBOURNE—To ask the Minister of Public Works to lay on the Table of the House an itemized account of the expenditure in connection with repairs to the Court House at Twillingate during 1923 and 1924, showing names of parties supplying material, names of labourers and how much each was paid; bills of all material, etc., and if any Commissions were paid on purchase of material.

QUESTION No. 4.

Order Paper of February 24th, 1925.

Ashbourne, Wm. .. ..$	1.54
Ashbourne, Wm.	50.87
Earle, Sons & Co.	35.78
Facey, S.	7.98
Fifield, John	51.50
Hodder, Edgar	.80
Hodge Brothers	7.82
Horwood Lumber Co.	114.37
Linfield, W. S.	4.69
Manuel, Arthur	6.75
Phellerin, Martin	86.09
Phillips, Jas.	205.80
Roberts, Andrew	208.20
Roberts, Andrew	26.43

Roberts & Co., E.	145.74
Roberts & Co., E.	106.00
Roberts, H. C.	561.09
Spencer, H. W.	39.50
Whyatt, Andrew..	82.00
Young, Edward	11.50
	$1,796.50

Total cost of repairs during 1923 and 1924 to the Court House at Twillingate, $1,796.50.

(Copy)) Dec. 31st, 1923.

H. M. Government per Court House, per Andrew Roberts, in account with Est. W. Ashbourne.

Dec. 27th—To 44 ft. plank, at 3½c.	$1.54

(Copy) Dec. 31st, 1923.

H. M. Government, per Andrew Roberts, for Court House, in account with Est. W. Ashbourne, Twillingate.

Oct. 27—To 1 pce. 12 x 12 Scantling, 264 ft., at 4c.	$10.56
Cartage	.75
Nov. 3rd—37 ft. wide Board, at 5c.	1.85
Nov. 5—510 ft. 2" Sp. plank, at $35.00	17.85
Cartage	.75
Nov. 7—2 tower bolts, at 32c...	.64
Nov. 26—147 ft. 2" plank, at $$3$5.00	5.15
Cartage	.75
Dec. 14—109 ft. 2' plank, at $$3$5.00	3.82
	$50.87

(Copy)

H. M. Government in account with Earle, Sons & Co.

Oct. 15—To 14 ft. 2 x 4 framing at 2½c.	$ .35
Oct. 15—To 34 ft. rough lumber at 2c.	.68
Oct. 24—To 14 ft. rough lumber at 2c.	.28
Oct. 24—To ½ gall. turpentine	1.00
Oct. 31—To 14 shingles	.06
Oct. 31—To 69 ft. 6 x 6, at 4c.	2.76
Nov. 2—To 134 ft. No. 1 M. lumber at $34.00	4.56
Nov. 3—To 119 ft. 2 x 4, at 2½c.	2.98
Nov. 8—To 39 ft. 6 x 6, at 4c. ..	1.56
Nov. 9—To 59 ft. 6 x 6, at 4c. ..	2.36
Nov. 12—To 35 ft. 2 x 4, at 2½c.	.88
Nov. 13—To 49 ft. No. 1 M. lumber at $34.00	1.67
Nov. 13—To 5 lbs. pitch, at 12c.	.60
Nov. 16—To 35 ft. No. 1 M. lumber at $34.00	1.19
Nov. 16—To 128 ft. 6 x 6, at 4c.	5.12
Nov. 16—To 63 ft. 3 x 4, at 2½c.	1.58
Nov. 16—To 22 ft. 4 x 6, at 3½c	.77
Nov. 23—To 60 ft. 2 x 4, at 2½c.	1.50
Nov. 23—To 37 ft. 6 x 6, at 4c.	1.48
Nov. 31—To 71 ft. 2½x6, at 3½c	2.49
Nov. 29—To 21 ft. 2 x 3, at 2½c	.53
Dec. 7—To 55ft. 2 x 3, at 2½c.	1.38
	$35.78

(Copy) Dec. 31st, 1923.

H. M. Government, bought of S. Facey

Oct. 31—5 ft. 5" piping, at 40c..	$2.00
Oct. 31—1 5" elbow	.60
Oct. 31—1 tube for chimney....	.20
Nov. 6—¾ lb. finishing nails ..	.10
Nov. 6—1 lb. 1" wire nails	.10
Nov. 6—2 tower bolts, at 40c...	.80
Nov. 6—2 doz. 1¼" wood screws, at 7c.	.14
Nov. 21—3 sets 1½" butts	.30
Nov. 23—1 doz. 2' wood screws	.10
Nov. 23—1½ doz. 1¼" wood screws	.11
Nov. 23—½ dz. 1½" wood screws	.04
Nov. 26—5 doz. 1½' wood screws	.35
Nov. 26—5 doz. 1½" wire nails, at 10c.	.50
Nov. 28—2 doz. 1¼" wood screws at 7c.	.14
Oct. 12—10 only 3½" wood screws, at 10c.	.20
Oct. 21—10 lbs. 5" wire nails, at 10c.	1.00
Oct. 31—1 set T. hinges	.50
	$7.98

(Copy)

In account with John Fifield, Twillingate.

To 30 hrs. labour, building Magistrate's Office ,at 25c. ..$ 7.50
176 hrs. ditto, ditto, at 25c. .. 44.00

$51.50

(Copy). Jan. 5th, 1924.

Mr. Andrew Roberts, Repairs Court House, Twillingate, in account with Edgar Hodder.

1 door latch .. .. .20
1 ketch for door .. .. .40
1 staple and hook .. .. .20

.80

(Copy) Jan. 4th, 1924.

H. M. Government (for Court House), bought of Hodge Brothers.

Oct. 15—To 60 ft. No. 3 pine plank, at $35.00 .. ..$2.10
Oct. 15—To 45 ft. No. 3 pine plank, at $35.00 .. .. 1.58
Oct. 25—To 91 ft. No. 3 pine board, at $35.00 .. .. 3.19
Oct. 26—To 17 ft. No. 3 pine plank, at $35.00 .. .. .60
Nov. 20—To 14 ft. plank, at $25 .35

$7.82

(Copy) Dec. 1923.

Horwood Lumber Co. to H. M. Government.

To 809 ft. 1" spruce, at $50.00..$ 40.45
Freight on same 1.60
44 ft. 2x4 spruce, at $35.00 1.54
247 ft. 2x6 spruce, at $40.00 9.88
193 ft. 2x7 spruce 7.72
502 ft. 1x6, at $45.00 .. .. 22.59
231 ft. 1x7 spruce, at $45.00 10.40
184 ft. 1x8 spruce, at $45.00 8.28
44 ft. 2x11 pine, at $80.00 3.52
50 ft. 1½x12 pine, at $80.00 4.00
18 ft. 1½x13 pine, at $80.00 1.44
Freight 3.00
1000 ft. 1 x 7 and 8 .. .. .. 40.00

$114.37

(Copy) Jan. 5th, 1924.

Capt. Andrew Roberts, H. M. Government, to Edward J. Linfield.

Nov. 7—To 1 door latch .. .. ..$ .47
—To 1⅓ do. screws, at 5c. .07
—To 1 mortise lock 1.55
—To 10 lbs. nails .. .. .. .90
Dec. 8—To 3 doz. large screws, at 15c. .. .. .45
Dec. 14—1 mortise lock 1.25

$4.69

(Copy) Jan. 3rd, 1924.

H. M. Government, bought of Arthur Manuel.

Nov. 3—10 lbs. 2½ wire nails, at 10c. $1.00
Nov. 15—1 tar brush .. .. .35
Nov. 15—8 galls. C. tar, at 45c... 3.60
Nov. 16—4 galls. C. tar, at 45c... 1.80

$6.75

(Copy) Nov. 13, 1923.

H. M. Government, in account with Martin Phellerin.

Oct. 9th—1 roll ruberoid .. ..$ 6.50
Oct. 9th—2 lbs. felt, at 25c. .. .. .50
Oct. 9th—3 lbs. nails, at 10c. .. .30
Oct. 24th—2 lbs. felt tins, at 25c. .50
Oct. 24th—68 ft. D. clapboard, at 2.04
Oct. 24th—1 roll hubber hyde .. 5.00
Oct. 24th—9 ft. board, at 4c. .. .36
Oct. 24th—1 gall. paint 4.00
Oct. 20th—70 ft. clapboard, at 3c. 2.10
Oct. 20th—10 lbs. nails, at 10c. .. 1.00
Nov. 5th—125 ft. clapboard 3.75
Nov. 5th—90 ft. plank, at 3c. .. 2.70
Nov. 9th—15 lbs. nails, at 10c. .. 1.50
Nov. 17th—20 lbs. nails at 10c. 2.00
Nov. 17th—37 lbs. Bolt Iron Thirama, at 8c. 2.95
Nov. 20th—400 ft. No. 1 M. board, at 3½c. 14.00
Nov. 28th—65 ft. D. clapboard, at 3c. 1.95
Nov. 28th—51 ft. No. 1 M. Board, at 3½c. 1.79
Nov. 29th—32 lbs. nails, at 10c. 3.20
Nov. 29th—5 lbs. felt tins, at 25c. 1.25
Dec. 2nd—28 lbs. nails, at 10c. .. 2.80

Dec. 2nd—98 lbs. bolt iron thirama, at 8c. 7.04
Dec. 22nd—25 lbs. bolt iron thirama, at 8c. 2.00
Dec. 22nd—9 sticks, at 1.40 .. 12.60
Dec. 22nd—40 lbs. bolt iron thirama, at 8c. 3.20
Dec. 22nd—10 lbs. wire nails, at 10c. 1.00

$86.09

(Copy) Jan. 17, 1924.

H. M. Government, In account with James Phillips.

To 686 hours, at 25c. $205.80

(Copy) Jan., 1924.

H. M. Government a|c Court House, In account with Andrew Roberts, Carpenter.

694 hours labour, at 30c. $208.20

(Copy) Jan., 1924.

H. M. Government a|c Court House, In account with Andrew Roberts.

2 tar brushes .. ..$ .80
2 doz. screws .. .. .20
2 sets door hinges 1.20
15 ft. No. 1 pine board .. .. .. .58
36 ft. hard pine, at 6c. 2.16
7 ft. whitehead, at 20c. 1.40
14 ft. pine plank, at 6c. .. .. .. .84
Paid blacksmith 1.00
16½ hrs. cartage per horse hauling lumber from C. Wharf to Court House, at 50c. 8.25
1 flagstaff, making, painting and placing in position 10.00

$26.43

(Copy) Jan. 4th, 1924.

H. M. Government, Court House. Bought of E. Roberts & Co., Twillingate.

45c. $13.05
Oct. 10—to 29 gallons tar, at
Oct. 10—to 9 lbs. putty, at .17c. 1.35
Oct. 10—7½ lbs. black lead, at .17c. 1.28
Oct. 10—1 pce. H.W. plank .. .. .50
Oct. 10—2 bdls. shingles, at 10.00 .. .. 20.00
Nov.—2 rolls felt, at 4.15 .. .. 8.20
10 lbs. shingle nails, at 10c. 1.00
56 lbs. 6" nails, at .10c. .. 5.60
2 gals. C. paint, at 4.50 .. 9.00
hire 3 ladders 3 mos. .. 3.00
Dec.—2000 ft. 6 x 6 scantling, at .04c. 800.00
432 ft. 7 x 7 scantling, at .04c. 17.28
—63 ft. 9 x 9 scantling, at .04c. 2.52
24 ft. 8 x 8 scantling, at .04c. .. .. .96

$145.74

H. M. Government for Court House. Bought of E. Roberts & Co.

Jan. 7—To 20 gals. W. paint, at 5.30 .. ..$106.00

(Copy)

H. M. Government (per Capt. Andrew Roberts) to H. C. Roberts, Twillingate, Newfoundland.

Oct. 11—To 15 lbs. wire nails, at 10c. .. ..$ 1.50
Oct. 11—To 6 lbs. felt, at 10c. .60
Oct. 12—To 5 lbs. wire nails, at 10c. .. .. .50
Oct. 15—To 5 lbs. nails, at 10c. .50
—To 59 lbs. sheet lead.. 12.50
—To 1 paint brush, 4 in. 1.60
—To 1 paint brush, 4 in. 1.00
—To 1 paint brush, 3 in. .95
—To 1 paint brush, 9|5 . 1.15
—To 1 paint brush, 0|8.. .65
—To 1 paint brush, 0|8.. .65
Oct. 18—To 10 lbs. nails 1.00
Oct. 22—To 22 lbs. felt 2.20
—To 10 lbs. nails 1.00
—To 1 tin paint .. .. .. .23
Oct. 23—To 1 file .. .. .10
—To 5 lbs. nails .. .. .. .50
—To 26 lbs. Lime (Magistrate's Office, 3c. .78
—To 6 lbs. wire nails, at 10c. .. .. .60

—To 350 brick (Magistrate's Office, @ $5. 17.50
—To 1 brl. cement 6.00
—To 12 galls. Canada White Paint, @ 7.20 86.40
—To 4 galls. linseed oil, at $2.25 .. .. 9.00
—To 1 gall. turpentine 3.25
Oct. 29—To 1 lb. wire nails (Magistrate's Office) .10
—To 3 panes 18x33 glass at $1.60 .. .. 4.80
—To 16 lbs. sheet lead (Magistrate's Office) 3.52
—To 10 lbs. wire nails.. 1.00
—To 2 screw bolts .. .. .04
—To screws .. .. .. .72
Nov. 5—To 10 lbs. wire nails.. 1.00
—To 26 lbs. felt 2.60
Nov. 12—To 20 lbs. wire nails 2.00
Nov. 14—To 15 lbs. wire nails 1.50
Nov. 15—To 2 lbs. wire nails.. .20
Nov. 16—To 20 lbs. lime (Magistrate's Office) .. .80
Nov. 19—To 15 lbs. nails 1.50
Nov. 21—To 2 lbs. shingle nails .20
Nov. 22—To 2 lbs. shingle nails .20
Nov. 26—To 15 lbs. nails 1.50
Nov. 27—To 14 lbs. nails 1.40
Nov. 29—To 10 lbs. nails 1.40
Dec. 5—To 1 paint brush .. .. .30
Dec. 6—To 7 lbs. nails .. .. .. .70
Dec. 11—To 7 lbs. nails.. .. .. .70
Dec. 17—To 20 lbs. nails 2.00
Dec. 18—To 11½ lbs. nails .. 1.15
Dec. 22—To 118 lbs. nails .. 1.80
Dec. 28—To 19½ lbs. nails .. 1.95
Jan. 4—To 11½ lbs. nails 1.15
Jan. 7—To 2 paint brushes, at 90c. 1.80
—To 1 paint brush .. .. .65
—To 1 paint brush 1.20
—To 25 galls. Canada White Paint, @ 7.20 144.00
—To 5 galls. light fawn, at $7.20 .. .. 36.00
—To 5 galls. lichen green, at $7.20 .. .. 36.00
—To 2 galls. willow. at $7.20 .. .. 14.40
—To 5 galls. stone grey, at $7.20 .. .. 36.00
—To 4 galls. primrose, at $7.20 .. .. 28.80
—To 1 gal. ivy green, at $7.20 .. .. 7.20
—To 2 gals. buff stone, at $7.20 .. .. 14.40
—To 1 gal. leather brown 7.20
—To 1 gal. brown drap .. 7.20
—To 1 gal. copal varnish 5.00
—To 3 galls. sp. turpentine, at $3.25 .. .. 9.75
—To 12 galls. paint oil, at $2.25 .. .. 27.00

$561.09

(Copy)

H. M. Government a'c Court House.
In account with H. W. Spencer.
158 hrs. labour, at 25c. $39.50

(Copy) Twillingate, Jan. 8, '23.

H. M. Government. In account with Andrew Whyatt.
328 hrs. labour, at 25c. $82.00

(Copy) Nov., 1923.

H. M. Government. Dept. Public Works.
Works. to Edward Young, Blacksmith, supplying to H. M. Gaol at ,Twillingate.
18 lengths 6 in. stove pipe. at 55c. per lgth. .. ..$ 9.90
2 6 in. elbows, at 88c. each 1.60

$11.50

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay on the Table of the House the following Answer to Question number two on the Order Paper of February 24th.

(2) MR. BROWN—To ask the Minister of Public Works to lay on the Table of the House a list of all allocations of Public moneys, main line and special, sent out to the District of Twillingate since April 30th last, showing in each case to whom grants were sent.

QUESTION NO. 2 ORDER PAPER OF FEBRUARY 24th, 1925.

Twillingate District Main Lines.

Date	Name	Place	Section	Amt.	Voucher No.
Oct. 21—	Elias Budgell ..	.LaScie		60.00	1433
	R. Newbury, Shoe Cove 'B		Shoe to LaScie	30.00	4
	L. Noseworthy, do. do. B'k			30.00	5
	Horace Short, Tilt Cove			60.00	6
	Walter Combs	.Round Hr.	Round Hr. to T'Cove	30.00	7
	Horace Short	Tilt Cove	Round Hr.to Snook's Arm	60.00	8
	S. Stoodley, In. B'ryg	Place	Snook's Arm to Bett's Cove	40.00	9
	H. R. Starks ..	Nipper's Hr.	Bett's Cove to Rouge's Hr.	72.00	40
	John Bartlett ..	Burlington	Rouge's Hr. to North West Arm	26.40	1
	Thos. Wells	Little Bay	Little Bay Mines to Indian Brook ..	150.00	2
	W. Knight, Jackson's Cove		Jackson's Cove to	78.00	3
	R. Evas	Harry's Hr.	King's Cove	42.00	4
	W. Knight, Jackson's Cove		King's Cove and Jackson's Cove to Colchester	54.00	5
	A. Anstey, Little Bay Isld.		Southern Arm to Salien's Cove ...	60.00	6
	A. F. Roberts, Lushes' 'B		Lushes' Bight to	40.00	7
	G. B. Paddock, Ward's Hr.		Ward's Hr.	40.00	8
	Wm. Quirk ..	Fortune Hr.	Fortune Hr. to Cot-	40.00	9
	Walter Yates ..	New Bay	trell's Cove	40.00	50
	Wm. Quirk ..	Fortune Hr.	Jew Bay Head to Fortune Hr.	48.00	1
	A. Milley	Exploits	Exploits to Sergt's Cove	48.00	2
	J. Henefeat ..	Black Island	Black Tickle to King's Cove	48.00	3
	E. J. Woolfrey	M'ton's Hr.	Moreton's Hr. to	36.00	4
	T. Jennings ..	Bridgeport	Chance Cove	36.00	5
	E. J. Woolfrey,	M'ton's Hr.	Moreton's Hr. to	36.00	6
	A. Jones ...	Western Hr.	Western Head ..	60.00	7
	W. Forward, Tizzard's Hr.		Tizzard's Hr. to Carter's Cove	60.00	8
	E. J. Woolfrey, M'ton's Hr.		Tizzard's Hr. to	40.00	9
	W. Forward, Tizzard's Hr.		Moreton's Hr. ..	40.00	60
Aug. 26—	Martin Phillips, Twillingate		Jenkin's Cove to French Beach ..	40.00	588
	Martin Phillips, Twillingate		Rink Road From Cong. Church to Bluff Cove	80.00	588
	Martin Phillips, Twillingate		Twillingate to Bluff Head	40.00	588

Martin Phillips, Twillingate	Gillard's Cove around Kettle Cove	180.00		588
Martin Phillips, Twillingate	Lowland Cove to Main Line	24.00		588
Martin Phillips, Twillingate	Little Hr. to Purcell's Hr. across March	40.00		588
Martin Phillips, Twillingate	Little Hr. to Jones' Cove	36.00		588
Martin Phillips, Twillingate	Durrell's Cove to Cod Jack Cove ..	36.00		588
Martin Phillips, Twillingate	Twillingate to Little Hr.	80.00		588
Martin Phillips, Twillingate	Twillingate to Long Point	40.00		588

QUESTION NO. 2 ORDER PAPER OF FEBRUARY 24th, 1925.

Twillingate District Main Lines.

Date	Name	Place	Section	Amt.	Voucher No.
Oct. 21—T,	Woodford, H'ing Neck		Herring Neck to	72.00	1461
	E. Powell	Merrit's Hr.	Merrit's Hr.	48.00	2
	H. Wheeler	Summerford	Friday Bay to Summerford	80.00	3
	H. Wheeler	Summerford	Cottrell's Cove to	60.00	4
	S. King	Cottrell's Island	Summerford	60.00	5
	Walter Clark	Stanhope	Lewisporte to Stan Hope	60.00	6
	Wm. Quirk	Fortune Hr.	Northern Hr. to Fortune Hr.	64.00	7
	A. Brett	Campbellton	Loon Bay to Campbellton	60.00	8
	S. Luscombe	Loon Bay		60.00	9
	W. H. Baggs,	Pt. Leamington	Point Leamington to Botwood	160.00	22
	Levi Gillett	Pike Arm	Pike's Arm to Cobb's Arm	80.00	70
	R. W. Fudge	Head's Hr.	Head's Hr. to Card's Hr.	80.00	1
	Attwood Brett,	Campbellton	Campbellton to Micharl's Hr. .	80.00	2
	Theo. Jennings,	Bridgeport	Bridgeport to Little Chance Hr.	60.00	3

Twillingate District—Special.

QUESTION NO. 2 ORDER PAPER OF FEBRUARY 24th, 1925.

Date	Name	Place	Amt.	Voucher No.
Sept. 25—	Walter Clark	Stanhope	200.00	846
	J. A. Bartlett	Burlington	100.00	8
	Henry Earle	Springdale	30.00	7

Oct. 10	Rev. S. Bennett	Grand Falls	50.00	1200
16	W. J. Gleeson	Virgin Arm	25.00	1325
18	Richard Newman	Shoe Cove	75.00	1403
Nov. 1	H. R. Starks	Nipper's Harbor	200.00	1537
	Geo. Roberts	Card's Harbor	75.00	8
	Herbert Lewis	Boyd's Cove	150.00	9
4	J. Goodyear & Son	Grand Falls	101.63	57

Twillingate District Loan 22.

QUESTION NO. 2 ORDER PAPER OF FEBRUARY 24th, 1925.

Date	Name	Place	Amt.	Voucher No.
Oct. 22	Alphaeus Milley	Exploits	80.00	1483
	Peter Rolf, Sr.	Southern Arm	75.00	5
	Edward Woolfrey	Moreton's Hr.	50.00	6
	Edward Woolfrey	Moreton's Hr.	225.00	7
Nov. 13	Horace Short	Tilt Cove	50.00	1599
17	Thos. Woodford of Elias	Herring Neck	80.00	1612
	Job Manuel	Northern Arm	100.00	13
	Sidney Vincent	Triton	200.00	14
	Edward J. Woolfrey	Moreton's Hr.	75.00	15
20	Elijah Marsh	Glover Hr.	25.00	25
	John Bartlett	Burlington	80.00	87
Dec. 1	Francis Rideout	Burlington	80.00	87

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay on the Table of the House Answer to Question No. 13 on Order Paper of February, which is as follows:—

13) MR. SCAMMELL—To ask the Minister of Public Works to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing what allocations of public monies, either main line, local or special, have been made in the District of St. Barbe since April 30th last and to show names of parties to whom grants were sent in each case.

ST. BARBE DISTRICT—LOCAL ROADS.

Question No. 13—Order Paper February 24th, 1925.

Date	Name	Place	Amt.	Voucher No.
Sept. 5	Octavius Taylor	Curzon Village	125.00	657
	Alex. Payne	Bonne Bay	200.00	8
	Byrant Crocker	Trout River	125.00	9
	Edward Dyke	Rocky Hr.	125.00	660
	Samuel Payne	Cow Head	125.00	1
	Henry House	Port Saunders	75.00	2
	John Brophy	Daniel's Hr.	75.00	3
	John Sullivan	Brent's Cove	100.00	4
	Elias Budgell	LaScie	125.00	5
	Jas. Combs	Brig Bay	175.00	6
	Jas. Thornhill	Parson's Pond	100.00	7
	Isaac Bartlett	Fortune	200.00	8
	Walter B. Osbourne	Seal Cove	125.00	9

	Denis Quigley	Fleur de Lys	150.00	70
	Jacob Simms	St. Anthony Bight	75.00	1
	Geo. Suley	St. Anthony Bight	200.00	2
	Esau Burton	Pacquet S.W.	50.00	3
	W. J. Bursey	Griquet	165.00	4
Oct.	1—Jas. Decker	Ship Cove	75.00	1065
Nov.	20—Benj. E. Way	Green Isld. Brook	10.00	1646

ST BARBE DISTRICT—MAIN LINE.

Question No. 13—Order Paper February 24th, 1925.

Date	Name	Place	Amt.	Voucher No.
Sept.	5—Walter Combden	White Bay	175.00	675
	John Troop	Current Island	75.00	6
	Chas. Pynn	Ha Ha Bay	60.00	7
	John Lane	Englee	75.00	8
	John S. Whalen	Flower Cove	200.00	9
	A. Northcott	Hr. Deep	100.00	80
	Matthew McGrath	Conche	150.00	1
	Wm. Clark	Canada Hr.	75.00	2
	Job Powell	Goose Cove	125.00	3
	John Penney	Cook Hr.	150.00	4
	Thos. Fitzgerald	Coachman's Cove	175.00	5
	A. B. Darby	Port Aux Choix	100.00	6
	Thas. Glavin	Bear Cove	100.00	7
Oct.	8—Thos. Decker	Baker's Cove	80.00	1187
	Angus Wentzell	Portland Creek	125.00	8

ST. BARBE DISTRICT—SPECIAL.

Question No. 13—Order Paper February 24th, 1925.

Date	Name	Place	Amt.	Voucher No.
Aug.	14—K. Lush per Bowering Bros.		150.00	354
Sept.	17—Henry Langford	Bold Cove	125.00	790
Oct.	14—Geo. Penney	Cook Hr.	65.00	1321
Nov.	20—M. Alcock	Griquet	38.50	1626
Jan.	27—Dr. C. S. Curtis	St. Anthony	75.00	1782
Feb.	19—Stephen Taylor	Woody Point	30.00	1812
	24—Rev. G. H. Maidment	Bonne Bay	70.00	22
	Postal Tele. (Messages)		56.75	25

ST. BARBE DISTRICT—LOAN 23.

Question No. 13—Order Paper No. Feburary 24th, 1925.

Date	Name	Place	Amt.	Voucher No.
Oct.	1—John W. Humber	Norris Point	10.00	1066
	John Payne	Hr. Round	100.00	7
	A. Northcott	Great Hr. Deep	100.00	8
	Jesse Patey	Port Saunders	50.00	9
	Job Powell	Goose Cove	100.00	70

Byrant Crocker	Trout River 100.00		1
Capt. Boutcher	Trout River 50.00		2
Edward Dyke	Rocky Hr. 150.00		3
John Compton	St. Leonards 100.00		4
Bramwell Pilgrim	Little Braha 100.00		5
Wm. Jackman	Bai Verte 25.00		6
Geo. Moss	Daniel's Hr. 100.00		7
John Penney	Cook's Hr. 75.00		8
Esau Burton	Pacquet 100.00		9
Geo. W. Small	Wild Cove 100.00		80
Abel Bartlett	LaScie 150.00		1

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS — Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay on the table of the House answer to Question No. 1 on Order Paper of Feb. 24th, which is as follows:—

(1) MR. SCAMMELL—To ask the Mnister of Public Works what Ferry Services were in operation in the District of St. Barbe the past season, who were the Ferrymen in each case, and what salaries were paid them.

QUESTION No. 1 ORDER PAPER OF FEB. 24th, 1925.

Ferry Service St. Barbe District.

Name	Place	Account	Yearly Salary
Walter Young	Bonne Bay	Motor Ferry	$1,550.00
Daniel Reardon	Goose Cove	Ordinary Ferry	50.00
Thos. Decker	Baker's Cove	Ordinary Ferry	80.00

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS — Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay on the table of the House answer to Question No. 10 of the Order Paper of Feb. 25th, 1925, whch is as follows:—

(10) MR. HIBBS—To ask the Minister of Public Works to lay on the Table of the House (1) the total amount of beef and other fresh meats supplied to the various oGvernment Institutions since the first day of June, 1924, to date; (2) the names of the persons from whom the said meats were purchased; (3) the prices per lb. paid for same.

QUESTION No. 10—ORDER PAPER OF FEBRUARY 25th, 1925.

Meats, etc., Supplied to Insttiutions from July 1st, 1924, to Date (Jan. 31).

Institutions.	Name of Supplier		No. lbs. Supplied.	Prices per lb.
Penitentiary	P. J. Warren..	.. ..	2,375	.24
Penitentiary	Wm. Thomson..	.. ..	423	.18
Lunotic Asylum	Wm. Campbell..	.. ..	25,430	.24
Lunatic Asylum ..	Moore & McLeod..	.. ..	4,410	.18
General Hospital	P. J. Casey..	.. ..	22,403	.24
General Hospital	Peter Casey..	.. ..	4,102	.20
Sanatorium	M. Donovan..	.. ..	2,672	.20
Sanatorium	T. J. Murphy..	.. ..	6,608	.24
Sanatorium	P. J. Warren..	.. ..	9,005	.24
Poor Asylum ..	Murphy & Bambrick..	.. ..	8,002	.24

Poor Asylum .. ..J. P. Kavanagh..	.. ..	1,259	.19
Fever Hospital .. ..J. F. Wiseman..	.. ..	2,870	.23½ to .35
Fever Hospital .. .. ..Peter Casey..	.. ..	535	.20 to .25
Sudbury .. ..T. J. Murphy..	.. ..	2,103	.24
Sudbury .. ..W. A. Joy..	.. ..	293½	.20
		92,490½	

NOTICE OF QUESTION.

Question No. 1 on the Order Paper was deferred.

Question No. 2.

MR. SCAMMELL—Asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if it is the intention of his Department to place a Lighthouse on either the Groais Island or Bell Island (known as the Grey Islands) in the District of St. Barbe, and if so, to give particulars as to character and location of the proposed structure.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I may say for the benefit of Mr. Scammell that the Government has never been asked of late years to put a lighthouse on the Groais Islands. The only place that I know where a lighthouse could be of any benefit to mariners is the place where the lighthouse is at the present time. I do not know if Mr. Scammell is referring to the Horse Islands, commonly called the Groais Islands by some people. In that case there is a light at the entrance to the harbour there.

Question No. 3.

MR. ASHBOURNE—To ask the Hon. the Prime Minister under what department the S. S. Prospero and S. S. Sagona are being outfitted for the sealfishery, and if it is a Government venture; also give names of parties supplying the outfits; is an additional insurance required, and if so, give rates and with whom insurance has been or will be effected? Have any arrangements been made as to the disposal of the seals on arrival of the steamers?

HON. PRIME MINISTER — Mr. Speaker, I beg to table the answer as follows:—

Reply to Question of Mr. Ashbourne, No. 3, of Order Paper of Feb. 27.

The Prospero and Sagona are being outfitted for the sealfishery under the Railway Commission as a venture on behalf of that Department.

The outfits for the steamers are being purchased by the Railway Purchasing Agent, Mr. Kent, and the men are being cropped by Messrs. James Baird, Ltd., and Jesse Whiteway, Ltd., entirely at the risks of these firms.

The attached statement shows the amount of inusrance effected on both steamers in connection with the prospective voyage.

An arrangement is being made with Messrs. Baine Johnston & Co. for the disposal of the seals on the arrival of the steamers.

NFLD. GOVERNMENT RAILWAY.

Sealing Voyage—Insurance Placed.

S. S. Prospero—

	Am't Insured	Rate	With Whom
Prospective voyage and outfit	£10,000	1⅛	Lloyd's through
Hull and machinery	£30,000	2¼	Nfld. Produce Co.

S. S. Sagona—

Prospective voyage and outfit	£10,000	1⅛	Do.
Hull and machinery	£30,000	2¼	Do.

Question No. 4—MR. BROWN asked Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines on whose recommendation Mr. Turner of Lewisporte, Camp In-

spector, was dismissed and one Manuel appointed in his place.

HON. MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES—Mr. Speaker, I beg to table reply as follows:—

Camp Inspectors are appointed for six months only, consequently party was not dismissed.

New appointment made on recommendation of Mr. Joseph Peters.

Question No. 5: MR. HICKMAN asked the Hon. the Minister of Justice if it is the intention of the Government to appoint a Magistrate for Harbour Grace during this year; if so give the name of person who will be appointed.

Reply: HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—The matter has not yet received the attention of the Government. As it has not yet received the attention of the Government, I would not like to say what the intention of the Government is.

Question No. 6—MR. HIBBS asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the Table of the House: (a) A statement showing what allocations of Public Monies, either Mainline, Local or Special, have been made in the District of Fogo, since the first day of June, 1924 to date; (b) To show the names of parties to whom Grants were sent in each case; (c) To state on whose authority the allocations, if any, were made.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—The answers to these questions have already been given to-day in the answer to another question asked two days ago. The questions here are the same as have been asked before.

The reply to questons No. 7, 8, 9 and 10 were deferred.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—In reply to a question asked by Mr. Hickman yesterday, "to lay on the table of the House the report on the Dock by the expert who was brought here by the Gopernment." I would like to say that while I have these reports here, I do not wish to table them to-day, because we have asked another expert to come down here and make an estimate on the cost of repairs to the Dock. I do not think it is fair to the party who has already given his views on the matter, to have those tabled until we get the second expert's opinion on the matter. Consequently, I would ask the Leader of the Opposition to let that question stand over.

MR. HICKMAN—I accept the Prime Minister's explanation, but I would like to have the reply before anything is done.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—Certainly.

ORDER OF THE DAY.

Address in reply.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker, before the debate is finished I would like to have a few words to say in reference to the matters outlined in the Speech from the Throne at the opening of the House.

On the day on which the House opened I asked the Prime Minister if he would adjourn the House until the following Monday, which has been the custom for many years, and it was with great reluctance that the Prime Minister agreed to the postponement. As I stated before, the Speech from the Throne is something that the members on this side of the House do not see or hear, until they come down here and hear it from His Excellency the Governor in the Upper Chamber at the opening of the House.

I have no objection to the Honorable the Prime Minister trying to hurry through the Legislation, and we on this side of the House will give all the assistance possible to measures which we consider of benefit to the country. The Government organ on the morning following the opening of the House said we had had notice served upon us that there would be no further delays or adjournments. At the

time I did not take it, that notice had been served on us—I would not take it seriously in any case, but I understood that the Honorable Mr. Morine said there would be no postponements, as if he were going to take charge of the whole affair and run it through. Now the first item in the Speech from the Throne relates to the Codfishery. I will deal with each item as I go along, and try to be as brief as possible, and not cause unnecessary delay. The Speech begins:

"The Codfishery of last year was prosecuted successfully and the products disposed of at the best prices known in the history of the Colony (exclusive of the abnormal war years). Those who engaged in this staple industry of the country reaped a reward which renewed their faith and interest in it."

The reason why I take each item is because this Speech is the Government's mouth-piece. It is what they are handing out to the people of Newfoundland through His Excellency the Governor on opening day. It is gratifying to Members on both sides of the House to know that conditions are a little better than at the close of last Session. This was brought about principally by the high price of fish —the previous year's catch was not very large, the price low, it went into consumption, and left the markets bare for the opening of 1924, which gave a ready sale for all we had. At the beginning of the season the price was not so high, on Labrador it was $5.00 a quintal, and people fishing there had to pay twenty-five to thirty cents going down in the schooners and back, which really reduced the price to $4.75 or $4.80 a quintal. Later in the season the price advanced and those who had brought their catch home obtained better results. But what I want to point out is that all the fishermen on Labrador and around our shores did not reap the reward told of in the Speech. They had all they could do to carry the burden, as they had to pay a high price for their outfits, and as I said before the Government as soon as they came into office put the duty on beef, pork and molasses. That on beef and pork amounting to several dollars a barrel, so this was an additional burden which they had to bear, and out of their returns they were not left such a great reward. We all know that outfits for the fishery are very expensive, lines and twines have been advancing yearly. Most of those who had traps which cost them a lot of money during the war time, now have been worn out, and cannot replace them, and that is why they will have to work for years with high prices for their catch before they will reap any benefit. I understand the Government this Session intends to introduce a Bill in reference to the Cull of fish. I did not hear it in the House, but outside, and, therefore, cannot discuss it till it is brought in and we see what it contains. However, I want to go from that to another item which the Government can take care of, it is the sale of Salt. I have spoken of this subject in the past, and it is a very important one to the country, so that if the Honorable Prime Minister can do anything about it, he will have the support of the Opposition. At the present time a man buys his salt and that's all he knows about it—it is salt —but there are many grades of salt, and that from Cadiz is the best for the cure of Shore fish. There is another quality which we get from Torrevieja, and another from Eiza, and they are all of different strengths. If a man is accustomed to use Cadiz salt, and he is given that from Santa Pola or Torrevieja without his knowing it, he will likely use the same amount with the result that his fish will become burnt, and damaged before he knows it. I think the Government should have the salt graded, so that the fisherman will know what kind he is get-

ting with the result that he will have better fish. Strong salt like those of Santa Pola are best, and fish cured with that is in most cases good. Mr. Warren has told us that he was speaking to the Premier of New Zealand as to selling butter from that country in Newfoundland in competition with the product of Prince Edward Island, our next door neighbor, and Mr. Massey said the reason why that could be done was that it was shipped under Government status. I am speaking of fish, because it is the mainstay of the country, and perhaps there is something that we on this side of the House may be able to advance, and out of which some good may come later on. There is one drawback in connection with the fisheries, and that is the lack of statistics. There has been a controversy over it. I have seen some letters in the papers, one of which was by a Member on the other side of the House, but they seemed to be mixed up over the matter. As I said before, we lack statistics, and I do not know how we are going to get them, but if the brains of the Government be used to advantage, it should be possible to obtain them. This is a matter which I will take up later, if the Government Bill as rumored, is introduced. The next item in the Speech deals with the work on the Humber, and says it has "proceeded with remarkable speed and success." Every Newfoundlander is glad of the industry on the Humber, as it has given employment to a great many of our people, but I regret to say that it has also given labor to many who are not our people, but who took their places, and were put in positions ahead of them. I have heard the report that six hundred Canadian loggers were brought here recently, but they are no better than ours who are thoroughly capable woodsmen, and it is to be regretted that something was not contained in the contract whereby the money paid to these outsiders would have been saved to our men. It is said that thirty-five millions have already been spent in connection with this industry. Newfoundland has guaranteed two million pounds, the Trade Facilities a similar amount, and I believe the rest is by the Armstrong Whitworth Company. I regret that so much money has been spent above the Twenty Millions, first calculated on. The more money that is put into the industry, the greater the possibility and probability of Newfoundland having to pay the interest on the amount guaranteed, whether that money was spent well or not I do not know, but according to reports the Canadian contractors that came down here got ten per cent on what was expended.

And under that contract what inducement for that concern to economize in any way because the more money they paid out or wasted the greater amount they obtained in the way of commission. I understand, however, that one particular concern has had a contract cancelled and has had to leave the country. We know but very little about the Humber and we know but little about the Newfoundland Pulp and Paper Company, Limited. The Newfoundland Government is supposed to have a Newfoundland representative on the Directorate of the N. P. and P. Co., Ltd., and so far as I know I was told by the Prime Minister that we have a Director appointed by the Newfoundland Government on the Board of Directors in the person of Mr. S. J. Foote and the Prime Minister stated that there has never been a report of any kind submitted, either written or verbally.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I did not say that. I said there was a report verbally, but nothing in writing.

MR. HICKMAN—I beg your pardon sir, I understood you to say that you had been given little or no information from time to time. But I want

to point out the laxity of the Government in having that tremendous industry going on there, in which our Government is guarantor for ten millions of dollars, and not having a man, no matter who he is, to go there and find out what is really going on and report to the Government just the same as the Head of the Department would report to the Government about his Department. From what source does the Government expect to get their information, if they do not get it from the member of the Board. I hope and trust now that this will help the Government and inspire the Government to see that information from the Humber will be secured through their representative on the Board.

The next item referred to in the Speech from the Throne is the mining industry and I will deal with that later, but the following paragraph deals with the Labrador Boundary Question, which is a very important and very live subject to almost everybody in Newfoundland at the present time. We all know what happened recently in connection with this matter. The Prime Minister and his two colleagnes, the Minister of Justice and Colonial Secretary, made a trip to Quebec to discuss the question and since they have returned we have got no information from them. We expected to have something laid before us at this session of the House, but we have nothing thus far. Now I have asked the Prime Minister to lay upon the table of the House a copy of the correspondence the Newfoundland Government had with the Government of Quebec. He has given me the correspondence that took place before he left for Quebec, but which contains nothing, except the arrangement of an interview; but the Prime Minister said that any correspondence that took place since the return of the delegates was private and could not be given. I consider that we, on this side of the House, are entitled to see all the correspondence in the interests and welfare of the people of this country. No doubt, this delegation that went to Quebec did quite a lot of work, at least, they did a lot of Curling.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—And we did it well.

MR. HICKMAN—So much so that I was going to advise young budding lawyers here who expect to remain in politics to join the Curling Club, if they are not already members of it. At any rate the delegation consisted of three curlers, and probably next time there will be a full team of four. According to reports we received every day and published in the "Daily News"—who compiled the reports I do not know—the delegates were doing almost everything else except discussing the Labrador Boundary Question. They arrived at Montreal on December 15th, had an interview with Premier Taschereau and some of his colleagues on the 16th, played Curling and lunched with the Governor-General and dined with the Prime Minister up to the last of December and then we had a report that the delegates had a meeting before they left for home.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—That was not all we did.

MR. HICKMAN—I quite believe that, but I want to point out that we have received no information about the Labrador Boundary and my candid opinion is that the Government got none to give us because they have none to show. The fact of the matter is that the delegates did not name a price while abroad, were never offered a price and the whole thing has been a fizzle from start to finish. Mr. Warren said that when he first started negotiations with the Quebec Government his offer was to sell the Labrador, if enough money was obtainable to pay off our National debt. If the country got the

amount of our National debt for the Labrador, I am sure that every member on this side of the House, at any rate, would sanction it, and even if we got a little less than the National debt, provided the price was not too low, we would not be against it. Mr. Warren further said that the lowest price mentioned in the negotiations that he carried on was twenty-five million dollars for the Labrador. Now as to whether twenty-five million dollars would be sufficient for the areas on the Labrador I do not know. However, my opinion is, that if we send another delegation to Quebec, Montreal or anywhere in Canada, I hope a lawyer will not be sent because, if there is, there will be no success attend the visit, with all respect to the Minister of Justice. This Labrador Boundary has been a milch cow for the last twenty years for lawyers.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—The fact is that the whole five Canadian delegates were lawyers.

MR. HICKMAN—It was also stated by Mr. Warren yesterday that, although our case was prepared for the Privy Council, there is no reason why Quebec should present her case right away. Quebec need not present her case for the next five years, if she has not done so already. Still there are Committees of lawyers in Canada, England and elsewhere engaged to dispose of this Labrador Boundary; and that is why I say now that if we got a little less than sufficient to pay off our National debt we might be inclined to support it. Would it not be proper for Newfoundland delegates to go to Quebec and try and make a settlement or does it mean that we have a bad case for the Privy Council? If it does not, alright.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—I think the theory some people have is erroneous. The delegation did not go to Canada to try and settle the Labrador Boundary at a price; they went there on invitation of the Prime Minister of Quebec and the Prime Minister of Canada to discuss terms as to the disposal of the Labrador Boundary.

MR. HICKMAN—Was it to dispose of it or hire it?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—The trouble with some people now is that they thought we were going to sell it.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Sell it over night I suppose.

MR. HICKMAN—I know it all alright.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I know what you know.

MR. HICKMAN—Probably our Labrador contains great assets which we know nothing whatever about. Nobody knows the value of the timber and mineral that are on the Labrador or what they are worth to us or to our children in years to come, and it is a big question to decide whether or not we should hold on to the Labrador or dispose of it at any reasonable price. Why there is water power on the Labrador greater than the St. Lawrence River or the Niagara Falls. Electricity has been carried successfully as far as eight hundred miles and who knows the value of that water power. There are electric companies operating Niagara Falls to-day with combined paid up capital greater many times over than our National debt amounts to. Therefore, I say that this whole matter ought to receive careful consideration because who knows but that that water power on the Labrador will not be some day as valuable to us as the equivalent of our National debt. Some people are inclined to think that the climate in Newfoundland is getting milder every year. Well if this year is any evidence, it certainly is getting milder.

There is a regular society that holds

forth here in St. John's, called the Bible Students. They hold forth every Sunday night. They preach the doctrine that the world is getting milder. One of them was telling a story last year of how mild it is getting on Labrador. He told me he found a large block of ice drifting to Norway; when they opened it they found a man it it who once had lived down in the Arctic and had become frozen into the ice. He further prophesied that the climate would be much warmer in this country sometime in the future of Newfoundland, and we would not need to wear any clothes, only a fig leaf. If this is true, I would like to see it come to pass. It would make Labrador property very much more valuable. Now there is no chartered map of the Labrador that I know of that is reliable. I tried to get a chartered map. I saw one a few days ago. It is printed and put out by the Grenfell Mission, the first I have ever seen. I am writing away to see if I can get a copy. I do not know much about Labrador, but Captain Randell, who is a practical navigator, has been on the Labrador coast, tells me that if you draw a straight line from Blanc Sablon which is the boundary between Quebec and Newfoundland and Cape Chidley on Labrador, this line would touch the water in many cases. Therefore, in settling a claim in connection with the Labrador Boundary in a case where a straight line is drawn from Blanc Sabon to Cape Chidley, we are not only going to lose the land but also a great deal of our coast. There is no proper chart of the Labrador Coast. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries made some statements in reference to the loss of a steamer down there last year. There is no chart, and you could not blame any man for losing a ship on an unchartered coast. I presume that the Labrador Boundary Commission is able to enlighten us on these subjects. I expect to hear from them afterwards. That is a matter important, if true, whether a straight line drawn from Labrador to Cape Chidley in many places goes into the sea. In any case in the sale of Labrador the fishermen's rights have to be protected and well protected. The fact of the matter is we will not give up the sea coast at all. We know what trouble the fishermen have had who have been fishing on Canadian Labrador. If a Newfoundlander wants to go and fish on Canadian Labrador and put out his traps, he has to pay fifty cents per fathom on his twine as a tax.. He has to pay the duty on articles landed on that coast. As the fishery is the great industry, then great care should be taken to see that our sea coast of the country is not lost to the fishermen. Because any rights given over to Canada, given to our fishermen made in agreement, may some time in the future be disputed and the same trouble may arise over that as has arisen over the French Shore and make a lot of trouble. It is something the same at the present time as the arbitration supposed to be held in reference to the American Government claim on Newfoundland for collection of dues on American vessels coming to this country. We were told that the Commission when they were up in Canada discussed the West Indies Trade. I am very glad to see that that was so. It is a very important subject. We have no direct communication between Newfoundland and the West Indies, therefore we lose great opportunities of marketing our produce. We have to route the fish via New York or Halifax. The fish is transhipped in New York in hot weather perhaps, and arrives in bad condition. The receiver is most dissatisfied. All we want is direct communication with the West Indies. Some years ago when I first came to do business in St. John's, all the fish

which went to the Mediterranean markets was routed principally by Liverpool. We had to meet claims on every shipment of fish that went forward, whether we were justified or not I do not know, but the buyer always if he was a dishonest man took the opportunity to make a claim. He could substantiate his claim. I have known a case where casks of fish were transhipped and covered up with some kind of a cargo which ruined it, but since that day steamers have been put on the Mediterranean and there is very seldom a claim and shippers are very much more satisfied. I claim that in Newfoundland there should be some kind of a connection with the West Indies. I know that if a man in the West Indies wants fish, take for instance Jamaica, where he buys fish on order, same as anything else, he knows the date on which the steamer is leaving Halifax. There are regular sailings. He runs over the stock of fish and he knows this before the steamer sails, cables in his order for requirements and he is prepared to pay two dollars more for cask fish. The Halifax merchants come here to buy fish giving advanced prices and paying two or three per cent insurance by schooner to Halifax. He pays fifty or sixty cents freight, has it packed in Halifax and gets more money than we in Newfoundland where the fish is bought, just because there is very ready connection. It would be much better if this country could get direct communication with the West Indies by subsidizing a steamer or having a steamer touching at Halifax and call here; we should get better results than we are getting at the present time. It is difficult to get anyone to talk about that matter when there are people in St. John's personally affected. There are people in the trade who have very great influence with the Prime Minister or the Government. When they have influence, it is impossible to put anything through in this country. Some years ago a bill was to have been introduced into this House asking for a subsidy for two steamers for the West Indies. Everybody in the trade sat upon that, but that was the best thing the country could ever have. Subsidized to connect up with the millions of people in the West Indies, that would be the best investment in reference to the fisheries.

The next item is the contract made for the construction of a steamer. The statement that £10,000.00 was saved by placing the contract in Holland, is absolutely false. Not a word of truth in it. Camouflage; I have got the proof right here which I will give you. We all believe that we require a steamer to carry passengers across the Gulf, because the steamer Kyle is not fit for the route. I crossed in that steamer in the winter. I could not be induced to make the trip again, and everybody agrees that we should have a steamer to carry comfortably the passengers from the port of Sydney to Port aux Basques. I have the contract here before me for the building of the steamer, and I notice that she is to be built on the same line as the Bruce. I mean a steamer with sleeping accommodation. I wonder whether the Government ever considered building a day steamer, such as crosses the Straits of Dover. This would have been much more suitable and built very much cheaper. After all the journey is little longer, but with a 15 or 16 knot boat, the passage could be made in the early part of the day and with more comfort and less expense.

Now on the opening day of this House in the few remarks which I made when I had first seen the Speech from the Throne I said that I thought that the Government should have taken advantage of the Trade Facilities Board in connection with

the construction of the steamer as well as the supplying the rails for the railway .And the Hon. the Prime Minister stated in explanation that they could not avail of the Trade Facilities Board. They thought that they could not get the steamer delivered on time and that is why she is being built in Holland. And he says that they have saved ten thousand pounds or fifty thousand dollars. Now according to the correspondence laid on the table of the House, which I asked for a few days ago, I find that on the thirteenth day of December the Hon. M. S. Sullivan cabled the Government that he had signed the contract yesterday at Shiedam. Prior to this there is no mention whatever of the Trade Facilities Board, but in January 25th, 1925, over a month after the contract had been signed the Prime Minister sent a cable to London, asking if we could not take advantage of the Trade Facilities Board, of the Imperial Economic Conference in connection with the construction of the steamer.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Would you mind reading that message?

Mr. Hickman reads the message which had been tabled.

MR. HICKMAN—Now what I want to point out is this, I do not want to say that the Prime Minister got up here in this House and tried to mislead anyone, but what I infer is that the Prime Minister forgot about the Imperial Conference Trade Facilities Board until the Contract has been signed and then he thought of it and made an effort to see if he could not still get the benefits which could be derived from this Board. I do not charge that the Prime Minister made any misstatements to the public. That is the way that I size the thing up. What I want to say is that the explanation which was given on the opening day of the House was not as satisfactory as it should have been. I will give the reply to the message that the Prime Minister has tabled. What I want to point out is that the contract was signed for this steamer on the thirteenth of December and you have not any correspondence here about any negotiations with the Trade Facilities Board. You never mentioned that anybody had seen the committee about it. Mr. Warren said that the Trade Facilities was made to take any contract whether private or public on account of the unemployment in the Old Country. Any private individual could have taken advantage of the Imperial Trade Facilities Board. And up to this when nothing has been said about it the Prime Minister thought about it when he was going to buy some rails and I give him credit for trying to get the Imperial Economic Trade Facilities Board to help us to pay some of the interest on the money. What I mean is this, that the Prime Minister told us that he had saved ten thousands pounds. The Daily News says this morning that he had saved thirty-five thousand dollars. They say that that is a mistake. They meant to say that he had saved fifty thousand dollars. You can make it fifty if you like. That steamer is to cost eighty-nine thousand pounds and that is nearly a half million dollars. If the colony had got the steamer in Britain the Trade facilities Board would have paid the interest on this amount to the extent of four per cent. And this interest on a half a million dollars which they will pay for five years amounts to a hundred thousand dollars. That is the amount that the Government would have been helped to pay if they had had the ship built in England. If you deduct the amount which they say that they have saved in the cost price they have still lost fifty thousand dollars. I say that in connection with his matter the Government has made a bad deal. They

also made a bad deal in having the ship built in Holland. The Trade Facilities Board guarantee the money for us to give the Humber. They did everything that they could possibly do for Newfoundland and when we have something which we might give them to help out their unemployment we give it to Holland instead and perhaps half the men working in the docks at Shiedam are Germans. Now according to this the contract for the steamer was made on the thirteenth of December and the steamer has not to be delivered until the thirty-first of July. How many months is that. It is seven and a half months and I think that they have got up to the 17th of August. That makes eight months. You have the list of the offers in this mornings News. There is a list of the contracts offered in England and many of them offered to have the ship ready in seven and eight months. The Colada Shipbuilding and Engineering Co. were eight and a half months. David William Henderson & Co. of Glasgow, eight months. Neptune Works, Walker, New Castle, seven months. And the statement in the paper says that the ship is to be delivered on the first of July when the correct date is to be the thirty-first of July which is practically a month later. Give the public the facts. I say that a great deal of money could have been saved if the advantage had been taken of the Trade Facilities Board. There is one company which offers to have the contract finished in seven months. If the offer of this Company had been availed of this country would have been fifty thousand dollars better off than she is now. And now the ship is to be built at Shiedam and delivered in July and that after all the British Government has done for us. That shows our appreciation to her for what she has done. Now if the Government did not know anything about the Trade Facilities Board then I know that some of the members of the Government did know. Because Mr. Warren said in his speech that he knew all about the Trade Facilities Board and how it was formed and what it was formed for and he had given this information to the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, some time ago. Now the next item is the unemployment. We hear a great deal of the unemployment in this city at the present time. Although the Speech from the Throne says that there is work we believe that there is not so very much. "Unemployment in the colony has greatly decreased by comparison with all the years since the war ceased and is now almost normal. Now the unemployment is still great around St. John's and what is the reason There is some reason. And there should not be so much unemployment. I know that the Government has given instructions to give Charity to those in need of it. That is all very well. It keeps a man from starving. But Public Charity is not what a man wants. A man with his health and strength wants work. He wants work something like he is used to. And there is a great many men who want work and cannot get it. There are things that the Government can do to give men employment and they can do this without taking away a man's independence. Giving assistance or the dole takes away a man's independence. I had a case the other day. A man came to me who I have known for some time. He is a fisherman and a very industrious man. He did not reap that rich harvest about which the Government speaks in the Speech from the Throne. He said "I have come to you because I am in this position. I have got a family of so many. I have two boys who are able to work. I am also willing to work. If I do not get work I have to get

something from the Government to support my family and I do not want to do that." He was not any particular friend of mine, political or otherwise, but I knew that that man was an honest man, and I said to him—"do not go and get the dole now. Let me know what you want, and I will give you credit for it, and you can pay me back next summer." That man would have had his spirits broken if he had to go down to the Government charity place and take out the dole, when he was willing and eager to work.

You know that work has been on the Humber, and a great many men are being taken away from the Humber because certain construction works have finished, and a great many foreigners have been brought in to cut logs, and so forth. Every foreigner that comes in here means another man out of employment. There is unemployment in Canada, and in the United States to a certain extent, and there is unemployment at Bell Island. A great many of our sailing vessels have gone out. Some years ago we had three or four hundred sailing vessels, and these all gave employment to certain men, but those vessels have gradually dwindled out, and the men are out of employment. It is high time that the Government looked around to see if something could not be done.

The Government needs certain buildings put up in this country, and they could give many people employment constructing them. The Government needs a bond warehouse, and not a very small one at that, where they can put all the goods coming in in bond, belonging to people who do not want to take delivery of them all at once. The building of a place like that would be a great help to the masons and carpenters of this country, and the Government would get some returns for the money they spend. The Government could have employed several men this winter—even now—in cleaning up the streets—Water St. and the other streets of St. John's, and get some returns for the money that they are giving out.

Why do so many people need relief when they get out of employment. Because the people working in our industries only make enough money to maintain them and their families when they are working. They just get enough to keep them alive during the time that they are working, and as soon as the work is over they have not got a cent of money left. How could men leave here and pay their passage to the Humber Valley, work there for twenty five cents an hour, pay his board, pay his passage back and support his family. Every cent that he gets during the time that he is working only supports him and his family.

The same thing applies to Bell Island. The men work at Bell Island for twenty-five or twenty-seven cents an hour shovelling ore. They have certain expenses when they are over there. They work hard at twenty five cents an hour, but as soon as they are out of work they have actually nothing left. No industry can be carried on in this country unless the people working in that industry are protected. If you do not protect them, it is better not to have any industries at all. These companies should pay a reasonable rate of wages to the men working under them, which will pay men properly for their work and help them to be independent.

The next on the programme is the Commission of enquiry. "Some very distrubing discoveries have been made by the Commission of enquiry with regard to expenditure in Charitable Institutions. That is a very good move for the Government to have a commission of enquiry into any place that is not properly run, and when the fault has been found, they should do the best they possible can to conduct the Department in a proper man-

ner afterwards. I am not saying that the Government has not done the best they can, or that the Prime Minister is to be blamed in any respect. I am not saying that he is not making an effort to have these departments run correctly and properly. All I know is that the Government is not responsible for all that is going on in the Departments. I know all about that, and I am not laying that charge on his shoulders now, although some day he will have to carry all the blame.

The enquiry into the Post Office—what does that amount to? There has been a statement made on the floors of this House which has not yet been contradicted—that there have been 26 new employees put in the Post Office since this Government came into power; and then the Speech from the Throne says that the staff is very much over-manned and under-worked. I should say that the staff is under-worked and over-manned if twenty six new employees have come there since this Government came in. I am not making the statement that twenty six new employees have come in. I leave it to the Prime Minister to correct me if that is wrong—but that is a statement which has been made on the floors of the House which has not yet been contradicted.

Also additions have been made to the Custom House staff, according to reports. There is another thing that the Government has done when it came into power; since they came in a great many men have been suspended, and in a great many cases the Government has had to take them back, and pay them their salaries for all the time that they were walking the streets of St. John's.

Now, the Government has very wisely brought down a man to look through the system at the Post Office. Whether he is a capable man or not, I do not know; but the fact that the Government has brought in a man means, I suppose, that he is the best man they can get, and their move meets with the approval of this side of the House. But there has been no report from that gentleman since he came here to show what he has done. As a matter of fact he has done absolutely nothing, and he has been unable to do anything, unless he started to do it very lately. He has been helpless up at the Post Office, and he has been unable to do anything.

Then I understand there are a great many irregularities in connection with the Post Offices in the outports. A few have had to suffer, while others have not. But there is no doubt that it is on account of the system that is in vogue at the Post Office that so many people have got into trouble. That system has been in vogue for many years now, and should be changed.

The next thing is the agricultural policy of the Government. I am glad to see that the Government is interesting itself in agriculture. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture and Mines is not in the House now, but I believe that he is in earnest in trying to improve that department. I am glad to see that he is going to meet some practical farmers. If there is any place where he can get information it is certainly from the practical farmers.

There is one thing that I am strong on in reference to Agriculture—and that is that we should be able to take care of the produce which the people produce. I made a statement here in the House last session, which I intend to repeat now, and that is that this country needs a Government Warehouse for the proper storage of vegetables, and to ensure their preservation. In St. John, New Brunswick, our next door neighbour, there is a large warehouse, which was built by the Federal Government. That is a warehouse which is used by the Government for the storage of vegetables, and keeping them in proper condition. The vegetables are taken in from the

farmers, put in the warehouse, and distributed from the warehouse. Very often you will see a steamer there in St. John, New Brunswick taking a load of vegetables from the Government warehouse for the West Indies.

We, in this country are able to grow all the vegetables that we need, excepting some perishable vegetables, such as cabbage. But of potatoes, carrots. turnips, parsnips and such vegetables we have abundance. But we do not grow as much as we can. If we had an outlet for our vegetables, the man who now grows fifty barrels of potatoes, would grow two hundred or more. A man here raises fifty barrels of potatoes in his garden, but all that he can sell is twenty barrels in the fall. He has to put the rest into his cellar. Then when the frost comes he cannot take them out of his cellar. He has to leave them there during the winter, and when he opens up his cellar in the spring he finds that the vegetables in his cellar are half rotten.

I say that if the Government is going to develop its agricultural policy in earnest, it can spend money on a thing that will be better than the Model Farm or anything else, and that is a proper warehouse, with sufficient cold storage to keep the temperature down so as to preserve the vegetables. The Government can let the farmers put their vegetables into this warehouse, and keep them there. We can dispose of them afterwards, because we can sell them to the West Indies if we have a surplus. We can export to the West Indies just the same as Canada exports her vegetables to the West Indies, or to those islands of the West Indies where they do not raise them.

I say that is the Agricultural policy to follow out, and that is a cheaper thing than any model farms, or special bulls, or anything that the Minister of Agriculture and Mines can import.

The next item is the financing of the Colony. The Speech from the Throne says:

"The finances of the Colony are in a highly satisfactory condition. Revenue has increased, and Expenditure has decreased, and there will be a surplus of ordinary revenue over Expenditure on current account in the year 1924-25. Tenders for a Loan of four million dollars, part of which was authorized last year, have recently been received, and the rates quoted have been most satisfactory. Part of the loan will be expended in Great Britain for the purchase of rails, and the Imperial Trade Facilities Board has undertaken to pay part of the interest for five years on the amount so expended, with the stipulation that the loan be raised in England."

If the country had thought of the new steamer, and had got the Trade Facilities Board to pay the interest on her, I presume it would be in the Speech, also, as it would be too important a subject to leave out. The Speech says our finances are in high condition. I am glad to hear it, but if that is the case, it is nothing to the credit of the present administration, or Minister of Finance. But nothing has been saved, that is true, because to-day there are more Government pensioners and employees than before June, 1924, when the present administration came into power. The Speech says the Revenue has increased, but the real reason why it has, is because the conditions are somewhat better, the price of goods is higher, there has been a lot of labor given on the Humber, and the increased price of fish brought wealth to the country. And also because more merchandise has been imported is why the revenue has increased. And now it says the Government have raised a loan on satisfactory terms. We do not yet know the real position, as we haven't been given much information on this matter. I asked the

Hon. Minister of Finance to lay upon the Table of the House the bids for the loan, but up to the present they are not forthcoming; possibly we may have them to-day, but he is absent at present. Now what I say is that while the Governemnt think they have done well to get that price, they have not really done so, because if our finances are in a highly satisfactory condition, the least rate we should get is par. Out of the Financial Times, the finanical paper of the highest standing, to which I subscribe, I have taken clippings which show the methods and means of raising the loan. At last session of the House I insisted that the loan should be advertised for, but the Minister of Finance said he did not think it wise that we should show our wares. There is not a single province in Canada but advertises for a loan, whether it be for fifty thousand or fifty million, and when they receive the prices everything is published in the papers. That is the course that should have been followed here, but the only thing we know of the loan is the following clipping which I cut from a Canadian paper a few days ago. (Quotes Clipping). That is less than 97½, but if our finances are so good as we are led to believe, we shoud have got a better figure, and I should not think there was any necessity, even though the Government had the sanction of the House to pay five per cent. to do so, as loans are being raised at 4½, even by the smallest towns. There are places which I have never heard of before, such as Boar Bay getting loans at par. There are many references here of the same nature. I cannot say the Government got the best terms that they could have. He advertised in the papers here giving financiers only four days in which to bid, and the time should have been longer. There is nothing whatever of our loan in the recognized financial papers of Canada. In reference to the rails which the Government are getting in England, under arrangement with the Trade Facilities Board, they are paying a price much higher than that for which the rails could be had from other sources. In his reply a few days ago, the Prime Minister says we are paying seven pounds a ton, but as this is giving needed employment to workmen in England, I have nothing to say against it, even though the price is a little higher, and there is no undue profit to the manufacturers. Now as to the taking off of duties. The Speech says these have been removed from beef, pork and kerosene oil. Now these duties were put on by themselves in June, 1924, as there was nothing on them when they came into power. At the opening day, the Bill was introduced, and particular stress was laid on the removal of duties on certain commodities. We ask that the duties on molasses be also removed, and there is no reason why it should not be, as it is an article that the fishermen can scarcely do without. The next item refers to the bounty for shipbuilding. What it is we do not really know, as the Bill is not yet before the House. If it is for repairing vessels, it is a good one, and will receive my support. If it is drawn up so that worn-out schooners can be repaired for the fishery, there is no reason why it should not be given asisstance, as the number of our vessels is dwindling, and it would be an incentive to replace them. We are not criticising everything the Government is doing, as it is our policy to help out, and while it is our duty to criticise anything that is wrong, we intend when anything is introduced that makes for the benefit of the country, to give it our help. The next subject of importance is the Dry Dock. An engineer has been here to look over it, and I asked the Hon. the Prime Minister for his report. The

Prime Minister tells me that he has one report but expects another from a second expert, and will let us have both when they are completed. That is satisfactory, provided the matter is brought up in the House for discussion as to what is to be done in the matter. The Dock is said to be in a terrible condition, and I have heard Capt. Randell say he has seen the ground some distance from the Dock rise and fall with the swell, and also that the pits in the machine shops could not be used when the Dock was flooded, because they were filled with water. What I want to point out is that the Dock needs very extensive repairs, and if it is to be made worth having we have got to spend a lot of money on it. Whether it would be better for the Government to spend money on it, or to hand it over to some other operators, is a matter for discussion. If it is to accommodate ships of large size, we will have to spend a lot of money. You will remember that last year the Metagama, which was damaged off Cape Race, came in here and her temporary repairs cost as much as if she had gone on Dock. But the Dock could not accommodate her, and she only came in because she was forced to do so. If the Dock is to be of any benefit—and we must look to the future as well as the present—it will have to be enlarged and put in a condition to accommodate the largest ships, and machinery will have to be installed, so that every kind of a job can be handled; therefore, I say the Government should interest competitors to come here, as a Dock operated by a Government is very little good, and nothing owned by a Government has shown any profit yet. Whereas a firm handling the same utility would make first rate dividends, labour would be given just the same and we would receive more benefit in the Colony than if handled by the Government. That Dry Dock cost originally $150,000, but at the present time to put it in proper condition would cost many times more than that.

The next paragraph in the Speech from the Throne deals with the removal of the Income Tax. I think that is a step forward. The removal of this tax, as it is carried on in this country at the present time, is a move in the proper direction. There are a few people comparatively who pay the tax and there are a great many who can afford to pay it and who do not pay it. Every firm doing business here to-day is compelled to pay a portion of their dividends every year and are compelled to give to the Assessor's Department every year a list of the employees and the salaries they get. Therefore, the people employed in that way are compelled to pay the tax because the Assessor knows every person's income; but there are many men who carry on small businesses in the country and who keep no books and the tax is never paid by them, so that it bears very heavily on the shoulders of those who pay. There is no doubt about it that every man from a clergyman down when he makes up his accounts at the end of the year does not want to pay any more than he can possibly help. At all events this sort of tax is one that cannot be very well carried on like it is at the present time. It is a great hindrance to small industries. If a small business or a small industry that paid this tax during the war and was hard hit since and was just recovering and showed a balance sheet of some profit, it has to pay a portion of this money under this tax, whereas it should be putting it in that business so as to put the business on a firm financial basis and give more employment all round to the people. The forms of income tax that other countries have may be alright if introduced here; but the tax here is a drag on the country, a hindrance to progress and should be abolished. In fact the Income Tax

Department should be done away with, and the Government would do well to do away with the Audit Department also. What is an auditor? An auditor is a man who looks after a concern, audits the books, sees that no mistakes and irregularities occur and signs documents. Look at the irregularities at the Post Office that came to light. I would take a broom, if I were the Government of the day, and sweep out the present Audit Department, employ a new auditor to conduct a proper audit into affairs from time to time and to lay upon the table of the House all information desired, and then everybody would be satisfied that the country is being run properly and not to have the leakages in departments that we have had in the past. Look at what has been disclosed in the enquiry about audits. Why the Auditor General had no power to take stock in the Controller's Department.

HON. THE FINANCE MINISTER—You could not very well blame the Auditor General if he had no power to take stock. The Government of that day did not give him the power to take stock; nor could you blame his department.

MR. HICKMAN—I blame his department, yes, and I have no hesitation in saying it again.

HON. THE FINANCE MINISTER—If they had been given the power things would have been quite alright.

MR. HICKMAN—For the benefit of the Government, Opposition and of the people of the country generally, I repeat that if we are going to have an Audit Department let us have one so that the books are audited in the proper way and then everybody will be satisfied.

The next item in the Speech from the Throne is that with reference to the Redistribution of seats. It says that a Bill is going to be introduced for Redistribution of seats in certain Districts throughout the country and that certain Districts will be divided up, except in a couple of cases of two men Districts. We have not seen the Bill and we do not know whether it is the intention of the Govrenment or not to divide up according to population or area, and until we see the Bill and find out what it is all about there is very little we can say on the matter. Whether one man Districts will give proper representation to the country or not I do not know, but, I presume, there is one thing and that is that it will give representation on the floors of the Assembly to outport men more so than at the present time. I must say that on the face of it I cannot see the necessity for raising the number of members in the House of Assemt ly to forty. At the present time there are thirty six members. What do we want forty for to run this country with a population of about 250,000 people and with an annual expenditure of eight or nine million dollars. Why that is only a one man job. There are lots of firms in the United States and each of which handle more cash than that annually. Perhaps, the Government have a reason and may give an explanation later on. My idea would be to reduce the number of members down to twenty instead of increasing them to forty.

The next item dealt with in the Speech From the Throne is that of Tourist Traffic. The Government during the last session of the House got authority to borrow six millions of dollars and two millions of this were to be spent on roads for tourists. New roads will be alright if properly kept up, and it would be far better for this country now, if when Sir Edward (now Lord Morris) came into office he had built roads instead of building railroads because the money spent on railroads have been a great source of expenditure year in and year out and have never paid in this country. Road building, however, might be a very good and proper thing to emtark upon, but I have

my doubts as to the wisdom of the Government in spending two million dollars on such work at the present time. The first thing we got to remember, before we try to encourage tourists to come to Newfoundland, is that the hotels here are not large enough to accommodate but a small number of people and a man who is travelling for pleasure is a man possessed of means and who wants good accommodation while travelling and who is not going to pass through the Provinces of Canada where he can get good accommodation and make a trip to Newfoundland, without having first class quarters where he can put up when he comes. Now the first thing the Government has to do, before spending money on new roads, is to find out what hotel accommodation we can offer tourists. We got good enough roads here already for the few tourists that come here and until such time as we construct further roads; but you cannot expect to attract tourist here until you get the hotel question solved first. People do not go to Bermuda or any other place pleasure seeking without knowing first that the hotel accommodation is suitable for them and they are not coming to Newfoundland either unless we have properly conducted hotels to put them in, so that if the Government intend to spend two million dollars now on roads and not touch the question of hotels the chances are they will want two millions more to spend before the tourist come here.

One thing was the need for advertising. I am going to tell the Prime Minister that I do not believe in his advertising. While the Prime Minister was in Canada on the Boundary Question we read some of his after-dinner speeches. I don't think he did any good advertising in his speeches. From what I got, he talked a good deal about conditions in Newfoundland, conditions Newfoundland is in. We have our country painted black enough in every way without somebody showing off the defects. Perhaps the Prime Minister did not intend to say anything but that is the meaning it conveyed to me. Now the Government purposes to appoint a highway commission. If they are going to build roads, that is the proper thing under which the roads should be constructed if the highway commission do not take it out of the hands of politicians then the road building is going to be like every thing else a dumping ground. Now if the Government are sincere and intend to appoint a highway commission they should get some practical man in charge of it. I understood the other day, I think, from the Prime Minister that Mr. Hall, the Government Engineer will likely be chairman. Now with all due respects to Mr. Hall, I don't think he has any experience in road building. He is alright for constructing bridges, but when it comes to the construction of roads I think a man of experience would be better fitted than the present Government Engineer. Another thing the man who takes charge of it is a man who must give all his time to it, and if the Government Engineer had charge of that and a thousand other jobs at the same time he will give the proper attention to none. The Highway Commission will not pan out as expected. Why not get a man like Mr. Hibbs recommended? A Newfoundlander who is now working in Ontario, or get the man who built Bowring Park. He is an excellent man.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—He is a German, isn't he?

MR. HICKMAN—You have Germans building steamers, why not have them building roads? Put a man like that in charge of the roads and make it a proper Highway Commission where the money is spent to advantage. Next item, the encour-

agement of the incorporation of municipalities. I suppose that is something done to take the place of the road boards. If the Municipalities are incorporated and the people can run their own affairs I do not see any objection. It will make better men of our outport men, more self-reliant and more intelligent if they have to meet together and run their own municipalities. The next item in the Speech from the Throne is in reference to the claim of the United States against the Newfoundland Government for illegal fees collected on American vessels in Newfoundland. Now we are not able to talk very intelligently in connection with that because we do not know very much about it. I understand our claim is to be settled by arbitration, and I suppose that is the means the Government intends to adopt. I presume that is the best way. One thing I want to say is that we are altogether too lenient with the United States. We are lenient with them because we think we cannot do without them. About two years ago the United States put on a duty on Newfoundland fish of $1.25. Port Rico is under the protectorate of the United States, the same duty applies to our fish going into Port Rico, which is a large consumer, probably a hundred thousand quintals a year, and we pay $1.25 on fish going into any other protectorate of the United States. Still the Government took no steps to retaliate in any way. Ships have been permitted into these ports under the same conditions as heretofore, and we should do something. We could do without the United States. We have the big country of Canada from which we can get all our food stuffs. We have markets elsewhere for our products, and if they see fit to put a duty on our products there is no reason why we should give any concessions to them. I ask the Minister of Justice to remember what I said and not forget it. $1.25 on every quintal at the present time. Speaking on the unemployment question, Mr. Warren yesterday made reference to unemployment. He put the two subjects together, unemployment and the fisheries. He said, we are splitting fish now as we did twenty years ago. We will always be splitting it the same way until somebody gets something better. Then he referred to the industry which Mr. Lake is carrying on in canning fresh fish. It is not a new industry, it has been in use for a good many years, but fresh fish cannot be tinned cheaply enough to enable us to export it and find a market for it. Some years ago, more than seven or eight a man came from Boston. He wanted fish put up in tins. He asked me if I could put it up. We put it up for him, he asked me the price and I told him. He paid the price. I wondered afterwards how he could pay that price for tinned fish and sell it in the United States. He told me he sold the whole lot in the United States for ———. In regard to this tinning of fish I do not think it can be done cheaply enough to be profitable.

Now as far as the exploiting of new markets goes every man in the fish trade has been exploiting all the new markets he can. Tries to exploit salt fish in Greek markets. A cargo was salted and sent over there. They never had salt fish before. Mr. Hepburn saw them cooking Labrador fish. They had it on a pan frying. You can imagine what it tasted like. It is no easy matter to educate people to eat salt fish, it is the hardest thing in the world to do. The same thing applies in other countries. The hardest thing is to find a market for salt fish. All the Government Commissioners will not make conditions any better in the consumption of salt fish. Shortly after the war

when fish was at a high price I visited Bay Bulls when the company was in operation. I went into the plant, the fish was then about nine or ten dollars a quintal. There was a long table and around the table were twenty or thirty girls picking the bones out of codfish to make boneless fish. The fish was then dried and put up in cardboard boxes and sent to the United States for sale for about twenty five cents per pound.

MR. BROWNE—Surely more than that?

MR. HICKMAN—I think that was about the price. It was about thirty-five cents a pound here, However, I must tell the Hon. Member that I don't know the price of boneless codfish here. There is one industry which I think should be encouraged. And that is the packing of herring. Everybody who talks about fish he talks about codfish. There is any amount of herring swimming in the waters around the shores of this country, and the people do not know how to put them up and do not know what to do with them when they have put them up. If the Government were to put a bounty on the packing of herring I think that it would be a good move. The herring fishery is a great industry. Mr. Warren in his speech the other day said that Russia would be a great market for our herring. The fact of the matter is that is not a new thing. I took that up several years ago. The Russians can get their herring from Scotland or Norway for as much as the freight to ship them from Newfoundland. What the Russians take must be very cheap. They would not give any more for the Newfoundland herring than what it would cost to freight them to that country. Mr. Warren says that he would not like to say that officially. But I do not see why Mr. Warren's opinions should not be taken unofficially because everybody in this country knows all about the fishery. Mr. Brian Dunfield was connected with Job Brothers for two months when he was down in the Board of Trade, telling the people of Newfoundland how they should market their fish, and I do not see any reason why Mr. Warren should not express his ideas. Now the last item on which I am going to speak this afternoon is the "Clean Up." It is not a matter to which reference is made in the Speech from the Throne, but I am just going to refer for a little while to this "Clean Up." This Government came into power last year on the "Clean Up" policy and they said that they were going to "keep clean." That means that they were going to take over the affairs of this country and administer in on a proper basis. They were going to run it on a business basis. And no doubt that was the intention of the Prime Minister and he has found out that it is not so easy to get things straightened out quickly as one would imagine without experience. There are a few things which we were promised by the Prime Minister which have not been carried out. There was one thing which he brought up in the House and which we considered very important, and that was the administration of the Crown Lands Act. At the present time there is a great deal of timber held by different people under lease, and it has been the custom for the Government supporters to make application for these limits, and after the payment of small amounts they hold them in the endeavour that they may be able to dispose of them to some corporation and make a lot of money on them. And sometimes these hopes have not materialised and these properties are still unoccupied and undeveloped. The manufacturers have been driven off. And last year at the beginning of the ses-

sion we brought this up and the Prime Minister said that he was going to have the Crown Lands Act amended and that in the future any timber that was left would be disposed of for the benefit of the colony and for the benefit of the trade of the colony, and that the Government would be in a position to deal with any propositions that might come before them in connection with development of timber properties. Now that amendment has not been introduced into the House. And it was promised last year. Here is the reply given to a question by Mr. Halfyard last year. I will read it from Hansard.

(Reads the answer from the Hansard.)

HON THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Previous Governments let out the timber limits without charging more than the minimum regulation bonus. The Governor in Council has the power to fix the bonus.

MR. HICKMAN—That is not the answer or explanation to us last year.

MR. HALFYARD—The question asked by me last session was whether the Government has the right to put timber limits up for auction.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—That is an entirely different thing. The Government has not the power to auction any land limits, but it has the power to fix the bonus. There is a maximum and a minimum bonus and it has been the habit of past Governments to demand the minimum bonus. I may say that since this government came into power there has been but one license issued and that has been at a bonus the like of which was never heard of before in this colony.

MR. HICKMAN—I am sure that the Prime Minister at the beginning of the last session agreed to amend the Crown Lands Act.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—That is an entirely different thing.

MR. HICKMAN—That is one of the things that was brought up at the closing of the last session. There was no explanation given. I remember bringing it up at the end of the session and that was all that we heard of it. I accept the answer given by the Minister of Justice. The reason that I stress on this matter now is that it was talked about in the House at the last session and I asked if there was going to be any measure introduced, but nobody gave me the explanation that I have been given now. I was under the opinion that the Government could sell lands by public auction.

HON THE PRIME MINISTER—Can the Government now sell lands by public auction?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—No, the Government cannot now sell lands by public auction. but the Government has the powers to fix the bonus at which the lands can be licensed.

HON. THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES—Perhaps it is my duty to explain that practically since responsible Government the practice has been that whoever had the most political pull got the pieces of land if there were more than one person looking for it. But since the Monroe Government assumed power and since I became the head of the Department there has not been one inch of land sold in this manner to any person. There has been a sale made to the Reid Newfoundland Co. of a block of land.

There were some twenty applications in for it. There was an application practically from men of every shade of politics in this country for this block of land. It was sold to the Reid Newfoundland Company, for which the Department received a cheque for forty-five thousand dol-

lars. It is the only land transaction which has taken place since Premier Monroe came into office.

CAPT. RANDELL—Did you say that every man in politics in this country has made application for this piece of timber land.

HON. THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES—No. You are one of those who did not apply.

MR. HICKMAN—I remember that at the last session of the House the Minute of Council Government came in for a lot of criticism. It was said the previous Governments did wrong in spending certain amounts of money by Minute of Council. Now we did not suppose that the present Government would undertake Minute of Council, Govt. and least of all did we expect that they would pay out monies on executive authority since they came into power. I asked the Prime Minister to table the list of the monies which have been paid out on Executive authority by the present Government since it came into power, but I did not get an answer. If the Government has done as they said they would do I see no reason why this list should not be tabled. Mr. Warren has made reference in his speech this session to the "clean-up," and for the benefit of the House I am going to read a part from the Speech from the Throne which was delivered at the last session of the House on the opening day. It is in connection with the enquiry which the Government promised would be made into the several public departments.

(Reads section from the Speech from the Throne of 1924, from Hansard).

I just wanted to read that part of the Speech from the Throne last year to bear out the argument that I used at the beginning, that the Governor, in reading the Speech from the Throne, is only the mouthpiece of the Government, and he has to read whatever is placed in his hand, whether the Government has any intention of carrying out what is contained in the Speech from the Throne or not.

I propose to move an amendment to this Speech from the Throne to the effect that molasses be placed on the free list.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, I just want to add a few words to what has already been said, more by way of explanation than by way of answer. As a matter of fact I think I may speak for every member on this side of the House when I express the very sincere appreciation of the spirit in which all the Honourable members have spoken. I apply this to the honourable mover and seconder of the address in reply, Mr. Cahill and Mr. Browne, coupled with the official leader of the Opposition, the leader of the Independent party, and the private members opposite, all of whom have spoken in the most helpful spirit of constructive criticism that it has ever been the privilege of any Government to hear. The Hon. Prime Minister must be very glad indeed to have the Speech from the Throne discussed in this spirit. The Leader of the Opposition has carried out his promise to deal with the Speech in the spirit of helpful and constructive criticism and not by way of obstruction. The addresses given by the honourable members have certainly typified that spirit, and I think it is an unique happening in the history of this House, to have the policy of the Government since the House last met receive the unanimous endorsation of the House in every respect. The Prime Minister must have reason to be proud to have his policy so unanimously adopted and approved by every member of the House.

It should be a source of satisfaction to him, and to Mr. Hickman,

and other members who are business men to feel that the days of old politicians are over. There was many a time in this House when the Prime Minister's seat was filled by men of many years experience in politics and filled, amongst others by lawyers, who are supposed to be trained in the way of looking for compliments, and in the way of saying things that get applause. Yet never on such occasions has the policy of a Government received such hearty endorsation by the House. The public outside the House naturally expect from and demand from the Opposition that attention be drawn to all the misdeeds of the Government, and surely it must be a matter of great satisfaction to the Government that no such reference has been taken in this case, because, and the public and everyone must agree with this, the Opposition has very properly refrained from making any such references, as they have no material facts on which to base them. It is the first time that the Speech from the Throne has gone through unquestioned, and with nothing but the endorsation of the members of the House behind it. Those of us who are associated with the Government are very glad to see this spirit existing at the commencement of the session.

The Government is starting in now to carry out the promises made last year—to endeavour to save as much time as possible. The Address in Reply has been gone through in a very short time, and now that debate upon it is almost finished, members will be glad to see that so many bills are ready for the House to debate, which will necessarily result in making the Session as short as it could possibly be.

Unofficially, and in a purely personal way, and speaking for myself and on behalf of those who went on the delegation to Canada, I want to thank Mr. Hickman for the very kind reference he has made to us. He is a keen curler himself, and if he happened to be round there at the time I can say that he would have been quite good enough to join those who represented Newfoundland up there on that occasion. Unfortunately we could not get a member of the House of Assembly to make up the team, and we had to get an ordinary Newfoundlander to fill up, but Mr. Hickman will be glad to learn that when next we go up there we shall be glad to have him on the team.

So much by way of generalities. There are one or two things that I think I ought to explain. The honourable the Leader of the Opposition no doubt thought that he was saying something new when he talked of a straight line from Blanc Sablon to Cape Chidley, and said that it would cut off part of our coast on the Labrador. There is no question about that. In order that I might explain this matter better to the House I sent down for a map. The Labrador Boundary that we claim is not a straight line from Blanc Sablon to Cape Chidley. If we had a line from Blanc Sablon to Cape Chidley it would run thus (indicates line on map) and it would cut off a certain piece of the Labrador coast here (indicates piece on map). But the boundary that Newfoundland claims is here. (Shows line on map). It is not an absolutely straight line, and it retains all our coast line, and runs in places hundreds of miles inland.

I am glad to see that my predecessor in office, Mr. Warren, is here now, so that I may take advantage of this opportunity of thanking him for his very sane suggestions. Mr. Speaker, in connection with this idea of selling the Labrador, there are two things that must be thought of. When you talk about selling

Labrador, you must remember that it means the selling of the land right out to the coast. In other words, selling, as I say, our territory, not alone the territory that is in dispute—the "hinterland" between the height of land and the sea—but selling in addition to that what is indisputably admitted to be ours. The latter point was not questioned at all in our conference, but what may be in the pleadings I do not know. What may be raised in the pleadings as to Newfoundland's undoubted right to the coast is another matter. The territory that we understand is in dispute is the territory between the sea coast and this height of land.

Now, as I said, there are two things to be considered in the matter of a sale. There is first the matter of selling the land right out to the coast, and having the dominion, or sovereignty of this land go to Canada, with Newfoundland getting rights to use the coast by treaty. That is one method of sale, and that method of sale would naturally involve very much more and very much greater thought both as to price and as to the sale itself than the second form of proposed sale. Under the second form of sale, we would consider only that portion of Labrador lying between the height of land and our own Newfoundland Labrador, territory of which so far as this country is concerned, we have only the most meagre knowledge. I do not know that we have any more meagre and scanty knowledge than Canada has. We have purely hypothetical ideas as to its timber, but we have assured ideas as to its water powers.

So far as this country is concerned, one of the things that we have all got to sit down and consider would be the price which we should ask for it. Even supposing for the moment that you wanted to sell that land—that you had agreed to sell it, and you had destroyed all idea of sentiment about parting with Labrador and the coast line, can you say what it is worth, apart altogether from what you would try to get for it. There is no method of valuation. There is no method known to ordinary business science that can value that land. You can only approximate something. Even suppose that you were certain of your rights, and that the Privy Council was going to render judgment in our favour, there is no one here today that can do any more than give a guess at what we ought to sell it for. I think that our friends in Canada are in practically the same position as to knowledge of what is down there.

There is just one word more I want to say in this connection, and that is as regards the position of the delegation. I want to explain this to the members of the House. This delegation did not go up to Canada to sell or try to sell Labrador. They did not go up even to endeavour to negotiate a sale of Labrador or any part of it. All this talk about a sale was naturally brought in by the Opposition as a means of saying something as something must be said from the Opposition standpoint. We did not go up there to sell the Labrador and come back with a bag of money in our pockets. That could not happen, because, in the first place, we would have no authority to even attempt it. Even if Canada had offered us five hundred thousand millions for Labrador the delegation had no power to even attempt to accept it. The only thing that we did was to go up there in response to the invitation that was sent us. And despite the natural interest that those who had claims were exhibiting, the Govenment took care to make clear that the conference was between the Governments of Quebec, Ottawa and Newfoundland, and no outsiders were to be represented. The

Delegation only went up to ascertain, without any prejudice whatever, to our case, what possibilities there were of discussing a legal settlement. But members on both sides of this House must remember that nothing whatever can be done by any individual of the Delegation, or by the Government itself, except in the proper way through this House, so, therefore, there is nothing to be afraid of or worried about, as a certain Clergyman was accustomed to say in the course of his sermons, '|The hour has not yet come," and that is the situation at present, the hour is not yet arrived. Now I would like to refer to a remark by the honourable member for Fortune yesterday, and to support it. It is this, that through the Honourable Leader of the Opposition and many others inside and outside this House may not think so, there is such a thing as an honest lawyer, and sometimes he settles a case out of court. It may be of interest to many to know that there is more money usually in a settlement of cases outside of court, than in fighting them out in court. A good lawyer like my predecessor in office knew that he would be more than justified in expecting both fees and praise if he had been able to bring back a substantial amount of money in settlement of this claim, though all the banter is to the effect of the lawyer keeping on the case so that he can get all he can out of it. And I may add that as far as I am concerned I want a settlement of the matter, because though like all poor lawyers I badly need any fees that can be got. I would consider that the best value I could give the country would be in way of a settlement. As Mr. Warren has said we have not the control of the situation altogether in our own hands. He left office with the Newfoundland case prepared. It but remained for me to sign and have it printed. The arrangement was that when our claim was printed the Canadian case would be exchanged with us, but this did not transpire. Now on our return, so that there would be no excuse on the part of the Canadian Government to complain of delay on our side, I immediately wrote the Attorney General at Ottawa to hurry up and expedite their case, and I make the statement now that there was nothing whatever done on our part to cause delay in any way. But their case has not yet been filed, and the position is that when it is filed we shall probably have to file an answer and they another, and it is difficult to say when the matter will get to the Privy Council. I would not undertake to forecast the result. It must be remembered that Canada is just as sure of her case being right, as we are ours. Ours, it is true, looks good on paper, but I have known hockey and football teams which looked good on paper, but when they got on the field were cleaned up. As far as our case is concerned, I think the expense in connection with it has been justified, and as one who has not yet been able to get my hand in the chest, though I need the money, I must say in justice to those who have been conducting the case, that they have had to deal with a matter that is entirely different from going out and selling a fire ladder or a hose. This matter of the Labrador is one in which the territory involves is three times the size of Newfoundland, and none should regard it in any but a serious light. The question is really a tremendous one. It is not a partisan question, or one effecting only this side of the House, but one in which the people outside are most vitally interested, and anything that can do to conserve our rights must, therefore, be done. It is merely ridiculous to talk of what we have

spent when we see the expenditure in Canada in connection with the same matter. Up there they have whole staffs of engineers, historical men, map men, and others, with suites of offices and the largest kind of salaries, preparing their case. And why? Simply because it is a great big matter. What amuses a lawyer is comment of the kind referred to. Why if you go on Circuit and want a case that has employed lawyers for years you will find it in one involving the possession of a few feet of ground. The desire for property is inherent in us. Now the Labrador question is a great big one, as the territory is so huge and valued at so much. It involves an area three times the size of Newfoundland. I want to say that as far as Mr. Warren and his predecessors are concerned, whatever remuneration they received is only very small indeed in proportion to the importance of the subject involved, and I say that only in justice to those who have preceded me. Now there is one other matter that I would like to clear up, and which has been referred to by the Honorable Member for Fortune. I wish to make an explanation of what might have appeared to be an interruption on my part when he was speaking yesterday. He was referring at the time to the conduct of Besco, as to the export duty on ore after the contract had been passed. As I said before when Mr. Bennett and myself as representatives of the Opposition were appointed on the committee, and joined up with others on the Government side, not alone was it a surprise to us that the Besco representatives would not sign another contract, but it appeared at first blush that the matters were so ridiculous and so difficult to follow that we agreed we should try to get a new contract drawn up. No lawyer would interpret the contract in its existing form, and it was made so intentionally. The Committee said that a clean cut one, clear and explicit, ought to be brought in. We had three things in mind, the continuity of work, the employment of the largest possible number of men, and the fixing of wages as high as possible, because if we secured these the export duty on ore would be only an incident and nothing at all in comparison to the benefits to be derived from these other factors. The more men at work the longer they worked and the higher the rate of pay, the more revenue would result. We suggested the adoption of a sliding scale of export taxation to Mr. Gillis who was here at the time as representative of Besco, the idea running through our minds being to get $250,000.00 annually from this duty. We felt that if it could be brought about that enough of ore would be mined to pay such a royalty as mentioned, then we could let the rest go free, because we would have such a large number of people employed. But what happened? We were told the contract had to go through without crossing a T or dotting an I; we came back into the House and the contract went through. Now I do not want to resurrect what happened since—as it was not the fault of those in the present Opposition—but the case to-day, as I told Mr. Wolvin in Montreal, is, whether rightly or wrongly, that the men at Bell Island have lost faith in the outfit and we will never get back again to the old conditions at that industrial centre till the popular status of the Besco concern is improved. I have no desire to review what happened after the passing of the contract, as perhaps it would not be fair because the man chiefly concerned is not now in the House. As Mr. Wolvin said to me in answer to a question when I was talking to him at Montreal, the clause in the contract relating to the smelter was

ridiculous, but was put in because a politician of the day, who was a big factor in the Government, had apparently given the idea to the Besco people that, if this thing was not gone through, there was the danger of a heavier tax being put on. I said "it was absurd and ridiculous because when the House was in session it surely was a ridiculous thing to come along here and not withdraw that clause." He said "we could not withdraw that clause regarding the smelter as that was purely thrown in as a camouflage and because the Government of the day, through these who were negotiating it, wanted something nice on paper." But there was no intention to put up this smelter, and he said himself that the reason why Besco did not bother was because they were only prepared that, in the event of the smelter not being put up in five years, the tax would begin to operate; but from the moment the bill was put on the statute book, not only was not a cent paid under the contract, but history in this country shows that steps were taken to have this clause removed. Now the present Government does not want to talk fireworks and without making any suggestion as to the future I will merely say that this Government will try and see that some definite arrangement is arrived at. That contract and that Act as it is on the Statute Book is an imposition and a fraud and a joke on the people. It was never intended to be carried out, it cannot be carried out and it is impossible to carry it out. The idea suggested of bringing coal from Sydney to the electric smelting plant on Bell Island, was never intended to be lived up to. I, therefore, must subscribe to the sentiments expressed by members on the other side of the House that we try and get a new agreement drawn up and stop this annual farce. There is one thing, though, in this matter and that is that one cannot get up and idly say that this must be done and that must be done. The hard part of the position is that those people on Bell Island are like a crowd marooned. They are over there today working for less wages than they would like to get, and they are working as shovellers for less wages than they deserve to get. But, God help them, they got to work under such conditions because there is no place else for them to go now, and, if, as I said to Mr. Wolvin, there was some place else for them to go there would be nobody on Bell Island shovelling ore. But one must not lose sight of the other side of the story. We do not want Bell Island mines closed, if they can be kept open, because the day that they are closed a hardship will be inflicted upon our people. For these reasons I endorse the idea that there should be an absolutely new agreement and a thorough enquiry into Besco affairs. The position taken to-day by the miners and workmen generally in Sydney is that they refuse to have an enquiry, except an enquiry on oath. Our position here is somewhat similar and the nature of such an enquiry would be advantageous to both Sydney and Newfoundland miners. Today the position is that the officials of Besco produce their sheets and a statement of their overhead charges and expenses showing that every time they shipped ore last year they lost money on it. We do not know whether their statement is true or not and we have no means of finding out. Of course, it must be borne in mind that this ore mined on Bell Island goes in competition with ores from countries that have more up-to-date marketing methods and more modern grades of machinery. At Bell Island today the ore is mined for the purpose of mixing with ore in stockpiles in a proportion of about

three to one. There are at the present time a couple of hundred thousand tons of old ore piled at Bell Island and the only hope is by mining fresh ore to raise the quality.

I did not intend to delay the debate, Mr. Speaker, but felt that the two subjects to which I have referred should have a little light thrown on them. I trust I have satisfied honourable members in this respect.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—As there is not much time to say anything more this evening, I would suggest the adjournment of this debate. I would like to have something to say and other members of the House as well before the debate ends.

Mr. Ashbourne gave notice of question.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Speaker, in reply to question No. 1 on Order Paper of February 27th, I would say that Robinson and Company and the Evening Telegram Ltd., have paid their accounts in full. Mr. Scammell, on behalf of the Union Publishing Company, has undertaken to pay their bill this week. A writ has been issued to collect from the Newfoundland Publishers, Ltd., the sum of $412.50 due by them.

Also I would like to lay upon the table of the House answer to a question asked by the Leader of the Opposition.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until Monday, the 2nd day of March at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, March 2nd.

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

Presenting Petitions.

HON. MR. LONG—I beg leave to present a petition from the residents of Point Crewe, Chalmers, Lories and High Beach in the district of Burin, asking for a grant of two thousand dollars for the purposes of repairing the bridges and roads. I need hardly say that the bridges and roads in this section of the country are in a deplorable condition, and I trust this petition will have the earnest consideration of the Government.

I beg to ask that this petition be referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. LAKE—In reference to this petition presented by my colleague, Mr. Long, I wish to say that this place is absolutely in need of the amount asked. It is about twelve miles from any settlement. It has no communication by road with anywhere else, and the only means of getting anything there is by water, and it is a very barren coast. I would ask the department to which that petition belongs to give it every consideration, so that these people may have some sort of communication with the main road.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I beg to present a petition from the residents of Lance Cove and Freshwater, Bell Island, asking for an allocation of about fifteen hundred dollars for the purpose of an extension to the public wharf at Lance Cove. It is needed to make an extension of about thirty feet. Some time ago the mail boat used to call at Lance Cove regularly three times a week, until the wharf was damaged. The wharf at the present time is not sufficiently far out to afford sufficient water for the boat to approach it and consequently the service had to be discontinued. This has caused much inconvenience to the people of these two settlements, who, as a consequence, have to pay excessive freights in transporting their freight by road. I commend the petition to the best attention of the Department of Marine & Fisheries.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE &

MINES—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a number of petitions from the residents of Merasheen, Isle of Valen, Rose-au-Rue and other points in Placentia Bay in connection with the improvement of the coastal service. I understand my colleague, the Hon. Mr. Sullivan, also has one from other parts of the district. There is one from the Rev. Fr. Fyme and all are very largely signed. They ask that the matter of the coastal service be taken up by the Railway Commission and improved. At various times I have discussed this matter here, but personally I think there can be no better service till the schedule of the Argyle is only for Placentia Bay—that is that she run only as far as Marystown and there connect with the Glencoe. I have also tried to get a smaller boat to ply on the other section —say from Marystown to Grand Bank or some such place so that the people there will not lose by the change. I beg leave to present the petition and I trust that a conference will be arranged so as to bring about the desired improvements. The service at the present time is altogether inadequate—it is just the same as when the Argyle was put on the route and though the population and trade have increased the facilities are only the same and the people have not been able to enlarge their business as they would have done with the improved service. We often have demands made on us for the boat to make special trips in order to handle the traffic, but under existing conditions these requests have to be turned down. I therefore hope this petition will receive the most earnest consideration of the Government.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in giving my heartiest support to the petition presented by my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture & Mines. The trouble is that the Argyle has more work than she can do and until her route is shortened the people will be under difficulties in getting their mails and freight. The suggestion is that the ship ply only from Argentia to Marystown and back, calling of course at intermediate ports. I have also a petition from the people of Bar Haven and other points to the same effect and I beg that it be fyled with those of my colleague.

MR. SINNOTT—I also wish to give these petitions my heartiest support, Mr. Speaker, and hope that they will be given every consideration by the Government.

Notice of Motion and Question.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, I beg to table the answer to question of Mr. Brown, No. 2 on the Order Paper of February 26th.

I also wish to table the answer to question of Mr. Godden on February 25th.

Mr. Scammel gave notice of question (1), (2), (3), (4).

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARGY—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table a statement of the expenditure and revenue of the Municipal Council for 1924.

Mr. Duff gave notice of question.

Answers to Questions

(1) MR. SCAMMELL asked Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs what new telephone offices, if any, have been opened in each electoral district in the country since April 30th last, and to show the cost in each case of establishing such telephone offices; also to ask like information regarding telegraph and wireless station officcs.

HON. THE MINISTER OF POSTS —The answer to this question will take some time to prepare, but I may say it is in course of preparation and I will have it ready in a few days.

(2) MR. HALFYARD asked Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs to lay on the Table of the House a statement giving: (a) the names of all new officials appointed from June 9th, 1924, to date, in any branch of the Posal or Postal Telegraphs Department, at the General Post Office, the East End Post Office, or any other Postal or Postal Telegraph Office in the city; (b) the date of each such appointment, and the salary paid each new official; (c) if any position in the General Post Office, or any other Postal Telegraph Offic in the city has become vacant; state the cause of each such vacancy; (d) if any of the officials have been promoted; state particulars with names, and the increase in salary, if any, in each case; (e) if one or more officials have been disrated; give the name, or names, and the reasons for such, and the decrease, if any, in salary as a result of such disrating.

HON. THE MINISTER OF POSTS —I beg to table the statement.

(3) MR. BROWN asked Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs to name "the parties interested" who recommended the appointment of the present Mail Couriers at Exploits.

HON. THE MINISTER OF POSTS —I may say in reply that these gentlemen were appointed on the recommendation of Mr. Ayre and Mr. Hickman.

(4) MR. SCAMMELL asked Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs: (a) if his Department has as yet decided on the amount to be paid per trip to Herbert Caines, Mail Courier between Parsons' Pond and Bellburn's, in the District of St. Barbe; (b) the name of the Mail Courier employed on the route between Hampden and Jackson's Arm, White Bay; (c) to furnish a list of Mail Couriers in the District of St. Barbe who are employed all the year round and to show route on which each Courier is employed and price paid per trip per week in each case.

HON. THE MINISTER OF POSTS —I beg to table the answer.

ORDER OF THE DAY.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER— Mr. Speaker, the motion in connection with the Address in Reply has now been debated for a week, and I do not propose to keep the House any longer in getting it off the order paper, so that progress can be made in the way of further business. It is a matter of great gratification to the Government, that the Speech has been dealt with at such length, and so fully by the Honourable Members of the Opposition with such little criticism. Whether it is due to the benign season of Lent, or whether it is that I am not so sensitive as I was last session, it appears to me that a much better feeling exists in the House to-day than there was last Session and I thank the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition for his statement, that if we propose to pass measures which are right and beneficial to the people of the country, he will be the very first to laud us, and to show appreciation of our work. A gentleman came to me and said I was a fool to be in politics because, said he, the country will give you no credit for what you do right, and blame you for what you do wrong. He did not know what he was talking about, because according to his own expression, the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition himself proposes to be the trumpeter of the Government during the next three and a half years. The gentlemen of the Opposition in discussing the Address in Reply have stated that there is considerable Legislation yet to be introduced in this House, and it is of great inter-

est to note how well posted they are in the details of a Bill that has not yet been presented—how many Districts the country is to be divided into, how many members there are to be, and where they are to stand for. They almost know all about the reduction on the Banks Tax, and the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition even knows more than myself, as to the introduction of a Bill dealing with the cull of fish. Now that is one subject I will never introduce a Bill to deal with. For the last thirty years I have been sitting at round table conferences, attending Board of Trade Sessions and fishery meetings, to discuss as to whether the merchants could come together in some way on this question of cull of fish, whether in St. John's or elsewhere, but I think it will be generally conceded that after all the hours of discussion we were never any further ahead than before. I think Mr. Hickman will recognize with me how impossible it is to do anything in that connection. Mr. Hickman has evidently been misinformed. Some exporter imagines he has passed the birch to us, but I can tell Mr. Hickman and the exporters that they have another guess coming to them and that they have to work out their own difficulties for themselves. If they want anything done, let them work out a scheme, report to us and then we will see what can be done afterwards in the way of legislation. The honourable member for Trinity, Mr. Halfyard, spoke for three hours a few days ago and though one hour was devoted to the subject for the codfishery I really do not know of one constructive suggestion that he made in all his remarks. He thought that there should be Fishery Commissioners appointed for the foreign markets. The honourable member for Fogo, Mr. Hibbs, also thought that we ought to have Commissioners to sell our fish. Now if we have any Commissioners at all we should not have them to sell our fish. I have been in the codfish business pretty well all my life and I have never required anybody to sell my fish for me. I have an agent in every place where our fish is sold and I am quite satisfied with the work they are doing. We do not want men in the foreign markets to sell our fish, although it may be alright to have men who are interested in the fishery to try and get us in communication with any new markets. We have had our experience of Fishery Commissioners under the Fish Regulations, which were thrown down because they did not have the endorsation of the Trade, and because the Trade was not behind them. Mr. Allan Goodridge was sent by Sir William Coaker a couple of years ago to Peru to investigate conditions and find out what the possibilities were for opening up a new market there for Newfoundland codfish. He made that investigation, presented an elaborate report, but I do not know if anybody read it or not. The report was sent out by the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and the result is that there has not been a single quintal of fish sent to Peru since Mr. Goodridge came home. So I say that the appointment of Fishery Commissioners is not a thing that appeals to me. Mr. Taylor, who was here last Summer as referred to by Captain Winsor, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, recommended that four Commissioners be appointed. The Fishery Board sat on it and they decided that such a proposition was extravagant and they suggested to the Executive that a roving Commissioner be appointed to do all the markets. The Government was not very enthusiastic about this roving Commissioner, as a roving Commissioner may be very hard to find at times, hence the pro-

position did not commend itself to us. I had a letter from a Mr. Cobb, a Director of the College of Fisheries, a man who is well versed in the canning industry, stating that he is prepared to send us a man to assist in getting our canning industry under way. Captain Gosse, who gave a lecture here last year, stated that our small herring and caplin should be tinned and that canned salmon should be a great industry here, but that more uniformity of size was required. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries will agree with me that the salmon canning industry is one that we should give more attention to during the coming year. Mr. Hickman, the other day, spoke of a little booklet issued by a Mr. Huntsman, which is an eye-opener to me. Here is a paragraph from it: (Reads paragraph regarding temperature of the water.)

I have been supplying fishermen for the past thirty years and I had them asking me for everything from a needle to an anchor; but I never heard of a fisherman wanting to be supplied with a thermometer when going fishing, and, according to Mr. Huntsman, it is the first essential article fishermen should take to the fishery with them. If this theory is correct, and a man has to get the temperature of the water before putting his traps in the water, I think it is well worth consideration, and any schooners going to prosecute the fishery next summer should have thermometers to bring along with them.

Mr. Hickman also referred to the West India service, and said that it was absolutly essential for steamers to take our fish direct to the West Indies, and he wound up by saying that everybody in the trade sat upon it. Mr. Hickman reminds me very much of the juror who said that he never met eleven more obstinate men. I say with the rest of the trade, it is not necessary to ship our fish direct to the West Indies by steamer. I shipped as much fish as anyone to the West Indies during the past year, and I got absolute satisfaction, though it was sent through Halifax and New York. We cannot subsidize steamers at present because we cannot afford to. That is all I have to say on that matter just now.

I would also like to say a word or two on the Agricultural situation, because I appreciate the interest that the Minister, Mr. Walsh, is taking in his department. He wrote a letter to me some time ago and asked me if I would call a few members of the Council together for the purpose of formulating an Agricultural policy. I told him there was no need of such a meeting as I did not know anything about agriculture. I told him to get in touch with a few expert local farmers and see if they had a few good suggestions to offer. He did so and some of the suggestions advanced appealed to us and some others did not. There was one good point brought out by Mr. Hickman in his speech and that was that we should have better facilities for storage of our vegetables. There was another by Captain Courtney who thought we should have some protection for our vegetables, and another was that we should have cheaper transport along our own railway line. Now when we get people growing three or four hundred barrels of turnips and potatoes in Salvage, they should not be charged an exorbitant rate to get them to Corner Brook. We should carry such vegetables over the railway line as cheaply as possible. The same applies to hay. We should charge a minimum for the carrying of hay over the railway lines, thus encouraging the growing of hay, without any expense to the Colony, and I hope we shall be able to do so.

Just a word also about the Hum-

ber and the logging industry. I think it is a very dangerous attitude to assume to criticize unfairly or rashly the Humber proposition, because we have to remember that we are shareholders in it, and, if anything happens to that industry, we suffer with the rest of the shareholders Of course, there may be reasons for criticizing some things done out there. We heard a lot of talk and a lot of criticism at last session about matters on the Humber; but we have a good Company in the Armstrong-Whitworth people, whose name is world renowned, and they are people who can be depended on for a square deal, and the fact that they are spending thirty millions of dollars in that industry, instead of twenty millions, is to their credit and to our benefit,— to our benefit because we were security for ten millions, and now we have more security there than before. We ought to think a lot of the Armstrong-Whitworth people because they have put an extra ten million dollars of their own money in that industry, as well as for other reasons. We have heard a lot of outside labourers being brought in to work in that region. I can quite understand the temperament and the feelings of Newfoundlanders in this connection when the outsiders are no better workers than our own people, and I can readily understand how the trouble came about. Some of the sub-contractors of the Armstrong Company, who wanted to get some special work done and done quickly, brought down men with them from Canada and paid a special wage, and that is why, in some cases, that some people from outside, experts in their line, got more pay than some of our Newfoundlanders. But as things go on, Mr. Speaker, very shortly you will find that there will be no outsiders employed on the Humber. Last Fall they were asking for three hundred loggers and we could not get our own people to go at this work. Captains Butler and Byrne were unable to find enough loggers to go in the woods, and, accordingly, the contractors imported men to do the work because they wanted the timber cut as quickly as possible and did not want to fall down on their contracts in supplying the people they were dealing with, and I think I would have done the same thing if the business had been mine. The result was that French Canadians came down to do the work and have been scattered around the various camps. As Mr. Warren said in his report, those French Canadians are all men of experience in this kind of work, and a large percentage of our men are not experiencd in it. They do not profess to be. They are fishermen and not loggers. If they get a number of Canadian expert lumbermen among a number of non-expert lumber-men then our people will be able to learn the lumbering business as well as anybody else in the world. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that it is going to be any harm at all, if we get a certain number of imported lumbermen. The Armstrong Whitworth people have said that the Canadian lumbermen would not get one dollar more than our men. They have their passages paid down and back if they stay a certain length of time. I think six months. Our men can get their passages back and forth also if they will agree to stay that time.

I would like to say a word about the steamer for the Gulf. The Leader of the Opposition has said that if we had got the assistance of the Trades Facilities Board in building this steamer we could have got her built ten thousand pounds cheaper in England than in Holland. But Mr. Hickman seems to have forgotten to read the message which was sent to the Trade Commissioner in London asking whether we could get

the assistance of the Board in the building of the ship, the reply to which was that they did not think they could advance the assistance because they said that a steamer was not a public utility. I do not know how they can argue that, but I know that Mr. Baldwin, the Conservative Leader and the Leader of the Government in the British House of Commons, said recently in the House, and Mr. Sullivan happened to be there at the time, that they would have to extend the Trade Facilities to the building of steamers also. That was after the contract for the ships had been signed, and having closed the contract when we did we could not have gotten the assistance. We did get assistance for the order of fifteen thousand tons of rails which we have placed with an English firm, but we do not receive very much advantage, because if we had placed the order in Germany we could have done nearly as well. Under the present condition we are doing about five thousand dollars better with the aid of the facility than we could do in Germany on this fifteen thousand tons of rails. Of course if we were to lose five thousand dollars by giving the order to a British firm we would rather do it than give the order in Germany after having the ship built in Holland. With regard to the dock, we have as I explained the other day another expert looking over the proposition. It looks as if we are going to have to spend a great deal of money on the dock. We are at present waiting for the second expert to make his recommendations, we are waiting to see what they both have to say on the subject. All I can say is that everything will be brought before the House in connection with this matter and all will have the opportunity to express an opinion on it.

The Public Enquiry has been commented upon to some extent. I think that it was the Hon. member for Fortune Bay who said that we should not publish the results of our investigation without giving the names of people and all details. I do not agree with him in that respect. We want to keep the public aware of what we are doing. We want to let them know what we are finding as well as we can. We are not seeking political kudos. We are having these publications made just to let the people know that things are so, and that we are doing it to get things better. If Mr. Warren's district of Fortune Bay did not spend as much money on doctors' bills as other Districts we want the people of the other Districts to become as good as the people of Fortune Bay. In connection with the public institutions we find that hundreds of people have been coming here to go into the hospital when there was no room for them. Boarding house after boarding house was being filled with sick patients, and the Government had to pay the doctors' bill and their board. It would be very much better for them to remain at home and await their turn, which has to be done in any case.

One word on the unemployment. Nobody feels more distressed about people being out of employment than I do myself, and the members of the Government. We certainly feel very sympathetic. But it is not the duty of the Government to find employment for every man out of work. Let that be clearly understood. It is the duty of the Government to give every encouragement to the industries that employ labour. It is not the duty of the Government, if they find a man out of a job, to give him employment. Of course, if he is starving they should give him assistance. Now in the course of the investigations that have been made we have been told that there are not so many people badly off as there were last year, but that those that are badly

off are more badly off than they were last year. It is probable that if the Government were to give such employment as the Rock Sheds, that the people most in need would not be the people to get help at all. We know that the people do not like receiving the dole, and we do not like offering it, but we cannot let the people starve and we do not know of anything else to do. It is hoped to put some men to work on the dock when the report is submitted. This should be about the first of April. But, Mr. Speaker, it has been remarked that the people of St. John's have not the same independent spirit of years ago. A number of people have lost their independence. They have acquired the habit of looking to the Government for assistance and the Government is being looked to. Nothing is easier than for the Government to throw out money right and left, but as the custodians of the people's money it is our duty to see that it is spent to the best advantage of the people of the country.

I would like to say a word on the Labrador Boundary. My friend, the Attorney General, has given a little information on that and I would like to add a little more. When we went up to Monteal we found ourselves up against one big question, and that was the sovereignity of the coast. Mr. Warren stated the other day something about twenty-five million dollars being mentioned as a price for the Labrador, but he did not say to what extent the sovereignty of the coast was involved. We found the delegates were strong on that point. Any sale, they declared, must embrace the sovereignty of the coast. It was largely on that account that we did not get very much farther than we did, and we had to come back and consult our colleagues in the Executive. The result was that I wrote a long letter to Mr. Taschereau, giving him a description of the various interests in the Labrador. There was provision to be made for the small fisherman who goes down in the steamer and builds his hut on the shore and sells his fish on the Labrador coast. Then there is the planter who owns property and imports his goods direct to the coast. We pointed out that we wanted these people taken care of and asked for suggestions about it. Mr. Taschereau, however, put that aside by saying that they would all be looked after and enquired as to what would be the price. Now it is very hard to fix a price, if you do not know what you are selling. It has been submitted to me since we have come back from Montreal that the question of the boundary line can still be taken up again and that Quebec will be willing to accept three miles from the coast. If Quebec would be willing to agree to this we might be willing to sell the property at a great deal less than if the sovereignty of the coast were included. I think that that is the principal consideration with us. The fishermen must be protected. We have got to remember that the Labrador property is very big. It is a hundred and twenty thousand square miles. And we have to give a little consideration before we enter into any arrangement. Quebec has got water powers capable of developing seven or eight million horsepower, and if she had the Labrador she would have four million more. That is a very valuable asset. It is very valuable to them, more to them perhaps than to us, and all that I can say is that in the negotiations that will take place we will make the best arrangements we can and then submit them to the consideration of the House.

Mr. Ashbourne in referring to the Speech from the Throne spoke about the policy of "Clean Up." We are doing some cleaning up, but as I told the House before it may take four

years to clean up, but we have begun, and I don't say that we are particularly proud of the progress that we have made, but we have begun in the right direction. Sir John Crosbie has done a lot of cleaning up in the Custom House. We have got the Post Office on fairly good lines. We have got Colonel Ross putting in a new system up there, I believe it is going to be effective. Colonel Ross has suggested the appointment of a postmaster for St. John's. Mr. Milley is taking the position. Mr. LeMessurier has retired, Mr. Martin has retired at his own suggestion, and Mr. Devereaux has retired. They are remaining on for one month, however, to give assistance to those following them. Their successors are promotions in the Post Office Department itself. I would like to encourage that sort of thing. I would like to see every man in every departmnet move up instead of having politicians put over their heads. It discourages them.

Mr. Speaker, I don't propose to take up any more of the time of this House this afternoon. I simply wish to make these few responses to the criticisms from the other side of the House, and to say that we believe that in the few years we have still to go we will be able to make a fairly decent showing in the policy of cleaning up.

On motion the Address in Reply was adopted, and it was ordered that the said Reply be presented to His Excellency the Governor at His Excellency's convenience.

Second Reading of Bill Respecting the Lobster Fishery.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a suggestion. There are 14 bills on the order paper for their second reading. I suggest to the leader of the House the advisability of distributing these bills now. I understand they are printed and ready for circulation. I think we would save time in the end. Some of the bills are of prime importance, and it is hard to expect members to take them up in the second reading, having seen the bill only five minutes before. We don't know any of its provisions until the bill is going through second reading. In fact, in Canada an explanation of the bill is given on its introduction. I suggest the advisability of having the bills distributed when they are printed so that we may be prepared to debate them more competently.

MR. HICKMAN—I agree with the member for Fortune Bay with regard to the Bills being distributed. It gives us members an opportunity to think them over, to read and study them. Perhaps at times on account of not having read the bill we ask to have the reading postponed. It would greatly facilitate the progress of the House.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—We would be very glad to assist the business of the House, but these Bills are not printed long enough for our own side to see them. I would like our own party to be familiar with them before the distribution. However, I quite see the point. I would be very happy to have the bills distributed before they are read the second time. As far as we can we will do it.

MR. SCAMMELL—Before proceeding with any remarks I would like first to add a word to what has already been said with reference to the fact that we do not have Bills placed in our hands until they come up for the second reading, and as the second reading invariably comes off true to schedule, members have very little opportunity to look into new provisions. I submit that we ought to have a little more time before proceeding with the second reading after Bills are distributed. This is a matter, of course, for the Leader of the Government. I merely sup-

port the point raised by Mr. Warren.

Now Mr. Speaker, to proceed with this Bill respecting the Lobster Fishery. Apparently the Government has decided to go ahead with the policy of prohibiting the prosecution of the lobster fishery in the District of St. Barbe this year and the next three years. I asked the other day, in my remarks on the Address in Reply, if the Government would reconsider their action in this connection, and I rise now, Sir, to further urge that position. With all due respect to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, with all due respect to the very admirable case that he made out for a close season for the next three years, I am not satisfied that the majority of people who are interested in the lobster fishery have been as thoroughly consulted as the Minister would have us believe. In fact, within the last day or two I have received messages from the West side of St. Barbe asking me if the Government intends to proceed with the close season this year. I replied that to all intents and purposes the Government intends to proceed with the close season this year. I replied that to all intents and purposes the Government intends to proceed with its legislation. Captain Winsor said that his Fishery Board had been deluged with requests for the close season for lobsters. I don't believe that Captain Winsor can produce letters calling for the close season for lobsters from six influential people in St. Barbe District. I challenge Captain Winsor to do so. The District of St. Barbe is the one district chiefly interested in the lobster fishery. Capt. Winsor pointed out that the Government would be able to put something in its place. Something that will supply a lack of labour and loss from the close season, but the Captain does not tell what the Government proposed to supply to make up for the deficiency.

I cannot, Mr. Speaker, see the urgent necessity for the close season, for lobsters without having given a greater length of notice to the people primarily connected with the industry. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries made reference to the lucrative lobster fishery near his own home some years ago. It is true that lobster fishery has dwindled and is almost gone, but, in my humble opinion, Sir, the fact that we are going to have a close season on lobsters is not going in any way to increase or enhance the value of the lobster fishery as regards the catch or price. The Minister quoted figures to show that the lobster fishery has dwindled. Mr. Speaker, I submit that these figures as we have them today, and as they stand for the past decade, are not such figures as can lead us to any definite conclusion as regards the lobster fishery. I have figures before me for 1912-13, 1922 and 1923. In 1912-13 there were 26,047 cases of lobsters packed. These figures are from the Finance Minister's budget speech. In the following year 1913-14, there was a decline of one thousand, the next year 1914-15 they jumped from 25,000 to 26,000. It goes up again in 1915-16. In 1920 and 1921 there were 12,450 cases. What I wish to impress on the House and the Government is that the figures form no criterion that we cannot come to any safe conclusion from the presence of the facts as outlined in the figures. We had a fishery last year. I don't remember the figures. We will presume you had a lobster fishery of 3,000 cases. According to these figures we might easily expect a lobster fishery next year of say ten thousand cases. Again, I say the figures as we have them here are no criterion as to what we may expect from year to year. I have merely risen this afternoon to urge on the Government that they ought not to proceed with this legislation. This

close season ought to be delayed for for at least twelve months. Probably I am the only member who is keenly interested in the lobster fishery from this side. I owe it to my constituency. I want to go on record as protesting against the Government's action in bringing this into effect this year. If the Government is anxious to conserve the Lobster fishery, why not revert to the system of proportion and conservation. Some years ago, we spent some 10 or 15 thousand dollars in protection of the lobster fishery in that way. The system was that paid officials went round the coast and bought up the small and the spawn lobsters and released them again.

In my opinion, if the Government is anxious as it appears to be to conserve the interests of the lobster fishery, they could have done something very more practical, very much more beneficial, less drastic and more likely to meet the object which they have in view, than bringing in a Bill to create a close season at this time.

In the year 1921-1922 we were obliged for reasons of economy to remove the vote to which I have referred for the protection of the lobster fishery from the estimates. We did not want to do it, but it was absolutely necessary to reduce expenditure. All around people were clamouring for it and we decided that one of the things that had to go was this vote for the protection of the lobster fishery.

At that time, I remember the late Mr. McDonnell, who was then honourable member for St. George's District, protesting against the vote being removed from the estimates, but the then Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Sir William Coaker, saw no other course open but to remove it. There had to be a substantial reduction in expenditure, and he felt that he was obliged to resort to this action. I deplored it at the time, but it was a matter of public necessity as against private gratification, if I may use the expression, and the vote went.

But now that the Government finds itself in such a satisfactory financial condition, I feel that a better way for the Government to conserve the lobster fishery would be to resort to the old time method of placing a vote in the estimates for the protection of the lobster fishery. A great deal more could be done for the thorough protection and propagation for the benefit of the lobster fishing industry by reverting to that system than by passing the Bill to create a close season such as is proposed today.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker, in reply to the honourable member for St. Barbe, I may say that so far as this Bill is concerned what I stated here before is that this Bill has had quite a deal of consideration by the Fishery Board, and after considering the bill in all its aspects, the Board came to the conclusion that it was in the best interests of this country that the lobster fishery be closed down for three years.

I think I stated here the other day that I only had one telegram or letter from anybody in St. Barbe District or in St. George's District, but I then forgot to say that I had a personal interview with Mr. Stephen Taylor of Bonne Bay, and he was not so much against the closing down of the lobster fishery, but he was discussing the question of the disposal of the gear which he said the people had on hand. True, I have not had very many letters from St. Barbe, either for or against the Bill. I had one letter, and one private conversation with two men from that district, and I have had no other letters either for or against. But all over the country we have had numerous communications and letters,

and we were asked to allow the district of St. Barbe to continue catching lobster for the next twelve months; but the Board gave that matter its consideration, and after giving it all the consideration that was possible, it was decided unanimously that the fishery should close down for three years all over the country.

I made a statement the other day that the Government had anticipated bringing in something else to relieve the people in that district who depend so much upon the lobster fishery. I was up through that district the past summer, probably when Mr. Scammell was not there, and I have been up and down the shore from Flowers Cove to Port Saunders, and to my own knowledge there were scores of people that were existing on what they got from the lobster fishery, and only barely existing on it.

I make the same statement now that I made the other day, which is, I consider that there has been no more opportune time in the history of this country for the closing down of the lobster fishery than today. The fishery last year—the cod fishery—was carried on by a smaller number of men than for many years before, and this year we want all men that we can possibly get to carry on the fishery. The Lobster Fishery is depleted, in spite of all that Mr. Scammell has said, because the figures show that it has been depleting year after year.

Nine men out of every ten who were running the lobster fishery last year did not make half enough to pay their ordinary expenses, besides keeping themselves and their families, whereas those who prosecuted the cod fishery did well.

It is a known fact all over this country that if something is not done to protect these lobsters that the lobster fishery will soon be a thing of the past. We have received all kinds of complaints from the markets to which we sell our lobsters, some saying that they are too small, some saying other things. It is easily seen that our lobster fishery is becoming a thing of the past, and I cannot understand how a member of the House of Assembly can stand up and ask the Government today to stop protecting the lobster fishery, in view of what has happened during the last eighteen or twenty years, just because a portion of his district wants to catch lobsters. If that had come as a petition from Bonavista Bay, I would not have supported it, because I do not consider that I would be doing justice to the country in which I was born.

I am sorry that I was away when Mr. Scammell was speaking. I went downstairs purposely to get the total catch and number of men employed in the lobster fishery last year. Mr. Hickman asked for that information the other day. I got that information and passed it over to him. But Mr. Hickman tells me that he has not got it with him today. I am sorry that he has not got it, but I am perfectly sure from memory that the lobster fishery last year went as low as three thousand and some odd cases, and I think that it is a pretty low figure for the industry in this country.

As one of the members of the Fishery Board and of this Government, I personally think that before twelve months have passed, even the people of St. Barbe will give credit to the people that brought in this Bill for the closing down of the lobster fishery for three years.

I stated here the other day that quite a number of people were asking that the fishery be closed down for five years, but the Board thought otherwise, and made it three years.

I think Mr. Scammell made some reference when I was away to putting back the protection law. I am

sorry to say that I find in this country that it is a hard proposition for the Government to carry out the laws of the land in reference to the fishery. It was stated here during the last session of the House that it was impossible to carry out the liquor laws, and I think that the lobster laws were very similar.

Mr. Speaker, personally I am fully persuaded that the best thing that can be done for the majority of this country is to have a close season for lobsters during the next three years. Surely these people have had lots of notice to get ready for the codfishery. Mr. Scammell said that some of these people may not get supplies this year. Surely the men who supplied, or would have supplied them for the lobster fishery, where they made so little, will be prepared to supply them for the cod fishery at the price that fish is fetching in this colony at the present time.

Again I would say that the Government of the day is seeing that these people who have been prosecuting the lobster fishery will not starve, but will be able to look after themselves and their families for the next twelve months.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is anyone that will disagree with the principle of putting a bill on the statute book that will conserve the fishery, whether lobster or any other fishery; but I think that the point taken up by the honourable member for St. Barbe should have the consideration of the House, and that is, that these men who prosecute the fishery—the lobster fishery—in St. Barbe or any other part of the country, from which they largely derive their livelihood, will be subjected to great hardship in not being able to continue it this year, and I understand that many of them are not able bodied men, as this industry is mainly carried on by the old men and boys. These can do this work, but could not engage at anything of a harder nature. If the Government, as intimated by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries can find something else to do for those who prosecute this fishery, and who depend solely on it, then all right. Of course, if it were a big corporation sending in a petition or protest, because they would lose a lot of money, their appeal would be listened to, but these men cannot do that, and their side of the matter can only be ventilated by their representatives on this side of the House. If the Government is sincere as to compensating these people by providing something else, of which they can obtain a livelihood, all right. Perhaps there is need of a close season to protect the lobster as they may be killed out, but we have heard a lot of Governments taking steps to do this thing or that, and of having matters under consideration, but if we would state definitely what steps they propose to undertake so that this hardship would not be inflicted on the people, all would be happy over the thought of the Government doing what is right in the interests of this fishery, and of the people of the country. I am sure that my honorable friend, Mr. Scammell, the representative of the district of St. Barbe, which is so vitally concerned, if sure, that these people would have a substitute industry, or way of earning a living provided, would be fully satisfied.

CAPT. RANDELL—Mr. Speaker, I have listened with great interest to the discussion of the Bill now before the House, and I would like to say that as far as the lobster industry is concerned I do not know much personally, but I have consulted people interested in it during the last few days as to this Bill, and have obtained their views on the subject. I find there is a general feeling that the lobster fishery should be re-

stricted as the catch is growing less and less as the years go by. As far as I can gather, those to whom I have been speaking think that protection could be brought about by restricting the time at which lobsters should be taken. Last year in one place I know that some men engaged in this industry cleared twenty-five hundred dollars by the first of June, and then started in at the codfishery. I would like to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the Government if consideration could not be given to restriction in that way—that is allow the industry to go on up to a certain time, and then close down for the balance of the year. Now the Minister of Marine and Fisheries says it is often very hard to enforce a law made in regard to fisheries, and that in some instances laws cannot be carried out. I do not know if he said that in so many words, but that was the trend of his remarks. He cited the liquor law as instance. As far as I am concerned, I take it that that is undoubtedly a confession of weakness on the part of those in authority. The Bill was brought before the House and passed, and we as a people have to acknowledge that it is not enforced. If the law was made and is a benefit to the country generally, I cannot see why it cannot be enforced. I think one law can be enforced as well as another, if it is handled in a proper way. I think that this Bill should be given consideration as to the operation of the fishery up to a certain time, and then closing for the balance of the year.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to make any extended remarks, as it would be out of order just now for me to do so, having spoken already on this matter, but I would like to point out that what I asked for was, that the application of the law be withheld for one year. As I said before, there is much difference of opinion as to this close season among the people of my district, and I may say that I am myself in accord with steps for the Preservation of the fishery. I merely asked that the Government stop the application of the law for a year, as the people are not prepared at present to turn to any other form of fishery, and nothing else in the way of employment is available to them.

Pursuant to order and on motion of The Minister of Marine & Fisheries the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the Lobster Fishery" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second reading of Bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 25 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series) entitled "Of Light Dues" was deferred.

Second reading of Bill entitled "An Act to Amend 11 George V., Cap. 45, entitled "An Act to Incorporate the Women's Patriotic Trust Fund and for other Purposes."

HONORABLE THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this Bill, I might say that it practically speaks for itself. It is a result of an application from the Members of the Women's Patriotic Trust Fund addressed to me last October by Mrs. W. G. Gosling, Honorary Secretary of the W. P. A. Trust Fund. In explanation I will read the letter.

(Reads Letter).

In other words the Women's Patriotic Association went out of existence, and there is now only this fund, and the Bill is only to assist those who are giving voluntary service in carrying on and in helping cases which deserve assistance. I, therefore, move the second reading.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend 11 George V., Cap. 45, entitled "An Act to Incorporate the Women's Patriotic Trust Fund and for other Purposes" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be refer-

red to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Second reading of Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Act 61 Victoria Cap. 47, entitled "An Act relating to the Constitution of the Supreme Court, and the Acts in in amendment thereof."

HONORABLE THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, this Bill is really to give effect legally to what has been done since 1921. The salaries of the Judges are voted by statute, and as some of the members of the Opposition know, the amount fixed by statute was increased in the Estimates but the statute was never amended. We are only remedying now what was probably an oversight and giving it effect as from 1921 There is nothing more to be said on this Bill as I think the members of the Opposition are acquainted with it. The salaries have been appearing as voted by statute while they really were not.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Act 61, Victoria, Cap. 47, entitled "An Act relating to the Constitution of the Supreme Court, and the Acts in Amendment thereof," was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Second reading of Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Companies."

HONOURABLE THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this Bill I want to apologize to the House, particularly to the lay members of it, for this formidable Bill, although it is really not so formidable as it looks, even though it contains some three hundred pages of printed matter; but, if honourable members feel like spending the Summer here, they can read it through. By way of explanation there is nothing to be worried about in the Bill. I had prepared a resume so as to put in tabloid form what the meaning of the Bill is for the information of the House generally.

General Purpose.

The Act is introduced chiefly for the purpose of consolidating the local laws as to Companies and to make additions thereto in order that the whole Companies law of the Colony may be brought up to date and in conformity with the Company laws of England, after which our laws are patterned.

Importance.

The Bill is one of considerable length and many of its sections will be of interest only to the legal members of the House. However, the Bill as a whole is of great importance to the business community as the modern tendency is towards the incorporation of business, manufacturing and other concerns. Although the Companies Act is introduced from the standpoint of lawyers, I think that business men will appreciate that nothing is of so much concern to laymen as the law and the working out of the machinery of the Companies Act. The Bill now submitted to the House amounts to nothing more or less than the bringing of the Companies law up to date. Little time need be spent in considering the Bill by reason of the fact that it is the work of the late administration. My predecessor in the office of the Attorney General, Mr. Warren, together with Mr. Justice Johnson and Mr. Justice Kent were appointed to take up this matter to amend the Companies Act, and we have today before you for consideration an Act, even if bulky in size, that will afford the country satisfaction, particularly in regard to its completeness of form. It will now be possible for Directors of Companies to have at hand the various

forms respecting the various matters that arise to a degree more than before. I think I might as well summarize the position with the notes I have here:

Advantages.

There is no need to dwell at length on the advantages of incorporation as all honourable members must be aware of the benefits that accrue therefrom. The fundamental advantage is the separation of private assets from business assets and the Limitation of Liability. A man's liability in a Company is limited to the amount of shares he subscribes for. In addition there is the advantage of simplicity in arriving at the value of one's interest in a company and the transfer of same. Shares in companies can be easily transferred and the business continue. The shares of well established manufacturing and public utility companies have a market price. Capital is obtained from people who could not by themselves engage in business. Many companies have hundreds of small shareholders.

Development.

Our laws are based on the Act of 1899 and in the following year 14 companies were incorporated,—Bowring Bros. Ltd., being first on the list, which included Masonic Hall Joint Stock Company and the Newfoundland British Society. Since then many companies were incorporated each year and there are now hundreds of corporate bodies doing business in the Colony. Naturally with the increase in the number of companies and the problems confronting them came the necessity for amendments to the Act. Many have been made from time to time, but it follows that even though this measure will meet present requirements future amendments will be necessary. However, we have had the experience of over a quarter of a century, and the present Act is based on the lessons learnt from these experiences, and is an earnest attempt to meet all the problems that have been the cause of doubt and litigation in the past. There is nothing radical contained in the Act and the present machinery under which companies have been operating for so many years have been interfered with as little as possible, and there is nothing in it that any layman need feel any concern about. It is divided into nine parts, as follows:

1. The constitution and incorporation of companies;
2. The distribution and reduction of share capital; the registration of unlimited company as limited and unlimited liability as directors.
3. The management and administration of companies.
4. The winding up of companies.
5. The application of this Act to companies already registered.
6. Companies authorized to register under this Act.
7. Winding up of unregistered companies.
8. Companies established outside Newfoundland.
9. Legal proceedings, etc.

By the Way.

Members will notice in brackets at end of sections certain figures, for example (1908 s.21). These relate to the English Companies' Acts. As stated before, our laws are based on the English and it is convenient to refer to English Acts, on which perhaps important decisions by English Courts and Privy Council have been given.

Registry of Companies.

Frequent references are made in the Act to Registry and Registrar of companies. Formerly the office was in the Registry of the Supreme Court. Death duties have increased each year, necessitating increase of staff and the place has grown to

quite a Department. I say this in justice to the illness of Mr. George Adams, a thoroughly competent official, and to the gentleman, Mr. Maddick, who has been carrying on Mr. Adams' work. Legal gentlemen of the House will endorse that statement.

Turning to Act Itself.

Part 1. deals with constitution and incorporation of companies. This deals with companies limited by shares, companies limited by guarantee and unlimited companies, and sets forth what must be contained in Memorandum of each and in what way the Memorandum may be altered. The articles may be table A or may be drawn up to suit the special purposes of the Company. Very little change from former Acts.

Part 2 follows closely the English Act of 1908 and deals with the distribution of the capital of the company. Much of this has to do with the internal management of companies such as share certificates; register of members; the reduction of capital which is subject to confirmation of the Court. It also provides that notwithstanding a company is limited, the liability of the directors, if so provided by the memorandum, may be limited.

Part 3 deals entirely with the internal management of companies, provisions being made as to its head office, meetings, resolutions, appointment and qualifications of directors, contracts, prospectus, allotments of shares and debentures and other charges on the assets of companies.

Part 4 deals with winding up of companies. Unfortunately because of financial stress in recent years many companies have gone into liquidation and many questions of proceedure and practice came before the Court for the first time. Companies are wound up (1) by the Court; (2) voluntary or (3) subject to the supervision of the Court. In each case special procedure is necessary and care has been taken under this part of the Act to meet all the requirements of any one of these three forms of liquidation. I wish to draw particular attention to section 135 on page 69 which deals with the appointment of the **Official Receiver.** Under section 139 of the Companies Act 1899, referred to in sub-section 1, it is provided that on an order of the court, the official receiver, by virtue of his office becomes provisional liquidator and acts under a liquidator who is appointed. That office has been held by Sir William Lloyd who has had considerable work in connection with it in addition to his duties as registrar of the Supreme Court. It will be noted that he retains the office until a successor is appointed. Sections 214-217 are very important. They are on page 101 and refer to rules set forth in schedule 6, which are a part of the Act and which come into force on the passing of the Act. Future rules come into force on their being published in the Newfoundland Gazette. These rules are set forth on page 160-212, over 50 pages of closely printed matter. Happily, they deal with proceedure, and, therefore, must be mastered only by the legal gentlemen.

Part 5 deals with the application of the new Act to companies already incorporated.

Part 6 deals with companies authorized to register under the Act and the requirements to be complied with before registration is effected.

Part 7 deals with the winding up of unregistered companies. Unregistered companies can be liquidated under this Act only by the Court.

Part 8 deals with companies established outside the Colony. It provides that companies incorporated outside this Colony which establish a place of business here must file

with the Registrar of Companies certain particulars.

Part 9 deals chiefly with legal proceedings and sets forth penalties for offences under the Act. All offences under the Act made punishable by fine may be prosecuted under summary Jurisdiction Acts. Chapter 127 of the Consolidated Statutes is repealed but it is expressly provided that the repeal does not affect the registration of a company thereunder nor does the present Act affect Chapter 9 of the Consolidated Statutes dealing with Trade Unions.

First Schedule:

Table A—Regulations for management of company.

Table B and Table C—Fees unchanged.

Form C—Form of statement to be published by Insurance Companies and Deposit. Provident or Benefit Societies.

Second Schedule:

Statement in lieu of Prospectus.

Third Schedule:

Forms of memorandum and articles of company.

Form E as required by Part 2 of Act.

I beg, Mr. Speaker, to move that the Bill be read a second time, it being my intention to then ask that it be referred to a Select Committee.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker, this Bill seems rather heavy and important, and I do not think should be discussed in a short time. We would be better satisfied on this side of the House if the second reading was postponed for the present so as we can have an opportunity to look it over. There are things perhaps that are not included in this Bill that might be included in it.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—We are only too glad to have the Bill deferred.

Second reading of Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Cap. 24 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series) entitled "Of certain fees and charges by stamps."

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this Bill I want to point out to the House that no material change in the Statute as regards the Agriculture and Mines Department is anticipated in the Bill, but under the request and advice of the Auditor General, the Bill is introduced in order to afford better facilities to the Auditors in the department. Under the present law a stamp has to be affixed on a documetn. That gives the auditors extra trouble and it is proposed to eliminate a portion of the fees by stamps.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, I accept the explanation given by the Minister, but really we do not know what it means and we would like to have an opportunity to consider it, and I think it would be better if the second reading was deferred.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—I have no objection.

Second reading of Bill entitled "An Act to amend chapter 134 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd series) entitled "Of the Operation of Saw Mills."

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—Mr. Speaker a similar explanation applies to this Bill as the last one and I would ask to have it deferred also.

Second reading of Bill entitled "An Act further to Amend chapter 129 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd series) entitled "Of Crown Lands, Timber, Mines and Minerals."

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—Mr. Speaker, I would also move that this be deferred.

Second reading of Bill entitled "An Act relating to Firearms."

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—On the moving of the second reading of this Bill some explanation may be necessary regarding the adoption of

the principal terms. There may be some difference of opinion. The effect of it is simply to control the issue of Firearms by way of license. Probably today we are one of the only countries in the world except places that are more or less wild, where there is no such form of control in the sense of carrying about weapons of defence. The idea is, as members will find when the Bill goes into its committee stage, merely to provide that the carrying about indiscriminately of firearms is to cease. We have had tragedies and near tragedies, due to the fact that irresponsible persons have been carrying revolvers. And with the arrival of industrial works and the corresponding moving in of people of different veins of thought as regards weapons I feel there should be some control over the carrying of firearms. Members will find on reading that very ample provision has been made for those who will have proper occasion for using firearms. As a matter of fact the Bill is simply a digest suited to our own purposes of the provisions which apply in the Old Country. I think this is one of the cases where on principle all will agree. When we are in the Committee stage of this Bill, any suggestions that will be made I will be only too glad to take it up with the House.

MR. SCAMMELL—Does this Bill seriously contemplate that the outport man who wants to use a gun has got to be certified by Inspector General in St. John's.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—There are exceptions that cover all kinds of uses in this country.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker, I want to ask one question. It has reference to a Bill that went through last year. It had reference to the sealfishery. We amended the Bill; but I see by reports that it went through the Upper House in its original form.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—They passed it just as we sent it up to them. It was simply a change of title.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to Firearms" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

The following Bills were, on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance, discharged from the Order Paper:

> "An Act to Amend the Revenue Act 1905, and the Act in Amendment thereof," and
>
> "An Act to Amend the Act 15, George V. Cap. XXI, entitled 'An Act respecting a Tax on Goods Imported into Newfoundland.'"

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Mr. Speaker, in moving the adjournment of the House I take the opportunity to say a few words, in connection with remarks made by the members of the Opposition. I must congratulate the Leader of the Opposition on his solicitude for the labouring man in England. I can tell him that we all feel the same, and I trust that we are all as solicitous for the labouring man of Newfoundland, and the fisherman of Newfoundland, as he is. The remarks that have been passed are versified on the part of the different gentlemen on the other side. What seems to stand out is the fact that for political expediency the facts seem to be distorted. I will deal with them presently. The Hon. member for St. Barbe in his remarks thought that all the sitting members should have an opportunity to discuss the Speech from the Throne. I am sure, sir, that there is not one man on this side of the House who wants to keep any member from having an opportunity to do so. Like other members who have spoken

from this side of the House, I want certainly to congratulate the Members of the Opposition from the Leader down for the fine manner in which they have reviewed the Speech from the Throne. We realise what it is to be in the Opposition. You have a certain duty to fulfil and I am sure that your only regret is that you did not have some material to make good matter out of. After all it is not the duty of the Opposition, just because the Government introduces a measure to denounce it. You are not sent for that to the House of Assembly. You are put here for just the same reason as we on this side of the House are. You are to assist in making the laws and you can help the Government in the proposals which they introduce, and it is your duty to do so. So far I am glad to say that the spirit of the Opposition has been along those lines. I observed that the Hon. member for St. Barbe gave a very long discourse on the Speech from the Throne and I hope that he is perfectly satisfied. I hope his constituents are. I regret that the Hon. member made some reference to Water Street. I thought that was a thing of the past. I am sure that most of us feel that the people of this country cannot get along without the merchants, any more than the merchants can get along without the people. And it is to the best interest of the people of this country, that a tolerant spirit should grow up between people and the merchants of Newfoundland. I regret to have to refer to this matter. I trust that I misunderstood the remarks of the Hon. member altogether. The Hon. member also wanted to know why we did not reduce taxation before. We did not reduce taxation before because we could not do it in the condition in which the finances of the country were at the time this Government took charge. But we took the first opportunity to do it in a legal manner. The Hon. member also referred to Sir William Coaker. I look upon Sir William Coaker as a personal friend of mine. There was one thing that can always be said for Sir William Coaker and that is that he was always a good fighter in the House and out of the House. Furthermore he was not an obstructionist. He was ready to change his mind on any matter when he could be convinced. The only trouble, Mr. Speaker, was to convince him he was wrong. I hope that Mr. Scammell will not be so hard to convince. Another thing that the Hon. gentleman spoke about was the exportation of pit-props. I think that I can assure him that the exportation of pit-props in this country is finished with the exception of this year. With the establishment in this country of the pulp mills that are being constructed, it is to the best interests of this country that this raw material be kept in the country. Canada has begun to realize this. She has decided to prohibit the exportation of pulp wood. You talk of the fishery of Newfoundland being the main industry. But do you realise that with the completion of the plant at Corner Brook that the output from this industry will be equal to a catch of a million and a half qtls. of codfish at eight dollars a quintal. With the cessation of the export from Canada to the United States of pulp wood newsprint is going up because they will not be able to manufacture enough to supply the demand. The result will be that we will have this market for the export of that part of the output of our own industry for which we cannot find a market in England. The Hon. member for Twillingate, Mr. Brown, made a few remarks on the Labour situation and he denounces the company for bringing men in here. I think that the Prime Minister in his speech made the

explanation that every effort had been made not only by the company at Corner Brook, but by the Government at St. John's, to get the labour in Newfoundland. Newfoundlanders could not be induced to go out there at an early date. So that something else had to be done. Anyway I am not allowed to talk on that just now. I am out of order, so the Speaker has just told me. However, I shall make a few remarks on that at a future date. I want to make some explanation on a matter in which the opposition are displeased. That is the placing of the contract for the building of the new steamer for the Gulf. The Government has been denounced for the building of the ship in Holland. It is wrong to save money for the people of this country apparently. We could not get the Trade Facilities to help us out. If we could why did twenty British firms get their ships built in Holland during the last eight months. Why did they not get this assistance. They could not get it. I was in the House of Commons when the Prime Minister of England, Mr. Baldwin, said that owing to the condition of the ship building industry he thought it necessary to extend the Trade Facilities to the building of steamers. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition can not produce one iota of evidence that I saw the Trade Facilities either before or after the contract had been awarded for the building of the ship.

It is the best thing that ever happened to the English ship-building Companies in this matter that we are getting our ship built in Holland. Is not that news for you. When this happened it showed the Trade Unions and Shipbuilding Companies what they were up against, and as I stated the Premier of England announced that the shipbuilding industry would have to be assisted by the trade facilities. The Harrison Company had ships built in Holland. Some of those present will remember Mr. Charley Blackburn. He is a director of that company. Before we placed the contract we consulted him as to what kind of work they had received. Mr. Bowring said that he though that we ought to have the ship built in England. That was only natural. I asked people who had got their ships built in Holland and they told me that they were as good as could be built on the Clyde or the Tyne. If we could have saved the amount of seventy thousand dollars by having this ship built in Holland and did not do so, Mr Speaker, the Opposition would be very prompt in denouncing us. They would be right in doing so. I leave it to the people of this country to decide whether we did right or not. We would not have placed the contract for the ship in Holland if it had been only a matter of two thousand pounds. In that case we would have given the contract to Swan and Hunter. The lowest tender from an English firm was for £98,715, and under no conditions would we have awarded the contract to them. I do not wish to make an explanation of this matter in the House, but if the Leader of the Opposition would like to know confidentially I would be only too glad to tell him why. I know of the cables that were sent in connection with the ship. Captain Gordon would show those that came in to me as soon as they had arrived. We have engaged the best firm of naval architects that could be got. I think that Capt. Randell can recommend Mr. Hamilton also. The Hon. member for Trinity knows Mr. Hamilton, and I am sure that he feels about him as I do.

We saved fourteen thousand pounds by having the ship built in Holland rather than in England by the firm Swan Hunter. Their tender was £100,-600, and the New Waterway Ship-

building Co. was £89,675. The difference in the tenders is £10,925. There is furthermore a difference of forty-four thousand nine hundred and fifty pounds between the lowest British tender and the highest British tender for work on the same plans and the same specifications. There is a difference of $53,990.00 between the highest British tender and the lowest tender which we accepted, and I am prepared to leave it to the people of this country to say if we were not justified in saving that amount of money by placing the contract over in Holland. . . .

MR. HICKMAN—You have not convinced me.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—If I cannot convince you I am sorry. But I think that those facts ought to convince everyone.

MR. HICKMAN—It is easy enough to convince me—give me the correspondence with the Trade Facilities Board.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Besides saving that amount of money on the contract price, there were certain things which the British firms would not include in their tenders, which were contained in the offer accepted. Wireless Radio installation, one and one half kilowatt set was not included in the British tenders; Wireless Direction Finding installation was not included; wireless submarine signalling apparatus was not included, and fixed and portable Morse electrical requirements were not included. And finally, under the contract with the firm in Holland the ship has to make her trial trip three quarters loaded, and has to load and discharge a three quarters cargo. The British firms would not have this. All these items would come to about three or four thousand pounds, so I consider that on that contract we have saved between thirteen and fourteen thousand pounds to the taxpayers of this country, and goodness knows we need the money. We are not wealthy. That saving is required to form the nucleus of a fund for repairing our own ships during the coming year, and to provide a shipbuilding bounty. There are several other reasons why ships cannot be built very much cheaper in England.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether I would be out of order in making reference to remarks made by a member on the other side of the House in connection with the Armstrong-Whitworth Company.

MR. SPEAKER—I fear that you are. By the indulgence of the House a member may explain remarks of a personal nature, but this is not such a matter.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—I trust that the explanation I have given the hon. members on the other side will convince them that they are wrong.

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

TUESDAY, March 3rd, 1925.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

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

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Speaker: I ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Moreton's Harbor and Summerford with regard to the construction of a road. This road has been badly needed for some time. I give the petition my hearty support and ask that it be referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Speaker: I have very much pleasure in recommending that this petition be given the fullest consideration. The people of Moreton's Harbor and Summerford are asking for something, which, in my opinion, should have been done long ago. The road is badly needed and I

have much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petitioners.

MR. SINNOTT—Mr. Speaker: I beg leave to present a petition from the fishermen of Fox Harbor, Placentia Bay. The petitioners ask that steps be taken to reserve a small amount of timber which is on the areas known as Sound Wood. This reservation is absolutely essential, if the fishermen of this important settlement are to continue operations. I give the petition my hearty support.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Mr. Speaker: I would like to give the petition presented by my colleague my unqualified support.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—Mr. Speaker: I ask leave to present a petition from a number of boat owners and skippers from various parts of Placentia Bay who are interested in that monstrous petition that I presented a few days ago asking for a Fog Alarm on the east side of St. Mary's Bay. It is not necessary for me to make any further comment on this and I feel sure that the residents of St. Mary's Bay, who are asking to have this very necessary aid to navigation erected, will be grateful to the boat owners and skippers of Placentia Bay in coming to their rescue. I ask that the petition be referred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

MR. SINNOTT—Mr. Speaker: I give the petition my hearty support.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Mr. Speaker: I want to go on record in support of the petition asking for this very necessary Fog Alarm, and, I think, I am quite safe in saying that this Government, if at all possible, will endeavour to accede to the request of the petitioners.

HON. MR. CRAMM—Mr. Speaker: I ask leave to present a petition from the Newfoundland Textile Manufacturing Company, Limited, praying that a Bill be introduced ratifying an agreement between that Company and the Government. I move that, with the consent of the House, the petition be referred to a Select Committee appointed for the purpose of enquiring into and reporting as to whether the rules as to notice have been complied with.

On motion this petition was received, and a Select Committee was appointed to consider and report thereon, as follows:—Hon. Mr. Cramm, Hon. Minister of Justice, Hon. Mr. Bradley, Mr. Hickman, Mr. Warren.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—Mr. Speaker: I ask leave to present a petition from a large number of the residents in various parts of Placentia Bay on the subject of a Fog Alarm asking that this necessary aid to navigation be erected in some suitable place on the west side of Placentia Bay. At the last session of this House a petition, containing eight hundred signatures, was presented by me and supported by my colleagues on this same very subject. Now I need not worry or delay the House with the history of the repeated appeals made here for these aids to navigation by my colleagues and myself on behalf of the people of the district of Placentia and St. Mary's, and also by the appeals made by the representatives who went before us. We were promised, as I said the other day, in open House in 1920-1921 by the then Minister of Marine and Fisheries that provision would be made the following session to have voted an amount for the erection of a fog alarm on the west side of Placentia Bay and on the east side of St. Mary's Bay. The petition emanated at Merasheen. It is signed by all the people there and by the residents of Red Island, Harbor Buffett, Spencer's Cove, Haystack, Bruley, Isle Valen, James' Cove and Tack's Beach. There are five hundred signatories to this petition and I have much pleasure in endorsing the prayer of it and I have every confidence

that the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries will make provision in his Estimates to have sufficient funds available for the erection of these two fog alarms in the most suitable places in both these Bays. It is almost unnecessary to point out that large expenditures were made during the past six or seven years on the erection of aids to navigation in various parts of the Island and such always had the support of my colleagues and myself. We all know the disadvantages fishermen have to encounter at the present time and it is our bounden duty to use every means possible to try and lighten the burden of "those who go down to the sea in ships" while pursuing their hazardous avocation.

I feel certain that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, with the practical knowledge and experience that he has and who knows of the difficulties that our fishermen have to contend with, the petition will have his most sympathetic consideration, and I also bespeak for it the united support of the Executive Government.

I trust that when the Estimates are brought down that there will be provision in them for these two fog alarms.

MR. SINNOTT—Mr. Speaker: The petition presented by my colleague has my strongest support.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Mr. Speaker, With reference to the petition presented by my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, and supported by my colleague, Mr. Sinnott, we have but to consider that from the time one leaves Trepassey until he gets nearly up to Burin there is only one fog alarm, when we must realize that there is very strong reason why we should all give our fullest support to this petition. Imagine the difficulties fishermen of Placentia and St. Mary's Bays have to contend with in trying to make the land at night time with fog or stormy weather prevailing. Speaking of a fog alarm for the west side of Placentia Bay, I might say that in the early stages of my political life a sum of money was voted for the erection of a fog alarm at Marticot Island, Placentia Bay, but, through some political falling out, it did not materialize. The late Mr. Jackman, the senior member for the district at the time, had a political row with the result that the fog alarm purchased for Marticot was taken, I think, to Cabot Island, Bonavista Bay; and we only ask you now, Mr. Speaker, to give us back what we paid for years ago. I feel sure that the members for Bonavista Bay will give us their very best support in this matter.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, entitled "An Act to Amend the Income Tax Act of 1922."

Mr. Warren, Mr. Hickman, Mr. Brown, Mr. Ashbourne and Mr. Duff gave notice of questions.

NOTICE OF QUESTION.

Question No. 1 was deferred.

Question No. 2:—

THE HON. PRIME MINISTER—I was not able to get that information from the railway people by this afternoon. They say that they will not be able to have that information until to-morrow afternoon. I will table the information to-morrow.

Question No. 3:—

MR. SCAMMELL—To ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if the Government has recently disposed of certain sticks and other timber lying at Old Day's Pond, Bonavista, and if so to state the parties to whom such sticks and timber were sold and to show the number of sticks in each case and the prices charged; and if such sticks or timber so disposed of have been paid for.

MINISTER MARINE & FISHERIES —In reply to the hon. member for St. Barbe to question Nnumber 3 on

the Order Paper: "If the Government has recently disposed of certain sticks or timber lying at Old Day's Pond, Bonavista," I may say that instructions have been given by myself during the last two months to deliver some sticks to F. J. House & Co., Bonavista Bay, and also to the Union Trading Company, Bonavista, and also to Philip Templeman Company, Bonavista Bay. "Show the number of sticks in each case and the prices charged." In reply to that I may say that up to the present time I have not received from the man in charge of the sticks the number which each party has received. So far as the price is concerned, I do not know what it will be. What is to be charged is a hard thing to say. I will have to find out first what these sticks cost. Then as soon as I find out the number of sticks sold, I will arrive at a price which I think will be satisfactory to the Government.

Question No. 4:—

MR. SCAMMELL—To ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries what grants for marine purposes either special or ordinary have been sent out to the District of Bay-de-Verde to places between Spout Cove and Freshwater, both inclusive, and to give names of parties with amounts to whom such allocations were made in each case.

MINISTER MARINE & FISHERIES —In reply to question Number 4, asked by Mr. Scammell, the hon member for St. Barbe, I beg to submit the following:

(Answer tabled.)

The remaining questions on the Order Paper were deferred.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Speaker, arising out of the Order Paper, and some questions thereon. It is some time now since I placed a question on the Order Paper addressed to the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs. It was Question No. 2 on the Order Paper of March 2nd. The Minister, however, is consistently absent from the House and the question has not been answered. I quite realize that the Government is anxious to facilitate business, and I do not think it is proper to have a question deferred from day to day. If our questions are not answered promptly we cannot make much progress with our business from this side of the House, and I think that somebody on the other side should see that answers to questions are forthcoming, particularly after they have been on the Order Paper for a week.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I quite agree with Mr. Scammell, that these questions should be answered promptly, and I shall try to avoid such an occurrence in future.

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 Lobster Fishery."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister in charge of this Bill, if the Fisheries Board who have given this Bill the consideration that the Minister has described, have taken expert opinion as to the action they are taking in providing for the prevention of catching lobsters for the next three years?

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, in answer to the Leader of the Independent Party I may say that we have not consulted anybody outside the Fishery Board with the exception of the people who have been catching the lobsters themselves, but we have consulted quite a number of people around the country—that is the people in the

country who have been carrying on the lobster fishery, and we have had untold numbers of letters from the people who catch the lobsters themselves asking us to shut down the lobster fishery for from three to five years; but we have not had any expert opinion.

During my lifetime as a member of the House of Assembly, or during my lifetime in politics, I found that when we have got to send out of this country for expert opinion on any matter, all it amounts to is that the following year we have to pay a large amount for that expert opinion without any great benefit coming to the country.

The men that compose the Fishery Board at the present time can give just as much expert opinion on these matters as any man we can import. Therefore, we have had the opinion of the men that catch the lobsters, and of the men who fit out people for the fishery, and we have got the opinion of the Fishery Board, and that represents every district practically in this country. After due consideration of these different opinions, and from the consideration that we can give ourselves from the figures showing the decrease in the catch of lobsters for the last few years, I feel sure that the majority of people in this country are satisfied that this is a justifiable Bill for the Government to bring in.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, I quite agree with what the Minister has said, but I think that he does not appreciate my reasons for asking that question.

I do not think the Bill goes far enough, and that is why I asked if expert opinion had been taken. The enquiries which you have made, and the enquiries which the Fisheries Board has instituted, shows that the people of this country are practically unanimous in wishing to have the lobster fishery closed down for from three to five years. Why is that It is in order that the fishery can be improved. That is, as far as we can see, the only way in which the lobster fishery can be resuscitated. I am not finding fault at all with this Bill, but I think that we ought to take some outside opinion and see if, during the time that the catching of lobsters is prohibited, we cannot make use of that opportunity to encourage the propagation of lobster.

I understand, for instance, that the female lobster carries its spawn attached to its body for nearly twelve months after it has actually spawned, and it is to be hoped that, for the next three years at all events, the lobster will be left to peacefully pursue its natural propagation. I am also given to understand that the artificial hatching of lobster is not an expensive and not a very difficult matter. We, therefore, I think, ought to take advantage of the fact that the people of this country have said that they are satisfied that the lobster fishery should be closed down for three years because they want a larger and more profitable lobster fishery. They have in fact practically said to the Government, "Yes, we are satisfied to take our losses, but we expect the Government to go further than that, and make use of the time when the lobster fishery is closed down to do something towards the preservation of the lobster." The Government should do something so that when the people are again permitted to catch lobster they may find that their little acts of denial are amply repaid.

That was the only reason that I asked if any expert opinion had been taken. I do not think that it would cost very much. The Marine and Fisheries Department of Canada have already been giving attention to this mattter, and I am sure that a few enquiries from there would be quite sufficient to put the Government on

its way to the artificial propagation of lobster.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, I just want to ask the Minister a few questions. Is it by the unanimous consent of the Fishery Board that you are bringing in this Bill?

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—It was unanimous.

MR. HICKMAN—So I presume you have made every possible investigation and have come to the conclusion that this is a necessary bill. Can the Minister give me the value of a lobster pot when left undisposed of?

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I will answer these questions when you have finished speaking.

MR. HICKMAN—There were last year in this country some thirty-two or thirty-three thousand lobster pots. I do not know what they cost. They represent money that is now tied up for those who prosecuted the lobster fishery last year. There were about fifteen hundred men employed in the lobster fishery last year, and there were eight hundred and forty-eight licenses used. There were eight hundred and seventy licenses issued, but some thirty of these were returned. At any rate, there were eight hundred and forty-eight people with licenses for catching loster last year, and there were about three thousand cases packed. This is a matter which I hope the Minister and the Board have taken into consideration, because the men who have been prosecuting the lobster fishery in a great many cases have no outfit for the codfishery. These men, to-day, are thrown on their own resources very largely, and in many cases have not the means of getting outfitted for the codfishery or of getting people to supply them.

Whether this Bill which the Minister is now bringing before the House is a good Bill for the preservation of lobster or of the lobster fishery I cannot say, but my opinion is that the position of the lobster fishery to-day has been caused through breaches of the law. Now there is a law in reference to lobster. There has to be a certain size opening in the lobster trap, and there must be a certain width between the laths that form the sides and bottoms of the lobster pots.

Now if the laws had been carried out and the traps used were the proper size, instead of needing nine hundred thousand lobsters for thirty-three hundred cases, it would be a great deal less. Now I say that it is abuse of this law that makes it necessary to bring in this bill and close the lobster industry for the next three years. And if at the end of the three years the law is allowed to be abused in the same way as in the past, the same thing will apply in a very short time as it does now before the close season commences. Whilst I am on the subject I might say the same thing applies to traps for the codfishery. There is a certain size to be used for the codfishery, and it frequently happens that some men use a smaller mesh than is permitted, and a great number of small fish are taken which should be left in the water. So in that respect the same thing applies to the codfishery as applies to the lobster fishery. The Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries is a practical fisherman and he well knows the reasons and objects of this bill this afternoon, and I say that I hope that he will see that this bill is carried out to the best of his ability while he is in office.

HON. MINISTER OF MINES & AGRICULTURE—Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Fisheries Board, and as one of the representatives of a district that, if not second, rates at least third in the productions of the lobster industry, I would like to make a few remarks on the important legislation that we are about to make.

I would like to endorse the stand taken by the hon. member for Fortune, Mr. Warren, when he pointed out the necessity during the close season, of the department trying to devise some means of obtaining some scientific advice on the lobster industry. It is an admirable suggestion, and I feel that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will take the matter into his consideration, and that during the three years that will pass during the close season, something along the sicentific line will be done. I want to indorse the attitude taken by the Leader of the Opposition. Mr. Hickman says that the wretched condition of the lobster fishery is due to the abuse of the law. I think that he is right. In my experience as a member of the House of Assembly, perhaps, I myself have been just as much to blame as any other individual man in this House. There is the same condition existing in connection with the codfishery and herring fishery and every other industry that we have at the present day. And unless the Minister presiding over the departments concerned, and representing the various industries, takes the very strongest measures, that it is in his power to take for the correction of these faults and breaches of the law, it is not a bit of use in putting this law on the statute book. It is not a bit of use if there is no intention of having it carried out. It is well known to everybody interested in the fisheries at the present time that a lobster fisherman applies to the department early in the spring to get his supply of labels when he has got his license. Then if it happens that John Jones has a lobster factory out on one point and Jim Smith has a factory on the other point just a little distance away; if it happens that one, say John Jones, runs short of labels, then he goes over to Jim Smith and gets some of his, and the result is that he is not using the official number that he has been given. Then these lobsters are sometimes bad and the article is exported by Newfoundland to important markets and from there it is sent out to other smaller markets, and it has been known that a portion of the body of a squid has been found in one of these tins of lobsters. This was probably in a decomposed condition when it was placed in the case. The same thing has been the case in connection with other fisheries, and will be the case, unless this House and the Government take this matter seriously and see that the laws are carried out. Sometimes when a man violates the law he goes to the member for the district and asks him to try to help him out, and the member goes to the Justice Department and holds up his hands and says that if you prosecute this man I am finished in the district, and so, if the Department of Justice listens to the story, instead of sending the man to the Penitentiary for six months or more, he gets off with a dollar fine. I endorse the attitude taken by the Leader of the Opposition, and I hope that he is sincere in what he says. Perhaps he knows as much about this industry as any other man in the House. It is very important. The hon. member for St. Barbe, represents the district that produces the greatest number of cases of lobsters in Newfoundland. I think that he will agree with me that this is a move in the right direction. It is about time something was done. Twenty years ago we produced about two hundred thousand cases of lobsters, where today we produce only thirty-three hundred. During the early years that I was a member of this House there was an annual grant for the promulgation of the lobsters. Mr. Dee was in charge of this department. There was a great deal of good accomplished in this way, but there was not the result that should

have been from the amount of money that was spent. That was where the politician crept in again. I know a great number of men who got paid two or three times for the same small lobsters. There were all kinds of abuses and there will be again if there is not a strict penalty imposed. It is well to impose the extreme penalty of the law. That is the only way that this House and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will be able to carry out reforms.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that I did not answer the Leader of the Independent Party satisfactorily, but I understand that he is quite in accord with what is being done. He is rather interested in what is to be done in the future, and I can assure the Leader of the Independent Party that the Fishery Board has taken the matter into consideration some time ago. We have given considerable thought to the question of what is to be done to increase the growth of the lobster industry, at the finish as well as during the three years of the close season. We have several matters in connection with this which we have to recommend to the Executive Government. It is our intention to do all that possibly can be done in that line. Mr. Warren is perfectly right and I agree with him. With regard to the question asked by the Leader of the Opposition when he asked if all the members of the Fishery Board were unanimous about having this close season for three years, I may say, "Yes." Every member of the Board was of the opinion that there should be a close season for the lobster fishery, and if we had taken the advice of ninety per cent. of the people of the country who were interested in the industry, we would have made the close season for five years instead of three. But we thought that if the effect of this period was not sufficient for the carrying out of the purpose which we have in view, then we can very easily increase it to five. Mr. Hickman asked me the price of the lobster traps. If he had asked me that question twenty-five years ago, I would have been able to answer him. At that time I often made them before daylight and after dark. But for the last few years I have had no reason for knowing the price of lobster traps. But I may say that I would think that the price would be about a dollar. It all depends whether he makes them himself or has somebody else to do it for him. If he made them himself he would probably make them for a little less. I also note that he is of the opinion that the present state of the lobster fishery is due to the breaches of the law. I partly agree with him. I am sorry to say it is. But I was a member of the Fishery Board of the Colonly for fifteen years up to eight years ago. Then one day I saw in the papers that the Fishery Board was going to be turned out and a new Board of practical fishermen were going to be put in to run the matter correctly. There were some few fishermen put on that board, but I do not know why some of them who sat on that board were never there. I know that this is the feeling of the fishermen of the Colony on the point. But when I went into the Department last year in the month of June, I found that there was not a single Warden for the protection of the fishery. The carrying out of the law was left solely and wholly to the fishermen themselves. I also found that during the summer we have had several breaches of the lobster law. Several times there have been ten or fifteen cans of salmon at one time brought down to me, which had been taken from a lobster case. In every case we took away the license, the first thing. Some of them came back and said that it was

a mistake. We wrote back and told them that they would have to pay for their mistakes. We had cases brought before the magistrates, and if the maximum fine was five hundred dollars, and the minimum was a dollar, the man got fined for a dollar. But I am glad to say that in one case on the West Coast one of the magistrates did his duty and sent an offender to the Penitentiary for three months. When all the lobster catchers of this country who violates the law are visited with the extreme penalty of the law then the Government will have a chance to carry it out.

But I don't believe the fishermen will carry out the law, because the members of the Government are not carrying out the law any more than the fishermen. herefore, when the heads of the department violate the law of the land you can understand the underdogs not doing anything better. The Honorable Leader of the Opposition spoke about the size and about the width of the openings in lobster traps. He asked me did I think this was making the difference. Well, I think it would be; but taking into consideration the depletion of the lobster fishery at the present time, I don't think it possible to bring it up any more without a close season. Even if it could be brought about by artificial propagation and placing the openings further apart in the traps so that the smaller lobsters could escape, it would be a long time before the lobster fishery would come up to the standard. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition said that there were fifteen hundred people last year carrying on the fishery business. That is practically true, and I am prepared to say that seven hundred people lost money, and lost badly, and five hundred out of the other seven hundred did not make enough to provide for themselves and their families for the winter. As far as the Board could find out only about 250 people out of the fifteen hundred people who went to the lobster fishery last summer made enough to carry themselves and their families over the winter. With such a splendid lobster fishery that we once had, it has boiled down to this, that two hundred people out of fifteen hundred got a living out of it. I think it is high time that the people in authorty in this country should see to it that this Lobster Bill is put in force. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition spoke about the smaller mesh in the cod traps; ;while this may not concern this Bill, in another way it does. I perfectly agree with him. I have had my attention drawn this winter, from people in different sections of the country, to the fact that people are putting into the traps two and a half mesh twine, and I may say for the benefit of this House that when I spoke of it the first answer I got was that the chap who told me was looking for a job.

As far as the information the Fishery Dept. received, it was that people were using a lot of small mesh twine during the last couple of years. There is one way that I would sugggest that the small mesh, that are put into the cod traps, could be eliminated and that is, if the merchants would shut down on buying tomcods; but as long as the fishermen are getting eight or nine dollars for tomcods it is a hard proposition to get them to throw them away. But it is the intention of the Fishery Department to rectify this, and I may say for the information of the House of Assembly that when I went to the Fishery Department there was no Fishery Board there. I did not feel justified in taking the position, though I have been a fisherman ever since I was fifteen years old or before, and I have been prosecuting it right up until the present time, and even though I knew practically as much as any man in

the country about the fisheries, I did not feel justified in asking the Executive Government to make rules and regulations without some help, and so I asked the Executive Government to allow me to appoint a Fishery Board that would carry on without any pay. Quite a few of the members live in the outports. It is not all times of the year that we can get them here to carry on the work of the Board, not in such numbers as we would like. But some of the members took the trouble and a great deal of expense and loss of time to come in here. I want to assure this House that these men took some responsibility placed upon themselves to come in here and pay their own expenses. These men come in for the simple reason that they want to see things done right, as they can be done, and in the interests of the fisheries of this country. If, as regards the Fishery Board, it cannot carry out the laws of the land without something done to help it, do it. As I said when I went to the Fishery Department this year, there was not a solitary dollar voted for the fisheries. Therefore, they were unable to engage the services of a fishery warden. If the people of this country want the fisheries carried out right, get us some money and we will do the best we can, and I feel sure that as a member of the Monroe Government that the Monroe Government are prepared to do all possible for the upkeep of the fisheries in this country. I feel sure that during the next four years when we are called upon to give an account of our stewardship we will have a great account. We won't owe the people a hundred dollars and pay twenty cents. The people of this country will owe the Monroe Government one hundred per cent. for the benefits they have given this country.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, I merely rise to make some remarks in a general way as regards some of the observations made by Capt. Winsor. I don't think I need stress the point that I have already outlined in my views as the representative of the District of St. Barbe. I do not propose to commit myself or to voice an opinion as regards the wisdom or otherwise of this Bill. I seek only to impress upon the Government the necessity for delay and to grant a year's reprieve before the proposed Legislation goes into effect. Now yesterday, Captain Winsor, referred among others to Stephen Taylor of Bonne Bay. I hold no brief for Mr. Taylor. He is not a political supporter of mine. He is not even a personal friend. I think the reverse is the case. But Mr. Taylor is I think one of the men most outspoken against the close season. Mr. Taylor is one of the largest merchants in Bonne Bay. He is one of the merchants who supplies most extensively at Bonne Bay and on the Coast. If Mr. Taylor with his experience on that coast as a supplying merchant, extending over a large number of years, is not satisfied with the application of this Legislation and the good that will come from it at the present time, he can be taken as a very safe judge. I will be frank with the Minister. I have had telegrams from my constituents on the matter from Flower's Cove and Trout River. The majority of the men's opinions were that the close season ought not to be enforced, the business men for the most part favoured it, but they argued that the application of this law ought not to come into force this year. Yesterday I received some very anxious inquiries form Port aux Choix on the same subject. I replied that the Government had decided to proceed with this legislation. I still have some doubt as to whether this close season is going to produce the results anticipated. I quite realize that the Government is sincere in trying to conserve an industry of such

importance, but it seems to me that something else should be attempted first. One remark of Captain Winsor's the other day confounded me. He said that as early as July last he had notified the public of the proposed action of the Government. I was confounded. It seems to me that despite this that this legislation was sprung upon the district, that the district knew absolutely nothing about it. If they had been given notice of it, would they have been so much in the dark? However, I take Captain Winsor's word for it.

Captain Winsor has seen fit to refer to the Fishery Board. He says his Fishery Board is the only one worth while. It is the only one that has been effective in this country. Captain Winsor stated that the Fishery Board over which he presides is the only one in the country composed totally of men connected with the fishery. I refer the hon. member to the Fishery Board of 1920.

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries in 1920 was certainly a man who knew something about the fisheries. I don't think Captain Winsor will have the audacity to stand up and say he was not, Mr. McDougall was also a member. He was a man who was member of every Fishery Board since Fishery Boards came into existence. No one in this House would have the hardihood to stand up and say that he knew nothing about the fisheries. He began his business by engaging in the lobster industry in Herring Neck. Then again there is Sir Michael Cashin. Would the Minister say that he was not a practical man conversant with fishery matters?

Now then I come to the Fishery Board in the administration of Sir Richard Squires. The members of that Fishery Board had as much knowledge as the men on the Board to-day, and I dare to challenge the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to contradict it. Mr. Grimes was a member of that Board. He was not an expert by any means, but he could give practical and sensible advice concerning the operation of the fisheries. He was a man who it was felt could give sound and sensible advice. I notice the name of Mr. W. F. Penney. Mr. Penney certainly always knew what he was talking about where fishery matters were concerned. He had a large experience as a business man in this country. Mr. Jennings was a member of that Board. He was a practical man and always gave a sensible and practical opinion where matters relating to the herring fishery were concerned. He had a unique experience in that industry. Taking it all round the Fishery Board under the Squires Administration was as good as the Board of to-day and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is not playing the game in eulogizing his own Board and decoying previous Boards.

Now, the Leader of the Independent Party said he felt the lobsters should be left peacefully alone for a few years, but if what I can hear is right they will not be left alone, unless the Government puts into being some machinery whereby the present law will be enforced. I feel that unless the Government promotes machinery to enforce the law as to the close season, and to see that its provisions are carried out the results anticipated will not justify the close season. Now referring to the Fishery Board again. Capt. Winsor just said that a lot of small Linnet is being put into cod-traps this year, if that be so, what he is hearing is different from what I hear.

MINISTER OF FISHERIES—I said I heard that was so.

MR. SCAMMELL—Well I hear that more big Linnet is being put into traps on a larger scale than ever. The Captain, of course, knows the reason of that. Again Mr. Chairman, I would like to impress upon the Minister that unless means are taken to see that the

provision is made for the enforcement of the Bill all efforts will be futile in this direction.

MINISTER OF FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few remarks in reply. I only said that I heard of small Linnet. The hon. member for St. Barbe made reference to Mr. McDougall as being on the Fshery Board. He was on the Board with me, and I must say he was a good man. As to Mr. Jennings, in his young days, I understand he was a fisherman, but some thirty-five years ago he took charge of a Lighthouse, and was up to the time he got in the Government. As to Mr. Coaker who held the position of Chairman ex-officio, he knew something about the fisheries, but how often did he attend the Meeting of the Board. I think I will take the trouble to find out.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, I notice that there is nothing in this Bill governing the times as to the export of lobster, and I do not see how we are to know if a man packed his catch in 1925 or before. I think something should be inserted in the Bill to cover this.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I may say for the information of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition that all the labels unused in packing are to be sent back, and even if they are not sent back a man would have to get a license to pack. Of course he may do so without a license and say he had done the packing before. I would like to and the word "buy" between the words "catch" and "sell".

MR. WARREN—Does that mean that nobody can buy a can of lobsters now?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—As Mr. Warren says, though the lobsters were caught before he could not buy them now.

MR. BROWNE—Mr. Chairman, yesterday I noticed the omission of that word "buy" from the Bill, and I was thinking that if someone approached a catcher of lobsters and bought a quantity he would then not be liable under the Act. A man who had them in his store could give a very good explanation as to having them there by saying he bought them, and he would not be liable. He might have killed them himself, but there would be no offence when he would buy them. I suggest the wording to be "kill, take, catch or sell, buy or can any lobsters killed, taken or caught."

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—As it at present stands there is nothing provided as to when the lobsters were caught.

MR. BROWN — Mr. Chairman, while I am on my feet I may say that I heartily support the principle of the Bill. I was listening to the speech of the hon. minister, in which he referred to the matter of magistrates in the Outports inflicting fines under other Bills for the protection of this fishery. I think there will be considerable difficulty in this connection, as no provision was made for a minimum fine, or an increased fine for the second offence. It is possible that a magistrate may take advantage of this Act, and considering circumstances in the goodness of his heart, inflict a fine of only one dollar. Where there is no minimum fine, it might be profitable for a man to go into the industry and catch the lobsters, because there is a chance that he would not be fined the maximum amount, and it would pay him. I think that this situation should be covered in the Act. Sub-Section 2 of Section 3 does not say what the man shall be in charge of, whether a boat, store, or anything else. I think these three matters should be amended, and then the Bill would be better. As I see it, it does not now cover very much.

MR. DUFF—It seems to me strange, Mr. Chairman, that in a country like this, we should not be allowed to

have a few fresh lobsters. I know a lot of people who engage in catching lobsters, and I suggest that some provision be made to allow them to sell the lobsters fresh.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to the hon. minister in charge of the Bill, that we rise the Committee, as it seems that there are many important matters in it to be straightened out; if it be put into effect it should not prevent a man selling a few fresh lobsters, though the wording of it says so. There is quite a lot of lobster brought in from outside of the Colony, the sale of which cannot possible affect our fishery, and I think this Section ought to be recast. It is absurd to say that a man cannot import what has been caught outside.

MR. HICKMAN—I think the suggestion of the hon. member for Carbonear is worth considering. I do not see why we could not buy fresh lobster. If the Government's idea as to the influx of touists materializes we will want a few fresh lobsters to supply them.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, I think the suggestion of the Honourable the Minister of Justice is a good one, and as drawn attention to by Mr. Browne there is something left out of Section 2. With the rising of the Committee, these defects can be remedied.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to Firearms."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. chairman: In connection with this Bill I would like to invite the attention of hon. members to the purport of it. With regard to the point raised by the member for St. Barbe respecting the carrying of firearms by our fishermen throughout the country and as to whether or not it is necessary for those to be registered. That point is answered by Section 8 of the Bill. Strictly speaking the object of the Bill, which happens to be a rescript of the English Act for local purposes, is not to cause unnecessary bother to people; but to keep track of small arms.

I am quite ready and pleased to get the views of the members before proceeding at all with the Bill. I would like to point out that it is not our intention to inflict any unnecessary bother or annoyance on the people of the country. We could insert under clause 8 "rifles" and cut out the words "smooth bore." This would leave exempt Rifles and Shot Guns and would cover everything as far as our own people are concerned.

I would like to say that the situation as I explained the other day is shortly this. This Bill is brought into the House for the purpose of putting into effect legislation to control what is going to be a very serious evil here. Members would be surprised at the number of revolvers that half responsible people in St. John's are going around town with to-day. That is a menace to the community. The police want to be in some position to control. There is no possible method of controlling the carrying of weapons of that kind at present. As far as the other weapons are concerned you will recognize in such a country as ours it is impossible to put rifles in the same category as across the water. Even applying to have the Magistrate issue licenses is in many

cases unnecessary bother. My object in moving the House into Committee instead of deferring it is to get the opinion of the members concerning it. It is absolutely necessary to get legislation concerning the use of firearms. It is particularly important in view of the fact that in centres where men are congregating in industrial works the carrying about of firearms is a menace to people from the outside more than our own people. It is nothing more or less than the idea of having some form of safety. What I am desirous of is getting the views of the Members on the general principle of the Bill. I do not intend to ask members to pass this Bill today. It is just to get the views of the members as to whether the House will accept the principle of the thing. It is not desired to inflict an act that cannot be carried out.

I think we ought to avail of the suggestion of the authorities to put into effect some form of legislation. We have had two tragedies. One very serious when a Chinaman ran amuck here, and another when a death occurred because of the possession of a revolver.

The Registration of Possession is the accepted principle. What I would ask the House to consider is this. You take the tragedy like that of the Chinaman. It was due to the fact that there was no method of keeping track of small arms. The vein of thought of those people is different. Their viewpoint is different from a Newfoundlander's who uses his fist. The idea is bred in him. The other people have recourse to firearms, so we feel that small arms should be kept track of. But I am anxious to have the opinion of the members as to what they think of the Bill.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman: Yesterday I suggested that the Bills be distributed before we were asked to discuss them in the second reading. Had I had a chance of seeing this Bill before going to its second reading I certainly would have voted against it. This Bill will be like the Cigarette Act, the Lottery Act, the Prohibition Act and many other Acts. They purposed to do a lot and they are never going to be observed. Now if it was necessary to keep track of small arms in the possession of individuals it is quite easy to do it. But to have a Bill of 4 pages devising all sorts of things and then not to apply to the main things, must become more than a farce. The Minister of Justice stated that the Bill was a rescript of of English Law. With this I beg to differ. Under this Bill you are not allowed to keep firearms in your house, for your own particular use, unless you are exempted by any one section of the Bill. I took occassion to look at the English Law to-day. There is no such Law as that in England. As far as I can see it is nothing more or less than officialdom for no purpose. If a man wants to murder somebody, if he wants to use a revolver, no man is going to do it in the street. But if he is going to use it, it will be in some place where he won't be seen. You have as much chance of stopping a man having a revolver in his possession as stopping a boy now from using a catapult. In England there was an Act brought in in 1870. It provided for the carrying of firearms. And the keeping of a gun in ones dwelling house was exempted from that Act. The Act itself is cumbersome. It is going to be more honoured in the breach than in the observance. But if it is necessary to keep a record of small arms it can be done much more simply than by this Act. If rifles are exempted from this Act as well as shot guns it refers then solely and only to revolvers and small arms and you have to take out some sections whereby you cannot bring sealing rifles ashore from sealing vessels without permission from the policeman. This will only lead to a

breach of the Law. Every man who gets a gun without taking out a license and who is not exempted by any of the sections of the Act is liable to a penalty not exceeding 200 dollars. In England the penalty is 10 pounds or 50 dollars. How is the Inspector General going to say how much ammunition a man up in Bay D'Espoir is going to need to keep in his house. I am prepared to support a Bill restricing the use of revolvers, in order to prevent catastrophes as we have had. But regarding this Bill as it stands, I propose to vote against it, and I move as an amendment to the first section that the Committee rise without reporting.

HON THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—It looks as if the Hon. Minister of Justice is introducing this Bill and does not expect it to be carried out. I should think that if he intends to have only the registration of small arms that would be enough, and would cover the situation well enough. It is not any use to put a law on the Statute Book unless it is intended that it is to be carried out. I think that it might be carried out in its entirety. I would think that the Hon. Minsiter would give this matter his attention and have the Bill passed which would just cover what he intends and than have it carried in its entirety.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman: From what the Hon. Minister has just said I am prepared to withdraw the motion which I have made. I do not think that it will stop criminals just to know that they are registered. If a man finds a revolver of his own or one left around by somebody else he will use it if he wants to. I think that for what it is worth it might be put through.

MR. DUFF—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that I do not think that this act is very applicable to the outports. There are not any people in the outports who carry small fire arms. If the law is made for St. John's then it should be made for St. John's. Everybody in the outports who wants to carry a gun must apply to the Inspector General and I think that that would be rather unnecessary and cumbersome. There is one thing I would like to refer to, and that is when we come back after the next election as a government, the people over around my district have a lot of these old sealing guns and when the people fire these there is as much danger to the person of the person, who is being celebrated as anybody else, so I would like to see something in this that would protect the people concerned. The firing of guns in towns should be prohibited, but fishermen and trappers should not be compelled to apply to the Inspector General in St. John's when they desire to go out and shoot something for their dinner, and the same thing applies to outport stores that may handle a bag of shot or keg of gunpowder. I would ask the reconsideration of the Government on this matter.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few remarks upon the bill now before the Committee. I agree with the Hon. Minister of Justice that the act should be amended, as far as the outports are concerned, to include rifles. The people in the outports are dependent to a great extent on their rifles. Practically every man who goes fishing owns a gun. When he goes out to the fishing grounds he wants to shoot tern and other sea game and they often use guns to provide fresh meat for themselves and their families. I think that so far as the outports are concerned it is out of the question to debar fishermen from possessing rifles. I notice in the act that there is no amount stated for the payment of the fee. I would like to know the amount it is intended to charge.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE

—Mr. Chairman, it was my own idea not to have any at all. If we are to have a fee it will be merely nominal to provide for the cost of the station. The sole object is protection and not revenue.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman, with regard to Section 8, I understand that clerks in the banks are in the habit of having revolvers for the protection of money. I do not see any reference to them in this bill. I think that that is a thing that should be taken up. With regard to the outports I think that it should be arranged so that the magistrates or the local constables are able to effect the registration of small arms and so save considerable trouble in having to communicate with the Inspector General here in St. John's. I would like to endorse what has been said by the hon. member for Carbonear, with regard to firing of guns at political meetings. I also want to refer to that section about the supplies of ammunition by freight to the outports. I think that should be worded so as to include firms or companies carrying on business of common carriers.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that I am in accord with the remarks of the Hon. Minister of Justice and I think that the intention of registering revolvers is a good one. I have thought for some time that there ought to be some sort of rigorous regulation in force as regards the purchase and carrying of revolvers because at the present time any criminal or crook or lunatic can go down to any hardware store and purchase one whenever he feels like it. I think that from that point of view the idea is a good one but I do not think that the Government ought to go to the extreme and bring in a lot of red tape about the ownership of fowling and sealing guns. The men in the outports have to have guns. Sometimes they want to provide fresh food for their families, such as fowl or other game, and often they have to use guns for signals. Guns must be taken to the Labrador, and I don't think that it is necessary as regards the fishermen, that they should be obligated to take out licenses for their guns. I think that the Minister of Justice might change the bill in that connection and still have the registration for revolvers and small arms.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Chairman, I am glad to have got the suggestions of the hon. members in connection with this bill. I appreciate the suggestions that have been given. I have given some thought as regards the bill and I think that it will have to be altered to arrange for the matter of the guns for the fishermen. I thank the hon. members for the contribution of ideas. I move that the committee rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again on 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 to-morrow.

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on to-morrow.

Second reading of the Bill, An Act to Amend Chapter 25 (Consolidated Statutes, 3rd series) entitled "Of Light Dues."

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Speaker, this bill is not very important and yet it is. It is in connection with the taxes on vessels and we propose to amend it as follows:—

(Hon. Minister reads the bill.)

So that it is only the intention of this bill to take the taxes off local vessels, and foreign vessels will still have to pay. That is really all. I would like to move that this bill be read the second time.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 25 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Light Dues' was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Second reading of the Bill an act to amend Cap. 127 of the Consolidated Statutes, 3rd Series, entitled "An Act Respecting Companies" and the Acts amending it.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of the bill I think that it would be best to have it referred to a select committee. There may be points that may possibly arise and we can get the advantage of the committee's experience which contained the hon. member for Fortune Bay. The bill is of a tremendous size and even on that account I think that we ought to refer it to the select committee.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Companies" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Select Committee for consideration.

The Committee to consist of Hon. the Minister of Justice, Hon. the Colonial Secretary, Hon. Mr. Cramm, Mr. Warren, Mr. Hickman.

Pursuant to order and on motion of The Minister of Agriculture, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Cap. 24 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Payment of Certain Fees and Charges by Stamps' was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of The Minister of Agriculture, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 134 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Operation of Saw Mills" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of The Minister of Agriculture, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend Chapter 129 of the Consolidated Statues (Third Series) entitled 'Of Crown Lands, Timber, Mines and Minerals" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend 11 George V., Capt. 45, entitled 'An Act to Incorporate the Women's Patriotic Trust Fund and for other Purposes.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester 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 said 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.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Act 61 Victoria, Cap. 47, entitled 'An Act relating to the Constitution of the Supreme Court, and the Acts in amendment thereof.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester 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 said 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.

Second reading of a Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 11 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series) entitled 'Of the House of Assembly.'"

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the second reading of this Bill deferred for some time. We have not had an opportunity yet to look it over, and I think that the second reading should be postponed.

HON. PRIME MINISTER — Mr. Speaker, there is no intention at all on the part of the Government to push this Bill through, and the Opposition may have all the time they like to postpone it from time to time. It is our intention eventually to refer it to a Select Committee, so that we may show that it is not our intention to pass this Bill in any great hurry. I hope, however, that during this session of the Legislature this Bill may become law, and that it may not be deferred beyond the present session.

I would like to make a few remarks regarding this Bill. The total population in Newfoundland in 1921, according to the census, was 259,259. The percentage of increase 1911 to 1921 was less than seven per cent., the smallest for thirty years. The population of Conception Bay (except Bell Island) has not increased in twenty years. In Port de Grave, Harbour Grace and Carbonear districts a slight decrease has occurred, and in Bay de Verde the increase has been small. North and West of Avalon, on the main Island, there has been an increase.

A redistribution of constituencies for representatives in the Assembly is therefore necessary, increasing those in the North and West, and it is desirable that a division of those large districts, each represented by three and two members, should take place.

In any plan for redistribution it is desirable to bear in mind certain almost fundamental consderations, as for instance:

(a) the religious denominations to which the people of the various sections belong;
(b) the great extent of certain existing districts and the need of division;
(c) the trade and social intercourse between localities, so as not to unduly disturb them;
(d) the occupations of the people, and the importance of securing representation of various industries; and, finally,
(e) the history of existing constituencies, so as to preserve their historical continuity as far as convenience will permit.

Redistribution of seats in the Assembly has been a slow process. The districts of St. George's and St. Barbe were created in 1878, thus enfranchising the people of the French Treaty Coast (so-called), but otherwise the changes have been slight from 1872 or previously. In 1873 the district of Twillingate and Fogo was given three members instead of two, and in 1885 Fogo was created a separate district, with one member. In 1890 the Representation Act delimited all the districts as they at present exist.

In 1891 the population was 202,040, or 5,611 per member. In 1901 it was 220,984, or 6,141 per member. In 1911 it was 242,619, or 6,806 per member, and in 1921 it was 259,259, or 7,222 per member. In the proposal now submitted, provision is made for an increase of four seats, or a total of forty, which gives 6,500 as the average per member of the number of people according to the census of 1921. An increase of membership in the Assembly may be objected to as

tending to increase the cost of elections and sessional pay, but the objection would yield to the arguments in favour of the increase.

For instance, the Roman Catholic population of the island numbers 86,-151, or about one-third of the total, and as denominational interests are very jealously regarded in this Colony in relation to political matters, it is of first importance to secure, if possible, such redistribution as shall provide that one-third of the new districts shall have a Roman Catholic majority. Minorities are naturally jealous for the preservation of their rights, and every reasonable effort should be made to guard them.

Outside of Avalon and the St. George district, the Roman Catholic people are so scattered that it is not reasonably possible to create constituencies in which they have a majority. But in the districts of Placentia, Ferryland and Harbour Man, now represented by seven members, they have clear majorities, and for the six seats in St. John's East and West it has been usual, by an understanding or convention between parties, to return five Roman Catholic members, making, with St. George, thirteen Roman Catholic seats. The population of St. John's East and West, according to the present boundaries, is 52,158, of which 26,172 are Roman Catholics, or very slightly over one-half, so that there is, in fact, no reliable denominational majority in the city. To rearrange St. John's East and West so as to provide sufficient districts with a Roman Catholic majority has been difficult, but the proposal now submitted has carved out four districts:

St. John's City (West)	2
St. John's East (extern) ..	1
Bell Island	1
	—
	4

With such a majority, and by adding a second member to what is left of St. George district, the twelfth Roman Catholic majority has been provided. Those, with one of the two seats in St. John's City (East), would give the thirteen Roman Catholic seats.

Port de Grave, Harbour Grace and Carbonear have smaller populations than in 1901, and Bay de Verde has an increase of about 450 only. The three former districts also decreased between 1901 and 1911, while Bay de Verde increased only about 400 in the same period; that is to say, for twenty years the population of these four districts has lost its natural increase by migration or emigration. Harbour Grace, which has three representatives, must lose one, and Carbonear and Bay de Verde, which together have three, must also lose one. On the other hand, Trinity, Bonavista, Twillingate, St. Barbe and St. George districts have increased in population and require increased representation.

In any scheme for redistribution a very important thing to be borne in mind is the extensive coastline of the large electoral districts on the East, West and South Coasts of the main Island. The settlements in these are so scattered, and the mileage is so great, that it is quite difficult and almost impossible for representatives to pay proper attention to the wants of the people, and divisions into constituencies smaller in area is practically essential. The need of dividing St. Barbe and St. George, because of their great extent, and of creating a new district by division of Burgeo and Fortune, are reasons justifying the increase of seats to forty.

On the South Coast, the districts of Burgeo & LaPoile and of Fortune are very extensive. The places are very numerous and the population of each very small. It seems desirable to make a new constituency out of the eastern part of Burgeo & LaPoile district and the western part of For-

tune Bay district, which new constituency we will call "Hermitage Bay". Even with three districts where two were before, candidates will have no easy task to visit their numerous places.

The industry at Grand Falls has within recent years put a large population into the district of Twillingate, and these people have little in common with the other inhabitants of the district, who are chiefly fishermen. A new constituency called "Exploits", extending from Botwood on the east to Millertown on the west, is, therefore, now proposed. The Humber industry bids fair to create similar conditions in the Humber region, now a part of St. George district, and as the population of this district and its area justify increased representation, a new constituency has been created called "Humber", including Bay of Islands and the Humber River section as far east as Millertown. The remainder of St. George is divided into the districts of Port au Port and of St. George, divided by the river St. George. This section of the Colony may be expected to increase rapidly in population. Port au Port is given the Roman Catholic seat which Ferryland loses.

Trinity Bay has been divided into South, Centre and North, and that part of the Bonavista peninsula, which included Catalina and Bonavista sections, has been created a constituency by itself. South and Centre constituencies (which latter would include all the islands in the Bay from Little Denier Island to Greenspond, inclusive) have been created, and "Bonavista South" will include the mainland from Hare Bay, "The Straight Shore" of Fogo, as far north as Ladle Cove, and all the adjacent islands east of Greenspond. The population of Fogo is above the number which would be represented by one man, and the inclusion of a part of Fogo in Bonavista North coincides with the relation of the people and the geographical position.

Twillingate will consist of the Two Twillingate Islands and New World Island, inhabited almost wholly by fishermen. Lewisporte will extend from the northern boundary line of Fogo to the Exploits River, and across the river to New Bay: that is to say, the Fortune Harbour part. The island adjacent on the east (except Twillingate and New World Islands) would be included in Lewisporte. Then comes the district of Exploits mentioned above, and then the district of Green Bay, extending from New Bay to Cape John, with its adjacent islands. St. Barbe district is divided by a line drawn southwards along the centre of the peninsula from a point west of Boat Harbour to a line drawn eastward from Cape Gregory, the northern boundary of the new district of the Humber.

By a conventional arrangement, referred to previously, St. John's West has usually returned one Protestant and two Roman Catholics (when the latter had an actual majority in the district), but in 1919 it returned two Protestants (one on each side) and one Roman Catholic. It is now proposed to create a one man constituency out of the South Side and parts external to the city, with a Protestant majority, leaving the city part as a two man district with a Roman Catholic majority.

St. John's East had during recent years, returned three Roman Catholic members, but it is now proposed to create the constituencies of Bell Island and St. John's East (Extern) both of which will have Roman Catholic majorities, and to make a two-man district of the eastern end of the city for which the conventional arrangement would be to elect one Protestant and one Roman Catholic. This arrangement will be in accordance with the principle of fair play applied to the whole Island.

From this redistribution may be expected a number of beneficial results. It now takes from six to eight weeks to adequately canvass any one of the three man districts, such as Trinity, Bonavista or Twillingate, and as long for St. Barbe and St. George. Redistribution would permit thorough canvassing in half, or less than half the time. In the old days it was possible to find candidates ready to give the time required for canvassing, but it is extremely difficult now, and after the redistribution I would expect a busier class of men to offer themselves as candidates than can be obtained under existing conditions. Under the present system, where there are three members for one constituency, it is usual to secure an outstanding man as leader of the team, and to fill in with less prominent men. After redistribution each candidate will have to do his own canvassing, as it were, and, having more responsibility thrust upon him, will probably be a man of more individuality. Under the present system, the people of one part of a district not infrequently have very little communication with the people of other parts, and as a result there is a sort of compromise amongst them, and the people in the South vote for the candidate from the North and vice versa; and very frequently all the Centre has no special representation whatever. After redistribution, the areas of constituencies being much smaller, a natural result will be that candidates will be better known personally to the electors than under the present system, and an increase of local candidates, so-called, might naturally be expected. Then, under the present system, the expense of canvassing the large constituencies is very considerable. The smaller areas will call for less money and for less time, and for this reason candidates will be more easily procurable. Redistribution should improve the standard of qualification for candidates; busy men who now keep out of public life might be expected to take a greater interest. Then, too, there will be increased attention to the districts when the representatives have to be personally responsible to the electors, not being able to "pass the buck" to any other representatives, and will at the same time be able to obtain a much greater personal knowledge of affairs in the smaller districts they would represent. Some good might result, too, from the special attention which candidates could give to the avocation of the people in smaller districts. In the constituency of Twillingate, for instance, as it at present exists, the pulp industry has nothing in common with the fishing industry of the greater part of the district, and a candidate who well represents the one industry can hardly be expected to represent the other adequately; that is to say, the man who is preferred by the people of Grand Falls cannot naturally be preferred by the people of Twillingate Island, or of the many other small islands which form so large a part of the constituency. The Humber Industry bears the same relation to the district of St. George. It is industrial, while the greater part of the district is agricultural. Under this scheme of redistribution, labour will probably be represented by the members for the districts of Exploits and Humber, and in view of the growing interest in labour in this Colony, it is desirable that it should be amply represented. Take it all in all, it will be agreed, upon consideration of the matter, that a very great advantage may be expected to result to the Colony from a redistribution of seats hereby submitted.

By this proposed redistribution, no three-man constituencies are left, and only three two-man districts:—Harbor Main, St. John's City (West) and St. John's City (East), which is left as at present because division is impossible without depriving the Ro-

man Catholics of a seat.

The comparative interests of Church of England and Methodist representation will work out almost precisely on existing lines.

These are all the districts, gentlemen. This section here (indicates (white space on map in interior of country) is the one for which I shall stand myself in four years time unless the Government do better in the next four years than the previous Government did in their four years term. Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the Bill be read a second time, and referred to a Select Committee so as to enable every member both on the Opposition side of the House and this side, an opportunity to examine the new boundaries of their districts and to make any amendments—in a small way—which we would consider. But if drastic changes in the boundaries are suggested the whole plan as to the redistribution, would topple to the ground like a house of cards. I may say that we are not pleased to have the number of representatives increased to forty, but we could not see any other way out. As a matter of fact I would rather have had the number reduced. It may be remembered that when I first went on the political platform I was credited with saying that I would like to turn Newfoundland into a Crown Colony and I was called Crown Colony Monroe, and told that I would never have a chance of election. But though I may or may not like to turn the country into a Crown Colony, I do think that half a dozen men could administer its affairs as well as forty. But while the people of the different districts wish to be represented as they are entitled to be, I think they will be better off under this new arrangement than before, and I look forward to the time when the various sections will call out their own men. We have splendid men in the outports who know their districts better than we in St. John's do, but what is happening. Somebody comes along and says, "Monroe, you go down to Bonavista"—and what is the result; we go down to some district or other without even being asked to do so by the people of the place. That is what is happening but under this new arrangement the people will take a greater interest in the matter of who is to represent them, and call out their own men. That is what I hope to see the people doing in the near future.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Speaker, if it is the intention of the Prime Minister to defer consideration of the Bill this afternoon, I would like to suggest that we ought to have drafted some parts from the Census of 1921, showing the settlements and the population in each case, included in the proposed districts. I think that honorable members will appreciate that that information is necessary to have, and I think that the Government ought to be able to get that information within a very short time. Take St. Barbe District for instance. What I am asking for is a list of the settlements comprised in each of the two new proposed districts and showing the population of each settlement.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—If we give you the boundaries, surely anybody can do that for himself.

MR. SCAMMELL—I do not think that the members themselves ought be obliged to go and do it. I think the Government ought to provide that information.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, I think the suggestion of the honourable member for St. Barbe a reasonable one and one very easy of accomplishment. I will undertake to get an official in my department to furnish the information It only needs referring to the Census and compiling the returns for the places outlined in this Bill.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill

entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 2 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the House of Assembly'" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Select Committee for consideration.

The Committee to consist of Hon. the Prime Minister, Hon. Minister of Justice, Mr. Warren, Mr. Power, Mr. Hickman.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

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

The House then adjouned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, March 4, 1925.

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

Mr. Speaker informed the House that in accordance with the intimation received, His Excellency the Governor would receive the Address in Reply presently.

Accordingly Mr. Speaker and the House proceeded to Government House, and being returned to the Assembly Rooms, 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, Nfld.

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.

(Sgd.) W. L. ALLARDYCE,
Governor.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Branch in the District of Placentia & St. Mary's for a grant of money to effect repairs and complete the breakwater which is siituated there. In 1919 the Government allocated one thousand dollars for the building of this breakwater, and the amount of money was not sufficient to complete the work, and they require another one thousand dollars to finish the work. It is very essential because of the situation of Branch. It is a poor harbor, and if the winds are any way from S.S.W. to S.E., they blow right into the harbor and because of the sea it becomes almost impossible for the boats to enter or leave it. My colleagues and myself had occasion to visit the place on one or two occasions, and we were nearly lost. We had to be taken off the boat in which we were by some people of the place. If anybody who does not know the place tries to go into the famous Branch Gut they are almost certain to meet with disaster. On the occasion on which my colleagues and myself were there, we were not rescued before we had a good drenching and well scared. These people have to live under extreme hardship, and I support the petition heartily and would ask that it be referred to the department to which it belongs.

MR. SINNOTT—Mr. Speaker, I beg to support the petition.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Mr. Speaker, I beg to support the petition. The breakwater is badly needed there. The men of the place have to fish under very trying conditions. They have to risk their lives every time they go out of the harbor. If this petition were granted it would make it possible for the men of the place to carry on their fishing under very much better conditions.

HON. MR. CRAMM—I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Old Perlican and Biscayan Cove on the subject of a road. This road has been made necessary by the fact that a new road has been located and built

from Old Perlican to Lead Cove during the past two years. The old road has fallen into disuse, and it was used very extensively by the people of Old Perlican and Biscayan Cove. At the present time they have to go a distance of about two miles at very considerable inconvenience to connect with the new road. A distance of one-eighth of a mile of road at the cost of about a thousand or twelve hundred dollars, would connect these two settlements with the new road and it would be a great convenience to the people, and I am sure they would greatly appreciate it. I have pleasure in giving this petition my hearty support and ask that it be referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Speaker, I beg to suport the petition presented by my colleague, Hon. Mr. Cramm.

MR. BROWNE—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the people of St. John's West residing in the neighbourhood of Mundy's Pond on the matter of the boundaries of the city. Some time ago the boundaries of the city, I think that it was in 1921, were changed and a large section which was formerly outside the city were put within the city boundaries. This petition is signed by all the residents who are property holders in this section of the district and they are without those facilities which the people of the city enjoy. They have no water connection and no sanitary conveniences or fire protection whatsoever. On four or five occasions the people have been obliged to stand outside their houses and watch them while they burned down. They have no fire alarms or anything of that kind at all, and the roads are in a bad condition. They feel that the Government might possibly be able to do something in the matter. The matter was brought to the notice of the City Council and their suggestion was that the petition should be brought before the House of Assembly and that is why I am bringing it up here to-day. I have much pleasure in asking leave to present this petition because I think that the matter is one which should be considered in the conference about to be held between the Government and the Municipal Council.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to support this petition. The people of this section of the town especially in the neighbourhood of the Ropewalk have none of the town facilities. I give this matter my hearty support because I feel sure that the Government intends doing something in this matter at an early date.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the Reverend Canon Smart, the Rev. Ezra Broughton and about one hundred and thirty electors of Heart's Content, on the subject of putting the road from Heart's Content to Carbonear in better condition, and also that a second street be built through the town of Heart's Content. Mr. Speaker the petition is of such importance and to express the wishes of the people clearly I would crave the permission of the House to read it. (Reads the petition.)

Mr. Speaker, those who have had occasion to travel from Carbonear to Heart's Content know that the road is in a very bad condition and those who travel that way in motor cars or carriages run the risk of having their cars or waggons damaged, as the road in some places is almost impassable, due to rocks and ruts. If it is the intention of the Government to spend monies on public highways I am sure that they could not do better than granting the request of the petitioners which speaks about prohibiting the cutting of trees about a hundred yards from the road will I am sure appeal to the House and to the community as a whole. The

distructive propensities are so great in us that if we see a good tree we are not satisfied until it is cut down. I think that the protection of the trees is necessary and to the interest of the people of the country. With regard to the building of the second street through the town I may say that Heart's Content is one of the most thickly populated towns of the outports and the petitioners think it is necessary, and I support the request, if the Government and the country can afford it. The inhabitants of Heart's Content are directly and particularly interested in the road to Carbonear, but thousands of people are interested in this road. The people of the adjoining settlements and places down the shore from Heart's Content to Lead Cove, which take a large part of the district, in the prosecution of their business to travel that way, and the same applies to that section of the district from Heart's Content up. Therefore, the Government would be conferring a great benefit on the people of that district by acceeding to this petition. I have, therefore, much pleasure in giving this petition by heartiest support, and I ask that it be referred to the Prime Minister or the Government for consideration.

CAPT. RANDELL—I would also like to support the petitioners in the matter brought up by my colleague, Mr. Halfyard, in connection with the District of Trinity. I think that it is most important that there should be a road from Heart's Content to Carbonear. In fact, I know of no road outside of the district of St. John's which is so much travelled and used.

MR. GODDEN—Mr. Speaker, I wish to give this petition my very hearty support.

MR. DUFF—Mr. Speaker, I also wish to support the petition presented by Mr. Halfyard, the honourable member for Trinity. I know that road very well from Heart's Content to Carbonear. It is a very narrow road, and needs to be improved. Also in connection with the matter of the trees along the road, I would like to call the attention of the Government that this is a very important matter, particularly in view of the fact that we have so many fire wardens at the present time. For instance in Ferryland District we find there are 16 Fire Wardens, and also in the District of Bay de Verde there are several and I fail to see what their duties are as there are no trees to protect and in view of this I would advise that these wardens should be instructed to preserve the little greenery that is left along the thoroughfares in these districts and also to plant some trees so that there may be something to show for the salaries they receive.

HON. MR. CRAMM—Mr. Speaker, I would also like to support the petition presented by the Honourable member for Trinity, Mr. Halfyard. I know of the necessity for that road, and the great benefit that would be derived from it. I would like to correct a statement that the honourable member for Carbonear made about the district of Bay de Cerde, namely that there were no trees in Bay de Verde district. Last year, we had a forest fire there that caused damage to the extent of several thousands of dollars. That may be news to Mr. Duff.

MR. MOORE—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the fishermen of Admirals, Fermeuse. They ask for a small sum of money to build a wharf at Admirals, Fermeuse, and I might say that Fermeuse is one of the safest harbors on the Southern Shore, and it is frequented by foreign shipping, and by boats going up and down that shore, and I am sorry to say that we have not in that harbor any place for a boat to land; so I hope and trust

that the Government will be able to see its way clear to accede to this reasonable request, that is signed by every fisherman of Admirals in Fer-m-use. I know the place, and I know that this is wanted there. I had intended to forward this petition to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and see if I could get on his good side to grant this request.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker, I would like to put myself on record as being in accord with the prayer of the petition presented by my colleague, Mr. Moore. In addition, I would like to say that the names on the petition are familiar to me, and I can see that every fisherman in Admiral's Cove has signed it. I know the place very well, and I may say that these fishermen—the inhabitants of Admiral's Cove—very seldom call upon the Government for assistance of any kind. I may also add that the building of a wharf of this nature, whilst it would not be of very great benefit to outside shipping, it would be of very much more benefit to the local fishermen themselves. At the present time there is no place for the ships going up and down there to land their goods. I am quite sure that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will do everything possible to see that the prayer of the petition is granted.

MR. LAKE—I beg leave to present a petition from the vessel owners of the town of Fortune, in the Distirct of Burin. I might say that this petition is signed by several vessel owners and captains, and they have taken the trouble to complete a statement which shows here that in Fortune there are twenty-three vessels from 180 tons downwards, having a total of 1,754 tons, engaging in the bank fishery and in the general foreign trade of the country. The town of Fortune is not, as generally supposed, represented by Mr. Warren, but by Mr. Long and myself. It hapepns to be my native town. At present vessels have great trouble in entering this harbor, and during the last two weeks there was a very serious accident, and it was only by the co-operation of the shoremen and fishermen that the vessel was saved. That, I might say, is almost a yearly occurrence. The breakwater at the present time is in a very bad condition, and needs considerable repairs, and in presenting this petition, I give it my heartiest support, and I trust that the department to which it belongs will give it the consideration that it deserves.

HON. MR. LONG—Mr. Speaker, I beg to support the petition presented by my colleague, Mr. Lake. The petition, as he has said, is signed by practically all of the people of Fortune, including vessel owners, and when one considers that nearly 23 banking vessels, or vessels engaged in the trade of the country are owned in Fortune, one realizes that proper harbor facilities are needed in this section. I need hardly say that along the whole West Coast the harbors are badly neglected; and the people are not asking for anything out of reason, when they ask for proper protection for their lives and property, and I trust that when this petition goes to the proper department, it will receive the earnest consideration of the Government; and that we will not again have occasion to present a petition on this matter. It is very seldom that the West Coast sends petitions in, but the coast there is so rugged and open to the sea that breakwaters are things of necessity. I give this petition my heartiest support, and I hope the Government will give the matter their earnest consideration.

MR. CAHILL—Mr. Speaker, as

pretty well all the districts are represented on the petition list this afternoon, I think I should not let the opportunity pass without presenting a petition from the district which I represent. I ask leave to present a petition from the fishermen of the settlement of St. Thomas's in the district of Harbour Main, relating to the shore salmon fishery in that district. It is signed by every fisherman in the settlement, and I would ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the Fishery Board to give the matter their prompt and careful attention, and try to see if the prayer of the petition cannot be acceded to at an early date.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS & TELEGRAPHS—Mr. Speaker, I beg to support the prayer of this petition. I did not know that Mr. Cahill was going to bring it up in the House this afternoon, but I do not think that there is any doubt of the wants and requirements of the people of St. Thomas'. It is very properly called St. Thomas' because St. Thomas himself was a fisherman, and this is a fishing district. I know that the people of this district would not petition for this, if they did not need it, and it must be really necessary for them. I therefore give this petition my hearty supoprt.

Mr. Hickman gave notice of question.

Mr. Warren gave notice of question.

Mr. Ashbourne gave notice of question.

MR. HALFYARD—Gave notice of question (1); Gave notice of question (2).

NOTICE OF MOTION.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—To ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Income Tax Act, 1922.

On Motion this was deferred.

NOTICE OF QUESTION.

HON THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I would first like to lay on the table of the House the following answer to Question 2 on the Order Paper of March 3rd, as follows:—

REPLY TO QUESTION OF MR. SCAMMELL.

No. 2 Order Paper, March 3rd.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—I beg to lay upon the Table of the House a Statement showing the Marine Insurance in effect to-day on each of the various steamers owned by the Government, and the names of the Agents with whom such Insurance has been placed.

Tenders have not been called in connection with any Insurance so far placed, because the rates quoted were in many instances lower than those for 1924.

No tenders have so far been asked for Insurance expiring in later months of the year.

NFLD. GOVERNMENT RAILWAY. INTEREST IN EFFECT ON STEAMERS AT MARCH 3rd, 1925.

Steamer	Amount	Agents
Argyle	£5,000	Nfld. Produce Co.
Glencoe	10,000	Nfld. Produce Co.
Kyle	17,500	Nfld. Produce Co.
Kyle	17,500	Nfld. Produce Co.
Prospero	12,500	Bowring Brothers
Prospero sealing	30,000	Nfld. Produce Co.
Sagona	30,000	Nfld. Produce Co.
Portia	30,000	Bowring Brothers

Malakoff	10,000	Dale & Company
Sebastapol	10,000	Dale & Company
Clyde	17,000	Dale & Company
Home	17,000	Dale & Company
Sagona	33,000	Dale & Company
Meigle	23,000	Dale & Company

NFLD GOVERNMENT RAILWAY. Rates quoted in answer to request made December 20th, 1923, re Marine Insurance on Steamers for one year.

Steamer	Date in effect	Tessier & Co.	Dale & Co.	Bowring Bros.	Munn & Co.	Cashin & Co.	Nfld. Produce	A. S. Rendell & Co.
Argyle	Jan. 1st %	2 7/8	2 1/2	3	3	2 5/8	3	3
Clyde	April 1st %	2 7/8	2 1/2	3	3	2 5/8	3	3
Home	May 22nd %	2 7/8	2 1/2	3	3	2 5/8	3	3
Kyle	Jan. 5th %	1 3/8	1 3/4	1 3/4	1 3/4	1 7/8	1 3/4	1 3/4
Meigle	Jan. 10th %	7 3/8	6	8	8	6 1/8	8	8
Sagona	May 8th %	1 7/8	1 3/4	2	2	1 7/8	2	2

MR. WARREN asked Hon. the Prime Minister if it is the intention of the Government to hold an enquiry or investigation into the relations between the British Empire Steel Corporation, Limited, and the Government, and into the operation of the iron mines at Wabana with a view to an amendment of the present contract, if necessary, and the improvement of the relations between that Company and the miners.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—In reply to the honorable member for Fortune, I may say the answer to this question is "yes."

MR. HICKMAN asked the Minister of Public Works if the report is true that Mr. A. Parsons, Governor of H. M. Penitentiary, is to be pensioned in the near future, and Mr. M. M. Young of Spaniard's Bay to be appointed to his place.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—In reply to my honorable friend, the member for Harbor Grace, I may say the matter has never been considered by my Department, and, therefore, I cannot answer it.

MR. BROWN asked the Minister of Public Works on whose recommendation moneys was sent out to Twillingate District other than that recommended by the elected representatives.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—If the honorable member for Twillingate, Mr. Brown will furnish me with an idea of the particular allocation to which he wishes the answer, I will be glad to get him the information to-morrow.

MR. BROWN asked Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs on whose recommendation the present mail courier between Lewisporte and Boyd's Cove was appointed.

THE MINISTER OF POSTS—In reply I may say that the courier in question was recommended by Mr. J. S.

Ayre, and is doing the work at $10.00 a trip less than the former courier.

(5) MR. ASHBOURNE asked the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the Table of the House a statement showing the number of inmates at the Poor Asylum, the date of entry of each person and the electoral district from which each came.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—The information will be ready to-morrow.

(6) MR. ASHBOURNE asked Hon. the Prime Minister what is the intention of the Government regarding the establishing of a Junior College.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—In reply to the question as to the establishing by the Government of a Junior College, the Government has come to no decision as to what assistance is to be given, but there is an offer from the Carnegie Foundation of an endowment of $15,000.00 a year, which, if accepted, would largely help to pay the cost of the College.

(7) MR. DUFF asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the cost of repairs to wharf at Freshwater, B.D. V., in 1924; names of men employed and amounts paid to each, as well as cost of timber and material; also to state on whose property this public money and material was disbursed.

Deferred.

(8) MR. SCAMMELL asked the Minister of Public Works what road moneys, either local, main line or special, have been allocated in the District of Bay de Verde between Sopt Cove and Freshwater inclusive, since June 1st last, and to give names of parties to whom such allocations were made with amounts in each case.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—In reply I may say the answer will be ready for to-morrow.

(9) MR. DUFF asked the Minister of Public Works the amounts paid the United Towns Electric Company for street lighting in the towns of Heart's Content, Carbonear, Harbor Grace, Spaniard's Bay, Bay Roberts, Clarke's Beach and Brigus for years 1923-24; number of street lights in each town and amounts paid for each town.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—In reply to this question, which was No. 6 on the Order Paper of March 3rd, the amount paid for lighting the Dock Bridge, Heart's Content, is $25 per annum. This is the only street light paid for by this Department for the towns mentioned.

(10) MR. GODDEN asked the Minister of Public Works the amount of fire insurance carried by the Government on all Public Buildings, and is this insurance placed with any particular individual; also how many policies in in force during 1923 and 1924 were cancelled.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Q. Amount of fire insurance carried by the Government on all Public Buildings? Ans. $1,661,200.00.

Q. Is this insurance placed with any particular individual? Ans. No.

Q. How many policies in force during 1923 and 1924 were cancelled? Ans. All policies in force during 1923 and 1924 were cancelled and new policies issued.

MR. HALFYARD — Mr. Speaker, with your permission I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works if the answer to my question on the Order Paper of Feb. 23rd is ready yet.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—I hope to have the answer to-morrow.

MR. SCAMMELL—I would like to ask the Minister of Posts for the answer to my question No. 1 on the Order Paper of March 2nd.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS—For the satisfaction of my honorable friend I would like to table the following information which I have only just received:

OFFICES OPENED SINCE 30TH APRIL, 1924.

Telephone Offices—

Bonavista District:

Indian Bay and Trinity Bay 238.05

Placentia & St. Mary's District:

St. Shott's 2275.31

Long Hr. 2045.68

Clattice and S. E. Bight .. 178.75

Burin District:

Marystown South, Beau Bois, Little Bay, Mooring Cove, Spanish Room, Jean de Bay, Rock Hr. and Muddy Hole 2068.60

Wireless—

Bonavista District:

Bragg's Isld. & Fair Isld...1048.75

Burgeo District:

Grand Bruit and Rencontre West (includes office) ..1881.90

Placentia & St. Mary's:

Oderin and Argentia (excluding outstanding amts. 791.81

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend 11 George V., Cap. 45, entitled 'An Act to Incorporate the Women's Patriotic Trust Fund and for other Purposes,'" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Act 61 Victoria, Cap. 47, entitled 'An Act relating to the Constitution of the Supreme Court, and the Acts in amendment thereof,'" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. 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 Chapter 25 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series), entitled 'Of Light Dues.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—This Bill, Mr. Chairman, is only for the removal of taxes on our own vessels trading in the Colony, and as there is nothing contentious in it, I think it might be put through 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 said 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.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Cap. 24 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Payment of Certain Fees and Charges by Stamps.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—Mr. Chairman, as I pointed out at the second reading a few days ago, this is only to eliminate the necessity of paying fees by stamps.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, there may be good reasons for amending this Act, but one thing about it is that, if licenses have to be paid and the stamp is attached, the money that purchases that stamp goes to the Treasury; and it is a great pity, in connection with the Department of Agriculture and Mines, that in the

past all licenses were not paid by stamps. I cannot see what great benefit it is. If a man has a license, the affixing of a revenue stamp to it only makes it appear something more official. However, it is not my intention to delay the passage of the Bill except to make this observation; but I do really intend to speak on the Bill respecting the operation of saw mills.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—Mr. Chairman, the only reason for this Bill, as I pointed out the other day, is to act on the advice of the Auditor General, in order to facilitate the auditing and accounting of the Department. For instance, under the present system an application might come into the Department say in the month of May and the money, not being forwarded with the application, might not come in until July, or about six weeks after the grant is ready to be sent out. For that reason you have to go over the books for the period mentioned to find out where the stamp was entered up and it means the keeping of two separate accounts. Certainly there will be no license issued until the full amounts are paid.

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 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.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 134 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series), entitled 'Of the Operation of Saw Mills.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—Mr. Chairman, this amendment is for practically the same purpose as the last Bill. The section we ask to amend, so as to obviate the necessity of having a stamp affixed to a document, reads as follows:

(Reads from Saw Mills Act.)

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I would like to take advantage of this opportunity to make a few remarks in connection with the operation of the Saw Mills Act. Under the Saw Mills Act a license may be granted by the Minister of Agriculture and Mines in any year up to the 30th of November upon application of bona fide fishermen, etc., etc. I understand that a fisherman can get a license without the payment of a fee, that is, for manufacturing materials for fishing purposes. That refers to licenses commonly known as fishermen's licenses, when the quantity produced exceeds ten thousand feet a charge of $1.00 per thousand feet is made. I think this amendment to the Saw Mills Act was made during war years when timber and everything else commanded high prices and when the Government of that day was trying to get all the revenue they could to meet war expenses. It was anticipated when the Bill was introduced that the revenue would be such that this tax, or royalty on timber manufactured by the ordinary mill man could be very well paid. I understand also that it has been very difficult to put that Act in force, and it is not obscrved by one-twentieth of our mill men. I hear it said that some mill men did not pay for their licenses at all and that others operated without licenses; and I know that the Department last year, and the year previous was owed thousands of dollars royalty on the output of mills. I think that this matter is of such importance as to receive the serious consideration of the Minister and of the Government. Certain laws have been eliminated from the Statutes because they were unwork-

able, and the one I am referring to this afternoon is also unworkable at the present time. Whether you have the machinery or not to enforce this Act, I do not know; but there are scores of mill men who cannot conform to this Act. They found it impossible to pay a royalty during the years of depression. Some of them are operating now with very little returns, but they find it a great hardship to have this tax hanging over their heads, and the Department of Agriculture will never be able to collect outstanding bills. You cannot collect when the mill men have no money. As I previously stated, when this Act was passed conditions were altogether different from what obtains at the present time in the operation of saw mills on Crown lands. I merely draw the attention of the Government to this matter, and before the session closes I trust you will see the advisability of repealing that section of the Act, with regard to the $1.00 per thousand feet royalty. In connection with this matter also I am told that in 1912 the freight on a car load of timber from Heart's Desire to St. John's was $13.-75; to-day it is $24.75. The best offer a man can get for a car load of lumber is from $40 to $45, and the man who cuts the timber and loads it on the car gets $15 for his work. I am sure the Minister knows that what I am saying is perfectly correct, and I trust he will use his influence with the Government to eliminate the payment of the $1.00 per thousand Royalty.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—Mr. Chairman, replying to the honorable member who has just sat down, I wish to say that I thoroughly agree with him when he speaks as a man who was himself a Minister of Agriculture & Mines. Perhaps he is more conversant with the Act than I am. I am of the same opinion as he. I think that instead of charging a royalty we could perhaps make the license fee a little greater. What I want to say is that since I have had control of the office what I found was that a large amount of-money was owing by saw mills scattered all over the country. Recently I had a list compiled by the Department, giving the names, locations and amounts due by the owners of saw mills with a view to collecting but we got no response. I was placed in an awkward position and had to hand over the accounts to a firm of solicitors to try and collect the amounts due. I have very little hope of collecting any great amount because the responses that have come to my notice have come from people who have had very little to pay. They have no mills and no lumber. I think a way out may be along the line of eliminating the clause whereby the royalty should be paid. If we have to collect the revenue we could raise the license fee. With regard to the statement of the honourable member as to the mills operating without a license, I have no knowledge of such happening. We have two inspectors, one looking over the northern service, one looking after the southern section. If any case comes under my notice I will have immediate steps taken to have it discontinued.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Chairman, I wish to endorse the remarks made by Mr. Halfyard in connection with the saw mills. I am very glad to hear that the Minister will consider the matter. There is a form of discrimination with regard to the saw mills which makes the Act unpopular, and of course that is to be expected. I know a person in the district of Fogo, Mr. French, and I understand that during the last few years he has paid about five thousand dollars. He told me that up to May two or three years ago other mills operating in the same district had not paid a cent.

that is unfair. It is very discouraging to the man who pays. Then again, if this royalty is not paid for a number of years it will be accumulating all the time. It means that if the Government takes action against the men operating those mills to collect, or if they do try to collect the people generally can't pay. I would say to the Hon. Minister either to strictly enforce the Act or to abolish it altogether. Don't have any discrimination—some paying and others not paying, for it all figures out this way. Anybody who buys lumber pays one dollar per thousand feet more, for the mill owner adds one dollar to the cost of the lumber, and the small owner has to do this in order to get back the royalty he pays. I don't know, Sir, whether this Act is altogether popular. Of course, I don't mean to say that because it is unpopular you should not enforce it; but is it possible to enforce it? I think it is wise for the Minister to seriously consider this matter. I hear that the mill owners owe about thirty thousand dollars, but I don't know whether that is correct or not. I speak subject to correction. While there are a great number of honest mill owners paying up, there are a number of others who have not paid at all. There is another matter of which I would like to remind the Minister. It must be quite apparent that there is a great waste, a very great waste going on in connection with the lumber industry. We must remember that we are in a way a lumbering country and should take steps to conserve our lumber. In a case where certain countries own large timber areas and there is a waste going on, they must be sorely in need of good business men. I refer principally to the cutting of timber in winter when the ground is covered with three or four feet of snow. I have heard from very competent lumbermen and loggers that after the snow goes they find the butts of trees standing up four or five feet. They just chop it off to the edge of the snow. I don't think that would be permitted in other countries. I don't think other countries allow them to cut the lumber while the snow is on the ground. After the snow falls they go and transport their wood, but previous to the snow falling their cutting is done. I understand that the A.N.D. Co. have awakened to that fact themselves. The cutitng of the wood in the winter time is disastrous to our timber. I hope the Minister will consider that and see if he cannot do something to protect our forests against that waste. I want to make my arguments more clearly. Take for instance the cutting of railway ties. The man who cuts the railway ties chops it off and leaves the tops of it in the woods. Even estimating that 100,000 ties are cut down and the tops left to rot in the woods, this would mean a loss of a million feet of lumber at ten dollars a thousand feet that would be a thousand dollars, practically half the value of the ties themselves. This would not be permitted in countries that are trying to preserve the timber, but I think the Government could draw up a law to prevent men from chopipng down wood and leaving the stumps in the woods especially if they were large trees. It not only means a loss of stumpage but it also interferes with the growth of other trees, and besides this is very inflammable and would no doubt cause many of the forest fires. I think that the Minister of Agriculture and Mines is open to suggestions. I think he should seriously consider what I suggest in connection with this timber conservation. I don't think it necessary to go to great expense to enforce the law. I think you have

four camp inspectors and I don't think that all the time is taken up in inspecting camps, so you could form some law that would empower those men to look after the stumpage of timber. I think that those fellows are having a very good time. I understand as regards the camps their coming is heralded many days in advance, and the campers have a very good report prepared for them to assure them that the logging regulations are being carried out, at any rate as far as the food supplies are concerned, and I think that those men would have a little time to spare to inspect stumpage of timber and see that this waste is not going on. Again perhaps it would be possible to have some other department take care of it. Perhaps there would be a good deal more of the royalty collected if we had some one to look after it. The reports are coming in and nobody to see about them, and nobody bothers very much about it. Finally when the bills are sent to those people they pass them over. There is no system to enforce the payment of the royalty. I think if we are going to insist on the royalty you should have some man in charge of it to see that the reports are promptly sent out. I don't see why you should have any trouble, you might try out this suggestion, and I hope that the Minister will seriously conisder it because after all you have got to conserve your timber. In Canada and the States all those things come under the consideration of their Governments. Perhaps they may not be as much up-to-date as we are, but I don't think it would do any harm to take a leaf out of their book.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, what has been said by the member for Fogo, brings to my mind some incidents while I was engaged as logging commissioner. I refer to what he said about cutting the trees to within a foot of the ground. Well, now, both the companies who are engaged in the manufacturing of pulp are endeavouring to do that, and because they are endeavouring to do that they had been compelled to bring in French Canadian lumbermen who have been the subject of so much comment. The Pulp and Paper Co. had to cut the wood while there was no snow on the ground, that is during October and November. At that time it was extremely difficult to get men to leave the fisheries and engage in the logging operations, and they had to get the timber men from the outside. Another point is that the wood is cut about a foot above the ground and that is before the snow comes, and it is then piled and most of the skilled work is then finished, and there is a great deal more work that can be done by ordinary unskilled labour. If the wood is cut in October or November, it always provides a lot of employment for men who are not otherwise skilled at logging. I do not think that it is necessary that the Department make rules and regulations about the matter, because it will work out itself. I merely mention this because there have been some criticism about the introduction of outside men for the cutting of the timber, and I think that this should explain the situation very well.

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 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.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consid-

er the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend Chapter 129 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled Of Crown Lands, Timber, Mines and Minerals.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

M. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

Committee of the Whole on Bill entitled "An Act further to amend Chap. 129 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd series) 'Of Crown Lands, Timbers, Mines and Minerals.'"

HON THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, while we are on this bill this afternoon I would like to offer a few remarks. During the last session of the House, that was the first session of the present Government, we brought up the matter of selling timber now in this country by public auction and thereby getting as much money as possible out of it for the Government. It has always been the custom when there was a good timber property open for a large number of people to make application for the area. It has been the custom for the Government to give it to some ardent supporter of theirs and he would pay some small fee for it, and then endeavour to sell it to some corporation and make a large sum of money on it. Sometimes they ask too much and the company or corporation is prevented from investing and so starting the pulp mill or saw mill as the case may be. At the last session I say, we brought this matter up and the explanation was that according to the act the Government could not sell by public auction. And we understood from the Prime Minister that he was going to bring in a bill before the close of last session to amend the act, so that the Government might be able to sell lands by public auction and to the highest bidder. I mentioned this matter before during the session, and the Minister of Justice, I think it was, gave the explanation that the Government could place any bonus which they should deem suitable for the lands in question, but that they were not able to sell them by public auction. He told us that during the past year the Government has disposed of some land for more than is usually receivd for it. I do not know what exactly the amount was. I hope the Hon. Minister will not have any objection to telling me. What I want to point out is that the act should be amended so that the Government can sell the land for the highest sum that it can get for it.

MINISTER OF MINES AND AGRICULTURE—In reply, Mr. Chairman, to the Hon. Member I beg to say that it is a pity that some member like him, or even himself, did not some years ago bring up this matter of the Crown Lands Act. If the Hon. Leader of the Opposition will take a map of Newfoundland at the present time it will not take him very long to find out that there is a very small amount of timber left for the disposal of the Newfoundland Government. Practically all the timber in Newfoundland has been licensed to somebody. With regard to the amendment that was to be brought in by the Prime Minister last year, I do not remember it. Perhaps the Leader of the Opposition does. With regard to the piece of land that has been disposed by the bonus system since this Government came into power I may say that it is a piece of land situated down in Bonavista Bay near Gander Bay. There were a number of applicants who were looking for it. They were all prominent politicians. The Government decided to dispose of it to the party which was doing some development in Gander Bay. The sale was made to the Gander River Pulp and Timber Co. The price was $45,800. The department received the cheque for this and it was handed over to Sir John Crosbie to the credit of the Treasury. That is the only

piece of land that has been sold by the Government since it assumed office. With regard to the licenses for the Labrador I am sure that the Government would hesitate before giving any license for any part of the Labrador whilst this area is being negotiated for between the Newfoundland Government and the Government of Quebec.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, I am glad to have the explanation of the Hon. Minister. But he says that at the present time that there are not so many properties available. But I understand that there are a great number of expired leases on the Labrador. I feel that if the Government had been able to sell this piece of land by public auction they would have got a great deal more for it. Even more than the $45,800. But they are not in a position to do this. It is the idea of this side of the House that the Act should be amended so that the Government would be in a better position to handle these cases. If they had a supporter who wanted a certain piece of land they would be able to tell him then, that the land was to be put up for public auction and he could have his bid for it and buy if he wished.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES—Mr. Chairman, with regard to expired leases on the Labrador I feel sure that the Leader of the Opposition will agree with me that it would not be a very judicious undertaking to grant leases or any other titles for land on the Labrador at the present time while the Government has negotiations with the Government of Quebec for the disposal of the Labrador. But I am a layman and do not know very much about the matter. Perhaps the Attorney General might be able to deal with the aspect of the matter better than I could.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, the Government can not sell lands by public auction, and it was the idea of the Opposition to have this act amended so that they could do it if they wished. Then if the Government had a supporter or a number of supporters who wanted to get a certain piece of land they could tell him or them that the land would be put up for public auction and he or them could have it if they were prepared to pay the price. That would be a fair course to adopt. In a great number of cases holders of licenses have not complied with the act as it stands. That being the case if the Government were to enforce the law a great number of these licenses would lapse, and the lands would come back to the Government, and then if we had the amendment passed the lands could be disposed of by public auction to the best advantage of the people of Newfoundland.

HON. THE ATTORNEY GENERAL—Mr. Chairman, just a word in connection with this bill. There seems to be no difference of opinion as to the policy of getting what revenue we possibly can out of Crown lands. Unfortunately our friends on the opposite side of the House, or those of them who were in recent Governments, assisted in the disposal of certain lands, and not either upon increased bonus, nor by public auction.

The actual fact to-day is that what land is left ungranted in Newfoundland amounts to very little. The position is that, whilst in fact the Act does not provide for sales by public auction, in effect the same result is obtained. The Crown Lands Act provides for a minimum rate, but the Governor in Council can fix the bonus at what rate he likes.

Without reflecting on any Government, the first time that anything but the minimum rate was obtained was on a transaction that occurred recently. Under the practice that had prevailed up to this, the Colony would have got something like eight hundred dollars; but when the parties in-

terested in the Gander proposition came forward, they were accompanied by about twenty-five or thirty land sharks, who were applying for this land purely for the purposes of speculation. The position was to assist this enterprise. It was represented that this particular section was important to be included in the general scheme to be laid before the financiers. Still the Government decided that, much and all as it would like to follow the practice that preceeded up to now, and grant this land after the method in which it had been granted, to the parties interested in the Gander River project it felt that, in view of the attitude not only that the leader of the Opposition had taken, but also that which the leader of the House had taken last session, this granting of land should cease; and so it is that this grant which has taken place since this administration came into power is a grant under which the Government and the Colony will receive forty-five thousand dollars, as compared to eight hundred. Without referring at all to the cause which brought about that action, it will be agreed that this is a step in the direction that everyone has been recommending.

As to the second point: the wisdom or otherwise amending the Crown Lands Act, it is not for me to say now. The unfortunate situation is that what we have left to auction does not make very much difference to this country. It is too bad that this practice was not brought into force years ago. As to the point that has been raised here respecting Labrador, and the lands in that territory on which the rents have not been paid, there are two points to bear in mind, and I speak, of course, purely from the attitude of one who would view it from the legal point of view.

It seems all very well to say that these people whose rents are in arrears have no legal rights. On the face of it, that looks a very strong position for the Government to take. I do not say that these people have any legal rights, but I do not go on and say that my opinion may not possibly be tested by these parties, who claim, apart altogether from any moral rights that they have got, that they have certain rights beyond moral rights; they have refused to pay us rentals, because we have refused to give them a good title. They had been paying these rentals, but they took the position that they would decline to pay further rentals, because we declined to accept their representations, and give them a good title. I do not say that the position is any more than a moral one, but it is a very strong moral position, and I would not like to be the one to undertake to say that the wise course for the Government to-day would be to start in cancelling the grants of these territories.

It would also be very unwise for this reason. The present negotiations might result in some form of agreement that might be submitted to this Legislature; but in a country like ours, once we start to cancel rights that people have got or claim to have got, we do not know what trouble is going to be started. Supposing the Canadian Government should put forward a proposition that would be sufficiently commendable to recommend to this House, and one which this House would accept, one of the first conditions that has certainly got to be contained it it is a provision for the protection of this country and the Government from any obligations under the timber holdings down there, either licensed holdings paid in full, or licensed holdings the rents on which have fallen into arrears.

I think that to come to a public decision here in the House of Assembly as to what attitude the Government is going to take with regard to the areas on the Labrador would not be possible

As regards the amendment to the Crown Lands Act, an amendment would certainly be necessary to give the Government power to call public auctions for the sale of lands. Under our present system to-day, if twenty men apply for the same area, the Governor in Council, under the Crown Lands Act, has power to fix the bonus rate. The Governor, in council under the Act to-day, in my judgment has got pretty extensive powers. The point still remains as far as what we call public auctions go, I think that the Act would need to be amended to give the Government that power.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, there are one or two things that I would like to say with regard to lands on the Labrador. Apart from the fact that negotiations are going on which may or may not result in a settlement, the mere fact that the lands are in dispute precludes the Government from selling them, and in any case, who is going to buy them if the Government cannot give a good title?

The Canadian Government and the Government of Quebec have already protested against the Government of Newfoundland selling or disposing of any further areas down on Labrador, and I would refer the Minister of Justice and the Prime Minister, in case they have not seen the record, to the reply to the Colonial Secretary dated May 5th, 1911, when Sir Ralph Williams was Governor.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Yes, I have seen that.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, I am very glad that I brought this subject up, because we get so much information in that way. Perhaps the Minister of Justice will be able to give me a little more information. Are there any persons holding timber properties on Labrador who have paid their rentals up to date?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Yes, there are.

MR. HICKMAN—And others who have not?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Yes.

MR. HICKMAN—And do you mean to say that those who have not paid are in just as good a position as those who have paid.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I did not go so far as that. I said that I would not like to undertake to say that the people who have not paid their rents have no rights. They certainly are not in as good a position as the men who have paid up.

MR. HICKMAN—The Minister refers to the present machinery as being inadequate to sell the lands by public auction on account of the Crown Lands Act, but he says that if lands are disposed of in the proper way they will get sufficient price. But the Minister must remember now that by leaving the Act as it is at present, future Governments will be able to carry on as Governments have in the past.

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 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.

SECOND READING OF THE HIGHROADS BILL.

HON. THE COL. SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, in rising to propose the second reading of this Bill, I would crave the indulgence of the House for a short time to consider some of its features.

It might be claimed that the Bill is somewhat revolutionary in character, because it is the first time, I think, in the history of Newfoundland that an attempt has been made to go outside of the beaten track in the

way of looking after our highways, except the excellent work which has been done by the Road Commission.

The Bill that is before us to-day is one that has for its subject a very long step in the way of improvement of the roads and highways in this country, and it is part of a programme that has been adopted by the present administration; a programme that is comprehensive in character; a programme that, if worked out, will, I believe, have on the affairs of this country very far reaching results for good.

This might be claimed to be the first step in the inauguration of the tourist policy of the present administration. Heretofore we have not made any effort, we have not endeavoured to attract the large number of people that come around yearly looking for some place of recreation, some places as health resorts, some places that have attractions that many people cannot find in their own environment. This country with a wonderful reputation as one abounding in natural resources and with scenery second to none, has laid outside the track of the tourist invasion from the outside world which many other countries are experiencing at the present time. We have heard and read a lot about the tourist policy of other places and can easily appreciate the efforts they are making to attract the large numbers of the leisured classes who have plenty of money and are ready to spend it on their amusement and comforts. The Atlantic to-day is the highway of a fleet of large and magnificiently equipped steamers plying from America to Europe with huge numbers of tourists, and the countries of the Old World are receiving the flow of gold which these people bring with them. We are right in the track of this traffic, and we have unsurpassed possibilities in the way of attractions, but they have never been utilized to the advantage of our people.

The tourist industry, if I may so term it, is a source of revenue to the United States, and it has extended to Canada, because though formerly the motor car was a luxury, it is now a necessity and the millions who own them in America cross over the border to enjoy the advantages of the neighbouring country.

And this has become so general at the present time that the man who a few years ago made the trip because he had a limousine, has now been forced to go further afield for his enjoyment, and the smaller man with the flivver is taking his place. These people are now coming down in their hundreds to Nova Scotia and the Eastern Provinces and their gold is keeping up the people of the communities which they visit. But there is no part of Nova Scotia or America that has the attractions which Newfoundland possesses. And what have we been doing. Shutting our eyes and leaving the people of other countries to do everything they can to develop their resources while we do nothing towards obtaining the revenue which we should derive from our God-sent advantages. It it true that we cannot expect tourists to come here unless we are prepared to properly house them.

The average tourist—and I have no hesitation of disparaging those who come here from time to time on the Red Cross and other boats—is not of the moneyed class, but generally from the ranks of the working people and come here for a short holiday, taking advantage of the cheap trip. But the tourist we want is the one with unlimited means and who is prepared to spend his money and not go away after a day or two, but stay here for the whole summer, and by his spending help the people—or the Government, if you will have it so,—to turn into revenue the attractions with

which our country has been so abundantly blessed. Now it has been said that the first step necessary for the attraction of tourists is the building of a hotel or series of hotels, but while I agree with the contention that hotels are needed, they are not the first thing. It is no use to have a hotel in which these people may sit in comfort or in which they may have every convenience and take their meals at their leisure and with satisfaction or sleep in comfortable beds. They must be able to go abroad in the country and see the attractions. A hotel—no matter how up to date—is no novelty to the moneyed tourist as he has been seeing them every day in his own country. What he wants is to go out and get the benefit of the air and see the attractions we offer. And I say the whole foundation of the enterprise is good roads, properly constructed, and of such a character as to suit those who, perhaps, are more particular than ourselves in this respect.

Of course some will say in this connection that the Monroe Government is spending money for the benefit of only the Americans and the wealthy classes, so that these may travel in comfort, but I may state that we have another object in view in this matter, and that is to get the gold which the tourists will spend from the day of their arrival till the day of their departure and thus prove to be revenue producers. It is true we may not have a tourist traffic next year that will be very appreciable, but I am convinced that in four or five years we can build up one that will astound every member who is in this House this evening. We already have the attractions and we want only a few essentials to minister to these people who desire comforts. They will not travel in cattle boats as they have the money to journey in luxury, and other countries are putting the best steamers available at their disposal. The Government in building the new boat to ply between Port aux Basques and North Sydney is taking an initial step that will prove of great value. She is to be called the Caribou, a significant name, as she will be the forerunner of others, just as the Regiment that bore that name was the forerunner of others in gaining prestige in the war. On the West Coast we have unsurpassed natural attractions—salmon and trout streams without number, lakes and streams and a most beautiful coastline. The vicinity of the Humber and Bonne Bay is not surpassed in scenic beauty by any part of the old world or new. Are all these natural assets to remain unproductive? No,—we are in the tourist business and have every confidence that every dollar we spend in fostering it will be returned by us tenfold, and that people who now may think we are merely spenders will in future years look upon us as the savers of the country financially. How could we get along to-day if we had to depend solely on the fish that we get from the sea? Half of our people would not be able to live at all, but for the mines and other resources which have been developed. We have even now come to the point where with all our other revenue producing enterprises we are up against it still, and I feel sure that when the accounts of the country are produced in this House by the Hon. the Minister of Finance they will show that we have got to have other sources of revenue to help us out in the present and future. I crave the indulgence of the House in referring at length to this Bill, and hope that it will receive the fair consideration of the members on both sides. This Bill is somewhat revolutionary as it means the replacing of a body of men that I have the highest admiration for. I refer to the Road Commission who have done great work with the facilities at their disposal, especially in connection with

the improvement of the roads around Conception Bay and the Southern Shore. I can look back to the time when the roads in these sections were in a very bad condition, but to-day they are practically boulevards. The work was done by these men, who volunteered to do it, and they did it well. They are worthy of every commendation. While I regret the passing of the Commission, it cannot be expected that these gentlemen can devote their time to such a far-reaching project as we have in view at the present time. Not alone in Conception Bay, Placentia Bay, and along the Southern Shore have the roads to be improved, but we have to develop the West Coast also. The highways about Conception Bay will of course be given consideration first as St. John's will be the centre at which we will attempt to provide accommodation in the beginning.

Well let us try the roads. I might say, though, that these roads are not all going to be built this year, or next year, or the year after. This policy will have to go down through a series of years and the work will be in charge of the Government Engineer, a man who we are all glad to know is available to undertake this very important work. Everybody knows of Mr. Hall's ability as an Engineer and it is fortunate for us that his services are now available because of the change of ownership of the railway. The railway is now a public institution and does not require the services of a Government Engineer. When the railway was under the management of the Reid Newfoundland Company Mr. Hall's duties were confined to inspecting the building of bridges, culverts, tracks, and everything appertaining to the railroad was done under Mr. Hall's direct supervision, and he was responsible to the Government and had to see that the Reid Newfoundland Company kept up to their contract. Under present conditions, Mr. Joyce is the Government Engineer as far as the railroad is concerned. So I say it is fortunate to have the services of Mr. Hall, who will be in charge of this highway project and under his personal direction the whole thing will be carried on. We have ample evidence of Mr. Hall's ability with regard to the building of bridges all over the country. If one wishes to call at my office or the office of the Prime Minister to-morrow morning, he will see for himself pictures of some fifteen or twenty bridges that were constructed by Mr. Hall within the past few years—a credit to the country, a credit to himself and an ornament to the roads with which they are connected.

This afternoon the honourable member for Trinity, Mr. Halfyard, presented a petition from Rev. Canon Smart and others of Heart's Content and he alluded very graphically to the possibilities and attractions of that particular part of the country. The barrens in that particular place do not contain much scenery it is true, but, as stated by the Rev. Canon Smart, it has its other attractions, such as game and fish, etc. What is true of that part of the country is true of almost every yard from here to Port aux Basques.

Those who will compose the Commission I have referred to will, I feel sure, be qualified to act on that Commission. Nobody will be put on that commission for the sake of political expediency. Mr. Hall will be the Chief Commissioner and three other Commissioners will be appointed to act under him. The powers of the Commission are far-reaching. They will have the right to go on with any highway that they may so designate after the Governor-inCouncil has approved of it. They will have the right to take charge of that highway and build it according to the plans that have been laid down. They will have the right to stop traffic, on that high-

way and they will have the right to acquire property and plant trees and divert streams and go through private property, and go through towns, although they may have Municipal Government, acquire towns, and build highways and in co-operation with the Municipality, develop the roads as they go through in conformity with Municipal Regulations, providing they do not clash with the Regulations of the Commission.

The appointments under this Commission will be for two years. All appointments will lapse after two years; but any member or members of the Commission can be re-appointed. I think this is a very wise precaution, because a man may be appointed to-morrow and in a year's time he may show his unfitness. Well, the Governor-in-Council has the right to remove him and put some other man in his place or have the right to re-appoint him. Hence I say it is not alone a very wise precaution ,but it is a very essential one for the proper carrying out of the work. Also this Commission will not be an unpaid Commission. It is not anticipated that work of this kind, which will require a great deal of care, time and attention should be undertaken by those who will serve on this Commission without some remuneration for their services. I am glad to see this provision in this Bill. Whilst we have had many instances of the self-sacrifice of private citizens and whilst in those particular cases that I have referred to the Road Commission gave their services gratuitously, yet at the same time we cannot except citizens to engage in work of such an important character as that which we have in view, without being paid for it. You may get a man to act on that Commission who may be the most efficient man possible, but who is debarred because he cannot afford to give his time gratitously. Therefore, I say it is right and proper for the men serving on a Commission of this kind to be remunerated for their services.

I think the general principle of the Bill will be accepted by all sides of the House. I do not say it is a perfect Bill. I dare say that it may need additions and alterations; but I commend it to the House because of the spirit in which the Government have taken up this matter.

I, therefore, move the second reading of the Bill.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Colonial Secretary, the Bill entitled "An Act to Provide for the Construction Reconstruction and Maintenance of Highroads" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY —Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the War Pensions Act, 1922."

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Cap. 3 Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (3rd Series) entitled 'Of the Election of Members to the House of Assembly."

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, March 5th, 1925.

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

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of St. Joseph's, Admiral's Beach and other parts of St. Mary's Bay for the

extension of the telephone from St. Joseph's to Admiral's Beach. The petition is signed by Rev. Father Enright, the parish priest, and one hundred and seventy-eight electors of that section. It is unnecessary for me to point out the immense benefit that would arise by the erection of this office. The amount involved would not be very much and I give this petition my hearty support. I understand that the Minister of the Department of Posts & Telegraphs is inaugurating a new system under which many of the offices which are telegraph offices and which hardly pay for their upkeep will be transformed into telephone offices which will be very much cheaper. I hope that now that this arrangement is being made that this very important office will be opened.

MR. SINNOTT—Mr. Speaker, I have very much pleasure in supporting the petition of my hon. colleague for the granting of this concession.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Burnt Point, Gull Island and Long Beach, in the district of Bay de Verde, for the allocation of a sum of money for the opening of a road to some timber. The timber in this locality is very valuable and the people are in the habit of cutting firewood there. I know that this road would be a very great assistance as it would open up some agricultural land to the people of the district. The petition is signed by every man in the three settlements named. I have very much pleasure in supporting the petition and I would like to have it referred to the Department of Public Works.

HON. MR. CRAMM—Mr. Speaker, I have very much pleasure in supporting the petition of my hon. colleague for the allocation of this sum of money for the people of these places.

MR. CAHILL—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Bacon Cove, in the district of Harbour Main, on the subject of a new road. This road would be a great benefit to the residents of the place and I give the petition my hearty support.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Lance Cove, Bell Island, in the district of St. John's East. They ask for the allocation of a special grant for the improvement of the main road. This is the only means of acccess that the people of this district have to the mines, where they work, and the places of business and to the churches. The allocation at the present time is divided up between the two councils, one on the front of the island and one at the back. In referring the petition to the Department of Public Works I would ask that if there are any special allocations possible this year that they might endeavour to grant the request here made. The petition is largely signed and I give it my hearty support.

HON THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay on the table of the House the Auditor General's Report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925. I beg leave also to lay on the table of the House the Public Accounts. I beg to draw the attention of the Clerk of the House that this book is not to leave this House. The Public Accounts for 1922 have been lost and I have been told by the Deputy Minister that they were sent up here and stolen, and the result is that we are without the 1922 accounts to-day.

(2) MR. HICKMAN asked Hon. the Prime Minister when he purposes opening St. John's East for bye-election to fill the vacancy made by the appointment of Mr. N. Vinicombe to the Board of Liquor Control.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The Government up to the present time has not considered the question of the opening of the district of St. John's East for bye-election to fill the vacancy

made by the resignation of Mr. N. J. Vinicombe. When it is the intention to do so a proclamation will be issued in due course.

(3) MR. WARREN asked Hon. the Prime Minister what progress has been made with the proposition to make Mortier Bay an open port and how the matter now stands.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Up to the present time very little progress has been made in this proposition for making Mortier Bay an open port. Colonel Peel and the High Commissioner went up to the States to raise the sum of money necessary in connection with it and I understand that they were not very successful. They were rather disappointed at the reception that the proposition got.

(4) MR. ASHBOURNE asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay upon the Table of the House a copy of all correspondence between the Executive Government and the Fisheries Board, relating to the Report of J. Allen Taylor, of Fleetwood and his recommendations.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker, in reply to the question of the honourable member, I may say that I will have the reply to that some time during the next week. I have been very busy during the last three or four days because the sealers have been around. If the honourable member would like to come down to the Department he can get any information which he may require from the books.

(5) MR. HALFYARD asked Hon. the Colonial Secretary to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing in detail the cost to the Colony of the services of the S.S. Malakoff for Trinity and Bonavista Bay services for the year 1923; also the cost of the Malakoff's services for the year 1924. Give the earnings of the Malakoff for the years 1923 and 1924 respectively.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, I may say that the information will take a little time to prepare. The railway department has been instructed to forward it as quickly as possible, and I hope to have it here in a few days.

(6) MR. HALFYARD asked Hon. the Colonial Secretary to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing the cost of repairing the Government wharf at Port Blandford to make it suitable as a railway terminus for the S.S. Malakoff.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, in reply to that question, I hope to have that information here this afternoon.

(7) MR. DUFF asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the cost of repairs to wharf at Freshwater, B.D.V., in 1924; names of men employed and amounts paid to each, as well as cost of timber and material; also to state on whose property this public money and material was disbursed.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker, I may say that the same answer applies to that question as to the previous one which I answered this afternoon. I hope to be able to answer it early next week.

Hon. the Minister of Justice gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 52 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Egress from Churches, Theatres and other Buildings.'"

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Income Tax Act, 1922" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Col-

onial Secretary, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the War Pensions Act, 1922" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 3 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (Third Series) entitled "Of the Election of Members of the House of Assembly" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 25 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Light Dues," was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Agriculture & Mines, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Cap. 24 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Payment of Certain Fees and Charges by Stamps," was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Agriculture & Mines, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 134 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Operation of Saw Mills,'" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Agriculture & Mines, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend Chapter 129 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Crown Lands, Timber, Mines & Minerals," was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Colonial Secretary the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Provide for the Construction, Reconstruction and Maintenance of Highroads."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I wish to make one or two observations on this Bill now before the Chair. The Bill is said to be one of the most important that has been brought before the House during this session, and it covers very extensively several public utilities, and entails the expenditure of large sums of money in this country. Therefore, it is broad enough and inclusive enough to permit of almost any remark on the general policy of the Government in spending money on roads, bridges, tourist traffic, hotels and such like.

Mr. Chairman, I may be permitted to remark casually that we are getting back to the "good old times" of presenting petitions. I am sure that every member of both sides of the House must be reminded of the time when a member representing a northern constituency was credited with bringing along every session a Saratoga trunk full of petitions. It is only the ordinary thing for members of the Opposition to present petitions, pray-

ing the Government to do certain things, but when members of the Government get up and pray to themselves it must appear extremely ridiculous to those who witness this proceeding. Be that as it may, it gives the members of the Government an opportunity to hear themselves speaking; and I wish they would take the same interest in Bills that come before the House. Now, last year a Loan Bill was passed, which included for building roads and highways, two million dollars. At that time I opposed the borrowing of money for that purpose, and nothing has transpired since to chance my opinion. We know as a House and as a people that we are apparently, or figuratively getting our heads below water financially and industrially. In common with other parts of the world, money had to be found here, and in some countries millions had to be found, and have to be found at the present time, to provide food and clothing for the unemployed. Now, unemployment is more acute in the city than in the outports; and it is an object lesson to us as to what would happen if the rest of the country were like St. John's.

Of course, we will be told that during our term of office some millions of dollars were wasted, and that we thew out money regardless of getting returns or value for it.

I thiuk we will all admit that in 1920, money was spent on current account. We did not have to borrow money. There was a large surplus, and quite a large amount of money spent on repairing the Railway, and on the maintenance of the Railway; the terminus at Argentia was completed, and it is generally conceded that money had to be spent. Then during the years of depression, millions of dollars were spent on the roads up country—the Deer Lake Road and the Badger Road. Possibly if the same conditions obtained today, money would have to be spent in a similar way. It was proposed that the Railways should be built to Bonne Bay. That was one of the schemes advocated by Lord Morris in 1910, and a survey had been made to build the Railway up there, and they were talking about a road to Hall's Bay to tap the large Bay of Notre Dame. It was not feasible to build a Railway to Bonne Bay. Our experience with branch Railways led the Governnient to abandon the idea of building and more money had to be spent to provide the people with the necessaries of life, and employment had to be found during the fishing season. For these, and for various other reasons the money was not spent in the districts where the people resided (not in every district) but it was thought that only the needy, and those who could not get to the fishery would go up country, as some person remarked at the time, to be eaten up with flies. It was no picnic, whether the men worked or not.

Anyhow, it is quite unnecessary to recall the happenings of 1922 and 1923, but I just mention this, Mr. Chairman, because I anticipate in the course of the debate on this Bill by the members on the Government side it will be stated that money was wasted by the outgoing Government during these years. The same, no doubt, will be said about the present Government in two or three years time, in reference to the money they are spending now on poor relief, for which they are getting no returns.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Why anticipate? No one has said that any money was wasted by the outgoing Government. Surely you do not think that anybody here would say anything like that. You do not think that I would suggest that the outgoing Government would waste any money. I have no intention of saying any such thing.

MR. HALFYARD—Of course no such suggestion has ever been made.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—But you said that we were going to say it. I am not going to say it.

MR. HALFYARD—It has been said since the House opened this session. It is a stock phrase that you use when you have nothing better to say.

Mr. Chairman, this Bill is brought in to provide machinery for the spending of large sums of money on public highways' and the question is now whether we can afford to embark on such an undertaking. It is speculative and questionable. It is a problem nobody in this House or outside can tell whether you will get proper returns for the spending of large sums of money on roads in this country. It is said that by repairing the highways and building new roads, we will induce tourists to come into this country—wealthy men, who may bring their motor cars with them to tour over the barrens and beauty spots of Newfoundland. Are there no beauty spots anywhere except in Newfoundland? The climate in Canada and the United States is just as good as it is here in Newfoundland, in certain seasons of the year.

MR. BROWNE—It cannot be any better there than it is here now.

MR. HALFYARD—No! You are quite correct. I was reminded of that while coming down to the House, and wondered if the opening of the House had anything to do with the weather, because whenever the House is in session, be it August or March, we have summer weather. It is thought by the building of roads fit to drive cars over, and linking up the different communities, that the wealthy will be induced to come here and spend a lot of money. Well, possibly something like that will happen, but it will not be very soon. The people who will come here, in my opinion, are those who will do so for the fishing and shooting and not for the scenery and climate. It is the sportsman who comes here—the one fond of fishing and shooting—but he will not come here now for shooting, as we have a three years' close season on caribou. My opinion is that even if tourists do cross to Port aux Basques they will not cross the country to St. John's to sleep in a good hotel, as they have that where they left, but will stop off along the line. The majority of the tourists coming here will not be well-to-do, but will be like a great many Newfoundlanders who take a trip to some other country. They will first count the cost, consider ways and means, and look out for the place where they can best enjoy themselves at the least cost. They will be like the round trippers who, it is said, are not of the well-to-do class but who try to get away from the heat of the cities and enjoy the trip on the water. They come here from New York, Boston, or other parts of the States, remain a few days, buy a few curios and go back again. It will make no difference to these whether we have good roads or not, as they could not afford to drive over them. I do not think this is the time for the country to undertake such a project as road-building, the returns from which are so problematical, although the expenditure will be very large; every member of this House should give that point his most serious consideration. The natural sun is shining and the sun of prosperity peeps out from the clouds, but we do not know how soon it will be hidden from view again. There is nothing certain about the returns that we get from the fishing industry—there is nothing more uncertain as to the quantity we will catch, and we all know that the price we may obtain is very uncertain. I know that the Hon. the Prime Minister, who is a business man, will appreciate that statement that there is nothing so uncertain as the fishery. We think in October that we will get a certain price in January or February, and we buy accordingly. When

the time comes we find calculations were all astray; and that is what is happening at the present time. It is a question whether those who paid high prices last fall will come out on the right side when the fish is marketed, and the general opinion is that the merchants will not realize the prices expected and get that encouragement which they should for the prosecution of next season's voyage. I mention this as we are borrowing two millions to spend on roads; can we afford to borrow money for this purpose now? We do not know what the condition of the country will be in eight or nine months from now.

Some say that this year the fishery will be prosecuted by hundreds, or even thousands, more than last year, and if the catch should be in proportion to the number of catchers, the catch will be large, and the price of fish will likely decline. The cost of outfitting is no less than it was last year, or 1922-1923, and that is what the fishermen are up against. It is not altogether the price that will be paid for fish but the cost of outfit, and I do not think they will be any better off in this respect now than they were then. The cost of all staple articles has increased, except sugar, which is a little lower; but flour and meats are away up, and supposing that conditions are not what we hope for next October or November, where are we to find avenues of employment for those who may make a poor voyage to provide for themselves and families. You may say we are going to spend a lot of money on roads, but these will not be built by the fishermen; to build roads properly you must build them in the summer, when the men are trying to catch fish. In October you have to give up road construction, therefore you will not help the fishermen in that direction. If we had a surplus of revenues, perhaps it would be all right to spend some of it on road-building; and as a matter of fact we must spend a lot of money on the roads we already have. We all know that in every district, especially where there are any motor cars, the gravel has been worn off the surface and nothing is left but the roadbeds, particularly where there is a lot of traffic. I know several places in Trinity District where money should be found for repairs. A road was spoken of in a petition yesterday—the road between Carbonear and Heart's Content, which needs repairs. There is no need to appoint a highly paid commission to repair this road; there is no road-building paraphernalia, such as referred to in this Bill, needed to put this road in order. As a matter of fact there is no need of this commission at all; we have one now which can spend the money as wisely as a commission of three appointed by this House. These are men who have worked faithfully and well without remuneration. The Road Commission which has done such good work is to be discontinued. Even if you go ahead with this road-building scheme and spend large sums of money, there would be no need of a commission outside the one you have. They built the road from here to Harbor Main, which has been referred to as a boulevard, and have been eulogized for what they have accomplished. There is no mystery in building a road, there are scores of men here who can give you the theory of the thing, and tell you all about the material needed, what is to be laid down first, how drainage is to be planned, and the degree of curvatures, etc., and how the material is to be laid down first, second, third and lastly. It only needs ordinary intelligence to see that that is done. You have a man in Kelligrews, Mr. Joe Dawe, who was the foreman in building the Topsail Road, and I do not suppose you could get a better man. Now when we hear so much about scientific road-making one would imagine that it was almost ne-

cessary to have a chemical analysis made of certain roads and that certain doses were to be administered in the holes found in the road. Talk about " the trappings of an elephant on the back of a cat". The Government is simply copying something we get from the Provincial Legislatures of Canada, where they have a population of about a million people, and with half a dozen towns each with a population equal to the whole of Newfoundland; besides Canada is in close touch with the United States, and people in the States have motor cars to bring them to Canada one day and return the next day, dropping off at hotels at Montreal when they come and stay over night. We think that because they made a lot of money up there through the tourist traffic that we are going to get rich quick by building roads for those who are to come across from the States to get to a fishing pool. I suppose the ordinary sportsman is not a jelly fish. When he goes out for a day's sport he does not mind roughing it a bit because it is a change for him. Take a man living in an atmosphere that may not be regarded as altogether healthy. Is it because that man has been working under certain conditions that he cannot spend a night in the woods or a week in a camp? He takes it as his choice and for the good of his health, that is, any man who is any kind of a sportsman. Any man coming here from abroad can get his luggage carried to the fishing pool if he is not strong enough to carry it himself. No man coming to this country to take in our scenic beauties and to engage in fishing wants to be provided with a luxurious limousine to take him to a fishing pool. I am reminded of something I saw in a paper in which a certain plenipotentiary who visited a strange country and the officials there were so anxious to show their appreciation of his visit that flunkeys were engaged sweeping the ground from his car to the hotel, and the plenipotentiary made the remark that he did not think he was a "blooming curling stone".

Mr. Chairman, I am quite serious in my objections to this House assuming a liability for a loan of two million dollars at this time to build roads for tourists. It is unwise, and I fear that we shall have to realise that it is unpatriotic and is not in the best interests of the country. I cannot speak too strongly on this matter because I think it is a wild goose chase. It is not altogether the initial expense of two million dollars that I object to most, but you are assuming a liability for all time, because five per cent. interest on two million dollars is $100,000, and if you build those roads for two millions they will cost at least another $200,000 per year for upkeep and maintenance. Therefore you will assume for all time, in addition to the initial outlay, liability of over three hundred thousand dollars. If, as I have already said, we had surplus revenues, then it might be alright for us to take on such a venture, but I do not know if we shall be in any better position financially this time next year than we are now. We cannot get money to repair the roads and bridges in Trinity district. There are bridges that have rotted away as the result of natural decay. I have appealed to the different departments and to the Executive Government and I cannot get $100.00, not to talk of two millions, to meet present pressing necessities for our own people—the producers of the country. We are asked to vote away two million dollars to bring outside people here in the hope of getting something from them when we cannot provide the proper means for travel for our own people who have to prosecute their undertakings with regard to the fisheries and agriculture. I know this does not apply to every district. I have a question on the Order Paper ever since Feb-

ruary 23rd asking for the amount of money spent in Bonavista District by the Public Works Department, and I cannot get a reply. The Minister of Public Works promised me one day that he would furnish the information the next; but the next day he is absent. Now the Department has prepared a reply to that question and still I am not afforded the courtesy of having that laid on the table of the House. I do not know the reason why. I might say that two days after I asked a question of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries concerning his department he had the information tabled for me; but not so with the Minister of Public Works.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—How do you know that the answer has been prepared?

MR. HALFYARD—I know that the answer to my question has been prepared. The Minister promised to supply it to-day, but I see he is not in his place in the House to-day. He also said yesterday that he had part of it answered and that he would have the whole of it ready to-day; but I am satisfied to take what is ready now and to wait for the rest of the answer. The Minister said that he would not give the list of moneys sent out because no returns were in. That, in my opinion, is only camouflage because you will always find it difficult to get returns in for money sent out. I find also that the amount of money allocated from the Department of Marine and Fisheries from June 1924 to date is over $8,000.00 as against $1,600.00 sent to Trinity District for the same period. It savours of discrimination. The necessity for spending money in Trinity District was just as great as in Bonavista District.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—It is only history repeating itself. Bonavista got more than Trinity did under the late Government too. They got forty odd thousand dollars for the town site.

MR. HALFYARD—I am not talking of harbour improvements; I am talking of the ordinary allocations.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I did not think there could be any discrimination practised at that time, and still Bonavista District got a great deal more than Trinity.

MR. HALFYARD—I am not referring to any large undertakings like the harbour site at Bonavista which will cost hundreds of thousands. I am speaking of general allocations. I could give you the names of places where moneys were spent.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—The amount sent to Bonavista for the year 1922-1923 was $87,393.00.

MR. HALFYARD—That is drawing a red herring across the trail.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—There is a lot of caplin across it too.

MR. HALFYARD—We have places in Trinity District at the present time impassable for want of proper bridges and roads and we cannot get money to meet those requirements, still we are bringing in a Bill this year to appoint a commission to spend in prospect $2,000,000 dollars for new roads. What do you intend to do? Do you intend to spend no money on the roads you already have? If you can afford to spend two million dollars on extra roads why cannot you get a few thousand dollars to repair the roads that we have? Perhaps only a few men of the Government know just how things are going, and I would take this opportunity to remind them of what I regard as gross discrimination. It was said by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that every request made by the members for Trinity District was granted, but I beg to differ from the Minister. I differ absolutely in every respect, and I can show correspondence to prove that he was in error when he made such a remark; in fact we could not get any money outside the ordinary vote of twelve or fourteen hundred dollars, and we were not

allowed to allocate that. We were not extended the courtesy to recommend the parties who should get that money to spend. We got sixteen hundred dollars for the year, whereas Bonavista got over eight thousand. Captain Randell and Mr. Godden were not qualified to recommend the spending of sixteen hundred dollars. I interviewed the Minister of Public Works. He said he had made a request to the Government for two thousand dollars for Trinity District, but the Executive had referred the matter back to him for further particulars. I took the matter up with the Acting Prime Minister, Sir John Crosbie, and the particulars were forwarded by the Minister of Public Works to Sir John Crosbie, but no money was forthcoming. In the letter to the Government special mention was made of the bridges at Little Heart's Ease, Chapel Arm, Winterton, Green's Harbour, Harcourt, Bellvue, Thornlea, Chance Cove and other places. At Little Heart's Ease a bridge four hundred feet long had rotted down and horses had to wade through the river. Chapel Arm bridge is also a long bridge, timber for both these bridges had been procured; in fact where the bridges at these places were not actually washed away or rotted down those that still remained were unsafe to pass over. Still we could not get money to have these bridges rebuilt. Requests are continually coming in, but it is useless for us to apply to the Government. I am speaking for my own district. I do not want anything personally. I exhort you to do something for the district at once. The time is passing, the winter is breaking up and it will soon be too late to get timber out of the woods, if you intend to give Trinity District any bridges, act quickly so that the timber can be procured. This is a very important matter and if I did not have this opportunity I intended to move the adjournment of the House to bring it to the attention of the Government as a serious and important question. The Government certainly has the money. They have a balance from the 1922 loan unspent, and a balance from the 1923 loan unspent. When it comes to relief for destitution Trinity District is most unfairly dealt with. There are places in Trinity District where deserving men who cannot provide for themselves, through no fault of their own, would think it a God-send if they had a chance of going into the woods and cutting timber for bridges. Talk about letting people die, they could die for want of the means of transportation and for the means of increasing their earning power by giving them facilities to get from place to place, and they could also die for want of doctors. In some places in Trinity District the system that the Government now have for dealing with sick people there is the risk of having men, women and children die for want of medical assistance. I will give you a case in point, a young man, 23 years old, belonging to Chapel Arm, Trinity Bay. This is an isolated place with regard to communication with the railway, and no relieving officer within miles. The Government was asked to send a doctor, but no doctor was sent. The result was the young man died a fortnight after being taken ill without medical assistance. I would give the Government credit for curtailing the expenditure of money for unnecessary purposes but don't let innocent, deserving people suffer, because you think money was spent unwisely in some cases two or three years ago. The necessity is there, and the machinery should be employed so that people will not suffer when through the action of the Government relief could be afforded them. Mr. Chairman, in connection with the roads, bridges, public utilities, and the destitute sick people of the outports, I trust that the few remarks I have

made will receive the consideration that their importance merits. You are appointing commissions for everything. I think that the Squires Government during the first two or three years of its administration may be regarded as the Government of agents, while the Monroe Government will be regarded as the government of commissions. It cannot do anything without appointing a commission. Mr. Prime Minister, you have referred to the outstanding claims the present Government have to meet that were left unpaid by the outgoing Government. Every new Government is asked to pay outstanding claims or bills that have been refused payment by the preceding Governments, and the Government that succeeds yours will have a similar experience. As a rule the bills are not presented at the time they are contracted. They wait until the House of Assembly is closed, or until the public accounts are tabled. Some of us know how it is done. I would advise the Honorable Prime Minister not to take for granted that there are no bills coming in in connection with these commissions. People do not work for nothing, especially brainy people. If you get work done you will have to pay for it. We have a Commission of Enquiry into the Post Office about the transportation of mails. If it is necessary to have better roads then the Government might spend some of this money to facilitate the transportation of the mails in the outlying districts. But, Mr. Chairman, apparently we are all like a crowd of sheep; we all stampede in the same direction and at the present time the stampede is in the direction of Commissions of Enquiry, and when we have to get a commission we have to get it from Canada. How in the world a Canadian can arrange the Postal system which is needed in Newfoundland I do not know; but a man who knows this Postal system from A to Z, and who has been working at the Post Office all his life is ignored. The question of transportation of mails in Newfoundland is altogether different from that which obtains in Canada and the States. As a rule they can transport mails according to schedule. We can only do that during a few months of the summer, but when steamers and trains are held up you want men like Mr. LeMessurier and Mr. Sam Bradbury who know from experience the best thing to do to meet the special circumstances. But efficiency, honesty and experience do not count. Mr. LeMessurier is not consulted and Mr. Bradbury is disrated and humiliated. What for? The service suffers, but needy, persistent, hungry political heelers take the places of these men. I have no brief for Mr. Bradbury. He has not consulted me, but when I was in the Post Office I found him to be one of the most useful and trustworthy officials, and he was appointed superintendent of mail clerks and transportation of mails, and I understand now that his services are no longer required, and you have to import a man from Canada to run the Post Office. In the Postmaster General's Report of 1918 the following is what the Hon. J. A. Robinson said about Mr. LeMessurier:—"He knows more about the Postal Service of Newfoundland than any man in the Island. He has grown with it from the far off days, when a mail once in three weeks or a month was sufficient during the Winter, and a fortnightly mail from Europe and another from Canada and the States was sufficient for our requirements. There is not a branch of the service, not a Post Office or a Courier's route of which he has not a personal knowledge. Nominally Chief Clerk and Accountant he has been for many years the pivot on which the whole Postal machinery has moved."

Mr. Speaker, conditions were made intolerable for Mr. LeMessurier and he asked to be retired. Then you take a man with absolutely no knowledge of Postal work and make him Deputy Minister of Posts and Telegraphs. The Prime Minister in reply to a question asked by one of the members of the Opposition said that he was sorry to say that there was no person in the Department of Posts and Telegraphs qualified to take the position of Deputy Minister. Well, I suppose we will have a splendid service now that we have two new men there. They must be supermen. I sympathize with the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs that he has been treated in such a way. I know how I would feel myself if I were the political head of that Department. Nobody expects the political head to know the workings of the Department. The minister of any department must depend upon the Deputy for advice. The Deputies of the different Government Departments are without exception, men of sterling character and ability. Mr. LeMessurier has gone through the service, and is a man of experience, honesty, and proven ability. Still you dispense with the services of such a man and appoint a man who may be an estimable citizen, but knows nothing about Postal work. One-third of the robberies which have occurred in the city branch of the Postal Service system has been traced to the messengers from the commercial houses to the Post Office. The Postal Department has been made a political football. It is not because two or three men have made mistakes and have to suffer as a consequence that the whole service should be held up to ridicule by getting a man down from Canada to show us how to run the Post Office. The people of this country want their mails dispatched in the quickest possible way. And we have to get Colonel Ross down here to tell us how this should be done. It is an insult to the people of this country. The General Post Office since the present Government assumed office has become a regular dumping place for political agitators. Men have been put into positions for which they have not been fitted. All Governments make mistakes, but what is the good of us if we do not profit by the mistakes of ourselves and others. Perhaps somebody will say that we made political appointments; but, Mr. Speaker, I will challenge anyone in the House or outside of it to prove that while I was Minister of Postal Telegraphs there were appointments made to the department for political reasons. It is stated in the Speech from the Throne that the Post Office is overmanned and underworked. Who, I ask overmanned the Post Office? Certainly it must be the present Government for I understand there are now fifteen more names on the payroll than there were last June. Do you think you can fool the people in this respect? You may fool them a part of the time, but you cannot fool all the people all the time. You must appear extremely ridiculous to yourselves and to those who are acquainted with the conditions that actually obtain at the Post Office. Don't imagine such misleading statements will go unchallenged, the Postal Officials know what you are doing, and they are the greatest publicity medium in this country.

Speaking of Commissions, Mr. Chairman, I disagree entirely with the importing of commissioners to enquire into our Postal system. If an enquiry had to be held, you could have got competent men here in the city, men who know the system, and are just as intelligent as any man you can get from Canada. If you wanted to improve your system you could have sent a man from here to learn something of the Canadian system, and if he could learn anything from their

system, it could be applied to our own. You should not have imported a Commissioner, that is where the mistake was made.

Mr. Chairman, referring to this Commission for Highroads, it is said that Mr. Hall, the Government Engineer, is to be the Chairman. Mr. Hall's duties in connection with the Railway should never be interfered with, and although the Railway is under different management, and you have a Government Commission running it, Mr. Hall should be on that Commission as adviser to the Government and management of the railway, and a man like him should not have his experience and valuable advice discounted and lost to the country. He is one of the best men that we have ever imported, and his experience and ability is stultified and overlooked now in the running of the railway, and he is given the position of looking after the building of roads and bridges.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I beg your pardon. He is still Government Engineer.

MR. HALFYARD—You told us that he would no longer be engaged at the Railway.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I said that he had nothing to do at the railway now, and his time would be devoted to this work. The railway is well looked after by Mr. Joyce, as competent a man as can be got in this country. His work should please Mr. Halfyard as he is a Newfoundlander. He was born in Carbonear.

MR. HALFYARD—That is no news to me, but you have Mr. Hall here, and you have to pay him a salary.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Yes, and he is going to earn it, I hope.

MR. HALFYARD—I submit, Mr. Chairman, that it is most improper that a man like Mr. Hall should be turned down, that a Government Engineer who understands everything in connection with the railway, and who is absolutely necessary to be there, should be told that he is no longer required.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—It is not necessary at all. He is not needed there.

MR. HALFYARD—You told us that he is no longer required. It is done for political reasons.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—It is not. He is not necessary there.

MR. HALFYARD—For political reasons and political expediency a man like Mr. Hall is ignored, and his services, which would be of great good to this country on the railway, are turned down, and he is no longer consulted about the railway.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Absolutely untrue.

MR. HALFYARD—Absolutely true.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—You do not know what you are talking about. You come in here like a man with one hemisphere of his brain functioning and the other not.

MR. HALFYARD—I am trying to get something into your brain, even if I have to use a pickaxe. I hope there is no one in this House who needs such an operation in order to get an idea into his head.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—You have a fine regard for ability. The very department you are talking about this afternoon is the department which shows up your own incapacity to run it.

MR. HALFYARD—I am trying to point out that the greatest mistake that was made in this country was not to allow Mr. Hall to perform the duties for which he was brought here.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—He is still doing them.

MR. HALFYARD—I beg your pardon.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—He is still doing them.

MR. HALFYARD—You told us just now that he was not.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—He is not required at the railway.

MR. HALFYARD—I say it is the greatest mistake you ever made. You have a railway here that may turn out to be a loss to you . . .

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—It did turn out to be a loss under your regime.

MR. HALFYARD—Not at all. Last year there was only a deficit of $6,000. I presume the country is to be congratulated in having a man of such ability filling the office of Colonial Secretary at the present time. It is a pity that he has to play second fiddle to another man who is running the Government.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—If we had the reins of Government when you had them the country would not be like it is to-day.

MIN. OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—If we were prepared to play second fiddle as you were to Coaker.

MR. HALFYARD — Sir William Coaker is just as honourable a man to play second fiddle to as Mr. Morine.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I don't know what it is you were playing, I think it must have been bass viol.

MR. HALFYARD—I am playing the tune that suits myself, whether it suits you or not. I suppose it is a little irritating for the Hon. Colonial Secretary to have to sit out there in that chair for such a long evening on such an important matter, but when it comes to presenting a petition to the House for a well, that is a different matter, and one which is more agreeable to him. But this Bill is to be railroaded through the House, and any man who has the audacity to get up and give his opinion on a Bill that is going through the House is playing a tune. That is the position that we are in to-day, that a member of this House cannot express an opinion but he is subject to insults from no less a person than the Hon. Colonial Secretary.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY — Where are the insults? If I have given any insults I am prepared to withdraw them, if you can tell me where they were.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Might I ask if, when you were on the Railway Commisssion, which was appointed by your Government, you had Mr. Hall working with you? Can you answer that question?

MR. HALFYARD—Yes, I will answer you when you sit down. Mr. Chairman, in reply to the question asked by Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, Sir John Crosbie, I may say that we did not have Mr. Hall with us. This House, as it was composed at the time, would not allow us to have Mr. Hall, and to give you proof of that . . . .

HON. MINISTER FINANCE & CUSTOMS—But pardon me, you were the Government, were you not?

MR. HALFYARD—We were, but do you think that all we did was done with our own free will?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Very well then, you admit after all that you were not the Government, but that you did what the Opposition told you.

MR. HALFYARD—I must admit that we were stampeded into doing lots of things.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—For all the bad things you said we thank thee now. I admit that we were a bad crowd alright, but I did not think that we were running the Governmnt.

MR. HALFYARD—The Hon. Minister of Justice knows that we could not have the Commission that was named by the Government. The Commission named by the Government first was, the Auditor General, Mr. Berteau, the Government Engineer, Mr. Hall, and the Colonial Secretary of the day.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—That was a beautiful commission. Do you think the Opposition was right in their objection?

MR. HALFYARD—That was the Commission that the Government named.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—You must have thought that the Opposition was right when you altered the Commission. You came down and altered it the next day.

MR. HALFYARD—I quote Mr. Higgins: "As I have already pointed out in this House, this railway is going to be on our hands for twelve months at least, and God knows how long after, now that we see the character of the Commission appointed." The Commission consisted of the Auditor General, Mr. Berteau; the Government Engineer, Mr. Hall, and the Colonial Secretary of the day. It makes no difference who the Colonial Secretary of the day was . . . .

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—You may as well tell us that it was yourself.

MR. HALFYARD—It so happened that it was myself. That was a lovely Commission, so the Attorney General says. Leaving myself out of it altogether, did not Mr. Berteau and Mr. Hall know as much about running a railway as any member of the present Commission?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—The difference is that Mr. Hall and Mr. Berteau were civil servants, and under the domination of the Government of the day, and bound to obey their orders.

MR. HALFYARD—Then you go today and appoint five members of the Executive Government, and of course that is not wrong. They are not under the domination of the Government. They dominate each other and everybody else.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Certainly not. If the Government is prepared to accept the responsibility for running the railway they are not going to pass the operation of it over to servants. The Government is responsible publicly here in the House of Assembly to the people.

MR. HALFYARD—What an argument for a Minister of the Crown to put up. Your objection last year was that it was a political machine.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—It is the proper position to adopt.

MR. HALFYARD—A Commission consisting of members of the Executive Government is not political, but a Commission consisting of the Auditor General and the Government Engineer is political. That is the position you take now. Is that logical?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—That is the trouble with you. You argue from wrong premises. The essence of logic is in the premises, and your premises is wrong. The position is that if the Government is going to run the railway it must be run by the Government and not by its servants.

MR. HALFYARD—The Commission was to consist of the Colonial Secretary, the Government Engineer, who is attached to the railway, and the Auditor General, who attended to the finances of the railway. Was not that running it by the Government?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—No, that is running it by people who are servants of the Government.

MR. HALFYARD—In reply to the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs I think he realises why we did not have Mr. Hall on the Commission.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Upon my word, I do not. I do not understand after what you said first. You said that he ought to have been there. I should have expected then that you would have seen that he was there, as you were Colonial Secretary.

MR. HALFYARD—I expect I shall have to get the pickaxe. I repeat again—as we all know the Commission consisted of the Colonial Secretary,

Mr. Berteau and Mr. Hall. The Prime Minister of the day, in reply to a question asked by Mr. Higgins from this side of the House, named the Commission. Mr. Sullivan then said that he would not allow the votes to go through. The House was in committee then on certain votes, and he held up the House that night, and then a conference was held with the Leader of the Opposition. They were agreeable that a Commission consisting of the Colonial Secretary, Mr. Cook and Mr. Shea should be appointed, and therefore the Opposition had as much to say with the appointment as the Government.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Do you think that is why the Government changed the Commission—because the Opposition objected?

MR. HALFYARD—That is the record.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Is not that an extraordinary situation to come in here and say that you did that because the Opposition made you do it.

MR. HALFYARD—I do not know, but we did not want to be here the whole summer.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Does not that show that you do not know your own policy?

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Hall should have been on that commission.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Then the Government did a most dishonest thing. You can sit on whichever horn of the dilemma you choose.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Hall was appointed and you and Mr. Sullivan threatened all sorts of things if he was allowed to remain there.

Quotes Hansard.

"MR. HIGGINS—What I had hoped would be that the Government would have lifted this railway matter clear of politics. It is practically a repetition of the old story, with all respect to the Colonial Secretary, the Auditor General and the Government Engineer, that the railway is going to be made a political machine, I care not how honest the intentions of the Prime Minister are. It is a pity that an outside commission, so constructed as to be non-partisan, are not taking hold of this matter. In the first place, take the Auditor General. I have no confidence in him because he has no time to attend to railway matters. Why it is an absolute joke to talk about the Auditor General being shoved about here, there and everywhere; and if he has all the time on his hands to handle the different things that are passed around to him, he certainly has not time to look after the railway as well. Secondly, as far as the Government Engineer is concerned, he is a very competent and capable gentleman, but I am confidently certain that he will not be in a position to devote that time that he should to the work of railway commissioner."

"MR. SULLIVAN—Well, I for one strongly object to the railway being made a party machine Why did you not appoint a commission, sir, from members on both sides of the House and not pay any salary for their services? We, as opposition members, want to get a fair show for our constituents, but with this commission in charge of affairs we do not anticipate getting a square deal. . . . . We came here and treated the Prime Minister right and in turn we expected to be treated right by him. We did not anticipate seeing the railway run by Government men, and before the House closes, Mr. Chairman, you will hear more about this."

MR. HALFYARD—Is it a party machine at present? I make the statement now that the transportation service of the country is a dumping ground for political heelers and supporters, and I defy contradiction. That is the machine that we have now.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—There have been no changes, the same men are running the railway.

CAPT. RANDELL—Then you give the commission no credit for what is being done.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I said the same heads are running it.

MR. HALFYARD—And it is non-partisan because four heads of Government Departments are running it? If you can get the people to believe that you can get them to believe anything. Why it is impossible for a man to get a job on one of the steamers unless he is a Government supporter.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—That is a trick taught by your masters.

MR. HALFYARD—These conditions did not exist under the previous Government. Coming to the appointment of Capt. Wes Kean, even some of the strongest supporters of the Prime Minister and Minister of Fisheries would not have him there if they could help it. Certain people protested against his appointment.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—I never heard of it.

MR. HALFYARD—The protest was made all the same by the crowd who want to run the Government. Now it is very interesting to know that the railway is non-partisan because it is run by five members of the Government. We were held up to ridicule when we were forced to do something which you now say was all wrong. That is the treatment that has been meted out to us, not only in that respect but in others. When anything is wrong you say why didn't we do otherwise. Now reverting to the matter of positions on steamers, I will give you an illuminating instance. A man named Barbour, who was forty years going to the ice, and last year had the misfortune to lose his schooner, applied to Capt. Dalton for a berth on the Meigle on her last trip north. As soon as the Minister of Fisheries heard that Barbour was on the ship, he phoned Capt. Dalton and asked why this man was on the ship. When Barbour came back he was told by Capt. Dalton that his services were no longer required. I think Capt. Dalton said that he had a letter from the Minister of Fisheries that Barbour should be dismissed. That's an example of how the service is run. I do not know if the commission has much to do with giving berths to the ice on the Government steamers Sagona and Prospero, but I know there are very few men from Conception Bay or Trinity Bay going on them. The sealers say that it is useless to apply for a berth unless a man comes from Bonavista Bay. Mr. Chairman, the Bill before the House would be received with better grace and be given greater support if the country had experienced a series of successful years for any length of time. We are told that the Revenue is greater than that of the previous year by over three hundred thousand dollars. You are congratulating yourself on the increase, but the wonder is that the surplus is not greater, when we compare our increased earnings with the previous year. We have passed through a year in which the importations are regarded as abnormal, but the question is, will our imports be as great next year and the year after? With the increase of revenue it is time for you to reduce taxation. But where are we to get off if we reduce taxation while we are increasing expenditure. We have a national debt, including the new loan, of about sixty millions, and we have assumed the liability of guaranteeing the capital and interest on ten millions in connection with the Humber, which makes our liabilities about seventy millions. We all hope that the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company will be a great success and that we will never be called upon to pay the interest, but we must

give consideration to such a possible liability and govern ourselves accordingly. Our liabilities are too great now for such a small population, and the chances of getting returns from the Road Scheme in this Bill are so remote and visionary that I must oppose the measure. We cannot afford to undertake such a venture when we are unable to provide for the encouragement of our staple industry. The country has been told that we cannot spend anything to improve our transportation system, or provide a subsidy of one hundred thousand dollars for the carrying of our fish to the West Indies, and yet you propose to undertake this road-building scheme, and we are told it is the best thing that was ever proposed. Every country under the sun is trying to take advantage of quick transportation facilities for marketing their products, but we must go on in the beaten track through Canada and the United States for the marketing of our fish because we think that this country cannot afford to spend one hundred thousand dollars on a steam subsidy to the West Indies. Now I am not speaking for or against that project. We are prepared to gamble two million dollars on roads for tourists, but we are not prepared to spend one hundred thousand dollars on steam subsidies to increase the price of our codfish by better market facilities. With regard to the maintenance of roads, we do not know what these roads will eventually cost, and it is no use having roads unless they are built properly and kept in repair. I had no intention of speaking at such length in connection with this Bill, but I must submit again that Mr. Hall, the Government Engineeer, should be connected with the railway as a consulting engineer with the commission. If the commission is going to be carried on as it is—and I have heard nothing to the contrary —why not have Mr. Hall there giving his sole attention to the biggest transportation problem in the country, and not having his activities confined to building roads and bridges. He should work in conjunction with the Manager of the railway, as he always did, and give valuable service to the commission from time to time. Where do you get your advice from if it is not from the Manager of the railway. The Manager is a very busy man, and he has to give some hours of his time every week to the Commission. If you had Mr. Hall there he could give you detailed information as to how everything is going on and act as kind of supervisor and advisor to you. You are not in a position now to suway because you have not the knowway because you have ont the knowledge or ability, and no one expects you to have it. Why not use the brains and ability of Mr. Hall, who does know something about the railway. You have one of the best men in the country as Manager of the railroad, and who is as good, if not better, than one you might import, and there is no reason why you could not have the services of the man who was brought into the country for the work he is prepared to do. Then there is Mr. Robinson, assistant to Mr. Hall, who can give you all the drawings, estimates and plans of bridges and culverts for roads and bridges just the same as Mr. Hall; so I would impress upon the Government as a matter of ordinary common sense and common decency to employ the man who is a valuable asset at the present time on railway matters. If you have money to spend, let it be spent on the roads we already have. Use the commission that is functioning at the present time and engage some local men in the country to construct the roads, men of practical experience, and not import men because they might have gone through some college and have some knowledge of science. Spend one hundred thousand or a half million dollars if you like on the roads

you have at present and you can do that work without having to engage the services of three extra commissioners, as is proposed in this Bill, besides a staff of clerks. Cut the thing out because the country cannot afford it under present conditions. The prosperity may be only temporary, but we pray it will be permanent. Conditions are not as bright as we would like to see them in connection with our national industry. We do not know what will happen next year. Therefore, as a conservative Government, try and conserve the interests of the country. Do not undertake any scheme which is only problematical. The outgoing Government were criticized severely for spending too much money, but I think the present Government are decidedly more lavish, although they told us they were going to cry halt to any such undertakings as they are now embarking upon.

MR. GODDEN—Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of making a few observations in relation to the subject matter now before the Chair. As has been pointed out by my colleague, if it is the purpose of the Government to spend any particular amount of money on road building, that should be done in the interest of Newfoundland people anyhow and not principally for the encouragement of outsiders. I take it that the Government have made up their minds that this Bill is to be made law, and that anything said from this side of the House will not make any difference, so that we must make the best of a bad business and try and throw out criticisms, suggestions and amendments to make the thing a little more worth while. The first page of the Bill, I notice, is entitled the Constitution of the Commission, and that the Government Engineer will be in chief command of that Commission. That is as it should be. Mr. Hall is a man of considerable experience, both theoretical and practical; but I am afraid you are going to have a good deal of trouble if you purpose having only three other Commissioners to control the money to be spent on highways. I fail to see how four men are sufficient, if they are not going to give their whole time to the work, and I take it that it is not the intention that they should give their whole time to it. Section (e) says: "Three members of the Commission shall be a quorum for the transaction of business." What will happen, I wonder, when two of these four men are in different parts of the country or are out of the country? Does it mean that the Commission will not function in that event? I would suggest that one or two more members be apopinted on that Commission, and I would say that it would be most desirable to have such men appointed on that Commission who are not interested in politics. In other words that the entire Commission should not have any political affiliations whatever.

Referring to Page 2, Section 2 (f), the salaries and compensation, etc. I think all the members of this House would like some idea of just what those salaries are going to be. The same thing applies to Section 6 on Page 3. Would it not be wise to state just what percentage the fees of the Assessors would be based on. Because if this is not done now you may find out afterward, it comes to a matter of settlement, that you are being charged any or an exorbitant amount.

Now as regards the Section under the heading LAND PLANS, I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the word may be substituted, and the word SHALL be inserted in its place. Because if that is the only means of knowing that the particular lands acquired by the Government is owned by them and it

is not so marked clearly, what is to prevent this land that is acquired by the Government being sold a second time by previous owners. Lots of these plans, I understand, are in the Agricultural & Mines Dept. to-day, lying forgotten and hard to find when wanted. Then in Section 11 (a). Wherever a road connects with a highway, etc. . . does this mean that all small culverts, or bridges, gradings, etc., desired by private parties shall be looked after by the Commission. That is how it reads to me.

HON. THE COL. SECRETARY—It means that any private highways that intersect on the public roads, the repairs of the private road will be borne and paid for by the Commission. Referring to Page 6, Section 24, under Heading FINANCES, it reads all sums, etc. (reads paragraph).

MR. GODDEN—Well, I submit, Sir, that all monies required by the Commission should be voted by the Legislature, and that no appropriation by the Governor-in-Council should be in order. I think that is all that I have to say. But I take it that as I said before, what I have said is not going to make any difference to the Government, and the Bill will be put through in spite of criticisms from this side. But I hope that any suggestions that I have made are quite in order.

MR. DUFF—Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few remarks on the Bill before the House, by saying here and now that I am not in favor of this expenditure. I don't believe the Colony can afford it. As I said before in connection with the tourist traffic, I am not in favor of it. I have spoken to parties in connection with this, and I only met one person who was in favor of it. I have come to the conclusion that it is a wild-cat scheme. I would like to see a tourist traffic and welcome it if it could be proved to me that it would be profitable and beneficial, on which the people of this country could spend their money. But I feel that in spending two million dollars on roads in this country, we will never get our money back again. I would recommend that the roads be widened. Speaking of the roads in the neighborhood of my own district. We have one from Heart's Content to Carbonear, and one from Harbor Grace to Carbonear that needs some attention. I think those roads are too narrow. On the South Side of Carbonear there is a very narrow road with picket fences on both sides. As soon as the snow comes it blocks the road; the traffic is suspended and cannot be opened again until the Spring. I have often wondered why some Government in the past did not do something to obviate that state of affairs; for instance, they could widen those roads or make some provision so that the narrow roads should not have picket fences because, after all that has been the reason why, when the snow falls, it blocks up these roads. Then again, I would like to say that the Motor Association, for the three or four years that it has been in being, has done great work, and without pay, and I understand and believe that the same people who looked after road repairing last year are here, and are perfectly willing to do the work again. We all know that Road Boards have wasted money, and did not get adequate returns. We have to get the worth of our money in the work performed, and if the Government intend by appointing a Commission, to get over this difficulty it is a step in the right direction. At the same time I believe the Motor Association could do the same work. Now look at the state of the city of St. John's, where there are 1274 families getting poor relief. Fortunately in the outports, the people are not so badly off. In the city they either have to depend on the Government

or else go under. In the outports they are a little better situated, and although we have our poor, there are not many, and are helped out by their neighbours, and get along somehow. But I do say that in view of the weather conditions at the present time, something could be done as regards improvement on roads, so as to give destitute people some asisstance. In St. John's here, it does not seem to me quite fair the way the money is spent. According to the papers people are getting relief and a great number of them do not require it at all. Take for instance the case where the dole is being given out. I understood that enquiries were made as to the people seeking relief. It sems quite evident now that this was not done. And, Mr. Chairman, right here and now, I say St. John's is getting more than its share, more than is just. I see in the papers some remarks about the outport doctors, in connection with the fever patients and the amount given out for poor relief. What hapens in the town of St. John's if some of the people's children are stricken with fever. They are at once sent away down to the Hospital. There they have nurses to care for them and everything is done for them. What happens in the outports? The people in the Fall put in their provisions, which consists of Flour, Beef, Pork, Tea,etc. The people, as a rule have only these provisions, and which is quite sufficient for them in health. But in a case where fever comes along they require fruits and medicines, something altogether different from what they eat in the best of health. Food of that kind may be death to a person who has fever as you all know. What the patient requires is something in the way of fruits or cereal. The money spent in the outports to relieve outport fever patients, is what is complained about in the Press. But take for instance the doctors. They do not make large sums of money while attending to a case of poor relief. The amounts paid are very, very small. I would like to enlighten the House as regards that matter, as I feel sure that injustice is being done. What I would advise the Government is that if they have 2 million dollars that they can lay their hands on for goodness sake reduce taxation. This country is essentially a fishing country. What is needed is reduction of taxation, so that the fisherman can market his fish as cheap as any in the world. If they cannot do that they must go under. I fear that this 2 million dollars that is to be spent on roads is visionary and imaginary, and the country cannot afford it, and therefore I will not support it.

CAPT. RANDELL—Mr. Chairman, with the few remarks that I have to make in regard to the Bill now before the House, I do not wish to delay the House, but I just want to put myself on record as saying that I am not in favor of this Bill. In the first place I don't see how the country can afford to spend two million dollars on propositions that are purely speculative, visionary, and without doubt, not likely to give returns commensurate with what has been expended. I understand that in connection with this scheme there is likely to be some hotels, or at least one hotel erected, in St. John's. I would like to ask some of the members on the other side if they have faith enough in the scheme to start in and erect an hotel for themselves. Why don't they put up the money themselves if they think they are going to make so much money. I think that this two million could be spent to much greater advantage for the people of the country, than in this scheme to get tourists to come here. It may make out alright. I hope that it will. It may notwithstand anything that I may say. At the same time I

want to put myself on record as being against the bill. If we had that money as a surplus and had no immediate use for it then by all means it may be right to put it up for something that is speculative. But in the present instance the idea is a crazy one. That may not be very parliamentary language to use but that is the feeling that I have. There is one thing that nobody seems to have considered and that is that we have not the climate that would be inviting to people to come here. The bottle a day may be some incentive but aside from that I do not know of anything else that we have. I have travelled quite a bit and I have seen quite a lot of scenery and some of that not so very far from the state of Maine either. If anyone travelled from here to Carbonear by train or otherwise I do not think that he will see any scenery that will be of very great attraction to tourists, or anything that they might go into raptures over. You can see a lot of barren country and rocks and there is scarcely any vegitation even during the summer when the farms are cultivated. Now on the matter of commissions. It was said a little while ago in reply to a statement from Mr. Halfyard that in the commissions which have been appointed since the present Government came into power the commissioners have been without pay and that they have given their services free of charge. Well, you have had a man to come here to look at the dock. I suppose that he was commissioned to do that, I do not imagine that he would come here without being paid. You have had another commissioner to look into the Post Office. I presume that he was commissioned to do it. I presume also that he is being paid. You have a commission for the railway. I don't know whether they are being paid or not. I presume that they are. If they are not paid they are paid indirectly. I should like to have it explained to me how it is that if a man is on a commission in this country and tenders for a contract from the department for which he is a commissioner, I should like to know if he is not getting something out of it. I have been told that in other countries it is not considered to be according to Hoyle for a man to be the Minister of the Crown for a department and to hold contracts with the department for which he is the minister. I may be wrong in making this statement but I have been given to understand that Mr. Sullivan is a commissioner of the railway and that he also was a contractor for coal to the railway. That is the answer that was given last year.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Sullivan was not on the commission last year.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—He did not get any contract for coal since he became a commissioner of the railway. When he was selling coal to the railway, he was not a commissioner of the railway.

CAPT. RANDALL—He has been selling coal to the railway during the past year.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—That is only fulfilling the order which he had contracted for before he became a Commissioner.

CAPT. RANDALL—Last year in the month of July on the 17th I asked who were the contractors for the coal which was to be supplied to the Government Railway how much they had contracted for, who were the tenderers and what were the contract prices and the answer which I received for this was that seventy thousand tons of coal had been supplied. I was told that there were no tenders asked The price of the coal was $6.50 per ton c. i.f. at Newfoundland ports and those who sold the coal to the railway were the Dominion Coal Co., the Evans Reid Company for which Hon. M. S. Sullivan was the agent, and Cashin

& Co. I expect that these explanations are for political expediency. I know that these explanations are for political expediency. I know that these contracts are just ordinary business contracts in this country. The Hon. M. S. Sullivan was made a commissioner of the railway of which he had the contract for coal and I fail to see the difference which the hon. gentlemen are trying to explain to me. The Hon. M. S. Sullivan could not have taken this position of commissioner of the railway while he held the contract for the coal with the railway. He would not have done it if he had considered it as an honourable man should. I do not mean to say he has acted in a dishonorable way but with regard to the commissioners I dare say that it is ailright. It is allright according to what has been the custom in this country during former and under former administrations. But because somebody has done a thing that is no reason why the present Government should do the same thing. That is the excuse that has been given the members of this side of the House when we have spoken about something which we do not approve. One of the excuses is, what did you do? What was done under your administration? But Mr. Speaker I do not hold with that kind of thing. I am not in accord with doing a thing because another did it. More especially do I disapprove of a thing like this being done by a member of this House. I am not in accord with this bill. I do not see where we are going to get the returns. I do not believe in spending so much money on a scheme like this. It is purely speculative and I do not believe that there is a man in this House this evening who believes that we are going to get adequate returns. If we had the climate to induce those people and if we had the accommodations it might be a different thing. But how long do you think that it is going to be before you can have a hotel? It will take two years to build a hotel that would be anything like a first class building, well equipped and well furnished. I do not say anything against building a new ship for the Cabot Strait service. I think that it was about time that we had something done in connection with this service. The Kyle is not the right kind of a boat for that service. Any man who knows anything about steamships knows that the boat there now does not fill the bill and I think that it is quite alright to get something that will fill the bill better. But if you think that you are going to get a great influx of visitors just because you think that they should come along and spend their money and to do this you are going to borrow two million dollars, I think that it is not wise. I think that it is a purely speculative venture.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, I just want to ask the Hon. Colonial Secretary, who represents Harbour Grace, what he has done for the people of Harbour Grace in the way of giving employment. Some time ago, I understand the Minister of Public Works had made some arrangements to give some employment to the people of Harbour Grace in the way of Highroads construction, and I have since been informed that the work has been stopped. I will be very glad if the Minister will inform me of the position of that matter to-day.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say in answer to the Leader of the Opposition, that he will remember last week a delegation of two or three came from Harbour Grace looking for some relief work to be started to relieve the destitution there. In company with the Minister of Public Works, I met these men and talked the situation over with them, and we told them that if there was any work that was essential, or would be of ad-

vantage to the district, we would have work started on it, and provide employment for those in distress. Apparently the matter was left in the hands of the Minister of Public Works and he sent the outport Road Inspector to Harbour Grace, and he discovered that the residents of Harbour Grace, who were the prime movers in this matter had formed themselves into a committee, and had proceeded to employ the men. Of course we told them that we could not approve of their action, because the money that was to be spent was public money, and had to be spent through the proper channels. At any rate, we had to stop these proceedings, because the whole population was at work. The result was that the thing became so embarrassing that we had to call the whole think off, and instructions were given to the Commissioner of Charities, Mr. Brownrigg, to get in touch with the relieving officer at Harbour Grace, and try and discover what cases of destitution existed in Harbour Grace, and see that proper steps were taken to provide relief for them. We could not undertake to employ the whole population of Harbour Grace. Instead of starting work to relieve the destitute, we found that when we started work every man in the place wanted to have his share of it. Of course, when this Roads Commission plan is developed, I have no doubt that there will be plenty of work to be done in that section. This work which we had for these men was merely the widening of some road that was considered too narrow. When the work has to be done, it will be done under the supervision of the Highroads Commission. The situation in Harbour Grace has been very difficult to handle, but we did the only thing that could be done. However, I was talking to Mr. Squires, the Relieving Officer in Harbour Grace, this afternoon, and he told me that everything was alright there now, and that those who were destitute were being looked after, and there is no necessity to take any notice of this claim of general destitution at Harbour Grace.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, I thank the Hon. Minister for the information we have received from him. I had been merely informed that the work had been arranged but had stopped. In reference to the Bill now before the chair, I would ask the introducer of the Bill if he would be good enough to rise the committee for this afternoon. I think quite a time has been taken up with cross-firing and one thing and another.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—If you are not prepared to go on.

MR. HICKMAN—Unless you insist.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I do not want in any way to hamper the honourable member.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, there is just one matter that I would like to refer to, arising out of a remark made by Capt. Randell, the Hon. Member for Trinity, which I hope he did not mean seriously. If what the hon. captain has said is true, I think not only ought we not go on with this Bill, but we ought to change our views about this country altogether. I was surprised to hear him say that our climate was not one that would attract any tourists here. That is a complete revolution of thought from what we have always been inclined to think about Newfoundland.

Personally, I think that our climate here is admirably attractive for those tourists who might otherwise go to Bermuda, but would find that place too hot in summer. I think our climate is particularly attractive during the season that these people would come here.

As I conceive it, the tourist trade that is going to come to this country is the tourist trade that Nova Scotia has been recently trying to attract--

the people who go south in the winter, and in summer want a climate such as ours. Frankly, if the hon. member is serious in that remark, I think we ought to abandon the whole idea of having tourists come here at all. I always thought that that was one thing we had . So far as a summer climate is concerned, I do not think that there is any climate more likely to attract tourists than ours. If the Hon. Capt. was serious in that remark, then I think the whole scheme is based upon a wrong principle. I think we have a very healthful climate, but we are not to be thanked for that. We have to thank God for that—it is not a Government measure.

MR. HICKMAN—I am rather surprised that you do not take credit for our fine spring.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, I might say that if Capt. Randell, the honourable member for Trinity, would ask his friend Capt. Mitchell, of the "Silvia," he would find out from him that there was an enormous number of people who would have come down here last summer if we had any hotel accommodation for them. But we have not had that class of tourist down here at all. It is only a certain class that come here on the round trip. We do not have the other class at all, because we have no place to accommodate them.

This matter is not new. It has been discussed frequently in this House and outside. I remember having a conversation with Sr Edgar Bowring last year on the matter. He told me that if we had a good hotel built here in St. John's, and two or three hotels outside connected with it, and if we made good motor roads, his company would put on two fifteen knot boats, running between here and New York.

I heard the same story from the Manager of the Newfoundland section of the Furness Withy Company in Liverpool. He told me that, as a matter of fact, they did not intend putting the new boat on this route until a new hotel was built here, but they must have changed their policy in regard to that, because they will have a new boat, called "The Newfoundland," come here this summer. But they have been encouraged in that respect by these developments that we propose bringing in.

I am sorry to hear the honourable member on the other side so pessimistic about the matter. We have to try and make an effort to bring people into this country ,and get revenue from them, instead of always getting it from the same source. Already our people are fairly heavily taxed, and we must not overtax them. But we must find some other means of revenue, and I know of no more lucrative way than to get some of these wealthy people come here and spend their money here.

Mr. Higgins, the Hon. Minister of Justice, referred to Bermuda. I went down to Bermuda one winter, and it was extraordinary the amount of money that people spend there. Of course, I know that we have not got a climate like Bermuda has in the winter, but we have a climate that Bermuda never had and never can have in the summer.

Some of these wealthy people are ony waiting for an opportunity to come to some place new. These rich people practically cover the globe, and when we are prepared to accommodate them, they will come here.

I move that the Committee rise.

HON, MR. SULLIVAN—Mr. Chairman, I regret that I was not here when Capt. Randell, the honourable member for Trinity, made certain remarks with reference to myself in connection with coal contracts for 1923-24. It is to be regretted that some honourable members of this House make unwarranted statements without being able to substantiate

them. Remarks made by Capt. Randell on Water Street may not carry much weight, but statements made by the honourable member for Trinity, Capt. Randell, on the floors of this House and broadcasted through the public press, should be carefully considered before made, and it would be well for any gentleman making statements in this House that might be injurious to individuals or our industries, to be certain that the statements he makes are correct before making same.

I think that this coal question was fully discussed in this House last year. I made the statement at the last session of this House, that Newfoundland had been overcharged by the Besco Company for the last three years, at least $1.00 on every ton of coal which we purchased from them. A short time previous to the letting of the contract for coal supplies for the Railway last year, the Besco Company had sold a cargo of coal at $7.50 per ton, cif St. John's, Newfoundland. Their sales agent came down here when it was proposed to place the contract for 60,000 tons for the Railway and steamers. Presumably as they had supplied a cargo of coal only six weeks previous at $7.50, their intention was to try to obtain the contract at a similar price for 1924. The honourable member for Trinity refers to me as supplying coal. He is absolutely wrong. The firm of Evans & Reid, Teasdale, Lidstrom, Ltd., of Newcastle-on-Tyne sold one cargo through their managing director, Mr. Lidstrom. Mr. Lidstrom was out here and saw the General Manager of the Railway and asked to get a trial order, and he eventually secured an order for a cargo of 3,000 tons of coal Please bear in mind that at that time I was in the Opposition and that the late Government was in power. The coal that I was tendering on was American coal. My price was $6.50 per ton, cif, St. John's, Newfoundland, American funds. Cashin & Company were also tendering. Their price was $6.50, Canadian funds. The Besco Company, through their agent, tendered at the last moment for $6.50, Canadian funds, cif St. John's, $1.00 per ton cheaper than they had supplied coal about six weeks or two months previous. The contract was awarded—40,000 tons to the Besco Company and 20,000 tons to Cashin & Co. Cashin & Co. got the coal because their bid was in early and was the lowest, mine being in American funds, was 5 cents higher, but I contend that if it had not been for the bid which I put in and which Cashin & Co. put in, it is very doubtful if the coal would have been supplied this country any cheaper than the year previous. For the honourable member's information, I might say that since I have been on the Railway Commission no coal has been sold by me either directly or indirectly. Am I to be debarred from doing legitimate business because I am working on the Railway Commission without salary? If so, the quicker I get off the Commission and give up politics, the better for myself.

There is one question that I would like to ask the honourable member for Trinity. Is he a director of A. H. Murray & Co., Ltd?

CAPT. RANDELL—That is quite right.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Then what is the difference between your position and mine, if I had sold coal to the Government? You are a director of that Company and a member of this House, and your Company were awarded the contract for supplying the public institutions with coal. If it is wrong for me to supply coal because I am a member of the House, then it is equally wrong for you.

CAPT. RANDELL—The coal was not supplied to the Railway on tender.

MR. SULLIVAN—It was, and I am proud to say that I am one of the men

responsible for making the Besco crowd cut down their price $1.00 a ton. By doing this, I was instrumental in saving for the tax payers of this Colony at least $60,000.

CAPT. RANDELL—Why did I get this answer then?

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—It is not for me to explain why you received the answer that you did. That is not my business. Tenders were called for, and as I said before, Cashin & Co. and the Besco Co., and I, submitted quotations, besides several other coal dealers, and you know the result. Instead of being praised for what I actually did, the honourable member seems to claim that I did something particularly horrifying.

CAPT. RANDELL—I am going by the answer I received to my question.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Did the answer say how much was to be supplied by each party who was awarded the contract?

CAPT. RANDELL—No.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—I think, Mr. Chairman, the honourable member ought to be more careful in future when he is making statements, and not make statements without being able to verify them. I was surprised at the tone of some of the other remarks made by the honourable member for Trinity. Every Newfoundlander who has the interests of this country at heart, has been trying in every way to boost the country and get capitalists and tourists to come in here from abroad. We are told by the honourable member that the scenery is not worth looking at and that the climate is bad. This is certainly poor propaganda and very damaging coming from a member of this House, and because of this, it is certainly much worse than coming from an ordinary citizen. We have scenery in this country unsurpassed. The honourable member must not be able to see as well as the rest of us, and as for our climate—where would you find better weather than we had all last summer? Compare the weather we had in Newfoundland last year with the weather they had in England. Contrast the weather we are having since the 1st of February until to-day with what they are having in other parts of the world. It is very poor policy indeed, for any one to run down their own country, and I was very much surprised indeed, at the statements made by the honourable gentleman when he referred to Newfoundland. It is not because the honourable gentleman does not observe and admire our sceneries that tourists coming in here would be of the same opinion. We have rivers and lakes teeming with salmon and trout. Where can the angler get such sport at such a little cost?

A few days ago in this House, the honourable gentleman, and others, also made reference to the business of the Armstrong, Whitworth Company, in connection with the Paper Mills at Corner Brook. The statements made were quite uncalled for. We should do all we can to boost this Company and not do anything which might have injurious results. Let us remember that we are indirectly shareholders in this Company to the tune of ten million dollars. If this undertaking is a financial success, Newfoundland benefits by it. If it is not a success, then we are losers. The British Government guaranteed ten million dollars, the Newfoundland Government guaranteed ten million dollars, and the Armstrong, Whitworth Company must have put ,at least, ten million dollars into this proposition. We are told by certain members of the House that too much money is being spent. The more money they are spending on equipping and building the plant, the better security we have for our money, and even if the Newfoundland Power and Paper Co. do not make a success of it, then with a plant of this kind, it would be very easy for the

British Government and the Newfoundland Government to arrange with some of the big paper industries to take it over and work it, because there is no doubt that this mill will easily pay the interest on the guaranteed twenty million dollars. Even if it did not, the Armstrong, Whitworth Company, who are into it to a large extent financially, could not afford to let it go by default. The Company that pays out in England, £800,000 or £900,000 a month to 50,000 employees, are not going to default on their interest in the industry in which they are interested in Newfoundland.

Making statements with reference to bad management at Corner Brook and that they are afraid that the Government may be called upon to pay the interest on ten million dollars, is destructive criticism and not constructive. I would like to ask the honourable gentleman who made him an authority as to whether there is bad management or not. One of the statements the honorable gentleman made was that he was told there was a lot of bad management at Corner Brook, and he gave an instance as follows: there was only twenty feet of water at low tide at their pier. This is a half truth. For the information of this House, I would like to say that they have two piers at Corner Brook, a shipping pier and the townsite pier where smaller steamers discharge. At the townsite pier, there is 18 feet of water at low water, and at the shipping pier, there is 28 feet of water at low water . Some of us take every opportunity of advertising our country so that we may assist her along the road to prosperity, whilst others take very opportunity of knocking the country and its resources. I had thought the honourable gentleman was a different type of man, and I regret that he should so far forget himself as to make the statements which he did.

Reference was made by members on the Opposition side of the House, that Newfoundlanders were not getting a fair show and objecting to the placing of English captains in the new steamers. The steamers are built by a subsidiary Company with English capital, not guaranteed by the British or Newfoundland Government, and, surely, they have a right to place whom they like on their own ships. Statement was made that the ships were to be managed in New York by an American Company. This is incorrect. The ships are to be managed, so I am informed, by the Furness Withy Co., Ltd. This firm, as you are aware, have large premises in St. John's.

Statements were also made about the importation of Canadian lumber men. The Newfoundland Power and Paper Co., from September to December, made every effort to secure Newfoundlanders to go in the lumberwoods, but certain propaganda work was done to prevent men from going in, telling them they could not make a day's pay. The wood had to be got, and it eventually became necessary to import a certain quantity of labor. Statement was made in this House that six or seven hundred men had been brought down from Canada. This is greatly exaggerated, and I am informed that there are not more than two hundred and fifty men brought in, and I have been assured by the managing director that in all cases, the same price per cord was paid to Quebec lumbermen that was paid to Newfoundland lumbermen. The Quebec men came in and took sub-contracts and made good money. Several of our Newfoundland lumbermen also made good money, and it was only yesterday that I was handed letters from Twillingate District, which showed that a group of men had returned to Hall's Bay, from the lumberwoods and had averaged $114.00 per month. One man went to Badger on December 5th, and returned after two months with $270.00, and it was

found that men could not be induced to go in for $2.50 per day to load wood, as they preferred to go in on the piece work system.

During the construction period, it was unavoidable that a certain number of outsiders should be brought in, but as time goes on, Corner Brook, you will find, will be the same as Grand Falls, and after a few years, there is no doubt but 95 per cent. of the people will be bona-fide residents of Newfoundland. The management realize that the quicker they can educate sufficient men to operate the machines, the smoother things will run, and, knowing Mr. Stadler as I do, I have no doubt that his policy is to get as many Newfoundlanders into the manufacturing as soon as he can.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, the few remarks that I have made this evening, will clear up some of the misunderstanding, and that in future, when members are making statements reflecting on others and on our industries, that they will be able to substantiate the charges they make.

CAPT. RANDELL—Mr. Chairman, when I spoke the other day in reference to the coal contracts I spoke from the answers I had received to my question in this House. If the answer is not correct then someone on the other side of the House is responsible. The Hon. member for Placentia says that I vilified him, but I say I did nothing of the kind, and I will not listen to such a statement without contradicting it. And another thing, as regards what I said about the Humber affairs the information was given me by the management. I was speaking to Mr. Stadler and I may say he was very frank in his opinions as to how the whole business should be run, how the railway should be conducted, how the Kyle should be managed and that he didn't think it advisable to have Newfoundlanders as masters and executives of the new ships that are being built. I listend to his criticisms until he came to this point and then I started in to answer him back. I had it from the Armstrong Whitworth people that they had about 18 feet of water at the wharf. They had ships there last year that they could not discharge, and I can name some of them if necessary. I did not vilify anyone in my remarks and I had no wish to detract from the work being done at Corner Brook, but I spoke as I did because I felt the Newfoundlanders employed in this enterprise are not being used right although it was for them that it was inaugurated. That is why I spoke as I did the other day. And I may say right now that I do not want to get up in this House and make any statements other than those I have information on and can substantiate.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—There are some things it would be better to forget in the interests of the country.

CAPT. RANDELL—I spoke according to the answer given me.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Were the quantities given in that?

CAPT RANDELL—No.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—The answer was given last year.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY —There would be no object in us withholding the information—it was the late government's doing.

CAPT. RANDELL—It was not in the answer. Anyhow, I do not think it would be considered right by the British Government to have such a thing going on. I remember reading of a member in England being disqualified because he was connected with contracts like this. I also understand that Sir John Crosbie while a Minister of the Crown and a Commissioner of the Railway is also agent for the companies which have insurance on the Government steamers. That bears me out in what I have been saying as to members doing business with the Government.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—The Opposition are doing the same.

CAPT. RANDELL—Does that mean that the Commissioner is not being paid directly or indirectly. I can substantiate what I say.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY —Will you substantiate the statement that the Commissioners are paid. If a man is doing ordinary business, do you expect him to drop it because he is in the Government. If for example, the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition, who is in business wanted to sell anything to the Government, hasn't he a right to do so.

CAPT. RANDELL—That is alright, but I do not want anyone to say that I am making statements that are not in accord with the answer which I received to my question in this House.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE —Mr. Chairman, I crave the indulgence of the House for a few moments. I am sorry indeed to see that the Hon. member for Trinity, Capt. Randell, lost his head completely this afternoon. In fact I had a higher opinion of him. Respecting the matter of coal, I may have a few words to say within the next seventy-two hours that may be very interesting to him, very interesting indeed. With regard to the matter of the Humber Company he made a statement as to what the manager told him in connection with the depth of water at the wharf. Now would he tell us the name of that manager?

MR. RANDELL—The manager that told me that was one Mr. Warren.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Warren is in Hong Kong now.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE —The Hon. member for Trinity also talked about being told other things by another man. Now would he mind telling the House who that other man was?

MR. RANDELL—I refuse.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE —I thought that. That is usually the way some people do things when they go behind the scenes and make charges, which they know they cannot substantiate. Still he boldly gets up and tells about insurance carried on the railroad. Yes, I insured for the railroad and shall do so again, if the opportunity offers; and for the information of Capt. Randell I might say that our rate was cheaper than anybody else ever put in there. Why should I have to discontinue insurance on Government boats? Must I close up my business because I am in public life?

MR. HALFYARD—Why did you not ask for tenders?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE— What did you do when you were on the Railway Commission?

MR. HALFYARD—I beg your pardon———

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—I beg your pardon. My tender at that time was juggled with and the insurance was given to Dale & Company.

MR. HALFYARD—You cannot give proof for that statement.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—I will give the proof and don't worry about it either. The rates we offered were cheaper than the rates offered by any other Insurance Company in this country, as I have said before, and that is why we effected insurance on these boats.

MR. HALFYARD—But tenders were not asked for.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—A year ago what did your Government do? Did you not pay 45 cents per ton higher than the next tender?

MR. HALFYARD—That is incorrect; it was 35 cents per ton higher.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE— Is that true?

MR. HALFYARD—I don't know; the papers say it is true.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE— Do you believe everything that you see in the papers?

MR. HALFYARD—Apparently, you do.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—

Whether everything that appears in the papers is true or not, I would prefer to see the tenders.

MR. HICKMAN—The Hon. member for St. John's West, in view of his own personal record, should not be so personal in his remarks.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—When it comes to personal records, yours is no cleaner than mine.

MR. CHAIRMAN—The Hon. Minister of Finance was referring to the Hon. member for Trinity in his ex-official capacity.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—This whole matter was brought about entirely by the member for Trinity this afternoon.

CAPT. RANDALL—I just made reference to it.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—You just made reference and you tried to get off with it; but you are not going to, because if you did it would be just as well for us on the Government side of the House to get out and leave Saints like you in here in charge of affairs.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on to-morrow.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, in moving the adjournment of the House, I think that it would be in the interest of the House, especially after the interesting and lively debate this afternoon, that I should refer to the reporting of our remarks in the newspapers. I think I should have referred a few days ago to this matter, but it was only yesterday that my attention was drawn to it, and to allow such reports to broadcast throughout the country, without contradiction on our part, would be unjust to the persons credited with having made such statements. It is in regard to the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries replying to certain remarks I had made with reference to the expenditure of moneys.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Is that an official Report. The House cannot enquire into reports made by papers because the House has nothing to do with papers.

MR. HALFYARD—We have newspaper reporters here and I take advantage to correct this misleading report. (Reads Report)

The Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries did make a remark something like that, but he did not refer to Trinity District. I, therefore, take the occasion to contradict that statement absolutely. Neither my colleagues nor myself ever sent moneys to Union Councils in Trinity District. I never sent a cent of Government moneys to a Union Council since I had a seat in this House.

MR. PUDDISTER—May I ask the Hon. member what paper he is quoting from?

MR. HALFYARD—The "Globe."

MR. PUDDISTER—I thought so.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, March 6th, 1925.

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

MR. CHAMBERS—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Channel in the District of Burgeo and LaPoile, on the subject of a wharf. The wharf that is there is practically beyond repair and has been in this condition for many years. As a matter of fact at the present time it is practically gone. They

have had a wharf at Channel for the past fifty years, and it is more indispensable to-day than ever. I have much pleasure in supporting the petition and ask that it be referred to the department to which it relates.

MINISTER OF MINES AND AGRICULTURE—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in endorsing the petition presented by the Hon. Member for Burgeo and LaPoile. I have been in that district several times and I know of the conditions that exist there. When I was in the district I was asked by several influential citizens of the place to support any request that might be made for anything to improve the wharf. I have much pleasure in supporting the petition.

MR. POWER—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting the petition of the Member for Burgeo and LaPoile. I know the conditions that exist there and I know a new wharf is a necessity.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I beg to lay on the table of the House the answer to question No. 5 on the Order Paper of March 5th. I also beg to lay on the table of the House the answer to question No. 6 on the same Order Paper.

GIVING NOTICE OF MOTION AND QUESTION.

MR. BROWN gave notice of question (1).

MR. BROWN gave notice of question (2).

MR. BROWN gave notice of question (3).

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker, in connection with these questions, I want to bring to the notice of the House the fact that some questions which have been on the Order Paper and were deferred have not been included in the Order Paper of the next day. I asked question No. 1 on the Order Paper yesterday, but the Minister was absent, and the question is not on the Order Paper to-day. The Minister is absent again to-day—the Minister of Public Works—and I am anxious to have the question answered.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I might say that the Minister of Public Works is ill in bed.

MR. SPEAKER—If the Hon. member will give a note to the clerk, these questions will be placed on the Order Paper to-morrow.

..NOTICE OF MOTION.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —To ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 52 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series), entitled 'Of Egress from Churches, Theatres and other Buildings.'"

HON. PRIME MINISTER—I ask leave to let that stand over until to-morrow, as the Hon. Minister is sick to-day.

The matter was deferred until to-morrow.

NOTICE OF QUESTION.

Question No. 1 on the Order Paper was deferred.

Question No. 2—

(2) MR. HALFYARD asked the Minister of Agriculture and Mines whether he has any knowledge of timber licenses on Labrador being granted by the Quebec Government; if so, table a statement showing the location and area of each lease.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—Mr. Speaker, in reply to that question, I beg to say that the Department has no knowledge of any such licenses being granted.

Question No. 3. Deferred.

Question No. 4. Deferred.

ORDER OF THE DAY.

Committee of the Whole on a Bill entitled "An Act respecting the Lobster Fishery." Deferred.

Committee of the While on a Bill entitled "An Act relating to Firearms." Deferred.

Committee of the Whole on Bill entitled "An Act to Provide for the Construction, Reconstruction and Maintenance of Highroads."

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Colonial Secretary, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Provide for the Construction, Reconstruction and Maintenance of Highroads."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman, with regard to this Bill now before the House in Committee, I wish it to go on record that I am opposed to the spending of the amount of two million dollars on any scheme which, to my mind, is so visionary, so fanciful, so unsubstantial, and such a delusion as that which we are now called upon to consider, namely, the expenditure of two million dollars on the tourist traffic.

I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, that there are some honourable members opposite to me who have been so dazzled with the ideas of this tourist traffic that they are trying to increase our public debt, trying to get two million dollars to spend on this scheme, without being assured that they have the country behind them in this project.

I regret, Mr. Chairman, that this afternoon there are not more honorable members before me, because I feel that this is a question that should be debated strongly, and with enthusiasm. There is no doubt that it may be discussed broadly and debated, but up to the present time I have heard no cogent or convincing argument as to the feasibility of bringing this tourist traffic to the country.

I feel, Mr. Chairman, that those members who to-day are contemplating a certain traffic from tourists have not got down and taken their pencils and figured out how the tourists are going to bring any great revenue to this country. On the other hand, Mr. Chairman, I feel that this money which we are getting from outside should be spent on the development of our most important industry—our fisheries. We cannot help but know that this is very feasibly a matter which is causing division amongst honourable members opposite. We find to-day that the greatest number of taxpayers of this country are fishermen, and what have we seen the Government—the present Government do as regards the fishing industry of our land. What have they done? I ask you, Mr. Chairman. I ask the honourable members opposite me to tell me what they have done to encourage the fisheries, or the fishermen of this country. I am afraid that they are in a state of lethargy in this regard. We all know the statement made by the Hon. Colonial Secretary the other day—that if we had to depend upon the fisheries of this country, that they would not supply more than a means for half of our population to live. But the time was, Sir, when the fisheries of Newfoundland were her mainstay, and if that statement which the Hon. Colonial Secretary made is correct, then I think that it is our duty—the duty of the Government if they see it, and if they do not see it, then our duty—to point it out to them and insist that the fisheries receive more attention.

It is a great privilege to have a seat in the House of Assembly to-day, but nevertheless it carries a great responsibility with it. We, on this side of the House are called upon to criticise freely, frankly and fearlessly, and we have to point out the errors of the Government.

I think it is convincing enough to show that the scheme before this House—this one of spending 2 million dollars on roads—is too unsubstantial

and visionary altogether. We are asked in connection with this to institute or incorporate a Highways Commission which will be another expensive Department, and will need to have a staff. The idea is to spend two millions, but why introduce a Commission to do it? Why cannot the Department of Public Works control that expenditure or the Minister of that Department confer with the Government Engineer to see it done instead of creating this new department which will need a new staff and is bound to prove expensive? After the money is spent there will be practically nothing for this Department to do. The interest on the Two Million Dollars, which you propose to spend on this visionary scheme, will be One Hundred Thousand Dollars a year at five per cent., and there is little doubt but the yearly repairs will cost in the vicinity of Two Hundred Thousand, so that the total outlay annually will be Three Hundred Thousand Dollars altogether. And what is all this expenditure for?—in the hope of bringing tourists here! I think, Mr. Chairman, it is time to call a halt to such expenditure. In speaking of our fisheries, why do we find the conditions as they are to-day? It is true this is the lumbering and laboring country, but it is first, last and always a fishing country. The fisheries are our staple industry, and they will ever remain so. We find to-day that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is not a member of the Executive Government. Isn't that a pretty state of affairs in a country whose mainstay is the fishery! No wonder there is not more done for the country in connection with this industry. In the Executive we have a certain number of Lawyers. But I don't see why they are all there, and I think this House could debate any matters of law that are brought up here. I think it is time, Sir, to have practical men on the Executive Board. I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, that we have come to the time when political expediency has taken the place of experience, perhaps to the sacrifice of the fishery. We have heard a lot about the tourist traffic, but little or nothing of the fishery, and I intend to lay before the House this afternoon some details in this connection, which I feel sure will impress the members present. I have already pointed out the Minister of Fisheries does not hold a seat on the Executive Board, and our staple industry is being neglected. I am convinced that the fishery is not receiving the attention which its importance warrants, or the consideration due it seeing it should be of such prominence in our Island Home. The codfishery is not the only fishery we have in this country. The Hon. the Prime Minister has said in answer I think to a plea as to the appointment of a roving commissioner that he has an agent in every market. But I contend and think we should go further afield in this connection. We all know that it is not too easy a task to market our fish to-day, and I believe the trade will bear me out when I say it was no easy proposition to market it during the past year, even though the catch was small comparatively. But what would happen if we had a catch as we had in 1917-1918. Would we be able to market that, do you think? Everyone who is interested in the welfare of the Colony and has an eye to business, can see the difficulty fronting us in this direction, and it must be attended to, as otherwise we would be recreants to our duty. The cod is like every other wild animal—it has its runs—and I say we do not know enough in connection with it at all. We know nothing practically of the habits of the fish. All we know is that there is an inshore fish, and a fish which lies off in deep water. We have no scientific board in this country, as the Canadians and others have to secure information, and we are doing nothing whatever in this mat-

ter, and if we have an excess in revenue, unless we are going to reduce taxation, it is our bounden duty to spend it in this direction of developing the fisheries instead of on visionary schemes such as road-building. Take again for example the sealfishery—we have treasures lying at our very door of which we know little. We should do more to encourage this important branch of the fishery. Further, we are told that there is a quantity of Halibut and Turbot in the waters surrounding our shores, but we do not even know how to catch it. Now, Mr. Chairman, let me give a few facts in connection with our herring fishery. In 1917-1918 we exported One Hundred and Ninety-three Thousand Eight hundred and ninety-five barrels of pickled herring, but in 1923 the export of this fish had dropped to Seventy-three thousand barrels, and what is the Government doing about it? Absolutely nothing. Reference has been made here to the engaging of a steamer to ply direct from Newfoundland to the West Indies, but we are told the trade does not favor it. We know that the West Indies take a considerable amount of our herring which we have to send through Halifax. Agents come down from there and send the herring up, and it is they that make the profit, instead of our own people. I know that this applies to most of what is caught in Green Bay at any rate. But if we had a steamer we could send them ourselves. I would also like to give some information as to the trade for the West Indies. In 1923 their trade with the United States was $814,703,262.00 and with Canada over $54,000,000.00. We are told that the United States had seventy consular agents who were really commissioners in the West Indies and the Caribbean Sea. Canada also has some, but how many has Newfoundland? Not one as far as I know. It has even been claimed by some that the trade of the West Indies is so great with the United States that the latter would willingly cancel the debt of Great Britain if she could get possession of these Islands. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that in taking up this matter of roads and tourists, we are looking beyond the subject which is of the most vital importance to the country. In connection with the herring industry, it is not only the man who catches the fish that receives employment, but the man who goes in the woods to cut the timber for staves, hoops and the women and girls who also handle the fish at various stages. The captains of schooners and their crews also find employment in bringing the catch to various ports for sale or shipment abroad. All these people are doing something, and are, therefore, producers, and we ought to take some steps at once to help this important industry along. It is right at our front door, and still we are doing nothing with it. A big drop in the export of herring from 1917 to 1923 was due to the fact that we had no market. Now we are told there are markets, and as I said before a Commissioner could find them. Without such a one we are at a loss as to the best way to go about this matter. In 1917 the pickled herring fishery brought us in something like Two Million Dollars, but now our exports are considerably reduced, and what is the Government doing about it? Nothing. We are told to-day that there are great markets in Germany and Russia, and we know we have millions of herring around our coast, but still nothing has been done to bring this fishery back to its former standing. A few years ago the fishermen were told it wouldn't pay to catch herring, and they went out of the business when Halifax stopped buying. We have lost sight of this fishery which is of the utmost importance and gone after the tourist scheme, the results of which are at best, problematical. I do not understand this lack of interest in the

most important industry—the fisheries —we have in this country, and I feel sure that the Government cannot be in earnest about this most vital question. We have to-day in this country roads, which the Prime Minister during the last session of this House, called a disgrace, and we have grants to-day given to outport places which will just about cover and take care of the amount of timber and plank required to plank our bridges. Further, there has been nothing done to repair the roads we have now. The Government can find two million dollars to spend on roads for tourists, but they have nothing additional to spend on our roads. We are told that we have a great country next door to us and the tourist problem in Newfoundland will never be much more than a fizzle. I may be mistaken but that remains to be seen. I want to be shown what returns can be expected for this great expenditure of two millions. As I said before, we have not yet been told anything as to how the money is going to be brought into this country by the expenditure of this amount on tourist roads. We are told that tourists are going to flock down here. Supposing they do, how is the money going to find its way into the Treasury. I cannot figure it out. I would like for some member of the Government to show me how we are going to get revenue by tourists coming in here. We are told that after the roads are built hotels will be opened in outlying places. Perhaps most of the roads will be built on the Avalon Peninsula, and if there is any money to be spent it will go to the people who carry on hotels and to people who carry on business here selling antiques and curios.

Really I am surprised that this House is asked to contemplate seriously the spending of such a large amount as two millions of dollars on such a project as the one referred to.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Chairman, like my colleague, Mr. Ashbourne, I want to go on record as being absolutely opposed to the spending of two million dollars for the building of new roads for tourists. I think that, as it is the intention of the Government to spend two million dollars on road-building, the right place to begin is in the outport districts, especially in the Northern districts of this country. Speaking as a representative for the district of Twillingate, it would take at least two hundred thousand dollars to-day to repair the roads in that district. In fact what we got there at present are not roads at all; they are goats paths, and our constituents are continually asking us to try and get money to repair the roads and bridges there. Owing to the dilapidated condition of the bridges there, it very often happens that cattle break their legs, so I think it would be a move in the proper direction on the part of the Government to repair the roads and bridges we have now. I am just in receipt of a letter from a prominent constituent with reference to the Grand Falls-Botwood road, which is in bad state, and asking for the sum of $10,000 to repair it.

(Reads letter to House).

Now the Grand Falls-Botwood road spoken of here was completed about eighteen months ago. Whether the road was completed as it should have been I am hardly in a position to say, but, if it takes $10,000 to repair the Botwood road to-day, it will take thirty-five or forty thousand dollars to put the Badger-Halls Bay line in condition so that motor cars can go over in safety. With such a state of affairs prevailing I think that the money anticipated to be spent on new roads should be spent on the roads in the outport settlements. Furthermore, I join with my colleague in stating that if two million dollars is to be expended something should be spent on the fisheries, or for that matter it would be a good proposition, in

my opinion, to spend this two million dollars and an additional two millions to get a fleet of sealing steamers to replace those in use at the present time. Our sealing steamers to-day are hump-backed like camels and it would be a move in the right direction to have some new ones built. It is not my intention to hold up the business of the House because my colleague has spoken at some length on this matter, but I would ask the Government, in the interests of the fisherman, the logger and the country generally not to spend this proposed two million dollars in a way that the working men of the country will not benefit one cent.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman, I have not had very much time to examine the contents of this Bill, but I have seen enough of it to oppose the expenditure of so large a sum of money as two million dollars to be found out of borrowed money. This country is not yet in the position to spend so large a sum now on motor roads, with the fanciful idea that we are going to get tourists down in such numbers as to repay the expenditure of it. I did hope that the Government was going to practise what it was preaching during the last general election—economy in our public expenditure—but up to the present time we have seen nothing carried out in this manner, except what was already planned by the Warren administration previous to its retirement from office. The Government cannot rightfully claim that what economies have been shown at this session is theirs, when all it did was to carry out the plans of the former government. The proposal now before us calls for the creation of a "Highroads Commission," to consist of four persons for whom good salaries will have to be provided. No one, from whom good results can be expected, can be expected to serve on the Commission, unless he is highly paid, for it will require much knowledge, time and attention, and the employment of such persons at high salaries suggests that you are determined on large expenditures. Are we in the position to spend lavishly to-day, when other and more important industries are demanding the immediate attention of the Government? My colleague, Mr. Ashbourne, has stressed the importance of the fisheries, particularly the cod and herring fisheries, and I am fully in accord with him. Our fishery is still the main and most important of our industries and what are we doing, not only to preserve it but to advance it beyond its present confines—practically nothing. Instead we are chasing after American tourists and are ready to spend two millions on what is only problematical, while we know with certainty, of the millions of fish of all kinds around our shores ready for market, if more encouragement was given for catching them. When may we expect the return of our two millions once it is spent? I fear we will be dead and buried before the country will see half the amount spent, return again.

Tourists have been coming to our country for years and they are gradually increasing in numbers according as they become better acquainted with its scenic and sporting attractions. Most of them come back again, even with the facilities that are ours to offer at the present tme, and I have not the slightest doubt that did we advertise these attractions on a larger scale, we would have a larger influx of tourists. One would imagine, from those favouring the Bill, that the only class of tourists that will come to Nfld are those in possession of motor cars, who will spend their time driving around, and be landed from the car to the salmon and trouting pools, without having to walk to them. There are such tourists, and there are also those in equal numbers who will be content to come by the

railroad, who will prefer a nice walk through the country and also to enjoy a canoe or row-boat over our beautiful lakes and rivers. They will prefer the rough-and-tumble camp life to the refinements of hotel life. Life in the open, enjoying the bracing air, the sunshine and the cool, invigorating breezes that our Newfoundland summers offer to all, will be more appreciated by this particular class of tourists. To think we can quickly rival Ontario and Quebec in the number of tourists coming to our shores, is not fair to delude our people with. Ontario and Quebec are close to the borders of the rich and populous New England States, New York, New Jersey and Michigan, who can within a few hours find themselves in Ontario and Quebec. Every week-end they can ride into these provinces and return again by Monday It is different with Newfoundland. They must drive through the Provinces of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, through Cape Breton, and then take passage by steamer. A journey that will take days to accomplish. And what are the provinces of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island experiencing to-day after all the money they have spent on highways. Very little tourist traffic compared to Ontario and Quebec, and the conditions of these provinces are such to-day, that delegations have had to go to Ottawa to implore the Government to help them out of the serious trade depression they are experiencing. We should go slow before we launch out on heavy expenditures when we have the experience of these provinces before us. I have no desire to discourage tourist traffic, but I do say that we have not made the most of the means that we have at our disposal. We have the railroad tapping many interesting and attractive parts of our country. Our steamers ply over beautiful bays and touch many points with scenic attractions that will please the eye of the most discriminating, and give them sport that will thrill them with delight. I repeat again—advertise these well. Show how near the railorad and steamers are to these places, with comparatively small cost to reach them. Place these advertisements in magazines and newspapers that are read by tourists of the class we want. Have it well illustrated. All this can be done at small cost compared to two millions for highways. Neither do I wish to discourage the building of highways. I would say—Go ahead with them as long as you can find money out of surplus revenue, out of money we have earned over and above our expenditure. Plan and work to have a surplus revenue from year to year, and out of it take a proportion for your highways. To build highways on borrowed monies with a debt of sixty millions already on an overburdened people, is not carrying out a policy of economy, or serving the best interests of the people. Our people are too heavily taxed already. It is with the greatest difficulty that the larger number of them can find income enough to make both ends meet. The cost of living is still going higher, and you propose to make the debt still higher without any definite assurance that their incomes will increase proportionately. I think much better use can be made of the monies being spent on the roads at the present time. There are too many roads in many localities which do not serve a useful purpose, but because some individual, during election year, makes it a condition of his support and influence that a road must be made to his door or his garden, too many of us comply with the demand, and the result is a number of roads, which while serving an individual, does not serve the community, for the reason that much of the money required in its principal roads

have been spent and wasted on the others.

One of the great needs of the country is the rebuilding of our Dock. Rebuilt properly it can, within a short time, earn enough and probably more to pay the interest on the money required for its construction, in the meantime finding work for the unemployed. But in the consideration of this need we are not to lose sight of the needs of the fishing industry without which the country cannot go on. I suggest to the Government to place this industry foremost, build highways only out of surplus revenue, and lighten, not add to the burdens of the people already heavily overtaxed, which further borrowing entails.

HON. THE PRIME. MINISTER— Mr. Chairman, I would like to say one word on this subject more particularly in reply to Mr. Ashbourne and Mr. Brown. But before doing so I would like to extend a welcome to Mr. Grimes on returning to his seat in this House once more.

It seems to me that both Mr. Ashbourne and Mr. Brown have not thought of one essential point, and that is that the building of tourist roads is an investment. If we were going to spend money on private roads in any district we could not borrow money for that. This is an enterprise which we expect to bring in returns in the way of tourist traffic. Though I don't mean to convince the hon. gentlemen, because I don't believe that I could, that it is going to be a profitable investment. Still it is an investment that we believe in on this side of the House. And though I don't say that the money is going to come in very rapidly, yet I do think when the tourist traffic begins that the people will be very much attracted to Newfoundland. And unless we embark on this project by building roads and hotels, the tourist traffic will never come. We have got to build roads and hotels, and we believe that the income will come as a result.

Mr. Grimes made a wrong statement, in my opinion, when he said that the people of Nova Scotia are going up to their Government with their fingers in their mouths looking for assistance because the tourists have not come. The people are going up to seek aid from the Government because the industries such as the coal and the iron are failing and the people, who have been largely dropping off from the farm enterprises and going back to the city industrial works, now find themselves without the means of livelihood. That is the reason that Nova Scotia is suffering to-day.

Mr. Grimes referred to the building of private roads in the outports. I don't know how many men accosted me while on my election campaign with exactly the same purpose. That is: "There is a small road wanted here, and another there. It is not a public utility. It does not lead through any town. But it leads to my farm and John Jones' farm and we want the road." In every instance in Bonavista Bay I told them that I would not give anybody one cent towards a private road. The public funds are only for putting main roads through settlements, and if they want private roads they must build them at their own expense.

I only want to say in connection with the tourist traffic that I firmly believe that it is a good investment, and the roads that will be built will be a benefit to the people if the tourist never came here at all. If the roads are built they will open up traffic and will bring motor cars here that will help to pay the expenses. At the same time I don't want to encourage people to be any more extravagant than they are. Tourist Hotels are badly needed. We find that many tourists are coming in on the West

Coast now. Would they not bring their families and come here for the Summer if they had good hotels to stop at and good roads to travel by. A tourist wants some kind of road to travel on, and if we want to open up the country we have got to build roads. I am firmly convinced, Mr. Chairman, that if we had to spend the money on roads that was spent on Branch Railways, we would be better off to-day. I want to say that I have very great faith in the tourist traffic, and I am not afraid to stand by it.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few remarks on the subject before the chair. Before doing so, however, I desire to say that I am approaching this subject free from Party bias. The subject is one I have believed in and have been intensely interested in for a number of years. I personally believe that we should have a better road policy for Newfoundland. It is regretable that during the last twenty-five or thirty years practically no attention has been given to this extremely important question. The various Governments, during the last quarter of a century, deserve the strongest censure for the indifference that has been displayed with regard to public highways throughout Newfoundland. Road-building in this country, Mr. Chairman, since I can remember, has been measured by the amount of votes that could be secured for the monies allocated for that purpose. The sums annually voted for road building or road improvement has been all together inadequate, and very little value has been given for that which has been voted. Some honourable gentlemen have stated that we have spent too much money on roads, and in answer I would like to explore that question a little further, and ascertain the correctness or otherwise of the assertion, and I do not think I can do that in a better way than by comparing the expenditure per capita on roads in this country with that of our great neighbour, the Dominion of Canada. Let us take the various Provinces from the Pacific to the Atlantic, and see what they are doing in the way of developing the country by roads. Let us begin at British Columbia. That Province makes an annual expenditure of $4,238,575.14. Its population is 524,582, which works out at an average of $808 per head.

Provinces	Expenditure	Population	Per Head
Alberta	$ 1,451,873.25	588,454	$2.46
Saskatchewan	2,964,355.70	757,271	$3.91
Manitoba	2,289,315.16	612,677	$3.73
Ontario	15,713,424.91	2,935,153	$5.35
Quebec	10,779,470.30	2,359,795	$4.56
New Brunswick	2,117,323.14	387,876	$5.45
Nova Scotia	3,436,625.34	523,837	$6.56
Prince Edward Island	433,695.02	88,615	$4.60
Newfoundland	**188,808.00**	**263,033**	**71 cents**

The above represent the amounts voted for the improvements and maintenance of roads plus the revenue derived from registrations and licenses of motor vehicles.

It will therefore be seen that the amount of money expended annually in Newfoundland has not been sufficient to keep the existing roads in repair, to say nothing about building new ones. It may be argued that stance the Deer Lake and Badger roads, etc. That is true, but we must also remember that Canada during the same trying period also spent much money upon the construction of

roads in order to furnish employment for her people in the same way that Newfoundland has done. Mr. Chairman, I think all honourable gentlemen on both sides of the House will agree that this apathy and indifference, this treating of a big and vital economic question as a joke, cannot continue for always. There must be a change, the country must be awakened to a sense of the importance of roads as a factor in the commercial and economic life of the country. When I say this, Sir, I at the same time realize the position we occupy financially and otherwise. I know that conditions in Newfoundland are in many respects different to those of Canada, but the fundamental principle remains the same, you cannot develop your country either from the standpoint of tourist trade or agricultural resources unless you penetrate its isolation by roads. We often hear people talk about the number of motor cars that are being imported into Newfoundland, it has been said that the city and country are being over-run by motor cars. In order to show you, Sir the ridiculousness of such a contention, I would crave the indulgence of the House for a few minutes while I compare the number of cars per capita in Newfoundland with that of the United States and Canada, and even taking into consideration the many handicaps that we admittedly live under the disparity is even then a remarkable one. The United States has a population of 104,231,737, there are 15,000,000 cars registered in that country which averages one car for every seven of the population.

Provinces	Population	Registration	Per Car
British Columbia	524,582	34,030	15
Alberta	588,454	40,642	14
Saskatchewan	757,271	61,367	12
Manitoba	612,677	42,205	15
Ontario	2,935,153	241,839	12
Quebec	2,359,795	62,087	38
New Brunswick	387,876	18,736	28
Nova Scotia	523,837	16,159	33
Princ Edward Island	88,615	2,167	41
Newfoundland	263,033	700	410

I repeat, Sir, that making due allowance for our own peculiar conditions, at the same time there is no reason why Newfoundlanders should be the only people in the world to be debarred from availing of the motor vehicle. If it is to the advantage of the people of other countries to substitute the motor car for the horse-drawn vehicles, does not the same rule hold good for Newfoundlanders, but before we can use motor cars economically we must have roads to drive over. Canada has outstripped us in the matter of road building, and as a natural consequence, the most backward Province in this respect has ten motor cars to our one, and the ratio for some of the Provinces would be 34 to 1.

Now, Sir, I would like to give the House a brief history of the present "Better Road Movement" in Newfoundland and why and where it had its origin. In 1915, a decade ago, we had a number of motor cars with practically no road to use them on. It occurred to me at that time that these motor cars that did so much to destroy our badly built roads should contribute something to their upkeep, and as the Government of that day paid little or no attention to the matter, I undertook to circularize the

owners of all motor cars in the city, asking them to help out the Road Board on the south side of Conception Bay by contributions, in order to enable the Board to re-build the Topsail Road. My efforts in that direction resulted in the sum of $185.00, which insignificant as it was had one good effect and that was to arouse the motor owners into forming an organization. Mr. Collishaw and other gentlemen had been endeavouring to form a Motor Association previous to that time, but without success. When I made this appeal to motorists and contributions were being made, they seized upon the opportunity, called a meeting of motor owners together and said to them "Why are you sending money to the South Shore Road Board, is it not better for us to form an Association, pool our money and then make some united effort at road improvements through the Association. A number of motor owners agreed, and then and there they formed the necleus of the Motor Association which we have to-day. If I had not sent that circular I wonder would we have a Newfoundland Motor Association in existence at the present time. However, that circular has been given the credit of being responsible for the inauguration of the movement. This was the first active organization advocating good roads for Newfoundland; much credit must be given to it for whatever good that has so far been accomplished. The Newfoundland Motor Association rendered valuable service in assisting us to bring into being the Road Commission in 1920. The Newfoundland Road Commission was created in 1920, but its good work, which is in evidence where ever the Commission operated, did not receive much encouragement or support in this House either from the Government or Opposition.

HOS. MR. BENNETT—I always supported your work.

MR. HIBBS—Perhaps I should exonerate you, but it is safe to say that the Commission's work was not appreciated to the extent that one might expect.

The revenue of the Road Commission was derived from motor taxes, and an annual Government Grant of $10,000.00 per year, and to show, Sir, how little this House was concerned with the building of roads, they actually decided in 1922, to withdraw that grant of $10,000.00, and after considerable bickering and opposition, it was eventually decided to permit the Road Commission to spend this amount, provided that it was spent in St. John's East and West. This was open breach of the original Act "For the maintenance of certain public Roads" passed in 1920.

As a result of the Road Commission work roads which were no better than cow paths in 1919 were converted into fairly passable highways.

Of all the public moneys expended for relief and otherwise during these strenuous years, the only allocations for which value was given was that expended by the Newfoundland Road Commission. In view of this indisputable fact one would naturally think that th Commission would be given charge of all expenditure on roads, but strange to say that the only that the Commission would be given the only moneys which created controversy, was that expended so creditably by the gentlemen who comprised that Commission, and who gave their time and services absolutely free. From all sides, it is true, praises were showered upon our work, but nothing more tangible was forthcoming, and while it is pleasant to be appreciated, it is very difficult to build roads on praise alone, and the attitude of both Government and Opposition towards this very first serious step to improve our disgraceful road system would indicate that faithful, honest, non-partisan effort was to be penalized.

We were building roads, we were

doing something substantial, something that reflected credit upon the country, and it seemed that we must therefore not receive any encouragement. I remember one of the numerous times when I interviewed Executive members regarding our road problem, and pointed out that the moneys being expended for relief work should be placed under the Commission, so that proper returns would be secured, the reply was, "Hibbs, you are mad, we are trying to relieve people, and you are talking of building roads."

Mr. Chairman, with regard to the Government's scheme as outlined in the Bills now before the House, I wish to repeat what I said in this chamber a few days ago. I am not by any means an extremist in respect to this tourist policy, I have some faith in the possibility of creating a tourist traffic in Newfoundland provided the Government approaches the matter right, but nobody can foresee just what is going to occur as the years go by, it must be regarded more or less as a speculation, a venture if you like, but a venture that I would have sufficient faith in to justify my support of the project. Every country in the world that has launched a new policy similar to this one, had to take a certain amount of chance, and the history of similar policies in other lands has justified the faith which the promoters placed in it. To be candid, however, if I could influence the Government's policy in this regard, anxious as I am to see a better road policy inaugurated, and desirous as I might be of seeing our House put in order so to speak, to cater to tourists, I would hesitate to spend $2,000,000.00 on one branch of this policy alone, unless we could afford to take care of other pressing needs. I would first of all take care of an industry, which we already have, and about which there is nothing uncertain, namely the Fisheries, and I would ear mark a half a million out of this two million dollar loan to be spent under expert direction, for promoting and boosting the various fisheries of the country. No matter what our opinion might be with regard to the development of a tourist trade, we cannot afford to neglect the greatest asset the country has, or is likely to have for a long time to come.

Mr. Chairman, last year I outlined a scheme, by which an amount of from a quarter to half a million dollars might be raised without involving the country in one cent's additional expenditure. My scheme was for the Government to authorize the Newfoundland Road Commission to raise a loan, the interest on which could be taken care of by the revenue received from motor taxation, and the present annual grant. The natural increase in motor cars will within a few years give the Road Commission a revenue of at least from fifty to sixty thousand a year. This amount would not only pay the interest on half a million dollars, but would enable a sinking fund to be formed which would take care of the principal in fifteen years. The Road Commission would independently pay off this amount itself, the same as is done in the various Provinces of Canada, and it would not be a charge upon the general funds of the Colony.

After a few years or so we may reasonably hope to be in a better financial position, and could then launch a more extensive policy. However, the Government has seen fit to undertake to spend two million dollars, as the initial step in preparing for this tourist trade, and I frankly admire their courage.

I wish to say, Sir, that my sympathies are with the movement to a great extent, I am supporting this tourist trade scheme on principal, I could not advocate such a policy under a Morris, Squires, or Warren

Government, and conscientiously condemn the same principal under a Monroe Administration. Some honourable gentlemen say that the whole scheme is visionary, which is true, but we would be badly off indeed if we had no vision as to the future development of the natural resources of Newfoundland. I had hoped that some safe sane scheme would be brought into being under the late administration, and such a programme no doubt would have materialized if the Liberal Government had not met a premature end. During recent years I took steps to acquaint myself with the possibilities of inducing tourists to visit Newfoundland. I placed myself in communication with numbers of people who visit this country annually, and have obtained some first hand information of what their opinions, in this respect were. I have also communicated with a number of our best known sportsmen guides in order to secure from them some facts as to our inland fishing and sporting resources, and the best means by which they can be tapped by roads.

On one occasion I came across the Gulf with a party of seventeen tourists, all but three of whom were strangers to Newfoundland. These people had formerly spent their vacations hunting moose and other game in Nova Scotia. Upon arrival at Port aux Basques, which by the way did not present a very inviting aspect on that particular day, as it was raining and foggy, I found these gentlemen unanimous in saying that if we had a good road, from Port aux Basques into the salmon trout rivers, and hunting grounds of the interior that it would be a great inducement to motorists to bring their cars, and thus be in a position to travel at easy stages and fish at will. One gentleman informed me that he was a member of a club, practically the whole of the members of which take an annual outing and he assured me that sixty or seventy from this one club could be induced to come to Newfoundland if only we possessed the necessary facilities of travel and comfort while here.

Modern touring cars are provided with camping outfits, by which the traveller can comfortably house his party where and when he chooses. The same thing in my opinion but even to a larger extent would occur here in St. John's, just as soon as the Peninsula of Avalon is properly supplied with roads, by which its beauty spots and fishing pools may be reached. Of course one of the first steps will be to provide a suitable hotel at St. John's, and in this connection I am very glad to see, that a number of prominent and representative gentlemen are about to form a company for the purpose of dealing with the hotel problem in the city. As I stated on previous occasions I believe that if we tapped the more important salmon pools, fishing rivers, and general sporting resorts, with roads, that suitable hotels would be erected at these points by private enterprise.

Mr. Chairman, with regard to the High Road Commission, a great deal will depend upon the management of the Government's scheme by that body, and the future of the whole venture, particularly as far as roads are concerned, will largely depend upon the personnel of the commission. I presume the Government realizes the importance of this phase of the question. I would strongly impress upon them the necessity of getting capable men, men who have the interests of this important project at heart, not men who will seek appointments on the Commission merely for the sake of the dollars that the job might bring to them, and above all very little progress can be looked for, if politics is not entirely eliminated in the consideration of appointees. Sir, we have before us an example of political interference with the work

of a similar institution. I refer to the present Road Commission. Everybody will agree, I think, that excellent work was done by the Newfoundland Road Commission up to last Spring when the change of Government came about, and while I am not reflecting upon the personnel of the present Commission, I do know that their activities were subjected to political wire pullings, and the result was that, comparatively speaking, very little value was given for the money expended last summer. The condition of the roads tells its own story in this regard, and now I would like to say a word on behalf of those who are actively associated with the Road Commission that operated from 1920 to 1924. These men, and some of them are associated with the present Commission, gave their services ungrudgingly in the advancement of the work they were intrusted with, and politics was never allowed to interfere with that work even in the remotest degree. I make this statement and challenge successful contradiction. I personally acted as Secretary on that Commission, and was actively identified with the work, and I know whereof I speak. During the strenuous period from 1920 to 1924 the position of Secretary of the Commission was no sinceure. My office was practically turned into a labour bureau, with hundreds of men daily seeking employment. My friend Mr. Halfyard who occupied an office in the same building can certify the correctness of this statement. Neither Mr. Soper or myself spent a holiday with our families while the work was in progress and practically every afternoon found us on some of the outlying roads supervising and directing the work. The policy of the new Commission the year past was to dismiss experienced men whom we had trained for four years, and who knew something of the art of building roads, and replacing them by others who were untrained and in some cases unfit for the work, simply because they were political friends of theirs. Road building is a science that I have tried to learn something of. In 1914 I took a correspondence course, and since then I have had some practical experience, and I contend that to-day I know how a road should be built, with the material that we have at our disposal, so that it will stand up against the wear and tear of present day traffic.

I repeat again, Sir, if the Government is in earnest, as I believe it is, and desirous of making a success of this important undertaking the whole scheme will have to be as non political as is possible to make it. I think the Prime Minister, Colonial Secretary and their colleagues in the Government would do well to follow the example set by Bermuda in her tourist trade programme. Bermuda has made a great success of her tourist trade, and with this success I have much pleasure in coupling the name of one of our fellow countrymen, Mr. John P. Hand, of Hamilton, Bermuda. Mr. Hand is one of the many Newfoundlanders, who has made good since leaving our shores. He occupies a very prominent position in Bermuda, being a member of the Legislature, and is also Chairman of the Trade Development Board of the Colony, and Mr. Chairman, I crave the indulgence of the House, while I read a few extracts from the letter which I have received from Mr. Hand with reference to the possibility of building up a tourist trade in Newfoundland.

"It may be of interest to you to know something of what we are doing in Bermuda, and of the importance of this trade to us right now. When the Armistice was signed, the only ship we had trading to the United States, was the old warship "Charybdis" which was on the Newfoundland station for many years, and which we

had converted into a merchant ship. We at once took steps to revive our tourist trade, and as our first requirement was good steamships, we sent a Commission (of which I was a member) to New York and London to secure them. We were fortunate enough to induce the Furness Withy Co. to purchase two steamers, each capable of carrying over three hundred first class passengers, and we made a five year contract with that Company to operate a regular service on schedule agreeable to us, for which we have been paying them about £30,000 per year. At the time we made this contract this amount was about one-third of our total annual revenue. The trade, thanks to wide advertisement, and excellent steamship service, was quickly revived, and we now have these two Furness ships performing each a weekly service between New York and Bermuda; and the Royal Mail Steam Packet Company operate a 14,000 ton steamer on weekly schedule from the middle of November to the middle of April, for which we do not pay any subsidy. In other words, during five months of the year, we have three large steamers arriving here each week from New York. This year we will have had about 30,000 visitors. The value of this trade to the Colony is, (conservatively) £600,000 to £700.000, and it is estimated that approximately 70% of our Government revenue is derived from this source. Whereas in 1919 one-third of our revenue was devoted to this development, to-day with the increased volume, the proportion is about one-tenth.

"In addition to £30,000 per annum for subsidies, our Government expends £7,000 for advertising, and £3,000 for sports and entertainment, the latter a very important feature in connection with the development of this trade. In addition to the Government vote, the hotels and business houses contribute to an advertising pool about £3,000 per annum, spend an additional £8,000 direct through advertising agents, and the two steam ship companies spend over £30,000 for advertising.

"Up to a few years ago the idea of developing the summer trade in Bermuda, which is sub-tropical, was ridiculed, but this year out of 30,000 tourists, the number coming during the summer months will be about 17,000; in other words we have succeeded in making Bermuda an all-year-round tourist resourt, largely due to our having the courage to advertise extensively its year-round attractions.

"Good roads made throughout the Avalon Peninsula, along the South West and up the East Coast, and from Port aux Basques to Grand Lake and Deer Lake, would do much to assist this trade. The most important factors, however, are good steamships, good hotels, and plenty of advertising. These things cannot be had without cost to the Dominion, nor without the courage among those who would be most likely to benefit from the tourist trade, to build hotels.

"The steamers now operating between New York and St. John's are not sufficiently large to develop a substantial volume of tourist, travel, but having regard to shipping conditions generally, and to the present state of Newfoundland trade particularly, there is nothing to warrant any steamship company putting on larger ships on this route. You should begin to put your house in order first by making St. John's a clean city, and then build a good hotel accommodation for about 250 guests, so planned as to be conveniently added to as the trade grows. Then you must be prepared to launch an advertising campaign to begin with a cost of about $25,000. A hotel, such as I have in mind, would cost about $500,000, the financing of which should not be difficult . As the trade grows the present steamers would have to be replaced by larger

ships, for which you would, undoubtedly, be warranted to pay substantial subsidies. This trade will not come to you over night, but the growth, especially in the early stages, will be slow; it has taken Bermuda over twenty-five years to reach its present position among tourist resorts. We began with a small hotel accommodating one hundred people ,and we will shortly open a new hotel, which we started about January 1st, and which will cost about $1,800,000, the bonds for which ($1,125,000) extending over twenty years, were taken entirely by Furness Withy Co., at 6%.

"In this country we have a Government Board called the Trade Development Board (of which I am Chairman) looking after this development constantly, and we are fortunate enough not to have any party politics, and, consequently, have only one interest at heart, namely the development of the Colony's trade, from which we all benefit indirectly. I would suggest that if any serious effort is made to increase the tourist trade in Newfoundland, this work should be done by the Board of Trade, to which body the necessary funds required should be handed over and without any restrictions, beyond having to account annually for the disbursement of such funds, with a report on the work done and the results accomplished.

"I am enclosing herewith one of our booklets, over 100,000 of which, at a cost of about $8,000, were distributed this year to steamship, railway and tourist agents in the United States and Canada. As an example of our faith in the tourist trade we are spending £10,000 on the British Empire Exhibition, where we shall have our own pavilion. The idea has been ridiculed by many people, who say we have nothing to sell to England, but our Board believes we have the most beautiful country ,and the finest climate in the world, to offer to the millions who will visit this exhibition, and that in the course of a few years, arising out of this effort, we will have secured a direct and regular steamship service between England and this Colony, and that this will aid considerably to our tourist trade.

"I have given you my views which, in connection with Newfoundland, may not be practical, but allowance must be made for the fact that I am not on the spot, and for many years have not been in close touch with your local conditions. However, if there is a substantial body of opinion at home, favourably inclined to the idea of at least making an effort to develop the tourist trade, the main points I have suggested are sound in principle, that is larger ships, good hotels, and plenty of advertisement. Other essentials are, as far as St. John's is concerned, a cleaner city, with sports and entertainments for the tourists when they come. In the latter connection, I understand that your half-holidays, when sports are going on, is on Wednesday, and that the steamers arrive on Thursday; this should be changed so that visitors would have somewhere to go on the day they arrive."

Mr. Chairman, this letter is from a Newfoundlander who has made good in Bermuda, has done a great work for Bermuda, and has a practical knowledge of the subject which we are discussing. It might be argued, Sir, that Bermuda possesses many more attractions than does Newfoundland. Personally, I don't subscribe to that idea. As a Winter resort, Bermuda is at her best, but her climate being sub-tropical, does not afford a greater attraction from a climatic standpoint in Summer than does Newfoundland, and yet Mr. Hand states that seventeen thousand out of thirty thousand tourists visited them during the summer season.

Mr. Chairman, a few days ago in this House, I stated that Newfoundland would have to advertise exten-

sively if we hope to acquaint people with the natural attractions which we possess, and it will be noted that Mr. Hand thinks that we should begin by spending twenty-five thousand dollars in advertising, I hope that shock will not be too great for any honourable gentleman present; but I repeat, Sir, that after we get our roads and hotels built, and after we secure adequate steamship service, a successful tourist trade will not be brought about unless we advertise and advertise in the right way. The importance of the whole undertaking is very great indeed, and too much attention cannot be given to it by every honourable member on both sides of the House. It is a scheme which commits the country to an initial expenditure of two million dollars. Having committed ourselves to this extent, we cannot afford to stop, we will have to go on, and, in my opinion, before you get your roads built, solve our hotel problem and provide the necessary facilities to accommodate tourists, not the least important of which will be your advertising programme, you will have to spend not two millions but ten. By that statement I do not mean that we will not be in a position to accommodate tourists before any such large amount of value for the money expended is apparent to every thoughtful man who knows anything about road building in a country like this where there are no municipalities to assist, and where the burden must rest with the Govt. alone, that two million dollars, although it might be as much and more than we at present can afford, will not go very far in providing adequate highways We cannot build more than from three hundred to three hundred and fifty miles of new road, including bridges, for two million dollars, and in order to do that much, you will have to have your work properly organized and supervised, if you are to get the maximum amount of value for the money expended. I am not saying this, Sir, with any intention of discouraging the project, but rather as a warning to the Government in connection with their contemplated scheme.

Before concluding, I would say again to Mr. Monroe and his Government, approach this matter cautiously and carefully. It is a big proposition and we are only now in the speculative stage, and there is always the danger of being carried away by impulsiveness on the part of those, who though meaning well, cannot possibly have any assurance of ultimate results. However, the principle behind the movement is a very sound one, even apart from the tourist trade programme, which is the most important aspect, viewing it from the standpoint of early financial returns. The value of good roads in the development of any country cannot be overestimated, as roads both in respect to agriculture and commerce, are the arteries through which the trade of every country flows, and I cannot believe that Newfoundland will be any exception to this rule.

I agree with the houourable the Prime Minister, that we would be better off to-day. if we had built roads instead of adopting the branch railway policy of 1913. Mr. Chairman, it is difficult for one to criticize the actual scheme itself in detail unless some programme showing the sections in which roads are to be built, was more fully submitted to us, but up to the present we have not had that information.

With regard to the wording of the Bill itself, I think that taking it on the whole, while there might be some room for improvement, it is very full and comprehensive. It is of course copied from Canadian Acts, and there is no doubt, but the highway authorities in those provinces, have given a great deal of attention to the subject.

And now, Sir, before taking my seat, I will again say, make this Com-

mission non-political and non-partisan, and your scheme will meet with the sympathy and support of gentlemen on both sides of the House, as well as throughout the country, in a general way, although we may not be able to see eye to eye in every detail. Personally I have faith in the tourist trade policy if properly carried out, and in so far as the Government places principle and country before party, they will have my support, and I sincerely hope the undertaking will meet with abundant success.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words in connection with this Bill, and I think I may as well say them now before we proceed any further. In all that has been said in connection with this matter, the various speakers have referred to the spending of two million dollars, but nobody has said whether it is to be spent at once or not. When the raising of the loan was spoken of last year we were told that two millions were to be cut out for roads. I think that the opinion expressed by Mr. Hibbs is probably correct, and that the upkeep and extension of the roads will cost altogether about ten millions. It is very doubtful if it is wise to take up this problematical scheme or not. In referring to the Bill the speakers on this side of the House have dealt with the subject in which they were most interested—Mr. Ashbourne with fish, Mr. Hibbs with roads, and so on, but all agreed that too much money is to be spent. I have heard the Prime Minister say that he believes in the project, and I am glad to hear that, as many things have been introduced and passed in this House which nobody had faith in, and consequently they did not prove successful. Now we cannot judge the extent of the traffic that will be coming here by the few who now visit us to fish in our salmon pools on the West Coast. These people only come for the novelty of the thing, such as living in the open and sleeping in camps. We will have to get more than these, and have other attractions besides the natural ones. In some countries the tourist policy has been carried on a most expensive scale, and some cities are practically maintained by such traffic, such as Bermuda, Atlantic City and points in the South of France like Monte Carlo and Cannes on the Riverie. The people go to these places because they have every facility to get there, and when they arrive there are all kinds of amusements and attractions, such as the Casino, the roulette wheel, etc. And we will have to get attractions before we can induce many to come here. Some time ago I was in Messina in the South of Italy, shortly after the earthquake. I spent two days at Tormino and the whole population consisted of tourists. I also spent a Sunday on the lakes of Killarney with an English friend, and viewing the scenery, he said it was grand. But I am of the opinion that we have far better in the hills around Broad Cove and Petty Harbour. The reason why he apreciated the beauties of Killarney was because he had been brought up in the City of London, and had never seen the lakes and the hills before. Now if the Government is going to expend two millions on the tourist policy, I think they should go slowly about spending it all on the roads, because I expect we will have to subsidise steamers to call here and take other steps to encourage visitors to come. Therefore, I think some of the money should be reserved till we find out if we can get these people here, as otherwise the policy would be a poor one, and unless the visitors come we will have the roads and nothing else. As to advertising our climate, great consideration will have to be given, because if we bring people here and they find nothing but cold, they will go back and tell their friends and prevent them from coming.

Of course, we in Newfoundland do not know anything about touring. We are all too poor. How many tourists are there in Newfoundland? How many people in Newfoundland make money enough to go touring in Bermuda and other places? So we know practically nothing about touring or tourists, except a few people who might happen to go away to see a little of the world. As I said before, to get steamers to carry tourists here might be more profitable than the building of roads. It is alright for the Government to put on a good steamer like the one built for the Cabot Strait, but people who travel on that steamer and then have to ride through a barren country over our railroad are not likely to repeat that journey again, and, perhaps, the Government might sometimes find it necessary to put another steamer on to bring people to more accessible places like Placentia, so that instead of one steamer for the tourist traffic they will want two. Of course it is all a matter of speculation. If we are going to have lines of steamers to come here we have to get better docking facilities for them. We will have to have the Narrows cleaned up and the rocks around there blasted away so as ships like the warship that brought the Prince of Wales here and other steamers can come through the Narrows and have docking facilities in the harbour. The Prime Minister said the other day that he was opposed to the West India steamship service. I cannot understand him saying that, a man who knows what a benefit to Newfoundland the West Indies and the Mediterranean are, linking us up as they do with about twenty millions of people, to whom we sell our products. However, I suppose he has his own reasons for that; but it is very difficult to put anything in force in this House unless the people of Water Street are satisfied. These people are very philanthropic in their talk, but when their pockets are touched because of any measure which might be beneficial to the country they are opposed to it. I think it advisable that our harbour should be looked after better than it is so that steamers can move in and out. As the honourable member for Fogo has said, if this highroads commission is to be a success it must be non-political. If the Government is sincere in this thing they will make the commission non-political instead of forming a commission and making Government appointments that are purely political. Any political dump is never a success and this commission will never be a success if it is filled with political partisans. We heard a great deal of criticism here yesterday over the remarks made by Captain Randell, who is a practical and independent man and got his information when he was out on the Humber, and any criticism he made was not for the purpose of criticising the Humber project but for the helping out of the project, so that things going on there might be looked into and remedied. A remark was made here yesterday about my colleague, Mr. Halfyard, being a party to giving me a contract for coal, and I am glad to have the opportunity of bringing this up this afternoon. I had intended bringing up this matter at the last session of the House, but I thought it better to let sleeping dogs lie. However, I am going to tell the House the story about that coal now. When the Prime Minister was first appointed leader of his party at a public meeting held in St. John's he said and thought to let the people of St. John's believe what an awful grafter Hickman was. He also used it in his campaign in Bonavista district and made the people there believe that I got considerable graft on coal. Now the Government from which I got that contract I opposed in the Spring Election of 1923, when I contested the district of Harbour Grace. In August

of that year tenders were asked for coal for the supplying of public institutions. I submitted a tender which I considered was low enough. When I was awarded the contract I was the most surprised man in St. John's. I never expected to get it. I did not ask anybody in the Government for it, neither did I know who comprised the Board of Works at that time. However, it was asked during last session of the House for those tenders for that coal to be laid on the table when it was discovered that my tender was 1.20 per ton under Harvey & Company, $1.00 under A. H. Murray and something like 45 cents over Morey & Company. I did not know why I got it until I met a member of the Board. He said to me, "You got the contract for the coal." I replied that I had but that I was rather surprised to know it. He said that there were five members on the Board, that he and another member voted for me and that the other two members voted for Morey & Company; but he said, "the reason I voted for you was that I thought you would give us coal and not a part of the Southside Hills." But the man who decided the whole matter of the contract was the Hon. Mr. Power, the father of the honourable member for St. George's. When it came to Mr. Power to decide he said, "I am going to vote for Hickman, because if he makes a few cents off the contract he will spend them in the West End of the city." That, gentlemen, is the history of the graft that I am supposed to have got two years ago. Now I just want to make myself clear. I am opposed to the use of personalities. I never used personalities against any man in public life. I toured Conception Bay as a colleague of Mr. Bennett's, the present Colonial Secretary, in 1923, and as an opponent of his for the same district of Harbour Grace in 1924, and he knows that I never stooped to personalities in either of those campaigns. I did not intend to bring this coal matter up, but yesterday afternoon my colleague, Mr. Halfyard, was accused wrongfully, in my opinion, and a reflection was cast upon him and the Government that he was a member of.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY —Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my deep sense of appreciation for the very fair criticisms we have listened to this afternoon, and, I might say, that I am quite in sympathy with many of the contentions put forward by Mr. Ashbourne, Mr. Brown and others with regard to the fisheries. We all know and we all must realize that it is the same story we hear every session with regard to the fisheries, and I want to say now that if there is anything I can do to assist the fisheries and to make them more lucrative or to have them carried out more profitably it will gladly be done, and I feel sure that any practical suggestions made from the other side of the House will receive the ready consideration of the Government. But we cannot afford to continue harping on the one string. We are now embarking upon a new enterprise and we cannot say positively or definitely just yet what will be the outcome until it is given a chance. There is a certain amount of chance taken in all enterprises, so also in this project we are taking a chance. I also want to express my very high appreciation for the care and trouble the hon. member for Fogo, Mr. Hibbs, has taken with regard to certain statistics that he has laid before the House this afternoon. I was not present when he made the comparative statements of the different provinces of the Dominion of Canada as to their expenditure on roads as compared to that in Newfoundland, Newfoundlanders, in some places, don't expend one-eighth or one-tenth what is spent in other places. Mr. Hibbs, one of the gentlemen to whom I referred when in-

troducing this Bill on Tuesday, is a man who has given excellent services and performed wonders with the means at his disposal, with regard to the improvement of roads on the Peninsula of Avalon.

We are now entering on a very much larger and more comprehensive scheme, and therefore we have got to get more comprehensive machinery. We can hardly ask the gentleman to carry out a large and important work, such as this is, although he has done so well in a small way. I hope that the new commission will do comparatively as well in the larger undertaking.

The Tourist business is one that I know a little about, although I have not given that matter the close attention, and have not made such researches as Mr. Hibbs has, but I know something about Bermuda. I spent a part of a winter in Bermuda, three or four years ago. I want to say right here and now that Newfoundland has many more attractions than Bermuda. The only attraction that Bermuda has is the fine weather, there is nothing else there. There is not a bird to be seen flying in the air. There is not a fish in the waters outside of what you get out of the sea—the fish that frequent Southern waters. It has a beautiful climate, but it has its bad seasons as well as its good ones. You will find, that in Bermuda, it rains for weeks and weeks at a time. Everybody is boosting Bermuda. I knew my friend, Mr. Hand, very well. He is a very able man. He had to leave the country a few years ago, being afflicted with tuberculosis. He had to leave his native land, and he went to the Southern States, from there he went to Bermuda, and his success was phenomenal. He is one of the most important and the most respected man in the whole colony to-day. Mr. J. P. Hand is known far and wide. He is a member of the Legislature, one of the leading business men and a large hotel owner, and when he went to Bermuda first it was a different country from what it is to-day.

I was in the Legislature, at Bermuda, when they were discussing the very question that Mr. Hibbs spoke about this evening, and you know that during the war they cut off all means of communication with Bermuda and the continent. The warship Charybdis was in Bermuda at the time. She was bought from the Admiralty, and converted into a merchant ship, carrying freight and passengers to New York. They spent four hundred thousand pounds on her which nearly swamped the Bermuda Government.

While I was in the House, every member had a look of consternation on his face. They were asking themselves how they were going to get sufficient money to pay for the repairs and alterations of the Charybdis. To-day, Bermuda could almost build a fleet of warships with the revenues they are getting in.

I do believe that ninety per cent. of this revenue is derived from the tourist traffic. There is nothing exported from Bermuda to-day. Their only export trade was onions and celery and other root crops, which they used to send to the American markets, but now they can only supply enough to feed their own population and the people that go over there.

As I said before, Newfoundland has very many more attractions than Bermuda. Outside of the golf links, Bermuda has nothing. They haven't even a theatre, but they have magnificent hotels.

I merely want to confirm the remarks of my hon. friend in reference to Bermuda as regards the tourist traffic. He made a remark about Norway. I am sorry I have not got the statistics to give you, so as to

give you an idea of what the tourist traffic meant to Norway. Their climate is much the same as our own, and they get tremendous revenues from the tourists coming from England and the continent. I have heard it said that Newfoundland resembles Norway in very many respects, and it has sporting facilities which Norway does not possess. We live next door to the American continent with one of the largest populations in the world, and more money than any other country to-day, and ready to spend it. It is not a dream. It is a well-conceived and well thought out policy that we have faith in. What expressions have we heard from distinguished visitors; what have we heard from Earl Haig and Admiral Feild of the "Hood," and the large staff of officers. I had the opportunity of spending a day out in the country fishing with some of the officers of the "Hood." What expressions they used! They wished that they could come back and spend three months here next year. They were astounded at the beauties of the country and the atmosphere and the climate, and that after touring the world, they would prefer to come back and spend three months here than any place they had been. And they would be perfectly satisfied if they could get the opportunity. But we have no places to accommodate the people that come here. We have no decent hotels in this country. They have ten in Bermuda, because they have sufficient faith in their own country. In regard to an enterprise of this kind, it has been more or less a case of bandying words between people for the past 8 or 10 years that we should not spend this money. The man that does not spend money on his business will never get anywhere. The country that never spends any money towards forwarding its business enterprises will certainly never get anywhere. I was just reading here in the Report of the Board of Trade this morning what it said about the tourist traffic. (Reads Report).

This shows you that the gospel is spreading. The Board of Trade is taking it up. Why should not the hon. members on the other side of the House become boosters instead of trying to knock this effort. Cannot they be Newfoundlanders first and politicians afterwards. We are not doing this with any political idea. We don't intend to make a political matter of it at all. The very constitution of the Board is not going to be political. We hope that the best men that can be found will be on that Commission. Men that the people have confidence in and men that are fit for the work. I need not again state that the people can have no misgivings with regard to the Government's attitude in this respect. We believe in what we are doing and every man can help to bring about that end. No man, I am quite sure, wants to see this fail. Every man wants to see this thing go through. If we can develop and augment our revenues we will be helping the fishermen. As I said on opening day, we have to broaden out so that we must get an increase in revenue by finding other sources of income. I want to say in reply to the Leader of the Opposition, that I will thank him for his very fair, t h o u g h brief criticism. I believe that Mr. Hickman would like to see this policy develop. It is only natural from his side of the House that he has got to say something that will indicate that he is not altogether in favour of the spending of large sums of money. But I want to make this statement as far as he is concerned. I had the unique distinction of going through the District of Harbor Grace with him as a colleague and again with him as an opponent. But I want to say this that I never heard

Mr. Hickman make any objectional personal reference to any political friend or enemy. I hope that his experience of myself is somewhat similar. I have always made it a point to avoid being personal because I feel that I have as many friends on the other side of the House as I have associated with me on this side. I think that it is a very unfortunate circumstance if men who cannot see eye to eye with one another on political matters that this should interfere with their personal friendly affiliations. I certainly regret that this should be so. However, I don't think that it exists to any great extent. I believe that this Bill will accomplish all that we claim for it. Of course the tourist traffic will not develop in one or two years. It has to grow and the expenditure will not all take place in any one year. It will probably take two years for this amount of money to be spent. Perhaps we will have occasion to bring the matter before the House in the near future to show how we are progressing in this work.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I fear that the remarks made by the Hon. Colonial Secretary do not give the information required by the members on this side of the House. But there is one remark which he made which I think should be considered that the Government expects a great influx of visitors during the coming season. If that is so do you not think that the first thing that we ought to do is to build a hotel. If people come here this year in the great numbers which is expected you should have accommodation for them. Do you not think they will want some suitable place to put up. The present condition of the roads will obtain for the next two or three years. Then if that is the case do not you think that it would be better to build an hotel first. That is a point that is worthy of consideration by this House and the introducer of the bill. One of the reasons for the repeal of the Prohibition Act was the effect it would have in inducing outsiders to come here. That is accomplished and the next thing should be to build a hotel. When the hotel is built we can build the roads. This is not the opportune time for the construction of roads to the extent that is contemplated in this bill. It has been said that monies sent to the outports have been wasted. Perhaps that is true to some extent. The experience of Road Building under the Road Commission is that to build a road properly it costs about five thousand dollars per mile, and in some cases they have had to spend as much as seven thousand dollars. If you were to send five thousand dollars to any community to repair ten miles of road you would frighten them. They would ask in amazement where all the money came from. I do not blame the outports because they have not better roads. They do not get money enough to repair the roads. After the winter's weather and the frost comes out of the ground it leaves bad places everywhere in the roads, and it takes every bit of money that they can get to fix up these and repair the bridges. I cannot see how you can expect the outports to have better roads. We cannot afford to have good roads. We are a fishing country and always will be. If we assisted the fishermen to a small extent and give them a bit of money to build roads to their gardens our money would be spent wisely and well because we would be helping in some small way these men in their agricultural pursuits. To spend money on the improvement of the harbours would also be spending the money rightly. Perhaps that is the first thing that we should spend our money on because as I said we are a fishing country. The highroads should take the second place. We must look after the people living in the outports. In this country the people have settled

down among the hills and it is impossible to build roads and highways among them. And we will never be able to take advantage of the highways mentioned in the bill before us. I am speaking for the country as a whole, and I think that this is not an opportune time to introduce a bill to spend such large sums of money on road building. Get the hotels built first and if the tourist traffic works out to a successful conclusion then you can get the roads built afterwards. It will do no good if you advertise the attractions of the country and have two or three hundred people come down here, and if there is no accommodation they will go back and spread the report that it is no good going down to Newfoundland because there is no accommodation. They will not be very particular about the roads. They do not expect to have boulevards and streets like they have in their own cities, but they do expect to have decent places to reside while they are here. And I repeat again what I said yesterday we cannot tell what conditions will obtain next year. We are just getting over a period of depression and are paying our bills with current revenue according to the statement of the Minister of Finance, therefore we should not be too sanguine as to what the result will be twelve months from now, and saddle the country with an additional yearly taxation of another hundred thousand dollars. If things are alright then we might build a few miles of road under the Road Commission, but there is no necessity of creating a department. I think that we should go along for another year and if we have a surplus we might spend a hundred thousand dollars under management similar to that which we have at the present time.

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 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.

Second Reading of Bill entitled, "An Act to Amend the War Pensions Act, 1922."

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, in moving the Second Reading of this Bill. I might say that there is nothing of a contentious nature about it. The Bill provides that the extension of time for the claiming of pensions has been put to the 31st day of July, 1925. This has been done on the recommendations of the War Pensions' Board and the Executive of the Great War Veterans' Association. Heretofore any applications not in up to January 1st, 1922, would not be considered; but it has come to the notice of the Pensions Board that there are quite a few cases in which pensions are being claimed for injuries and diseases which are immediately attributable to the war, and it is to cope with such cases that this Bill is for.

The first section provides that a pension shall not be awarded unless an application has been made for it within three years after the date of the death in respect of which pension is claimed, or within three years after the date upon which the applicant has fallen into a dependent condition, or on or before the 1st of July, 1925. The second section provides "When a member of the Forces in receipt of an additional pension on account of his child or children dies under conditions which do not entitle his dependents to a pension, a bonus equivalent to such additional pension for one year at the rate being paid at the time of death shall be paid by the Commission for the benefit of the child or children to such person as the Commission may direct." The object of that is when the pensioner dies leaving a wife and

young children, the pension ceases and it is then a crucial time for the survivors it was thought by the Board of Pensions to continue the pension in the way of a bonus for one year afterwards.

Section three says: "On the death of the wife of a pensioner, pensioned on account of disability, the additional pension for a married member of the Forces may, in the discretion of the Commission, be continued to him for so long as there are minor children of pensionable age and provided there exists a daughter, or other person over seventeen years of age, competent to assume, and who does assume the household duties and care of the children." By this is meant where a married member of the Forces leaves a wife and she afterwards dies, then provision is made for the children, provided they are minors, and provided there is a daughter there to take the responsibility of the household and to look after the spending of the money.

Section four provides an augmentation to British soldiers who were members of the Imperial Forces, who resided in Newfoundland prior to 1914, who are since living here and who are receiving pensions from the Imperial authorities. Their pensions will be augmented up to the amount they would receive as a member of the Newfoundland Regiment.

Section five provides for the annual bonus which is paid for another year. This was paid last year and a Bill passed the House last session for this purpose. It is now provided to incorporate the bonus in the Bill again this year, and make the bonus payable up to the 30th day of June, 1926

I might say that this Bill does not involve any additional vote. The whole expenditure will not mean much and besides this expenditure will be offset by those who are going off the pension list from time to time. These are the salient points of the Bill and I would ask that the Bill be accepted and put into Committee Stage at the next sitting of the House.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the Bill, affecting our returned soldiers who did so much, will receive the hearty support of every member of the House; but I thing the honourable introducer will appreciate the necessity of deferring the Second Reading of it because it has only just been placed in our hands and we would like to deal with the Bill intelligently.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, in order to facilitate the business of the House, I think it would be just as well that the second reading be accepted seeing that the principle of the Bill has been accepted by the honourable member.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, I feel sure that nobody is going to obstruct the Bill. But whether it is important or not, it has been only put in our hands a moment ago. Unless there is a desire to rush legislation through there is nothing to be gained by passing the Second Reading this evening.

MR. MOORE—Mr. Speaker, I am very much interested in this Bill and I think when the honourable member who has just sat down was Colonial Secretary he was frequently approached in connection with matters contained in this Bill also. I understand that this Bill in the main is for the purpose of assisting returned soldiers who were paid for a year after the war and who became ill since. Well I think that this Bill should go through this House, in all its stages, right now. I know of men in several districts who are suffering from diseases and injuries which are directly attributable to the war. I know particualrly of one man in St. John's who was getting $30 a month for his leg which became tubercular as a result of his war activities, but the doctors who examined him said that his disease was not

brought about by the war and his pay was stopped. I interviewed Commander Howley on behalf of the man to try and have something done for him, but without avail, and it is for men of that kind that this Bill is going to help. I am persorally entirely in support of this Bill and if the Government does no other good than provide for some of the poor returned soldiers who are now lying in Sudbury and other institutions, I feel sure that it will have amply justified its existence.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Mr. Speaker, in connection with this Bill I might say that matters have now got to the stage concerning returned soldiers and pensions that this House has got to deal with cases that the Pensions Board had no authority to deal with. I know of sons in a family in my district who were killed in the war and the sons who were left home to support their mother, the father being dead, have since died, with the result that the mother is left in destitute circumstances. I know of a man in Baine Harbor who is in a frightful condition, and who is not able to get any financial assistance from the authorities although he had sons killed in the war. These are some of the reasons why we are asked to pass legislation so as the Pensions Board can deal with cases of this kind and so as to give a square deal to the fathers and mothers of sons who went overseas and never came back. The Government does not want to place an extra burden on the country. The Bill emanates from the Pensions Board and the Executive of the Great War Veterans' Association. Surely it is not the intention of any honourable member of this House to hold up a Bill of this nature. The honourable member for Trinity, Mr. Halfyard, admits the principle of the Bill and why does he object to the Second Reading passing the House to-day? Why the delay?

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, it is only a matter of ordinary plain procedure or necessity. You are not going to call down His Excellency the Governor until the session is closing are you. Well that is the only reason. If there is no necessity for putting this Bill through in a hurry why are you railroading matters through the House. But if you want it to go through of course it is going through. Only dont depart from the usual parliamentary procedure.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE —Mr. Speaker—There is nothing in the procedure of the House to prevent this Bill from going to the second reading, provided you are satisfied. And as Mr. Halfyard said that he was quite prepared I think we should go on with the second reading.

MR. HALFYARD—I suppose there must be some reason. I suppose the Hon. the Prime Minister is having a lot of ladies here on Monday so he wants to get this done all the quicker, so that he will be able to give the ladies more attention.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Colonial Secretary, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the War Pensions Act 1922" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill 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, March 9th, at three of the clock p.m

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, March 9th, 1925.

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

MR. POWER—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Woods Island, in the District of Bay of Islands, in connection

with a ferry service from that place to Corner Brook. A large number of the people of Wood's Island are employed at Corner Brook and they want some convenience in getting back and forth. I therefore give this petition my heartiest support and hope it will receive the consideration which it merits.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY —Mr. Speaker, I beg to table the reply to the question of Mr. Duff, No. 4 on the Order Paper of March 6th.

HON. MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—Mr. Speaker, I wish to present the answer to the question of Mr. Halfyard on March 6th.

NOTICE OF MOTION.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—To ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 52 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of Egress from Churches, Theatres and other Buildings."

On motion of the Hon. the Minister of Justice the Bill was read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time on to-morow.

NOTICE OF QUESTION.

MR. BROWN asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the table of the House a statement showing: (a) What work was done by the "Dredge" while operating at Newtown and Wesleyville last summer, and what was the total cost of her operations in that connection; (b) How many days were spent each at Wesleyville and Newtown, and how many loads were taken from each place; (c) Give the names of men authorized to act as Supervisors at each place, from whom the Captain was to take his instructions, and if no supervisors were appointed, why was not instruction given to the Captain direct from the Minister; (d) If Supervisors were appointed, to show how much each was paid for their services, and also to show amounts paid other give the name in each case; (e) To lay men for services rendered, and to on the Table of the House, copies of all bills for supplies and coal to the "Dredge" while operating at these places, and to show the name of the Supplier in each case.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Brown, I beg leave to ask that question.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I beg to table the answer.

MR. BROWN asked Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs to lay on the Table of the House, copies of all correspondence in connection with the removal of the Postal Telegraph building at Newtown, and to state: (a) On whose authority it was removed from one site to another; (b) Give names of the persons authorized to have the building removed; (c) To table a statement of the cost of removing the building, and to state the names of the men paid in this connection, and the amount paid to each man, and also to show what work was done besides for which cheques were issued as payment, in connection with the removal of the Post Office, etc.; (d) To state whether the opinion of the people was consulted before the removal was authorized, and if a public meeting was held for the purpose; (e) To state if the building is now on private owned land, or on land owned by the Department. If owned by the Department to state from whom it was purchased and the amount paid for same.

HON. THE MINISTER OF POSTS—Mr. Speaker, I beg to table the answer.

MR. BROWN asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing what work was performed on the road between Gambo and Carmanville, and to give: (a) The amount of money spent to-date on ths road, and to lay on the Table of the House, copies of the Returns for such expenditures,

showing the names of the men employed; (b) Show the names of surveyors and foremen employed, and to lay on the Table of the House, copies of all bills for supplies in connection with this work, and the name of the Supplier in each case; (c) Also to state if it is the intention of the Government to continue the work the coming summer and fully complete it.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—In reply Mr. Speaker I may say I have no knowledge of work done between Gambo and Carmanville and therefore I am not in a position to answer sections (a), (b) and (c).

MR. DUFF asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to answer my question No. 7 on the Order Paper of March 5th.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—For the information of the House I may say I passed the information to Mr. Ashbourne after the closing of the House on Friday.

(5) MR. HALFYARD asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing the total amount of money paid by his Department or any other Department of the Government for the building of 2¾ miles of road from Old Perlican to Lead Cove, Trinity District.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—In reply I may say the amount of $8,000 was paid the Road Commission for work on the road between Old Perlican and Lead Cove, Trinity District, on the recommendation of Capt. Randell and Mr. Hibbs.

(6) MR. HALFYARD asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the Table of the House a statement giving the names of any Labor Agents employed by any Department from June, 1924, to date; state the sphere of activities of each Labor Agent and the salary paid each.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—The answer is not ready yet but I will furnish it as soon as possible.

(7) MR. HICKMAN asked the Minister of Public Works what is the position held by W. Strickland of Spaniard's Bay; what salary he has been receiving and is he still under pay and what work is he doing.

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

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that my question No. 3 on the Order Paper of Feb. 23rd has not yet been answered.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—I now have the answer to question No. 1 on the Order Paper for March 6th which I will now lay on the table of the House. I also wish to table the answers to No. 5 of March 3rd, which was asked by Mr. Scammell in reference to the District of Bay de Verde; also the reply to question No. 1 of March 3rd by Mr. Ashbourne as to the Poor Asylum.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, I am sure the honourable members on this side would appreciate the courtesy of a reply and I again respectfully ask for the answer to question asked by me on Feb. 23rd.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—The answer is being sent up from the department now.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, I think there is some misunderstanding. The reply to question No. 5 of to-day refers to the work undertaken in October, 1924, and recommended by Capt. Randell and Mr. Hibbs. I think there is a misunderstanding because the work I speak of was done by Mr. Goodyear last year and paid for through the Government Engineer. I would also like to ask the Minister of Marine when we are going to have the report of his department.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—It has been on the table of the House some time.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, I wish to remind the Hon. the Minister of Posts of the report of his depart-

ment for 1923-24, and also remind the Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Hon. Minister of Finance, of the report of that department being tabled as soon as possible.

HON. THE MINISTER OF POSTS—I beg to table the report.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received the following correspondence from His Excellency the Governor, which he then read:

> The Governor has the honour to communicate to the Honourable House of Assembly the appointment of the Comimssioners of Internal Economy of the Legislature in accordance with the provisions of Section 4, Cap. VII., Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series), as set forth in the accompanying certified copy of a Minute of the Honourable the Executive Council approved by the Governor on the 3rd instant.
>
> (Sgd.) W. L. ALLARDYCE,
> Governor.
>
> Government House,
> St. John's, Newfoundland,
> 6 March, 1925.

February 27th, 1925.

Under the provisions of Section 4 of Cap. 7, Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series) it was ordered that the following gentlemen shall be the Commission of Internal Economy of the Legislature, namely:

> The President Legislative Council,
> Honourable A. B. Morine, K.C.,
> Honourable S. Milley,
> The Speaker House of Assembly,
> The Prime Minister,
> The Colonial Secretary, and
> The Attorney General.
>
> Certified true copy.
> (Sgd.) ARTHUR MEWS,
> Deputy Colonial Secretary.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Colonial Secretary, the Bill entitled "An Act to Provide for the Construction, Reconstruction and Maintenance of Highroads" was read a third time, and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill 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.

Committed of the Whole on Bill entitled "An Act Relating to Firearms."

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Mr. Speaker, I would ask to have this Bill deferred as it is only being printed to-day.

It was ordered accordingly.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Colonial Secretary the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the War Pensions Act, 1922."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—When we were dealing with this Bill on Friday last, I endeavored to explain its provisions which are of such a character as to commend it to the approval of the entire House. The main object of the measure is this. To-day unless an application for a pension has been made prior to January 1st, 1922, though a soldier or sailor may suffer from diseases or disability directly attributable to his war services, he has no claim. The object now is to extend the date of application to the 30th of July, 1925, so that any men suffering from a disability due to War will be entitled to the same as those who had the pension previously. The Bill also provides that where a pension is derivable through children they shall receive it one year after the death of the parent I previously pointed out that at this particular period children needed the pension most, and it would be a hardship to deprive them of it forthwith after the parents death, therefore, it is extended for one year afterwards. Also, in the case where the mother is

dead somebody in the family either a daughter or other responsible female over seventeen years of age shall be entitled to receive the money for the use of the child or children. It further provides that where the pension of a man who served in the Imperial Forces and has since returned to live here, whose pension is not so large as if he had been in the Newfoundland forces, an augmentation shall be added to bring it up to those granted the Newfoundland forces. There is also provision for bonus on war pensions. This is passed annually, and we merely propose to do the same this year. There will be no increase in expenditure by this Bill, as the decrease by death and other sources will be more than equal to the additional amounts granted. I, therefore, submit this Bill for the consideration of the Committee.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, could the honourable introducer of the Bill give an idea as to the number of applicants outstanding coming under this section of the Bill.

HONOURABLE THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—The report of the Pensions Commissioners states that the amount involved is $423.00.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, with regard to this section of the payment of a bonus, I would like to know what the policy of the Government is. I notice that is payable up to June 30th, 1926. Is that in accordance with the Canadian authorities? And will that bonus be discontinued here, if and when the Canadians discontinue?

HONOURABLE THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—This bonus is granted every year by special Act of the Legislature, and the policy of the Government is to follow the Canadian policy in this respect and no other.

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 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.

Committee of the Whole on Bill entitled "An Act respecting the Lobster Fishery."

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Marine to the fact that Mr. Scammell who is interested in this Bill is not able to be present this afternoon, and I would, therefore, ask to have it deferred.

It was ordered accordingly.

Second Reading of Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 3 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Election of Members fo the House of Assembly.'"

HONOURABLE THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I consider it both an honour and a privilege to introduce to this House this afternoon for Second Reading a Bill which has for its object the granting of the franchise to the women of Newfoundland. I do not commend this Bill to the House simply because the ladies have asked me to do so; I do not bring the measure forward in a spirit of indifference as to how the House might see it; but I bring it forward this afternoon with a full feeling of honest conviction, that in granting this request of the ladies this House of Assembly will only be doing something that has been their due, and what we owe the ladies during the past number of years. This is not the first time that this measure has been brought before this House of Assembly. The Bill was introduced here in 1920, and also in 1921, and, perhaps, before we go any further it might not be any harm if I were to revive the memories of some of the Members who were in the House at that time as to what did happen, and also of those who were

not present then as to what took place during those years. On May 20th, 1920, Mr. LeGrow, who was then a sitting Member for the District of Bay de Verde, presented a petition to this House signed by seventeen hundred women of St. John's asking for the Franchise. That petition was supported by Mr. Fox, Mr. Higgins, Mr. Vinnicombe and Sir John Crosbie. No one opposed it, and it was referred to the Department to which it related. I am inclined to think that the Prime Minister of that day concluded that the Department to which that petition related was the waste-paper basket, because it disappeared and we have not heard of it any more. A month later you, Sir, our much respected Speaker —as Member for St. John's East— asked leave to introduce a Bill, and on June 10th, 1920 a Second Reading of the Bill was moved by you, supportd by Mr. Vinnicombe and Mr. Walsh, and it was opposed by two Members of the Government, namely Mr. Guppy and Mr. Jennings. A vote was taken on the Bill, and it was defeated on a straight Party vote, thirteen to nine, the Government voting solidly against it. Mr. Targett had expressed his intention to vote for it, but I do not think he was present when the vote took place. That was the end of the first period, and the end of the Bill for 1920.

In 1921 Mr. Warren presented a petition signed by 7,485 women, and he called the attention of the House to the fact that every District in the Island was represented except his own. He said he did not intend to introduce a Bill that Session, but it might be that a Bill would be introduced before the next General Election. Mr. Higgins and Mr. Bennett supported it, and the Prime Minister who spoke in favor of it, stated that it would not be a party measure. On May 16th or about a week later the Prime Minister intimated to the House that he would introduce a Bill to amend the Election Act of 1913, and we heard nothing more about it. Apparently it remained on the Order Paper until August 6th, and might I say the length of the Sessions held in those days causes me not to wonder that some of the Members of the Outport districts wanted their sessional pay increased, as it was nothing unusual for the House to be three or four months in Session.

After that it was on the Order Paper for three months, and then it was Mr. MacDonell who relieved the embarrassment of the Government to some extent by asking that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee, and that was the last that was heard of it, and there ended the second lesson. So, Mr. Speaker, when we consider the way the ladies have been treated and the discourtesy extended to them, and when after that they come here in their hundreds this afternoon still smiling, I say that we cannot, even though we are the hardest-hearted people in the world and the greatest women haters in the world, help but admire their behaviour in this matter. I said that this was not a party measure. I have not asked a single member on this side of the House how he intended to vote or what were his intentions with regard to this Bill. I think, however, that there is one member whom I think I can assure the ladies is prepared to support the Bill. I canvassed the district of Bonavista Bay three times in eighteen months and when speaking at public meetings, Capt. Winsor never lost an opportunity to tell the ladies, who often attended the meetings in very large numbers, that he would be prepared to support the Bill to the last ditch. Capt. Winsor is looked upon as the ladies' man of the Party. So, Mr. Speaker, even if I cannot speak for any other members of this side of the House, I think that I can speak for Capt. Winsor, because I think that he could hardly go back to the

District of Bonavista and tell the women that he did not support the measure. Now when I say it is not a party measure, I do not say that it is not an important measure, because it is. It is extremely important. In it we must be prepared to double the franchise of the people of this Island. We are prepared to double up the responsibility and that is something that no member should consider other than very carefully. He cannot look upon it as a joke. It is a serious matter and one that cannot but be well considered by this House. I have seen where some of the members of this House said that they could not do anything without first consulting their constituents. In this case the constituents have been very well consulted. This Bill has been up since 1920, and I feel satisfied that members of this House can well assume that their constituents are in accord. So, Mr. Speaker, I say that while it is not a party measure it is an important measure. I said in my remarks at the opening of this Assembly that there were three questions which we had to ask ourselves, and the first and most important is whether we will give the franchise to women at all. Before we answer this question, I think that we ought to give some little consideration to what our neighbours have done. It is not always necessary to follow the example of our neighbours but at the same time it is always advisable to know what they have done and what has been their experience, and what has been the result of their actions. We find on going over the records that New South Wales, a colony of Australia, granted municipal franchise to the women in 1867, or 58 years ago. The first country that granted the full franchise was New Zealand in 1893, or thirty-two years ago. The colonies of Australia formed themselves into a Commonwealth in 1901, and at the very next session of the legislature they voted a full measure of franchise for the women. In Canada we find that the first franchise was given the women in 1917. That was when Sir Robert Borden went to the country on the question of conscription, and a Bill was passed to permit the widows, wives, mothers and daughters of members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force to vote at that election. In 1918, the next year, the Canadians gave the full measure of franchise to women at the age of twenty-one. Now let us turn to the Old Country and see what they have done. The lawlessness of the British suffragette before the war is a very well known historic incident. They mobbed the Cabinet Ministers. chained themselves on the railing of Downing Street, they went on hunger strikes and had to be forcibly fed; they assaulted historic monuments and St. Paul's Cathedral and Westminster Abbey, the British Museum and the National Gallery. The House of Commons had to close their doors against the entrance of women. I feel that there are many in this room that think that this action on the part of the women did not advance their interests at all. I feel sure that most reasonable women will admit that while the suffering of the women are very admirable in as much as it was very courageous, at the same time we cannot but think that it did not do anything to advance the cause. While this militant movement on the part of the suffragette was going on, the war came on and the suffragettes dropped their enthusiasm to go about the business of the war. I need not relate what the women of England did during the war. Everybody knows how they took the men's places in every phase of life and contributed so enormously towards the result of the war. I need only state that the result was that when the Parliament met in

1918 they voted a full measure of franchise to the women of England at the age of thirty, by seven to one. The same Parliament that had refused the vote to women had passed the Bill by a vote of seven to one. In 1919 a further provision was made to give the women the right to become justices of the peace and to sit on juries. I may say that in connection with that matter a cousin of mine, a sister of Hon. F. C. Alderdice, is a justice of the peace in the North of Ireland, and I am satisfied that she is able to perform the duties of the office as well as any man who ever held it. The first woman to be elected to the British House of Parliament was strangely enough an enemy of Great Britain. She was the Countess Markievieux and was the first to be elected to the British House of Commons. The Irish Sinn Feiners refused to sit in the House of Parliament to which they had been elected so that Lady Astor was the first woman to sit in the House of Commons of England. In 1923 9 women were elected to Parliament. 1924 the number was reduced to three. So it does not seem that the women are likely to take possession of the House in the near future. That is the history of what the Mother Country has done up to the present time, and we would like to know from them, the Colonies, and the North American Continent, what has been the result of the experience gained since suffrage was given to women. The Prime Ministers of New Zealand and Australia were over in England a short time ago and they were asked what their experience was and they both said that the granting of suffrage to women was a very great success and that they would not repeal the Act on any account. We find ourselves, together with South Africa, the only English speaking country in the world, which has not given the franchise to the women. South Africa is largely populated by the Boers who are not English speaking and therefore we are the only English speaking people who have not granted the franchise. I want to ask you to-day why we are in this position and why we have not given the vote to women. Surely our women did as much during the war as the women of any other country. I say, Mr. Speaker, that after considering whether we shall give the vote to women at all or not, the balance so far seems to be in their favor. The next question that the House will have to consider is at what age we are to give it to them. In England the Franchise is given at the age of thirty. At this session of the British House a petition was filed asking that the age be reduced so as to give the franchise to the women at the same age as the men, that is twenty-one. But it was found that if the women got the vote at twenty-one, there would be two million more women to vote than men and so they would swampt the votes of the men; so they did not give it.

Now we ask ourselves at what age we should give it to the women. In Canada they have made it twenty-one. In England they have made thirty the age. I think that in England a large number of the women do not vote. A large number of them are very indifferent about it and I think that one might be inclined to imagine that a great many young maidens just passed the thirtieth mile post, be a little delicate about advertising the fact by their appearance in a public booth. However that may be I am inclined to believe that the best age to give the vote to women here would be twenty-five.

I don't concede at all that the woman is not as well qualified to vote at twenty-one as the man is, but I have my doubts as to whether the vote ought to have been given to the men at twenty-one. The next question is

what privileges we are to extend to the women, and this Bill gives permission to the women to sit in the House of Assembly exactly on the same terms as the men do, and their privileges are exactly the same. The Bill calls for the fact that a woman sitting in the House of Assembly must have an income of four hundred and eighty dollars, or must be the owner of property to the value of forty-five hundred dollars. I don't say that the women are going to make a desperate effort to get into the House of Assembly, but if they are given the vote I submit that they should be given the right to get the proper people to represent them, whether it be male or female.

Mr. Speaker, I shall be making more remarks on this subject after it goes to Committee. I only wish to introduce this Bill this afternoon, and I want to sum up my few remarks now by saying that all arguments go to show that the women of Newfoundland are merely looking for their just rights. The question we have to ask ourselves in this House this afternoon is, are we going to give way to their very reasonable requests? Are we going to give the women what they are asking for, or are we going to make the public pronouncement that, in the opinion of the majority of this House, the women of this country are less deserving, the intelligence of the women of this country is less developed and the judgment of the women of this country is less to be depended upon than that of the women of any other part of the English-speaking world?

I have much pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE— Mr. Speaker, as the Prime Minister has intimated, those of us who sit on this side of the House have not been directly or indirectly approached by him on our attitude to this Bill, and, as he correctly intimates, it is a question upon which we have to act for ourselves. I rise to second the motion that this Bill be read a second time, and I do it only after a great deal of thought. I do so because I am convinced that there is no other course properly open to me under the circumstances.

In the first place, as the introducer of this Bill has said, from the first time that this measure came under review in this Assembly I have always supported it. If the women asked for the vote they have a right to get it, and we have no right to refuse them. I have never been influenced by the fact that the number who asked for this vote was small or large. I have not been one to view it from the angle of a politician, and I have no right to view it from that angle.

The question of giving the women a vote is a question of principle, whether it is right or wrong to give the franchise or not. As I see it, the Prime Minister very properly summed up the question in his concluding remarks when he asked whether we feel that the mentality of the women of Newfoundland and their general character and general conduct are such that we would hesitate to commit any question of public importance to their judgment. As far as I personally am concerned I will frankly state that my experience in public and professional life has been that, given the deliberate thought of a woman, you generally get more sound judgment than you do from a man. And I think that any one present who has had experience in professional lines, particularly, will agree with me that, from the standpoint of discernment, the matured judgment of a woman, generally speaking, is more remarkable for its soundness and sanity than that of a man. That, at least, has been my experience. I don't fear for a moment the idea of committing any public question to the decision of the women.

Then again the experience of other countries and their attitude on this subject whilst it does not bind us ought to serve as a guide for us and ought more or less to give us some suggestions that will help us in debating this subject. I say that right here under our own observation we can see the changed mission of women. The changed conditions of the world have compelled us to admit that some of the old conditions are passing away. The woman of necessity has become a factor of the world around her, because of the changed conditions of the world in the first place and because of the absolute competency of women, themselves fit in. Right here in our own town if we carry our minds back 20 years and consider the commercial life, the office life, the general administrative work of that time as compared with to-day we can see the gradual growth of the power of women, and the first conclusion that we will come to is that they can't be excluded from public life. I don't think that those of us who are men should take the position and decide that women have not got the same power to judge as we have. Therefore I say that having been asked as to whether we ought to give the vote to the women or not, we have no right to refuse it. I do not fear the argument which tries to dodge the issue by taking the position that the woman's mission in life must preclude her from the franchise to the degree that the man has. That is her own business. Whilst the home is primariiy woman's sphere and her rule there will always be her finest feature. I would not like to think for a moment that merely allowing woman the right to vote is going to alter her makeup or her tempernment. I don't think that we will find that because the woman has the right to vote that she is going to neglect her home. In fact, I rather think that it will be the reverse. I believe that if she is given the opportunity and if she decides to go out on important occasions and use her influence she will be a greater factor for good than the man. I believe that there are certain aspects of life that are more naturally going to be the concern of the women and in such their interest is going to be felt immediately. I have no fears myself as to what is going to be the result of giving the women the franchise in Newfoundland. And to take the history of the institutions about us to-day, we are compelled to admit that nothing of any magnitude has been done in educational or charitable movements that has not been helped by the entry and driving power of women's organizations. I have no fears as to the fact that the women of this country, no matter what may be the age they are given the vote at, will vote as intelligently as the ordinary man. For that reason I support the second reading of this Bill. I think that the greatest compliment that could be paid the women is the fact that could be paid the women is the fact that we are trying to make a dividing line that would not make the franchise too young or too old. No woman of course would object to be in the 25 class. We might call it the class between the flapper and the staid age. I would have no hesitation to give the women the vote at twenty-one, the same as the men. I think that under the educational progress of recent years that the history of the public institutions show that they stand side by side with the men. A study of the office work of the town will show that most of the secretaries are women. So as far as the age is concerned I quite agree with the Prime Minister that whilst it is not a matter of our altogether being bound by what is done elsewhere we may be somewhat inclined to think that the House at first ought to consider the notion of making a half-way concession. Of course as to the

question of 21, this does not obtain over the whole world as it does here. There is limitation of the franchise for men in certain parts of Canada, there are qualifications that put a limitation on the voting power of men even at that age. I support this Bill and look forward confidently to the future years proving that the entry of women into our public affairs will bring nothing but beneficial results.

MR. WARREN, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister, in introducing this Bill, said that it was not a Party measure, and that his Party will vote as they please. My party is a little different. I have made it a party question with my party. Sir, and this party is going to vote for Women Suffrage. All the questions about this Bill have been thrashed out by the party, and the party is now committed to vote for the second reading of this Bill.

But while the Prime Minister disclaims any idea of making this a party measure, in his opening remarks he, at all events, gave it a party tinge, not so much as far as his own party is concerned, but in speaking of the history of the Bill, as far as previous parties are concerned. When I was a member of the late Government, I was approached with a view to the introduction of a Bill to provide votes for women. It was always stated and clearly understood that any such Bill would not be a party measure, and when I eventually presented a very big petition, signed by some twenty-five hundred women, I clearly stated that I was not committing myself to support Woman Suffrage or to the introduction of a Bill. I think that the ladies who came to me with the petition understood clearly the position. Of course, I can't say what took place at party meetings, but I can say that when I became Prime Minister I told Mrs. Gosling and her associates that during the session an opportunity would be given to introduce a Bill and to put that Bill through or not, in the same manner as the Prime Minister has done here to-day. I do not think that the Prime Minister is altogether fair in saying that the ladies were treated with discourtesy. They understood that it was not a party measure. It was introduced by private members, and there were members on both sides of the House prepared to vote either for or against it ,and because this Bill was not eventually proceeded with cannot be regarded as discourtesy any more than the abortive attempts in the British Parliament could be called discourtesy, nor could the British Parliament be said to be discourteous this year because they refused to reduce the age from thirty to twenty-one. Personally, I disclaim all discourtesy as far as the women are concerned.

After the very excellent reasons which have been given to the House by the Prime Minister, I need hardly say why I think that not only one, but all the members of this House, ought to support this Bill. On the opening day I said that the Speech from the Throne was very radical. I still believe that it is very radical. There are two Bills which the Prime Minister had introduced this year which will undoubtedly have a big effect on future elections. The first is the Redistribution Bill, which provides that, in nearly every case, there shall be single man districts, and divides the districts up so that they will not be so disproportionately represented as they are to-day. The next most—and I do not think I need apologize for using the word—the next most radical Bill is this one, and I feel quite sure that the giving of votes to women coupled with that Redistribution Bill will have not only a lasting, but a beneficial effect on the future elections in this country.

I do not know why anyone should be alarmed at the idea of woman having a vote; that she will change in

temperament or in sentiment, or in any other way. I have been over in England, where they have had the vote for a number of years, and I found that the women over there were just the same as they were before. They have not altered a bit, nor do they fight any more than they did previously. There is no reason why a little domestic squabble over the way which the vote should be cast should irretrievably break up the household. I do not think it will.

May I ask the Prime Minister—I have not had an opportunity to peruse the Bill carefully, but I heard him say that the women could stand for election, and become members of the House of Assembly—that is so? At what age, may I ask?

HON. PRIME MINISTER—25.

MR. WARREN—Is that in the Bill? I did not carefully peruse it. I did not see anything there about a woman becoming a member of the House of Assembly. But if a woman cannot become a member at the age of twenty-one, and cannot vote until she is twenty-five, I shall certainly ask that she may get the vote at twenty-one.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—You would like to have them young in the house?

MR. WARREN—If I am going to have any associated with me, I would like them young, and I do not guarantee that I will not move in Committee that the Bill be so amended that women get the vote at twenty-one in any case.

As the Minister of Justice has said, our law of franchise is a little larger than in some other countries. I have seen imbecile people—old men who cannot look after themselves—and are being taken charge of by the country ta the Poor House, I have seen them being taken out to vote: and I have seen girls in offices, of twenty-two and twenty-three earning some of the money to keep those men in the Poor House, and they cannot get a vote; and I don't see why they cannot get one.

There are those who are getting poor relief today; there are men who are being kept at the Government expense, and there are women of 22, 23 and 24 who are contributing to their support, not only working in offices, but in shops and everywhere else where women can be found working today; and yet they cannot get a vote, whilst the old man whom they are supporting can have one. Such a state of affairs as that ought to be altered.

I will not take up any more of the time of the House. I have not consulted anybody outside of my party, but I hope that all members will take advantage of this opportunity to give the women what they are looking for, and what they have already obtained in other countries. And in these other countries they have exercised that vote with great credit to themselves, and to the countries in which they use that vote.

MR. CASAHIN—Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few remarks on this Bill that is now up for second reading. Looking around here this afternoon, I think I am the only one who took an active part in the late war, and being a returned officer, naturally I came to the conclusion that I should know something about what women did during the war. Consequently, I want to tell them in advance, although I do not consider that they are very representative of the women of Newfoundland, that I am prepared, and intend to support the principal of the Bill that has been introduced for the second reading by the Prime Minister.

During the three or four years which I spent overseas I happened to be knocked out once or twice, and in visiting and being a patient in various hospitals, I had occasion to

see what women were doing as nurses, as drivers of motor lorries and drivers of Red Cross cars. I have spoken to various commanding officers, and I remember what one of them said to me once, which has since struck me very forcibly. He said that "women were more truthful, and exhibited more gratitude, and on many occasions more physical courage than men." I am sorry to say that in that respect I have come to the conclusion, after seeing quite a lot, that I have to acknowledge that that officer was correct. I think possibly that the ladies have exhibited more gratitude than men, especially politicians, who are very prone at times to show themselves insincere; while women are much more inclined to be sincere. That is my personal opinion, and comes through personal experience, although I am only two years in politics.

With reference to the opinions of the ladies in Newfoundland who have not in any way contributed to having this cause brought before the House, I merely wish to state that, so far as my district is concerned, I have visited every House between Doyle's Bridge and Cape Race, and I know every man, woman and child in that district, and I think I may take the same credit for my colleague, Mr. Moore. In our campaigns during the last two elections, he and I have visited all those houses, and invariably the women say to us that it is a pity we have not got a vote to give you. When we ask the question, we are invariably told that they are in favour of having a vote. I think so far as that Bill is concerned my district wants it. Personally, I would feel more safe going back to that district, especially being a young man, and I feel sure that my majority would be away over what it was last election. I feel confident of that, and I do not think that any women in the district will come out to oppose me.

During the past number of years, in fact since the beginning of time, women, in my opinion, have been merely the occupation and amusement of men. The highest aducational advantages were denied them. Professions, practically of all characters, have been closed to them. But during the past twenty years women have convinced the world that, if they are not absolutely the equals of man, that they are at least independent of him in this respect, that they are able to earn their own living. Therefore it is only right and proper, that this matter should come before the House, and now every member should vote for this Bill. It was only a matter of time until this Bill will become law, and it will only be a matter of time until this House passes this measure. We may pass away. We are only here by accident now, but the women of the country will eventually bring this matter up to some administration, and some administration will pass the Bill. Why should it not be this administration; this Legislature convened here today, who will have the privilege, or if any one considers it an honour, to have the honour to give the women of Newfoundland the franchise. They are certainly entitled to it.

During the late war—I speak so much of the war, because I was taking part in it—during the war in Russia a battalion of women was formed known as the Battalion of Death. They played a wonderful part in the war, led by women, while possibly there were many amongst us, and also among the Russians who should have played their part but stayed at home. Therefore, as I stated before, that women are possessed of physical courage is borne out. When this Bill reaches the Committee stage, I intend to add a few extra remarks, but in passing this evening, I thought I would take

the opportunity to assure the ladies present and the House, that this Bill has my heartiest support.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Speaker, as one who served in a little way in the war, I wish to endorse what Major Cashin, the Honourable Member for Ferryland, has said. Speaking on the Address in Reply, I outlined briefly the valuable services rendered by women during the war. Today it gives me great pleasure to give this Bill my heartiest support, and I think it is my duty to do so. It was my plasure while in England as an Officer of the Imperial Army, to hear Mr. Lloyd George speak on the Granting of the Franchise to Women, I did not have the privilege to hear Mr. Asquith speak on the subject—and I think that as he related the splendid devotion displayed by the women particularly in the making of munitions, and in other avenues of war endeavor, all present were deeply impressed by the noble part they played, and as spoken of here today by Mr. Cashin. I did not intend to speak today on this subject, but as I am on my feet, I may say that during my campaign in Twillingate District the greatest enthusiasm was displayed by the women in connection with the granting of the franchise, and when it passes this House, as I have every hope that it will, I trust it will be given full approval by practically every voter in the country.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a word or two in connection with this Bill, and on rising to express my congratulations to the ladies who have so persistently followed this movement to a point where they can now see victory in sight. Personally, I have always favored this measure, and I have had the opportunity in my official capacity to have interviews with ladies, prominent in the movement, and I have always taken the position that though suggested Legislation did not comprehend giving the right to women to sit in the House, that if they were granted the power to vote, they should also have the right to seats here, and I am glad that this Bill now provides for this. A great deal has been said of the right of women to vote, and I think the Honorable the Minister of Justice placed his finger on the true position today when he said "We have no right to refuse them the vote." When the country was in distress we had no hesitation in calling upon the women to save the Nation. They responded nobly, and we would never have won the war, if it had not been for the cooperation and devotion of the women, and I think they have every right to full privileges as free citizens. During the past twenty years there has been an evolution in the status of women, and I have no hesitation whatever in saying that in St. John's their earning power is as great as that of the men today. Families who formerly were in straitened circumstances because they had no breadwinner but a man, are now in comfort through the industry of the young women and girls. In all kinds of offices today, government and commercial, girls hold responsible positions; they predominate in the factories, and in all walks of life they are doing splendidly. It would be a sorry day for many families in this city but for the girls and young women. And why should they not have the vote? In many cases they have more intelligence than the ordinary man, and if they have the right of saying how the country shall be managed, the women also have the right to the Franchise. The Honourable Prime Minister is perfectly correct in putting this Bill before the House, and I may say here that if the previous Government as referred to by the Honourable Member for Fortune, did not treat it with discourtesy, they

certainly showed indifference, and it therefore never came to an issue. We of the Opposition of that time tried to bring in the Act, but the Government of the day would not do it. Therefore, it could not be said that we of the Opposition were against it. As an administration we are pledged to give a square deal to all. We are only acting justly in giving this square deal to women, and I have no doubt that all the Members on this side of the House will support it. I also trust that the gentlemen on the Opposition side will also display the spirit of fair-play and do so. The passage of this Bill is the best expression you can give to the world of what we think of the women of Newfoundland, and though late in performing this act of justice we should do it well, and show our appreciation of what the women have done of a philanthropic and charitable nature. I, therefore, heartily support this Bill, and while in the latter stages of its discussion there may be a few minor alterations in it, nevertheless I fully endorse it.

MR. MOORE—Mr. Speaker, as this is apparently an evening for testifying, and I supported this measure before, I wish to again place myself on record on the second reading of the Bill as again supporting it as moved by the Honourable the Prime Minister. I think it is very fair on his part to allow the Honourable Members of this House to use their own opinion as to voting for or against this measure. I may say that I am in a rather awkward position as to this Bill. For the past ten years, or ever since I had a seat here, I have been canvassed by some of the ladies connected with this movement. One of them is here this evening and I hope she has kept what I told her one time before, to herself. I have also been asked by some ladies to vote against the measure, but I held the women were entitled to the vote. They said the ladies who were canvassing did not represent all the women of- Newfoundland, but I said they had worked hard for the vote and deserved to get it. Speaking on the subject to a clergyman some time ago he said that after the world was made, God rested, and after man was made there was also a rest, but since woman was made there has been any rest for God or man. It is the same with the ladies in connection with this Bill—they have never rested in promoting it—and I compliment them on finally bringing it in here. I am fully convinced it will go through this House and I will give it my heartiest support as I did when it was brought up here on a former occasion.

MR. BROWNE—Mr. Speaker, I feel that I should avail of the opportunity which this debate affords to express publicly what I have often said privately as to the position in which I stand on this question of Women's Suffrage. I have been interested in the matter for years—perhaps not so long as some other honorable members—but I have been able to observe some features of the work of women in war times which have deeply impressed me with their responsibility and position in the world today. Unfortunately, unlike the honorable and gallant member for Ferryland, I did not take any active part on the battlefields of Europe, but I helped in some little way in the training of men in Canada, and there I saw the women working under conditions that normally they would not be expected to work under. I saw them working in the munition factories and in undertakings, under most trying conditions, and they did it in a way which showed their attitude of mind, and that they realize the responsibility they had towards the state in a time of stress. And what is Government anyhow? No king or administration owns a country. Government is for the people and must be by the people. And the women are of the peo-

ple. That is the principle that has been promulgated by all civilized countries throughout the world, and which should guide us. Government has come through various stages of progress; it has fallen from the hands of groups of men and today whereever there is an enlightened government it is in the hands of the people. And the time when women should get that power, to say how government shall be conducted and by whom, is when they come to the age of recognition of their responsibilities to their country. Women have shown the greatest ability in the handling of household affairs, in the bringing up of families and the care of children —far more ability along these lines than men—and as the honorable member for Fortune has said, why should they not have a voice in saying who is to manage the affairs of their country. When the members have given this question their consideration the only answer they can come to is to vote for it. The question has been raised of taking woman away from her sphere, the home, but that argument is easily answered. In fact it is too obvious to need an answer, at all. The fact that they can now leave the home to take up all kinds of trying and difficult tasks and fill them competently is the answer to that. The whole thing now rests on the alteration of one word in the Statutes, and that is whether the word person referring to a voter is to read male or female person. Though I have not consulted with my constituents as a whole on the matter—it was not an issue during the election campaign,—I feel sure that I am voicing the opinion of the majority of voters in St. John's West when I say they would welcome to their ranks a body of women who would share their responsibilities and duties with them. I have canvassed some of these people on this movement and they are one hundred per cent in favor of granting the franchise. I take this opportunity to express my belief that Newfoundland would benefit in untold measure by the advent to the ranks of the voters of a body of women who have proved by their conduct in the past that they are prepared to do their duty to their country in the future.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker, I do not think that I would be doing my duty to my lady constituents of Bonavista Bay if I did not get up and say a word or two on the Bill now before the House. The Prime Minister told the House this afternoon that the ladies were counting on the support of one man, at least, and that man was Captain Winsor. I may say for the information of the Prime Minister that a deputation of women called at my office last summer on behalf of Women Suffrage. When I saw them coming in I expected I would lose an hour before I would get disengaged with them, as I was very busy at the time. They asked me my opinion and what I was going to do on the subject and I told them I was going to support them. As soon as I gave them my answer they went out. Now there are lots of men who came to my office and after I give them an answer, right or wrong, they hang around for an hour or so and lose a lot of one's valuable time. It is very true that I did promise the ladies of Bonavista Bay my support and it is not the first time that I did so. I might say that I was practically the first candidate that ever promised the ladies of Bonavista Bay to support the measure, if it ever came before the House. Why did I do it? I did it because I considered that at least ninety per cent. of the women of this country are just as capable to go to a booth and cast their votes as any ninety per cent of the men of the country. I have knocked around quite a deal during

my short term of forty odd years and I have seen and known times during a period of seven or eight years where businesses would have been more successfully carried on by women instead of having them carried on by men. As an outport man of this country I think it my duty to day to stand up here and tell the ladies of St. John's that I will support this Bill now before the Chair to the very utmost. I was never to the war, as my age at the time prevented my going. I have come into contact with a number of young men belonging to my own settlement who were to the war and some of them were with the first five hundred and I found out from a couple of them who spent two years as prisoners of war in Germany that they owed their lives to the women of Germany. They told me repeatedly that if the women there had been so cruel to them as the men were that they would not have lived six months. They also told me that an aged lady had been thrashed by Germans for giving food to the prisoners. I consider that is proof beyond doubt that women acted as nobly and as courageously as the men, and, therefore, why should they not get a vote in this country the same as men. I feel sure, Mr. Speaker, that, if the ladies had given a vote in October last, the majority for Monroe and Winsor would have been 1000 instead of 400 and that would go to prove that a great many of them would have more sense than their husbands. I know of a case in my own home town where a man who had six children who had more than he could do to get himself and his family along. He died and left his wife and those children without any means of support whatever. The mother, I am proud to say, started out to work with the result that she made a much better living for those children than the father did when he was alive. Therefore, taking everything into consideration, I think it is my duty and the duty of every member of this Chamber to vote in favor of Woman Suffrage.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, it has been wittingly remarked by a previous speaker that this evening is one for testifying, so I suppose it is alright for me to occupy a few minutes in connection with this Bill. At the outset I might say that I regret the absence of the Leader of the Opposition who is ill, as I have heard it remarked that he was favorable to this Bill, and if he was here he would give it his support. It is somewhat of a personal matter whether we support or oppose the Bill; but the ladies here this afternoon must be delighted to hear the remarks made from the Government side of the House and it looks as if the Bill will pass unanimously. It seems now that we have arrived at the time when the ladies of this country will be given the franchise and they have in sight the successful result of their efforts. I think that it will be quite satisfactory to the ladies to know that the Bill will pass the Legislature, and, as Captain Winsor complimented the ladies who called upon him for not wasting his time, I, therefore will not waste the time of the ladies who have taken the trouble to come here this evening, and I assure them that the Bill will have my hearty support.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Speaker it has been said by a number of speakers that when the Bill went to Committee they would have something further to say in connection with several clauses contained in it. As you know, Sir, it will not be my privilege to have anything to say in Committee, therefore I crave the indulgence of the House for a few moments to say a word in connection with the Bill at the second reading. Without at all beating about the bush, I have to say that I am going to vote for the

Bill and give it my hearty support. In doing that I am not the victim of any propaganda. Sometimes I agree with propaganda and sometimes I do not. There is a possibility of carrying propaganda too far sometimes and to the extent of defeating the cause. I have never changed my mind as to whether women should be given the right to vote because I have never had any cause to change it, as I have always believed that women should have the vote.

A great deal has been said and said justly that the women won their right to their franchise by their work during the war. I am of the opinion that that onus should not have been placed upon the women to prove that they had won the franchise. I believe that it is the right of a woman to have a vote whether she won it during the war or not. I believe it is a matter of justice. It is also a matter of natural right for a woman to have the privilege of going to the ballot box testifying that she has the inherent right to say who shall govern her country. In my opinion there never has been, and there never can be a good and sufficient reason advanced by anyone to show that the women should not have the right to vote. The woman is on absolute equality with the man; and if the man has the right to say who shall govern his country the woman has the same right. I cannot for the life of me see the distinction between a man and a woman in that regard. We live together; we marry together and we die together, and Mr. Speaker, the time has come for the women to get equal rights with men, and I have very much pleasure indeed in supporting the motion now before the Chair that the bill be given its second reading.

MR. LAKE—Mr. Speaker, as an Hon. Member has said this afternoon it is up to me to give my version of the matter. Now just like many others I have given this matter careful consideration for the past six months and I want to say that I intend to vote for this Bill.

This year before I left the District of Burin I put the matter before some of the towns. The matter went into debate and then some of the Ladies waited on me and asked me if I would support the Bill. I told them that I had an open mind on the matter, as I believed that the Bill should come up and be debated upon by those most interested in the matter. I am glad to be able to say that the people of Burin are of the opinion that the ladies should have a vote.

Now I am not like my friend, the Hon. Member for Ferryland, who said that had the ladies had a vote I would have been elected by greater numbers. I can't say that, for being an old married man I probably would not have the same chance as the younger men. In fact my wife told me last year that had she a vote she would have voted against me. So you see I stand in a different position from some of the men around here this afternoon.

I have been waiting for several Hon. Members to speak, for I had been expecting that some of them may oppose the measure. So far no one has appeared. Now I would like to know why it is that some of them did not support the Bill when it was brought in before. Why is it that they waited till now when the Prime Minister has brought it in and it is favoured so strongly. I am very anxious for some of the Hon. gentlemen to get on their feet. I would have liked to have heard them speak first as I would have liked to have a chance to say something in contradiction. I suppose that they are going to get cold feet in front of the ladies. I am very well pleased that the Bill has not been brought in as a party measure, but as a general measure, as then each man can speak out, and

now the ladies will be able to judge and decide what members are for it and what members are against it. And besides if it came in as a party measure we would have to decide in a party meeting whether we were for it or against it, and only those who were against it would have an opportunity of having their views heard. It was generally understood that the Member for Burin Distrit, Mr. Lake, was opposed to this Bill. Nobody heard me say so. I told the ladies of my district that I had an open mind on the matter. But as to what my colleague, Mr. Long, may have to say I am not prepared to say. But as we will not have the privilege of going back as two in one I suppose he can just do as he likes. I will be going back to one part and he will be going back to some other part. But I would like to hear the views of some of the other members who were opposed to this measure. So far we have nothing, and as it is my fortune to be here for the first time I am pleased to be able to state in conjunction with the good ladies of Burin District that they have decided in favour of women franchise and I have much pleasure also to state that I will heartily support the measure now for second reading.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Mr. Speaker: It is not my intention to say much in connection with the Bill before this House. After what has been said by the different speakers, I think it is a foregone conclusion that this Bill will have the unanimous vote of the House. I had pledged myself a year ago to support the Bill. About three weeks ago a delegation called on me and asked me whether I was going to vote for this Bill or not. I said yes. I have given my word and I see no reason to change my views. When this measure comes up to be voted upon, I am going to vote the straight ticket for the ladies. I am sorry they did not have the vote before. I am glad to welcome the prospective members of the House of Assembly. It is going to be much more pleasant when the election campaigns start in the future. I would be delighted to have a lady as opposition candidate against me in whatever portion of Placentia Bay it may be my good fortune to contest, and there is no need of apologizing for giving the ladies a vote.

When we come to consider it, every British colony, with the exception of South Africa, has given the women the right to vote, I think it is time that the women of Newfoundland should have the vote. The women who have been fighting for this franchise for the last three or four years deserve great credit. There is no need to tell what the women had done during the Great War. They did their duty the same as the women in other British possessions. They did their duty whether working at home or overseas. They drove motor lorries in France, ambulance cars,and nursed the sick. Even the old women, many of whom could not get out of their beds knitted socks for our boys overseas. There is no reason to get up here and apologize for giving the women of Newfoundland a vote. I am proud to see that they are going to get it. I believe the vote is going to be unanimous.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to speak on this matter this afternoon, but like the other gentlemen present I thought it would be too bad if I did not take advantage whilst the ladies were present, otherwise they might believe that I was not inclined to vote for the Bill. I believe in the principle of the Bill that the women of this country should have the vote as well as the women of other countries of the world. I believe in the principle of a person, no matter what his or her sex may be, having equal priv-

ileges in the affairs of the country. I regret , as Mr. Halfyard has said. that some gentleman referred to the fact that the question was brought up before and that it did not materialize. I do not know if there are any members in the House of Assembly at present who had anything to do with shelving that question. I was always in favour of it and will vote for it when it comes up before the House. There are many reasons why, and I need not elaborate on them. One fact has struck me and that is that from the splendid speeches we have had this afternoon I believe that when we get the ladies in the House we will have all the members developing in oratory and among the other good things you will find all good-looking members in the House of Assembly.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Speaker, it has been my experience to find myself in disagreement with the Prime Minister on many of the measures that have been discussed in the House, because the stand taken by him did not seem, to me, to be the practising of the Square Deal promised by him in his election manifesto.

His introduction of the Woman Suffrage Bill today, and his strong pronouncement in its favour, shows that he intends to give a square deal to the women,—a measure which I have supported for years. Women play a very important part in the life of a country, the most important of all having the care of a home, the training of children who are to be the future custodians of the country; what kind of custodians they will be, depending largely on the training received at the hands of their mothers. We stand by justice and fair play, when we give our support to Woman Suffrage. I could never understand the mental processes of those who oppose it, most of whom think it quite proper for a woman to attend political meetings during election time, but think it wrong that she should on polling day, once in four years, go to a booth-room to record her vote. How that much time taken once in four years would interfere with her home duties, I cannot see. That she should seek to know how the country is governed, how taxes are imposed, what effect it has on her home, on the income required to conduct the home, to me is perfectly proper, for upon her devolves how that income is to be used, and what saving can be effected.

Women play a large part today in the social, industrial, commercial and political life of countries. In Canada, Australia, the United States, and Great Britain, their part in political affairs has been done with great credit to themselves. In Great Britain, Lady Astor, Margaret Bondfield and others have shown, particularly in legislation affecting women that they are fully capable of dealing with it in a satisfactory manner. I need not say more, except to join with the other members of the House, who have already spoken favourably of the measure, in giving it my whole-hearted support.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 3 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Election of Members of the House of Assembly'" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the While House on tomorrow.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, March 10, 1925.

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

MR. GODDEN—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Heart's Delight respecting the main road leading from that place to Carbonear. This road needs attention and improvement, as at the present time it is in a bad state. This road affects people of both Heart's Delight and Carbonear, and I have no doubt that as soon as road work begins in the Spring that the road in question will receive the consideration of the Gvoernment.

MR. GODDEN—Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the honourable member for Carbonear, I also beg leave to present a petition signed by over four hundred residents of Carbonear regarding two main roads. One road is that I have already referred to and the second road runs from Carbonear to Heart's Content. A petition on this same subject was presented by my colleague, Mr. Halfyard, last week. The petition has my hearty support and I ask that it be given the consideration which it deserves.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, I beg to support the prayer of the petition.

HONOURABLE THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition on behalf of the Truckmen's Protective Union and other people of St. John's in connection with the proposed change in driving from the left to the right. In presenting this petition, I do not say that I am in accord with it; but at the request of the petitioners I submit it for the consideration of the House. It reads as follows:

(Reads Petition)

This petition is signed by the President of the Truckmen's Protective Union and two hundred and eighty odd other people and I have much pleasure in presenting it.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker, I beg to support the prayer of the petition.

MR. LINEGAR—Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the motion, though I have not yet seen the petition. I shall have more to say on the petition later on after I have had an opportunity of examining it.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Red Island in connection with the coastal service on Placentia Bay. This petition affects nearly every harbour from Placentia to Rushoon. I ask that this matter be referred to the proper Department of the Government for consideration.

I also beg to present a petition from the inhabitants of Angle's Cove in connection with a breakwater at that place.

HON. MR. BRADLEY—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the residents of the town of Brigus in the district of Port de Grave on the subject of a public wharf. The situation in Brigus today is a most serious one. From the standpoint of bringing a steamer there of any size either to discharge coal or take men and their belongings to the Labrador coast facilities are nil. In the past several attempts were made to put a public wharf there, but it seems to have been misdirected energy. Last Summer I had the honour of going through that district, accompanied by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. We visited every public wharf and lighthouse in the district and the Minister was particularly interested in the question of a wharf for Brigus. His opinion, with which I coincided entirely, was that the attempts that had formerly been made had been misdirected. We selected a site on the old Munden property. The property has since been acquired by the Government and now funds are required to put the wharf there. It is a matter of grave importance to my constituents and this petition is sign-

ed by practically all the voters of Brigus.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of supporting the prayer of the petition just presented by the honourable member for Port de Grave. As has been stated, I visited Brigus with the Hon. Mr. Bradley and saw conditions and the absolute need for a public wharf there. I may say there was no wharf there. A part of a new wharf, built a few years ago at a cost of three thousand dollars, was in use there and this was simply money thrown away. After visiting the place I found a most suitable site, namely, where Munden's had their premises some years ago. I may say that the site for the new wharf is an excellent one and it has since been purchased by the Government. In justice to the people of Brigus I am more than pleased to give this petition my strongest support.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Speaker, the petition presented by the honourable Mr. Bradley has my unqualified support, as I realise as much as any man in the House the difficulties the people of Brigus are up against for the need of a public wharf. There is no doubt, as has been pointed out to the House, that the money spent there a few years ago for a wharf was wasted and misdirected. If a public wharf was built on the Munden property, acquired by the Government, it would be a great convenience to the residents of Brigus and suburbs. At present a great many people who go to the Labrador every year have no place to land or discharge anything. I support the prayer of the petition and I trust that it will receive the sympathetic consideration of the department to which it relates.

HON. MR. BRADLEY—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of the settlement of Port de Grave, in the district of Port de Grave, on the subject of a breakwater in that place. I understand that an attempt was made there some years ago, probably ten years ago, to erect a breakwater at the entrance to Port de Grave Harbour. The attempt failed for certain reasons, one of which was that a storm broke out, and swept the breakwater out before it had been secured, which is sufficient proof of the necessity for it. Capt. Winsor also visited this section with me last summer, and the whole situation was pointed out to him. The petition is signed by practically all the residents of that place.

I give my support to the petition, and ask that it be referred to the department to which it relates.

I also beg leave to present a petition from the residents of Bareneed on the subject of a public road in that settlement. The petition prays that a road be built through the settlement leading to a number of farms. There is a considerable amount of arable land up there, but it is difficult to cultivate it, because the only way that the farmers can carry anything out of it is on their backs.

I ask that this petition be referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from the elctors of Heart's Content in the district of Trinity, on the subject of a public building. The petition is signed by several men there as a committee, by the resident clergyman, and by about one hundred and thirty others.

The petitioners set forth that Heart's Content is the principal town on the south side of Trinity Bay, the terminus of one of the most remunerative branches of the Newfoundland Railway, and the shipping port of the Anglo American Telegraph Company; and is without a public building. The present post office is a disused store; and the petition describes it as an eyesore. Without further describing

the unsightly building and its total inadequacy to meet the requirements of such a large population, I would certainly ask the Government to give the matter their earnest consideration.

I may say that the petitioners also point out that the rent now being paid for the offices which are being used as a post office and postal telegraphs office; the magistrate court, and the sub-collectors room, would provide five per cent. interest on a capital investment spent in the building of a public building for Heart's Content.

I was very much surprised on my first visit to Heart's Content to find that they had no public building. I do not know the reason why they have been neglected in that respect so long. Possibly the reason for the people not having a public building such as they have in other places, would be the presence of the Anglo American Telegraph Company there, doing a very large business; and perhaps the large commodious building of the Anglo American Company met the requirements of those who had to do business with the Telegraph Office. But there, as in other places where there is an Anglo Telegraph office as well as a Newfoundland Postal Telegraph Office, the Postal Telegraph office must be used.

The question may be raised—why is it that the prayer of this petition has not been answered before? For various reasons it was difficult to find money to meet the request for public buildings, but I trust that the Government will give the matter their consideration; and if they can see their way clear to grant the request, I am sure that they will have done something that will please the people of Heart's Content.

I support the prayer of this petition, and ask that it be referred to the department to which it relates.

CAPT. RANDELL—I beg to support the petition presented by my colleague, Mr. Halfyard, from the inhabitants of Heart's Content, in connection with a public building. It is a thing which I think has been long needed by the people of Heart's Content, and I hope the Government will see their way clear to grant the prayer of the petition.

Giving Notice of Motion and Question.

Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 209 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series) entitled 'Of Banks and Banking.'"

Mr. Ashbourne gave notice of question.

Mr. Hickman gave notice of question.

Mr. Godden gave notice of question.

Hon. the Minister of Justice gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Terra Nova Sulphite Company Act, 1922."

Order of the Day.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Colonial Secretary, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the War Pensions Act, 1922" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Marine & Fisheries, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the Lobster Fishery."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MR. HICKMAN — Mr. Chairman, might I ask in reference to this Bill if it is the intention of the Government to prevent anyone catching lobsters to eat fresh. During the discussion of the Bill before I took this matter up, and I understood it was to be considered by the Government. It was then thought by some of the members that during the season persons should be allowed to catch and purchase some fresh lobsters for the table. Under the amended Bill that is taken out altogether?

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, the question of catching lobsters for table use was discussed at great length at a recent meeting of the Fisheries Board, but it was the unanimous opinion of the members of the Board that it would be advisable not to allow any lobsters to be caught under any conditions at all, and the Fisheries Board is making recommendation to the Government of this country not to allow lobsters to be caught at all.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, before we turn to the consideration of this bill, I must say that I have not had much time to consider the provisions it contains because it has just been given to me. I would like to know if there is any distinction made between the men who catch the lobsters and the men who buy the lobsters.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Chairman, this was one of the points discussed at the last reading of the Bill and it is provided for in section 2. In connection with the imported lobster this act does not apply, nor does it apply to lobsters that were caught before the passage of this act or coming into force of this act. This is one of the things that had to be provided against.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, this point that has been raised by Mr. Warren does not seem to me to be explained after all. Where is the bill clear on the point of importing the lobsters for sale. What section is it?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Section 2, subsection A.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if it is the intention of the Government to take any special measures to see that this act is going to be carried out. It is necessary that some special penalties be imposed or the act will be useless.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Yes, the Board is considering that matter now.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, I must plead ignorance of a phrase here as I am not a lawyer and so I would like to have the Minister of Justice explain to me the meaning of the expression "Parol Complaint."

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Chairman, it just means that a man can just go to the magistrate and say to him "Somebody is breaking the act." It is not necessary to put it in writing at all.

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 without amendment.

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 3 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Election of Members of the House of Assembly.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE POSITION—Mr. Chairman, I was unavoidably absent from the House the other day, and I did not get the opportunity to support the bill at its second reading. I wish to put myself on record as being in favour of this bill. And I regret very much that this bill was not passed in this House of Assembly many years ago, so that many of the ills to which this country is heir to at the present time would not have been. Many of the disasters which have happened to this country would never have taken place if we had given the women the vote. I re-regret very much that the women did not have the vote at the last election. I am sure that if they did the free distribution of rum which is now taking place in St. John's would not be going on. If the women had the vote they would have decided the fate of many other bills on the statute book differently than they have been decided. I am not going to say very much on this bill this afternoon because I am going to ask the Government to have the Committee rise so that certain amendments which we have shall be placed before the committee. The amendments which we have to the bill are only minor ones and they do not effect the vote of the women in any way whatever, and will only effect the bill in certain small minor matters which I think, should be amended so that the bill can be made more workable. The ladies need not have any fear that we will bring any amendment that will effect the bill because although it is not a party measure all the members of this side of the House are unanimous in favour of it and they have no objection to it whatever, and therefore I would like the Government to defer the committee to the next sitting of the House. This bill will be passed by this House and go up to the Upper House and passed there, I think, and then it will only have to get the signature of the Governor to become law. Therefore I ask the Prime Minister or the introducer of this Bill if he will be good enough not to pass this Bill this afternoon, so that we may get an opportunity to look it over. I have not seen the bill very long. I saw it first yesterday and so have not had sufficient time to peruse it.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, the introducer is quite prepared to consider anything that the Opposition may suggest, but the Leader of the Opposition has not said what the amedments are, and we would like to know what they were so that we might be prepared.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, I might say that one of the amendments which we are going to ask for in this bill is a small amendment to the Election Act and was brought up at the last session of the House and that is in reference to the placing of booths in certain industrial sections of the country at the general elections. A great number of people of the country working at the industrial sections of the country have been disenfranchised at the last election because they were working at the Humber and other industrial centres. In the last general election and bye-election there were hundreds and even thousands of people working in these industrial centres who on account of the election act could not cast their votes. These men were compelled to leave their homes and go over there to earn a living for their families, and they could not afford to leave their work and pay their passage home to their own districts to vote, and therefore hundreds and even thousands of men were disenfranchised. And I do not think that it is right that people of this country should be prevented

from voting simply because there is no booth in the vicinity of their employment.

Now the amendment of this Election Act is a very simple matter, that is for the Goverment—for the Minister of Justice—to have the power granted by this House of Assembly to place a booth in any industrial centre. If he had a petition presented to him, and signed by, at least twenty-five people, from any particular section, living there and who could not get home to cast their vote. That is one of the amendments and the principal one. This will not effect the Bill as far as the Bill itself is concerned.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, the object of this Bill, as the House well knows, is simply to give the franchise to women. It seems to me that the Leader of the Opposition is trying to make out of this Bill an opportunity to bring in something foreign altogether. It is not suggested, for a moment, that there is going to be a lot of men around the Humber, away from their districts, or at any industrial centres so that they will not be able to vote at their own districts, and so I think it is rather unfair of the Leader of the Opposition to bring in a proposition of this kind, simply because we are trying to get votes for women included in this Bill. As regards the point he took up, it was debated in the House last year, and we refused to do it. We have been accused that this was a deliberate attempt on our part to prevent other men from casting their vote in the by-election in Bonavista Bay, which would have been in their favour instead of ours. I told them then, as I am telling you now, if every man in Bonavista Bay had been permitted to vote, we would have had a bigger vote than we had. I am perfectly satisfied, myself, on this matter, although it is not the sort of thing we can very well satisfy the House about. Everyone has his own opinion on the matter. But we did not try to shut this out last year, nor did we refuse to comply with the request of the Opposition because we were thinking of the Bonavista election. We refused it because we considered it was wrong in principle. I think it is wrong now. If a man is standing for Bonavista Bay, and quite a number of his constituents are away in the Humber or Grand Falls, how can he represent the affairs of the country to those people? And if the people are not in their district, and he cannot see them there, and if there is no means of canvassing them, no means of laying the affairs of the country before them, they ought not to have a vote. So I say that I don't approve of the proposed amendment that Mr. Hickman intends to bring in. I don't think that this issue at the present moment has anything to do with the Bill before the House.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Chairman, as the Leader of the Opposition has just said this Bill is not a party measure, so that the views of the Leader of the House need not be accepted by any of the Government members. Therefore, I would wish to give my opinion of the matter. I want to state right here that I can't conceive of the House entertaining such a proposition. I think it is the worst kind of red herring drawn across the trail. What we are considering is the principle as to whether the women are to be given the right to vote. Surely it is not intended seriously by the Leader of the Opposition that making provisions for the women to have a vote means that the women will want to be on all fours with the men. Surely he does not mean that all the men are going to be turned away from the Humber and their jobs are to be given to the women. I don't think that they are going to rush out in any great numbers. I think that they are going to

let the men man the mills and cut the logs for a while. But I don't think that should be regarded seriously as suggesting that this is a reason for bringing in amendments to this Bill. If the Hon. Member wants to have his amendment debated let him give notice that he is going to bring in an amendment to the Election Act. The fact that one amendment is brought in does not prevent us from making others. This Bill is only to decide whether we will give women the vote. You are trying to make out that our views are against woman suffrage because we are not opening booths at the Humber. Now there is another bill before the House apart from the merits of the stand that we took last year as regards the suggestion of opening booths in the industrial areas. There is the Redistribution Bill. There will be a member for the Humber next election. There will be a man right on the spot. For Grand Falls there will be a member. Right on the spot. So there is no occasion to worry at all. There will be no occasion for outside booths. But I think that the Leader of the Opposition is trying to bring in an issue that does not belong to this Bill at all. The right of the women to vote and the limitation of that vote is all that concerns this Bill. That is all that we have to consider. So far as that is concerned today the only place where the women labour in any great numbers concentrated is in St. John's. But outside St. John's there are few places where women are engaged in any large numbers in factory or such work. So it can't be suggested that even if the Redistribution Bill never came into force that there is not ample opportunity for the women in St. John's to vote today. It is not fair to ask the Hon. members to consider this amendment which does not refer to this Bill, and I have to respectfully suggest that it is most improperly interjected.

MR. SCAMMELL—First of all I want to say, sir, that I was not present yesterday for the second reading of this Bill. Had I been present yesterday I would have given it my support. Some years ago a Bill calling for the extension of the franchise was introduced into this House. I was sitting on the other side of the House. The measure, strictly speaking, never got down to the point of a decided vote. Had it so got down I probably would have opposed it because at that time I felt that I had very little opinion as to the way the rank and file of the people of my district were thinking with regard to the matter of woman suffrage. Since that time I have stood in two general elections and I feel that if my oponent had stood in the place where I very safely stand today he would have given the support to this Bill. I am not giving the support to this Bill and I wanted it clearly understood that I am not giving the support to the Bill because of any agitation that has been going on in St. John's. If no agitation had been going on in this connection my common sense would have prompted me to take the step in this direction. I am supporting this Bill because I feel that the wives and mothers of this country; Those mothers who produced the men that fought in Flanders; the women who produced the men to go down to the sea in ships; that the mothers who produced men in every direction in the industrial life of the country should be the women best qualified to vote.

You have in St. John's' from the ladies' point of view a large leisure class, who are keenly interested in bringing this about. In the outports you have a different class of women not so keenly interested in having this Bill on the Statute Book. And it is because of those that I support

the Bill today. I speak correctly when I say that in my own district I owe a great deal to the work of the women in my behalf. Had there been a change and had my opponent represented the district instead of myself I feel sure that he would have made the identical remark as I have made. So I give this Bill my support for the reasons that I have outlined.

But in regard to the point mentioned by the leader of the opposition I regret to say the Prime Minister saw fit to talk to the galleries. The Minister of Justice in particular who is an expert on that fine art, I think that it was very unfair of him to say that Mr. Hickman was trying to draw a red herring across the trail.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Pardon me, I said no such thing. I merely said that the introduction of this amendment was drawing a red herring across the trail. And to the credit of Mr. Hickman I say that he has done it unintentionally.

MR. SCAMMELL—Whether you did or you did not I think that the Leader of the Opposition was quite within his rights in introducing an amendment to this Bill.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —A rose would smell just as sweet by any other name.

MR. SCAMMELL—That may be so. In view of the explanation and pointing out that there is another way to go about the job, there is nothing more to be said. The Honourable the Prime Minister is also lacking in this connection, and apparently has learned very little during the past six months. Ulterior motives were attributed to us last year when we proposed the amendment to the Election Act, and I gather from his remarks today that there is still something rotten in the state of Denmark. The Honourable the Minister of Justice says there is now before the House the Redistribution Bill which will alter the situation materially, but admitting that it will do so, that Bill will not become effective before three years from now, and after it has been dealth with here by a select committee and gone through various other phases, in the meantime we may have a number of bye-elections. If the Re-Distribution Bill is accepted and becomes law it will not come into effect for three years, and nobody here has a lease of life or a lease of his seat in this Assembly. We never know when there will be a bye-election, and the amendment proposed by the Honorable The Leader of the Opposition has as much force today as it had when put forward last year,—the Redistribution Bill notwithstanding to the contrary. That is all I wish to say except to reaffirm my support of the present Bill, and to express regret at the spirit in which the amendment proposed by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition whether he be right or not, has been received by the Honourable the Prime Minister and the Honourable the Minister of Justice.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, as I have already pointed out, we turned down the very self same proposition last year, and it may have been thought that we did so, because of the approaching bye-election in Bonavista District, but it certainly was not on that account. I did think when the Opposition proposed the amendment that they felt it would benefit them to have a booth at the Humber and other places, but we did not think it right apart altogether from the Bonavista bye-election, and I do not feel that it is proper now. If we could not accept the proposals then, why should we accept the self-same thing now. It is wrong in principle as I have already explained, and that is why it is objectionable now just as it was last year.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, I would like to make myself clear in

connection with this amendment, and to withdraw it if it should adversely affect this Bill which I want to see go through. My idea of the amendment is that it should be either in this Bill or in the Election Act. The Honourable the Prime Minister and I differ on this point, but my opinion is just as strong as his, and I have good reason for my belief. I represent a district in Conception Bay—Harbor Grace—and I have also represented another, Bay de Verde. From both of these a large number of men worked on Bell Island, and at election time all kinds of efforts were made to get them home to vote. Both sides infringe the law, and break it, by bringing these men to their districts to vote, and candidates lay themselves open to being unseated if a petition was filed against them. Not only that, but it costs the candidates hundreds of dollars to bring men from Bell Island to their homes, and I say it is unfair to these men to have to leave their work, and also unfair to the candidates to place them in that position. If a booth were opened at Bell Island for the different districts in Conception Bay, such as Harbor Grace, Carbonear and Bay de Verde, these Electors could go there and cast their votes instead of going home, thus saving money to the candidates, and removing the chances they take of breaking the Election Act. I possibly have been more in contact with this kind of thing than the Honourable the Prime Minister, because he represents a fishing District where most of the voters are home at election time. Perhaps some of them would be at the Humber, but his district would not be so influenced in this matter as one in Conception Bay. I might tell the Honourable the Minister of Justice that I have no desire to draw a red-herring or even a red-rose across the Bill, but I thought it would save further trouble in amending the Election Act to amend this measure. Now as you say that we have an ulterior object in doing this, I will not ask that the amendment be made to this Bill. The Honourable the Minister of Justice in his explanation said we will have a re-distribution of seats which will remedy the trouble, but I do not see its effect. I do not suppose that under that Bill a man will be able to vote in a district to which he does not belong.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —The temporary work at such places as the Humber will then be over, and the people there will be permanent residents. I did not like to interrupt before, but wish to point out that by special provision of the Election Act men can be taken from Bell Island by water to vote. That is they may cross an arm of the sea.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Surely the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition did not pay such men.

MR. HICKMAN—I had an idea that you did.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —I did not like to interrupt before because I thought you had more on your conscience in this connection than those on this side.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Bennett was the first who thought of it. Now as to the Re-Distribution Bill, it will not give a man the right to vote in another District than his own. In that case is it fair to men who are away from home.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —If we had a booth at Bell Island the men of Conception Bay would go home anyhow. They look on going home to vote once every four years like going to the regatta.

MR. HICKMAN—In any case it is the opinion of the Members on this side of the House that by the means we propose all would have the Fran-

chise whether they were home or not. But after what has been said by the Honourable the Prime Minister and the Honourable the Minister of Justice, I do not wish to draw a red-herring across the trail as I am anxious for this Bill to go hrough.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few remarks as I introduced an amendment to the Election Act last year, so that transient residents at industrial centres could vote for any candidate for a district of which they were bonafide electors. It was stated then by the Hon. the Prime Minister, or the Hon. the Minister of Justice that possibly the whole Election Act would be taken up during the ensuing year, and amendments introduced, and then it would be possible to deal with the amendment then before the House. We only ask that an addition be made to Section 33 of the Election Act. We are dealing with that Section of the Statutes governing the Election of Members for the House of Assembly. Section 33 reads as follows:—

33. "In addition to the polling districts constituted and the polling stations appointed in the several electoral districts outside of St. John's district, the Governor, by proclamation, shall appoint in the town of St. John's one or more polling stations for each of the said electoral districts, and each polling station so appointed shall be under the control and supervision of the Returning Officer of its respective electoral district; and for the purposes of this Chapter shall be deemed to be a polling station within the electoral district for which it is appointed.. Such polling stations shall be kept open from the hour of eight o'clock in the morning until eight o'clock in the evening of the day of polling."

It was thought necessary by the Government to put that section 33 in the Election Act. It was thought proper that men of outlying districts, who happened to be in St. John's during the time a general election was held should have the privilege to vote for the candidates for their districts. If the attitude taken by the Prime Minister is correct and he wants to follow it up in considering this Bill, he should have deleted Section 33, otherwise I cannot see what objection could be made by adding this to Section 33, as an Amendment, viz.—

"Whenever an Election is held to elect a representative, or representatives, to the House of Assembly, should twenty-five or more, bona fide electors of the District where an election is being held, transient residents of any industrial centre, such as Deer Lake, Corner Brook, Grand Falls and Bell Island, by petition duly certified, request the Executive Government through the Colonial Secretary, for polling booths to be opened under the same conditions as set forth in Section 33 hereof; the Governor in Council shall cause such booths to be opened."

How that is "drawing a red herring across the trail" in connection with the Woman Suffrage Bill I do not know. Why it is silly for anyone to suggest that we cannot at this stage of the Bill, further amend the Election Act by inserting this clause. We will be the laughing stock of the community if, every other day, we introdce an amendment to the Election Act and I feel sure that the Minister of Justice would be the first to ridicule the action.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I thought we were going to vote this Bill through unanimously. I certainly would not vote for this amendment in the light of the Redistribution Bill.

MR. HALFYARD—The Redistribution Bill will not alter the situation one iota. Does the Minister of Justice assume that there will be no

transient residents out at Deer Lake and Corner Brook? Loggers and workmen generally will be going from outside districts as they go to Grand Falls and Bell Island. As a rule men go there in the Spring and the Fall of the year, and these are the seasons of the year when elections are held in this country. Therefore, it is very unfair for this House to disfranchise men who have to leave their homes to go to such industrial centres. If we are going to be fair to the ladies, well certainly we must be fair to the men also, especially to the producers, the men who bring the wealth into the country. In this Bill you are giving the franchise to females twenty-five years old and over, and at the same time disfranchising the men at industrial centres by refusing to give your assent to the insertion of these few words that I have suggested to section 33 of the Election Act. There will not be many districts represented at Corner Brook and other places mentioned in the amendment. The men are principally from Notre Dame Bay, Bonavista Bay, Trinity Bay and Placentia and St. Mary's Bays. The coast will be very small. It will only mean the opening of four or five booths. The idea is to treat male and female who have reached the ages of twenty-one and twenty-five years, respectively, on equal footing and give them all a square deal as regards the franchise. I think we should take advantage of bringing in any amendment to the Election Act at this time that would tend to make the Act more workable. We all know what happens during an election. Men of both sides are anxious to get a vote because they do not know but an election may depend on one or two votes and they run the risk of being unseated and disqualified should they be elected. I do not think there has ever been an election held in this country that the Election Act has not been broken in some particular. For instance men are often paid to go home to vote. No working man, no matter how anxious he is to cast his vote, can afford to leave his employment and come over the railway any long distance just to record his vote for the man of his choice. The paying of men to go home to vote is a corrupt practice. I am not blaming one party more than another. It has been done, and will be done unless the Act is amended, and we are in a position to remedy that now by inserting the clause I have suggested. Whichever way you look at it, it is a straight-forward proposition and it is not a hardship to anybody. It is only an act of justice to the men who happen to be away from their homes when an election takes place. What the Prime Minister intends to pursue is, in my opinion, very unfair and it is time that there were ladies in this House of Assembly to see that everybody gets a square deal.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Give their Bill a square deal first.

MR. HALFYARD—They are getting a square deal.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—They are not by bringing in this kind of a discussion.

MR. HALFYARD—This Bill amends the Election Act and we are simply taking advantage of this, the proper time to add an amendment to section 33 so as to make it possible for men to vote at certain places outside their own districts.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—This Bill is providing for women.

MR. HALFYARD—If that is not "drawing a red herring across the trail" I would like to know what is?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—You knew when you brought in the amendment that it would not be accepted. Last year it was not accepted and why bring it in again this year?

MR. HALFYARD—The Prime Minister in his opening remarks this session stated that he thought certain actions of the Opposition last year had political motives behind them. Admitting that such was the case last year, which it was not, what is the reason for not accepting it now?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—We claim we did not refuse you for political reasons last year.

MR. HALFYARD—Well, why refuse it now?

HON. THE RRIME MINISTER—For the same reason as last year. I told you last year that I thought it better to do away with booths for outports in St. John's' or anywhere in the interior of the country.

MR. HALFYARD—I cannot see why this amendment cannot get the unanimous support of the House; and one has to hesitate in giving his opinion on any Bill coming before the House at the present time. We may be accused of sidetracking some issue or of "drawing red herrings across the trails" for political reasons; but I think that persons who make such a statement are playing to the galleries and are more guilty of such tactics than any member from this side of the House. There is another matter in connection with this Bill that I would refer to. I do not know if the Government thought of it or not. In St. John's East I presume a bye-election will be held in May month, which will be six months after the seat was vacated. If it is the intention of the Government to hold an election in May in St. John's East I daresay the requirements of the Legislative Disabilities Act will be met, namely:—If you have a by-election after the month of May, I think you will have to take a new voter's list. The election list stands good only for twelve months.

I think the voters' list was taken last year, mostly by telegram. Therefore, if you can put off an election in the month of May you will avoid a new voters' list.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—We will have to have it revised next May anyhow, if we have the ladies in it.

MR. HALFYARD—That is right too. If this Bill becomes law within the next few weeks, the ladies will be qualified to contest that district or any other.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—That is why I am so anxious for the ladies to get the vote. I am anxious to get a lady colleague in the East End.

MR. HALFYARD—But to get back to the point raised by the Leader of the Opposition with regard to the Committee rising for a further opportunity to consider this Bill. I do not think there is anything unreasonable about it. We are railroading bills through this House just as much as if we were on the last week of the session, with the rules of this House suspended. Bills are put through the second reading without being laid on the table. Nobody has an opportunity of reading or studying them, and I would venture to state that neither the Government, nor the Opposition, can do justice to the Legislation by meeting this House every day in succession. You have no more time to consider those bills than the Opposition. It is just as well if you govern by executive authority. Two or three members of the Government may have some knowledge of the bills, but I am prepared to state that the rank and file knows no more than the Opposition do, and yet you can railroad things through so that legislation cannot be properly attended to. You are rushing the bills through as soon as they are out of the printers' hands. I submit you can rush things as much as you like, but if you are determined to rush things through in a few weeks, this House will know no more about the

bills than if they were done on Executive authority.

This is a very important Bill and certainly I see nothing wrong in suggesting that the Government members have twenty-four hours to look through the Election Act, not only with regard to this Bill but the other parts of the Election Act to see if we cannot give some opinion that perhaps may make legislation a little better. If the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice who have spoken on this matter are determined to rush things through, they will have to be rushed through and we can only submit to it.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman, I regret the position that has been taken by the Minister of Justice in refusing to give consideration to suggestions in the amendment to be brought in by the Leader of the Opposition. It is only fair that every voter should have an opportunity in this country of being able to register his choice as to the man he wants to represent him in the House of Assembly, or the woman, if they are given the franchise in a year or two.

As to the Prime Minister's idea of last year that it should not be done, he has given no reason why it should not be done. What is your reason Mr. Premier?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I will tell you that later.

MR. GRIMES—With regard to the number of voters in the last general election who were disenfranchised in the interior of the country there were about sixteen hundred voters who did not have the opportunity to vote because the same privileges did not happen to them as happened to those who were living in St. John's. Do you think it fair that because a man comes to St. John's he has the right to vote, but if he goes up to Grand Falls or some other place in the interior he is disenfranchised?

Mr. Chairman, I don't think the Premier and the Minister of Justice have given this due consideration. I do not know whether the other members have given it any consideration whatever, but I don't think those men, if they had spoken their own convictions, would see anything exceptional in the suggestion made this afternoon. As Mr. Scammell has pointed out, we do not know what may happen in twelve months' time, for the present it may do alright. But, if a vacancy should occur it may be in the Humber or some district of the Humber, and because a man has gone out from Bonavista Bay or Trinity Bay or Fogo or Notre Dame Bay, as he is compelled to do so because of the circumstances; and because he has to leave his own district he cannot vote.

The Minister of Justice stated that the redistribution of the seats would remedy this because there will be districts in the Humber and at Grand Falls and other places, but that won't help the man who goes to the north or the south. He will have no right to vote. To say that there are no transient voters there would be not to recognize conditions that have been prevailing there for the last seven years. Grand Falls has been established for a number of years, yet, in the last general election there were in the neighbourhood of about three or four hundred voters in Grand Falls who could not vote. The same thing is going to happen in the other districts that are going to be created at the Humber. They will be in the same predicament as the people at Grand Falls because, as they are in the unfortunate position of going up there instead of to St. John's, they have no claim for consideration. I submit, there is no democratic principle in refusing the man who has to go up there the same privilege as the man who comes to St. John's. These men can't help going up there. They have got to go there to earn

the wherewithal for their families, and the Premier and the Minister of Justice should be only too ready to offer facilities to men of that kind who are forced to leave their homes. They have to spend large sums of money going forth and back. They have to pay board for themselves as well as provide for their families. And because these men are living under circumstances worse than the people of St. John's—men who have to live and work under such hard conditions and heavy expenses, these men are to be disenfranchised. I don't think the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice have given the consideration that they ought to have given to this matter, and I think if they would consider the matter a little more they would see the justice of the most of these men in claiming that they have the same privilege to vote as the man who comes to St. John's.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I quite agree with what the Minister of Justice has said. That was just the point I was going to make when he got up. I have been asked to give my reason why I consider these voters should be disfranchised. I think that I made that point clear both last year in Committee and when I spoke in the House just now. It is hard enough to get things done properly now without adding to the difficulty by establishing booths in districts for men from other districts when there may be no more than 25 such men. You do not want a polling booth in every district. Again, as I stated just now, a man who is standing for a certain district wants to represent his policy or that of his government to the members of the district to which he belongs. If he happens to be going back to his district after four years he has to render an account of his stewardship and he has got to explain to the district what has been done by his government and let them vote on that statement. He cannot do that if the people of his district are scattered all over the island. If there happens to be a very big number of people belonging to his district in other parts of the country it is not humanly possible to go over all that district, look those men up, and canvass them. So I say that it is not an unreasonable hardship to disfranchise them. I see nothing else for it.

When St. John's was practically the only market for Labrador fish that the men could avail of, and men had to be here in port when elections were on it was agreed to have a booth for all districts here. I would rather give that up than attempt to establish polling booths for every district in every district. And that is the reason why I refused to consider this proposal at the last session of the legislature. I know perfectly well that member of the Opposition thought that we refused to have these booths placed in these districts because of the election that was coming on in Bonavista Bay. If a booth had been established on the Humber our side would have done as well as our opponents.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, it is the greatest surprise to me this afternoon to find that the Government has made this amendment a party measure. I feel sure now that if I had thought of it I would have never mentioned this amendment to this bill because I could have easily have figured that the members on the other side of the House if they had made a party measure of this amendment could not possibly vote for the bill. I thought that this would be an opportune time to get this amendment to the election act put in and I certainly thought that it would not be looked upon as a party measure. I thought that every member of this House could use his own judgment

as to whether it is right or not that men of this country who are compelled to leave their homes to earn a livelihood for their wives and their families should be disenfranchised. As the law stands they are disenfranchised and thousands of men who are working in the big industrial centres will continue to be disenfranchised unless this amendment is added to this bill. Now the Prime Minister has told us that this is a party measure and the Attorney General has intimated the same thing. Then I say that we will not attempt to introduce anything that may hinder the passing of this bill, as we are all desirous of having this bill placed on the Statute Book, and as far as I am concerned now we have discovered that the Prime Minister and his Party have the same mind on this subject and are still desirous that a large number of people be disenfranchised we will not take any steps to include anything in the bill before the House or to prevent it from going through.

MINISTER OF ARGICULTURE & MINES—Mr. Chairman, before the committee rises I would like to first avail of the opportunity of offering my congratulations to His Honour the Speaker, who had the honour of presenting to this House something less than two years ago a largely signed petition from the ladies of Newfoundland asking that the Franchise be extended to them. I happened to be one of the supporters who occupied a seat in this Assembly at that time, and I think it is something that the ladies who are behind this measure ought to be proud of. It must be a matter which will give great satisfaction to His Honour the Speaker to know that in less than two years the petition which he presented to this House is going through this House with the unanimous support of the members. I think that it is something that the Speaker and every honourable member of this House should be proud of.

I supported the petition at that time, not because of any particular section of ladies in Newfoundland, nor because of any argument I had heard in support of the measure, but from my own sincere conviction, and from not seeing why women should not have an equal say in the affairs of this country with men.

It is unfortunate that there came into this debate this afternoon something that looked as if it might mar the splendid feeling of co-operation exhibited by each individual member on both sides of the House. I have much pleasure in reiterating what I said when I supported the petition two years ago. I am glad to know that the ladies are going to be extended the franchise. I do not anticipate that things are going to be as some people fear—and I do not agree that this House is going to be monopolised by women. I do not think there is going to be anything of the kind.

I am more familiar with the women of the outports than with the women of the city. I know that it will take a lot of inducement before any of the immediate members of my family will offer themselves as candidates for any particular district.

I look forward to the time when some good will accrue to the country from having women in politics, and I feel sure that we will have no repetition of the scandals that we have had in the past. It has become a matter of common knowledge that when a man offers himself as a candidate for the House of Assembly, he becomes a public target, and the public newspapers rake up all the members of his family, and make all kinds of references to his actions. I hope that the entry of the women into the political arena will have some material benefit along those lines.

I do not wish to further delay the

committee, but I do not think I would be doing my duty, if I did not at this stage give the Bill my heartiest support.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS — Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the measure now before the chair. Yesterday afternoon, at the second reading of the Bill, the House was pretty well taken up by members on both sides speaking in support of it, and I have only to add my quota and say that I am a firm believer in extending the franchise to the women of Newfoundland. If I were a member of St. John's, either East or West, I would certainly strongly support the Bill, because of the many ladies here present. I am sorry that a number of my lady friends from the district of Harbour Main are not here today to hear me say that I am strongly in favor of extending the franchise to the women of Newfoundland. Capt. Winsor told us yesterday that he had promised the women of Bonavista Bay that he would support a measure that would give them the vote I have no doubt that he got a good many votes by making that promise, and the Hon. Prime Minister also. But the Prime Minister and Capt. Winsor proved their s i n c e r i t y in their strong advocacy of the measure yesterday afternoon. The Prime Minister, as always, was sincere and earnest; and no one can deny that he is honest in his intentions, and firmly determined to carry out his promises. I feel proud of such a man being at the helm of our country today; a man of backbone and a man of honour, whose word is his bond, a man who is determined to do justice to all and recognize that the women of this country should be put on a par with the men when it comes down to the franchise.

I think I might say that I owe my election during the thirty-five years that I have been in politics to the good women in my district. All the good women in my district were on my side. I do not know that there are any bad women in the district; but if they were, they were on the other side, of course.

When we think of the good work done by such women as Florence Nightingale, the great heroine of The Crimea, and of the women whom we admire who became known to us during the late war, such as Edith Cavell, their sacrifices on behalf of their countrymen appeal to us all. And have we not many an Edith Cavell here in our midst? Have we not Florence Nightingales all over the country, women prepared to lay down their lives on behalf of their brothers, and uncles, and cousins and fathers? Who is doing more on behalf of the country than the women of the country? I say certainly, sir, we are doing the right thing in giving the women the franchise. The hand that rocks the cradle is the hand that rules the world. I feel that every member of this House will favor this measure, and I hope to live to see it being carried out, and that please God, we will see some of the ladies take their seats in this House, and I am sure that we will all extend to them the greatest welcome and help. As the father of the House, I would advise all the members to do all that is in their power to give all the encouragement that they possibly can to the women of the country. Perhaps I shall not go back for election to my district, but if I should be prevailed upon to do so, the first section of the people to whom I should appeal for political support would be the women. I expect that you young men, yourself, Mr. Chairman, and all young men that sit on either side of this House, will be out early tomorrow morning canvassing the young ladies, and looking for their votes to help return you to your seats at the next election.

I believe the ladies have as much brains in connection with politics as the men and if I live long enough I expect to see great and beneficial legislation enacted through their efforts. I regret to say that in my experience I have found the men rather careless as to recording their votes at an election. A man will say, "why should I bother about voting and lose my time and get nothing out of it. I did get a few dollars for a well or a road to my garden but my neighbor got the benefit of that as well as myself." I do not believe this will be the attitude of the women. I imagine they will vote for Mr. Monroe, of whom they have heard so much and whose reputation stands so high in the public estimation, and I feel they will not be disappointed, as he has the ability and integrity to carry out his programme of reforms and clean up and keep clean. He will give a square deal to the ladies and I hope in a short time to see far-reaching and beneficial results from the enactment of this measure. My congratulations to the ladies and I trust they will enjoy in full measure the privilege extended them.

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 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.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, in rising to make a motion for the adjournment of the House I would like to say that on tomorrow I hope to table not only the report of Mr. Crandell who has been making an inspection of the Dry Dock, but also that of Colonel Mitchell who has been doing the same and who is connected with the firm of W. I. Bishop, of Montreal. Both these gentlemen report that the Dock is in a very dangerous condition and that it is absolutely necessary to have something done in this connection immediately. Colonel Mitchell presents a very interesting report on the whole Dock situation and I am having it printed and will give every member a copy so that he may consider it fully as until it is read through thoroughly no one will be in a position to discuss the situation. I think it is necessary that some action be taken immediately because the reports of both these gentlemen are extremely alarming. Colonel Mitchell tells me that it is quite possible that the next steamer which goes in Dock will be found up in the Railway Yard and her crew with her, and that it is very dangerous to use the Dock any longer. I want to bring in this report to-morrow so that you all may consider it fully and I will present Mr. Crandell's at the same time. The latter expert did not go into the details of the situation so fully as Colonel Mitchell who has taken every possible step to ascertain the true condition of the Dock; and not only of the Dock itself but of the piers around it and the general working of the whole situation. The Hon. the Leader of the Opposition asked me the other day if there was any suggestion as to selling the Dock or of giving it over to anybody else to operate. I spoke of this to Colonel Mitchell and suggested we get in touch with the firm of Vickers through their Montreal agency. Colonel Peel of the Vickers Company was here this Summer and he asked me to let him know if were prepared to sell the Dock. Now Colonel Mitchell says that we really have nothing in the form of a dock to sell, but it seems to me that as we have to make repairs, if the Vickers people want it they may be a party to these repairs, and I asked Colonel Mitchell to get in communication with them and let us know

where they stand in the matter. I mention this in advance, as I will lay the reports on the table of the House tomorrow for the benefit of honorable members, and I hope they will give the matter the most earnest attention as it is a most important one.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until tomorrow afternoon at three of the clock. The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, March 11th,

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

MR. BROWN—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Beaumont in the district of Twillingate, and with your permission, sir, I shall read it to the House.

(Reads petition)

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that fishermen who go to the Groais Islands fishing very often have to leave their vessels and come ashore, and it is only a chance whether they save their lives or not on times. The Groais Islands is a sort of a deserted place and, in my opinion, has not got the attention that it should get. I think, sir, that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who is present at this particular time, well knows the need of the slip asked for in this petition. In supporting the prayer of the petition I ask that it be referred to the proper department and given that consideration that it deserves.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting the petition presented by my colleague, and, in view of the small amount asked for, I ask that it be given the best consideration of Government.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Speaker, I have very much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition presented by the honourable member for Twillingate, Mr. Brown, and, as the subject matter of the petition affects a section of the district that I have the honour to represent, I am keenly interested to see that the request is granted. The need of this very necessary marine work has been brought to my attention on a couple of occasions, and, as has been pointed out already, the people who fish at the Groais Islands cannot very well do without it much longer and I think the petition should receive the support and attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. And, if the money is to be forthcoming and the slip is to be built this year, we ought to have a definite answer so that men might have an opportunity to go in the woods to procure the timber for the erection of this slip, as there is no timber procurable around the Groais Islands. I think the Government would do well to let us know how they stand on this matter so that we may inform the signatories of this petition. If the grant for this work is forthcoming, perhaps the members for the districts of Twillingate and St. Barbe could have a conference with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries with a view to getting the necessary timber so that this work could be proceeded with at once.

MR. LINEGAR—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the Boilermakers of St. John's. With your permission, sir, I shall read the petition to the House.

(Reads petition).

I might say with reference to this matter that a similar petition was presented here during the latter part of last session of the House, and, consequently, there was not time to deal with it; but since that time the Boilermakers have been working on this thing with a view to having embodied in the Boiler Inspection Act the clauses set forth in the petition. The request is a very important one, concerning as it does the handling

and repairing of steam boilers, but I am sure that all parties have been considered by the petitioners in their suggested amendments to the Boiler Inspection Act. I hope and trust that, in referring this matter to the Department to which it relates, no undue delay will occur, but that the matter will be taken up for consideration by the Government at the earliest possible moment.

MR. BROWNE—Mr. Speaker, I take very great pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition presented by my honorable colleague. I might say that, if the request of the petitioners is granted, it would have a beneficial effect in so much as it would be an encouragement to the trade of boilermaking which in this country has fallen back for several years past. If favorable consideration is given this matter, I feel sure that it will tend to give more encouragement to boilermakers to continue to work at their trade, and to give them a feeling of security which, at present, in their estimation is lacking.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from a number of residents of Torbay requesting an allocation for the improvement of a road leading from Newtown to the Beach. The people of that section are fishermen and farmers and the road is used by them very extensively. In referring the petition to the Department of Public Works I would ask that when the matter of allocations shall be made this year in connection with road extension that this request be taken note of. The road in question is a half mile long, and, as there is no grant for it, the only hope is an allocation of a special nature. The people largely depend upon this road for getting out manure for their farms in the early part of the year, and I give the prayer of the petition my strong support.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 209 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series) entitled 'Of Banks and Banking,'" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Terra Nova Sulphite Company Act 1922,'" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. ASHBOURNE asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs what position Mr. Alexander Robertson holds in the Customs House, his duties, when engaged, if paid by the day, week or month, salary paid him to date, and if he is engaged in commercial business as a Manufacturers Agent.

HON. THE MINNISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Hon. member for Twillingate I may say that Mr. Alexander Robertson is an employee of the Custom House. His duties are to appraise the goods which come into the country. He is paid a monthly salary, and as regards his being in a commercial business I do not know anything about it. He is a sworn official of the Custom House like all of the rest of them.

MR. ASHBOURNE asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs what position Mr. Peter Skirving holds in the Customs Department; if he was an employee of Ayre & Sons, Limited, if he is still in the employ of Ayre & Sons, Limited, and if so, whom does he represent at the Customs Department, the date when his services were engaged, the salary paid him, and the amount received by him to date.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Speaker, in reply to that

question I may inform the Hon. member for Twillingate that Mr. Peter Skirving is assistant to Mr. Robertson and is not as far as I am aware in the employ of Messrs. Ayre & Sons. He is also a sworn employee of the Custom House and his salary is monthly and is to be voted by the department when the estimates come in.

MR. HICKMAN asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay upon the Table of the House a list of Grants, special and otherwise, sent out to the District of Bay de Verde from his department since 1st June, 1924, to date. To give the names of persons to whom the Grants were sent and to furnish returns if any.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker, in reply to that I have not had time to prepare the answer to that question today and I will get it as soon as possible.

MR. HICKMAN asked the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the Table of the House a list of Grants, special and otherwise, sent out to the District of Bay de Verde from his department since 1st June, 1924, to date. To give the names of persons to whom the Grants were sent and to furnish returns, if any.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Speaker, I will have that answer ready for tomorrow.

MR. GODDEN asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs if any seizures of Liquor, Cigarettes and Tobacco, have been made at Wabana during the year 1924; if so, give dates, names of steamers or vessels connected with the seizures and by whom the seizures were made. If such seizures were made what action was taken by the Customs Officials with regard to same, and if no action was taken, why not.

Reply tabled.

MR. GODDEN asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs if any seizure of Liquor or Tobacco was made on schooner "Helen Var"; give particulars of goods found; give reasons why the case was dropped and the Captain let off.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Member for Trinity, I may say that there has been a seizure upon the schooner Helen Var and the case came before the Court and was postponed sine die or for a sunny day, I am not sure which.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, before proceeding with the order of the day I would like to inform the House that this morning we received a message from Fogo telling us that the Stellar Maris was in a sinking condition and was in communication with the Prospero. This afternoon we have just received a message from Captain Burgess of the Prospero:

"Our position Lat. 51 min. 23 sec. "N., Long. 53 min. 28 sec. W. Steer-"ing South West. Searching for "Stella Maris' crew. Saw smoke "early this morning."

We have found it advisable because of that message to get the Sable I. which left early this afternoon back again. By this communication it seems that there are now eighty men on the ice and we must but do everything possible for the safety of these men.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Lobster Fishery,'" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 3 of the Consolidated Stautes of Newfoundland (Third Series) entitled 'Of

the Election of Members of the House of Assembly" " was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bili entitled "An Act relating to Fire-arms."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, I think that the bills have now been distributed and the Hon. members will find that the bill is now in line with the suggestions which were made when the committee last sat on this matter. It has been arranged so that it now applies to "small arms" 'exclusively. No other form of fire arms will be affected by it. With regards to the registering of arms outside of St. John's this can be done by a magistrate. Perhaps some of the members have just had this bill delivered to them and they may not have had time to go over it. Shortly, the effect of it is this, that all small arms such as revolvers and pistols have now to be registered. No other forms of weapons are covered by the bill. I have to apologise for the delay in bringing this bill before the House, but it was caused by the time taken up in trying to get the bill in line with all the suggestions that have been offered on it. I am not desirous of having this bill forced through the House this afternoon and if any of the members would like to have the committee rise so as to give them a chance to peruse the bill I would be quite agreeable.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, I suggest 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 tomorrow.

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

HIGHWAY TRAFFLIC BILL.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, in rising to move the second reading of this Bill, I might say that it is somewhat of a subsidiary Bill to the one that I introduced and was passed in this House a day or two ago, providing for the appointment of a Highroads Commission. This Bill has for its object mainly the operation and regulation of traffic on roads and highways.

The preliminaries of the Bill, as honourable members will see, are merely the interpretations of the different titles that are named in the Bill. It is not my purpose to go into any minute details in explanation of this Bill this afternoon, as we will have an opportunity tomorrow or afterwards of going into Committee and discussing this Bill fully, and viewing it in all its aspects. But I should like to take advantage of the second reading of the Bill to explain its more salient features, so that honourable members may generally understand the object of the Bill.

Primarily, the object of the Bill is to give control to the Highroads Commission for the regulation of traaffic over the highways and other places. The Bill constitutes the Highroads Commission as the authority to take the place of and perform the duties that are now being filled by the Inspector General of Police, and the privileges of the city council, or municipality of St. John's and other places over the granting of licenses, and registration. Whilst

part of the fees collected for registration and licenses will still go to the city of St. John's, the remainder will be used and spent by the Highroads Commission.

Under this Bill authority for the regulation of traffic, as I said before, will be vested in the Highroads Commission. Today the man owning a motor car in Harbour Grace, or Carbonear, or any other part of the Island outside St. John's, has to get a license from the Inspector General of Police in St. John's. It is proposed to appoint inspectors at certain points to meet this contingency, so that undue expense and hardship will not be imposed on those who require to register cars and be licensed as drivers outside the city.

It also acquires the right to regulate speed, and to regulate lights and brakes, and to generally regulate the passage of traffic on roads and highways. The rate of speed is a very important point, and the Bill provides a very definite schedule with regard to this particular matter. It provides for a rate of twenty-five miles an hour outside of cities, towns and villages, twenty miles an hour within cities, towns or villages, and only ten miles an hour at intersections or curves where the driver has not a clear view of approaching traffic, and only ten miles an hour when motor vehicles are passing each other on a bridge or on a narrow road. It also provides that a motor car shall not be driven at any time at a rate of speed that is dangerous to the public under all the surrounding circumstances, and any breach of this provision is punishable by double the ordinary penalties; and imprisonment may be imposed. It is not because twenty-five miles an hour is permitted outside towns and cities, and twenty miles an hour within, that a driver can drive recklessly at these rates of speed. He must drive carefully under all the circumstances, or he must submit himself to punishment.

The Bill also provides that in future the rule of the road shall be that vehicles shall pass each other on the right side, instead of the left as heretofore, and this new regulation is, I submit, very far reaching and important; and it is proposed to put it into effect on January 1st, 1926, after having been very widely advertised; and after it comes into force, drivers of cars will be required to carry signs in large letters on their windshields marked with "Keep to the right," until such time as the general public and everybody interested become accustomed to the new laws.

I might say that this new regulation brings us into form, or in line with the general practice right through the North American continent. Newfoundland today is the only country on this side of the water whose traffic regulations require vehicles to keep to the left; and two years ago Nova Scotia was the last to change their methods as adapted to driving of motor cars, and made it the rule to drive to the right; and the experience of those who were instrumental in bringing about that alteration, and the experience of drivers and others has been that it has made a marked improvement in the regulation of traffic in Nova Scotia. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I submit to the very careful consideration of this House this proposed alteration of our traffic laws. I feel sure that after a short time there will be many people who will be ready to adapt themselves in anything that will be for the improvement and safety of the general public; and I feel sure that this innovation will be acceptable, and that the future will justify this alteration.

We are entering upon a policy that I had the honour to explain in a somewhat brief manner a few days ago, of inviting tourists to come to this

country, and whilst I do not claim and will not accept the principle that we should alter our laws to suit those who may come into our country, still I think we ought as far as is possible, bring our regulations as regards traffic in conformity with those with which those who may come in here to visit us will be experienced in. We hope to get people in here if it is at all possible, and when they come in here, we want to make them feel as much at home as we can.

Let us anticipate what might happen on the West Coast of Newfoundland. I do not think there is any honourable member in this House who is bold enough to say that the time is far distant when we will develop a large tourist traffic on the west coast of Newfoundland. We hope to have good roads built up from the landing place of these tourists—Port aux Basques, to Bay of Islands, Curling, Corner Brook, up to Deer Lake; and when these roads are constructed we are going to have a considerable amount of motor traffic over these roads. You can hardly imagine a man who has driven his car down to the terminus at North Sydney, and who up to the time he leaves North Sydney has had to keep to the right, coming across the Gulf and being compelled to change all that, and keep to the left. I merely mention this as an incident, apart altogether from our part of the country over here.

I think it is very desirable that, so far as our traffic regulations are concerned, we should start to bring them into conformity with those of the neighbouring provinces.

Another point—the motor business of this country is growing more largely than any other business. We have hundreds of our young men today who have acquired expert knowledge in driving motor cars, and have done quite a lot of driving here; and it is not at all unreasonable that many of those young men may go abroad and seek employment as chauffeurs, and it would be very difficult for them if they find that the laws in the places they go to are entirely different from ours; and such a state of affairs might lead to confusion, and even to accident. All the motor cars that are here today are fitted with a right hand drive, and nearly all the cars that will be built in Canada and the United States will be fitted in that manner unless specially ordered.

Therefore, I think that there are a great many advantages to be derived from this alteration, although I am quite prepared to admit that there may be a great deal or argument against the change.

Motor cars today are no longer a luxury. It is only a very short time since there were no motor cars outside St. John's, but now, I am proud to say that all around Conception Bay, and in other parts of the country there is quite a number of cars. The Honourable member for Burin, Mr. Lake, told me the other day that he was going to have a motor car this year up in Burin. It shows that the use of the motor car is becoming more widespread every year as we go along. Therefore, it is to be desired that the laws of the country will be in conformity —one part of the country with the other.

Section nine is important, because it deals with the responsibility for accidents. It will be borne in mind that in this community we have had several serious accidents that possibly might have been avoided if there were a proper understanding on the part of the drivers and others as to what the law really meant in regard to accidents, and reckless driving, and in cases of criminal negligence. It is a very serious matter to have a man or woman in charge of a large car, or to have what might be called a juggernaught in the hands of an irresponsible party, and the

Law must safeguard the rights of the people, and this Bill in no uncertain terms proclaims the penalties for those who commit violations of this Law. Section 9 states

(Reads section)

In other words it is incumbent upon the driver who meets with an accident to prove that he is innocent or not responsible for whatever happened. The Law most jealously guards the rights of the common people against those who have cars, and every protection must be given the public. This Bill also states that the driver involved in an accident must remain on the spot to render assistance. We have had some very painful instances of motorists running down people and not stopping to assist them, or to see what damage had been done. This Bill also provides that no person under the age of seventeen years shall be allowed to have charge of a car. It rarely happens that a boy or girl under that age is sufficiently responsible to be put in control of a car which may cause such occurrences or circumstances as we have unfortunately seen in this City. It further provides that no intoxicated person shall drive a motor vehicle. In Toronto if a policeman can prove the taking of one glass of liquor by a person in charge of a car, it is considered a penal offence, and rightly so. Some people may take a glass of liquor without any injurious effect, whilst it would make others drunk, and, therefore, under the Law it is punishable for a driver to have the least suspicion of drunkness on him. The Bill further provides for the fixing of License Fees and their collection by the Municipality. Half of these fees will go to the City Council in this City, and to the Municipality in such places as Grand Falls, Harbor Grace, etc., that will have that form of Government later. Provision is also made—and as part of the present policy of the Government, we want to give encouragement to outsiders to come in here—that Tourists bringing their cars with them and staying three months will pay no import duty, will have the use of the streets and highways on payment of the nominal sum, which amount $5.00 will be paid to the Customs. If the Tourist remains longer than three months, further payment can be arranged and it will be left to the Highroad's Commission and Minister of Finance to adjust the amount. Section 12 deals with the infliction of penalties. In addition to pecuniary penalties imprisonment is provided for in some cases, even for a first offence, term ranging from thirty days to six months. There is also provision for the suspension of licenses for periods of from thirty days to six months, and under certain circumstances for two year.

(Reads Section)

In other words not alone will a violater of the Law be sent to prison, but he will also be liable to a fine, and with those provisions I think the public will be practically safe from motor car disasters such as have happened in the past. Now the whole idea of the Bill is to provide facilities for motor traffic, and at the same time safeguard the rights and secure the safety of the ordinary public. Liberty without license is the tenor of the whole Bill. The License Fee is a small one, so as to induce many people to take out one after they have passed an examination for fitness to drive, that is to say, they must be thoroughly fit to be in charge of a car, and with all due respect to the present authorities, I feel the examination in the past has been too lax, and as all who have ever driven over our country roads will admit, they have met people driving motors who should never have been allowed to do so. I hope that the very strictest

kind of examinations as to competency to drive will be instituted by the commission, and that nobody will be allowed to take the wheeel of a car unless he or she is qualified in every particular to do so. The Bill further suggests the reduction of fees on motor cars from the present rate on the ground that they are unduly large. I think that any person who has taken the trouble to find out will admit that our fees are far ahead of those charged in other parts of the world. The object of the reduction is to induce more people to get and use cars, as by doing so they will be giving a large amount of employment. The motor car industry is a large one here today, and it can be considerably extended. Today the car is no longer a luxury, but has become almost a necessity. In Western Canada today the farmers use their cars more than any other vehicle or implement on the farm. There are many progressive farmers residing in the surburbs near here who may be expected in the near future to provide themselves with cars in order to bring their produce to the City, and I believe they will find the motors much more economical than the keeping of horses. Now in the United States and Canada they have a regular system under which people crossing the borders pay no tax. For instance a man in Montreal can take his car and drive over to New York, or even to San Francisco, and there is no charge on the car, same applies to those crossing from the United States to Canada. It is a kind of reciprocity agreement, and it helps one as well as the other by the expenditure resulting from the exchange of traffic. Some millions of cars cross annually from the States to Quebec, and that Province today is reaping the benefit of the influx of money which it would not have without the motor cars. Even with the attraction of her liquor laws she would not have the traffic but for the car, which makes it so easy for such huge numbers of people to cross the border. And what is happening there on a large scale will happen here in a small way. Today a man can take a car and travel to Harbor Grace easily in three hours, while twenty years ago it would take a day to make the journey, and we can all remember not so long back when sitting around the Christmas fire, we used to talk of taking the nag to Topsail. But the car has annihilated space, and, therefore, this industry and inovation has come to stay, and it devolves on us to develop and use it for the benefit of the people on the whole. We cannot banish the cars, as they are here to stay, and we must see that they are used for the general good. Section 13 refers to the Criminal Provisions. As I pointed out before the time has passed when we can no longer shirk our responsibilities in connection with this traffic, and it is up to us to conduct it as it is conducted in other countries. If a person sins, he must be punished. It is our bounden duty to protect the children and the public generally, and to see that those using motor vehicles, which may prove a menace or cause serious accident, shall be punished for what may happen while they are in charge of same. This section reads.

(Reads Section).

Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading I feel that there are certain people who do not see eye to eye with the Government with regard to this Bill. Still there are a very large number I am sure who welcome this change. I know that the Motor Association have placed themselves on record as being in favour of this Bill in every possible respect, and in moving the second reading I may say that tomorrow when it goes into the Committee stage if there is any Hon.

Member who desires any further information in respect to the working of this Bill, I will have much pleasure in furnishing it.

MR. GODDEN—Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House are in favor of the general principle of this Bill, but there is one very objectionable feature, the changing of the rule of the road from the left to the right. Generally, in the past the drivers of all kinds of vehicles have been used to the rule which says keep to the left, same as it is in the Old Country, and now we are asked to make a drastic change. And why? The principal reason given is that because the people in America and Canada act differently, because their rule says keep to the right, therefore, in order to induce people to visit us we must upset our own comfortable order of things to suit them. I say, what is good enough for Great Britain is good enough for us in Newfoundland. And those of us who have visited the largest cities on both sides of the Atlantic cannot but compare very favourably the way the traffic is handled in London against that in San Francisco, Chicago, New York, Winnipeg or Montreal. In these Western cities one is struck by the great energy that is used up by the traffic cops in wildly gesticulating, shouting and blowing whistles in order to control all the traffic. It is quite the reverse in London. There, you see the traffic policemen all serene, controlling everything by a motion of the hand. Pedestrians are able to go from one side to the other without any great hurry. We don't want Canadian or American Institutions forced upon us, perhaps I should say, talked on us. The Honourable Colonial Secretary mentioned that the Motor Association were in accord with this Bill entirely. Well do I know that when this change of the rule of the road was first spoken about a few days ago that everybody was flatly against it. But what has happened? Wherever any men have got together to discuss it you will find the father of this measure with them and talking them over to his way of thinking. I think it was last Friday evening that the Motor Association met and discussed this question, and I know quite well that a number of men went to that meeting with the firm intention of protesting against this change. But, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Morine was there. Yes, it is Mr. Morine who is talking this on the country, and at that meeting of the Motor Association, the members against their better judgment feebly gave in to him, swayed by his eloquence. That is what has happened. And I venture to say this also that the Honourable Members of the Government have been talked into it by the same gentleman. Their own convictions are that the change is very unnecessary. But they have also given into Mr. Morine.

But, after all, there are only about four hundred motors in the country, and there are thousands upon thousands of horses. Now what have the truckmen and the carmen got to say about this?

The Honourable Minister of Finance presented a petition from these men. It was supported by Mr. Linegar, protesting against this change from the left to the right. But if they had held a meeting and Mr. Morine had been present he would probably have talked them into it. He could talk them blind. I wish I had the eloquence of Mr. Morine. Another reason that is given, is the tourist traffic to come. If this dream of the tourist traffic evolves and it is only a dream after all, and the honourable members must admit this. Don't try and delude the public into thinking that this traffic bill is going to be the means of bringing thousands of tourists to our shores. Canadians and Americans will not want to come here

unless we have the means of housing them, and the means of getting all over the country and the different parts of the country, not necessarily by motor car. Now the very first essential of opening up any country, is a railway. This is a very sore question in Newfoundland. As the Prime Minister has said, and quite rightly, it would have been much better if moneys had been spent on roads rather than on the branch railways when you have a ramshackle of a railway such as we have. However, we are getting away from the point. What I want to say is, that this change of the traffic rules of the road is very unnecessary. If we had the tourist traffic, and if we were sure that hundreds and thousands of tourists were coming down here in the next two or three years, then it would be time enough to make any alterations in the rules of the road—when the tourists actually come here, but not until then. Why should we make ourselves uncomfortable for strangers? I protest against this change, it is utterly unnecessary and very untimely.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Speaker, the amount of discussion contingent upon this matter makes it very evident that this is a very unpopular move, so I have no hesitation in standing up and protesting against changing the present rule of the road which has been to keep to the left, and I see no cogent reason given here today which would influence me to alter my opinion on that matter. And so this afternoon, though we are very few in numbers, I think it is our duty on this side of the House to point out this to the Government and to ask them for certain consideration for our own people—the people who have always lived in Newfoundland—rather than give preference to those who come here from Canada and the United States. I notice there is no mention of any tourist's' coming from England. What about it if they come? Have they not been always used to driving to the left? Would it not be just as difficult for them to change as for the Canadians who come down here? I think, this afternoon, before it passes its second reading, this point should be given consideration, because after it passes second reading we will have to accept the principle of the Bill.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —It will not be necessary to accept the principle of the Bill.

MR. ASHBOURNE—In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, in answer to the Minister of Justice, I believe this is the most important part of the Bill. I believe it has some good points. I think the discussion should take place to-day, and if there is any alteration of the principle to be made in the Bill it should be made before it comes into the Committee stage.

Another point is this in connection with Chapter 8, Subsection k.

(Reads this section)

Does this mean that if the driver is on the right hand side of the road and the fire engine is coming behind him that he has to shoot across to the left hand curb. I don't see how this is going to work out. Supposing that there is a car coming towards you on your left. Then if you cut across you are going to collide with him.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—His following on the right hand side of the road interferes with the passing of the fire engine. But everything is held up for the fire engine.

MR. ASHBOURNE — Well, Mr. Speaker the point I want to bring out is this, that any change will of necessity no doubt entail if the Bill goes into effect a great many accidents, and it is to prevent these that

we think it is our duty to stand up and defend the present rule of the road. We are Britishers and I do not see why people who live here in Newfoundland and own carriages and horses have to give way to people who want to come down here and bring their cars from Canada and the United States. It is a well known fact that a horse—a very sagacious animal—learns the rule of the road probably as quickly as a man does. and it is natural to expect that the horse having been accustomed for a good many years to keeping to the left will in the future go on doing the very same thing. What shall we find? We shall find that when there are a large number of motor cars coming to town the chances are the horses and farmers will be going back to their homes; the horses will be keeping to the left hand side because it is not customary for the drivers to keep a close watch on their horses, and it is quite natural to let the horse take his own course home. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that in this matter alone you will see that the probability is that there will be a great many accidents. Yesterday we heard a petition which was sent to this House introduced by the Hon. Minister of Finance endorsed by Mr. Linegar from the Truckmen's Union. And I think that we should take warning by that. I do not see why the rights of those who have horses should be made second to those who have motor cars, particularly when it happens to be such an unpopular move. So the reason why I am protesting is because we are British, and in the mother country the rule of the road is to keep to the left. We have always looked upon that as peculiar to this country. I don't think that any of the tourists who may come down here will have any difficulty in remembering what we do in Newfoundland. They will say this is a little country and while we are down here we must remember to keep to the left. I don't' think there would be anybody who would forget that. If we are in Canada and are driving a motor there we have to drive to the right. Therefore it is only proper to argue that either the Canadian or American tourist who comes down here should be required to keep our law. There are a couple of other points that I want to speak about, but I do not want to take up the time of the House now, so I will leave them over until the Bill comes into the Committee stage.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker it is not our intention to prolong the dis-ussion on the second reading of the Bill because in the Committee stage we will be able to take it up section by section. As far as we can see in going over the Bill we have to object to the part known as the "Rules of the Road." We think that is going to entail a great hardship on this country. All who have motor cars know very well that it is the horses more than the drivers that know the present rule of the road. And in coming from any of the outlying settlements very often the driver is asleep. When the horn blows the beast puts in to the left hand side of the road and it will do the same now. We consider that this is a hardship which would be put on the people to acommodate tourists who may come here from Canada or Ameria, with their motor cars. It is even problematical whether they will come here or not, and they will be so few in numbers in the next few years that there is no necessity at the present time to put that over on the owners of horses particularly in this city. Now this is purely a Canadian law and every single law that has been put through this House of Assembly since this present Government came into power has been a Canadian law from start to finish. The fact is that we are heading into onfederation as

fast as we can. And this Government has no other objet in bringing this law into force than the object of which I have now spoken. In England the left is the side on which the people drive. Why is this law good enough for England and not good enough for us. Is it not good enough to follow the rules of the Mother Country instead of Canada.

As to the principle of the Bill, we agree with the regulation of traffic, with the regulation of the motor cars, and the speed of motor cars, and everything else that is in the Bill in the interest of the city and country and which calls for safety.

(Reads No. 9. The prohibition of acidents.)

Well, I think the rule of the road should be headed "how to make accidents" beause that is what is going to happen. We are going to have many acidents. This rule is not necessary at the present time.

Now as I said before this Bill will be in the Committee stage tomorrow, and we will have an opportunity to go through it in part. But we object to the part in reference to the rules of the road, and we hope that the Government when it comes into the Committee stage will see their way clear to change this. If not we will be forced to bring in an amendment in reference to the Bill that refers to the rule of the road.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Speaker, from listening to the recent debate in this House I am wondering how many members know the rules of the road of this House. We have a rule which says that in the seond reading you discuss the principle of the Bill and the principle only. Another says that as far as the House is conerned that when the Bill is in the Committee stage the members are to go into detail on it. A few days ago the Prime Minister introduced a Bill providing for the women to have a vote. There was dead silence in the second reading, but in the Committee stage the members were falling over one another. Today there is a Bill dealing with the matter of traffic, and from the statements of the Members one would gather that as they are in accordane with the principle of the Bill it must immediately be drafted into the Committee stage and discussed.

I only rise to pass a few remarks on one or two points. The principle which has been raised by Mr. Ashbourne has been drawn to my attention by a gentleman outside the House, and in order that when we get get into the Committee stage there may be no delay and everything may be satisfactory I am going to put a proposition to the Hon. the Colonial Secretary.

(Reads the section on the Rule of the Road).

Now does it make any difference how the fire apparatus is approaching. Supposing the apparatus is coming towards me. I have to cut across in front of it, and at the same time the man on the left is taking the place that I left. There must be something wrong with that section. As soon as I hear the apparatus I have got to clear from one side to the other. I am just bringing this matter up now so that we can save time when we get into the Committee stage.

There is one other point that I would like to see in this Bill. There are more accidents and there are likely to be more accidents caused by want of lights than by anything else. On this account in order to make traffic as safe as possible there ought to be a clause that every wheeled vehicle ought to carry a lamp. if that is not done you are leaving open an avenue to accidents which can certainly be closed. I think the opportunity should be availed of, so that not only motor cars but all wheeled vehicles should carry lights by night.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Colonial Secretary, the Bill entitled "An Act to Regulate Travel on Highways and the Speed, Operation and Load of Vehicles thereon" was read a seond time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second reading of Bill entitled "An Act to amend Chap. 52 of Bill entitled 'Of Egress from Churches, Theatres and Buildings.' "

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this bill, lest some of the members might be tempted to make enquiry, I may say that it is not a copy of any Ontario Act, but is made up from legislation on the other side of the water. It is an amendment to the act with regard to buildings where the public is accustomed to accumulate in any numbers. For some time there has been a feeling here that it is nothing else but the kindness of providence that has prevented tragedies occurring in St. John's. There has been a total disregard of all ideas of passage egress. Under the present act no provision is made with regard to the keeping of the aisles and passage ways inside buildings clear. Only the matter of what might be termed "outside" arrangements are placed under control. It is now proposed to take authority for keeping the inside aisles free of obstruction.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Speaker, does the present law provide for the opening of doors outwards?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, yes. I might explain for the information of the hon. member that this act provides for the internal order in buildings. The act as it now stands provides for the excess.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION — Mr. Speaker, without having read the bill it seems to me as far as I can see that it commends itself to the House, as it is a means of safeguarding the public, and there is as far as I know no objection to it from this side of the House. It is very refreshing to handle a bill of local construction, and I can assure you that when we see a bill which contains four or five pages we immediately come to the conclusion that it has been imported. I am glad to hear from the Minister of Justice that it is a local affair.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 52 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Egress from Churches, Theatres and other Buildings," was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER— Mr. Speaker, in rising to move the adjournment of the House I want to lay on the table of the House the copy of Mr. Crandle's report on the dock, and also that of Col. Mitchell, which has been printed. Copies of the report will be handed out to every member of the House, and they can consider it before the matter is discussed. I am going to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we adjourn the House until Monday. The Government has to meet a deputation from Bell Island and we have got to consider some legislation in connection with the dock, and there are several matters which require our attention before we can bring them in; consequently I would like to move that the House at its rising, do adjourn until Monday.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until Monday afternoon next, 16th inst, at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, March 16th.

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

MR.| WARREN—Mr. Speaker, I rise, Sir, on the matter of the privileges of this House. I desire to draw your attention to the speech made in another place which has been printed under the title of the official synopsis, and I would like to ask your ruling as to whether the members of this House are at liberty to reply to that speech or to discuss it in debate.

MR. SPEAKER—It is a well founded principle of parliamentary practice that reference in one House should not be made to the debates or proceedings in the other nor can any recriminatory reference be made to members of the other House.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Speaker, in that case I will confine my remarks to the privileges of this House. I asked for a ruling from you on this matter although I was perfectly aware as to what the ruling would be. Now in this speech made in the Upper House by the Leader of the Government on the highways bill the hon. gentleman referred deliberately to debates which had taken place in another place. Now as far as I am concerned it means nothing to me. I am an independent member of this House and I am anxious that the dignity of this House should be kept up. Now there are references in this speech, I think,, that the Hon. members of this House cannot possibly overlook. Now May lays it down:—

Reads.

Now of course the case is different here because we have our official report of the speeches printed here for publication. The other authority says:—

Reads.

Now we can deal with anything which comes up in the Upper House, but I rise to point this out to you and to the gentleman who is not only the Leader of the Government but also the Leader of this House, that the debates which have taken place in this House have been repeated in another place, and that it will only lead to acrimony and ill-feeling. Now there is another point to be considered. When one reads that speech one feels that the practice should be peremptorily stopped. Rule 101 and 102 provide that no member shall use offensive or disrespectful words in reference to another in the course of debate, and that no member of one House shall use offensive words in respect to any other member of another House. Now, Sir, I did not debate the High Ways Bill, and I am not feeling sore about it in any way. But I point the matter out to you with the idea of stopping it. In reference to the speech in the Upper House the learned Leader of the Government in the Upper House referred to certain members as Parish politicians and Jeremiahs. I do not know what the latter reference may be. But, Mr. Speaker, if any member of this House were to refer to me as a Parish politician I would ask you, Sir, to make him withdraw, because I think that it would be an offensive epithet and consequently a breach of rule 101 of this House.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the people of La Scie. This petition was handed me by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and I have not had sufficient time to acquaint myself with the outline of the petition, but from the heading of the petition it can be seen to what it refers. The petition asks for a grant for the repair of the public wharf. They ask for a sum of money to the amount of $2500.00. The petitioners point out that the wharf is very important, not only

to the people of La Scie, but to Brent's Cove, Hr. Round and Horse Island as well. There is very little more to be said on this matter just now, but that I hope that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will give the matter his most favourable attention and that he will do his best to see that the petitioners get what they are asking for.

MR. POWER—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Little River asking for a grant of five hundred dollars for the repair of a bridge. I may point out that this bridge is the connection by which the people of this vicinity get their produce to the station, and it is very necessary to have the bridge repaired. I ask to have the petition referred to the department to which it relates.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from the people of Harbour Buffett. This petition is in line with many other petitions which have been presented from points along the South Coast. It is in connection with the coastal service which has been very unsatisfactory. It is in connection with the calling of the steamer Argyle. I ask that it be referred to the Railway Department. I also beg leave to present a petition from the people of Chambers Island on the same subject.

Mr. Ashbourne gave notice of question.

Mr. Scammell gave notice of two questions.

Mr. Grimes gave notice of two questions.

(1) MR. HALFYARD asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the Table of the House a copy of the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General, under Section 33 (b) of the Audit Act, to cover the period extending from June 1st, 1924, to January 31st, 1925. If this Report is not in the hands of the Minister of Finance, why not, as last year the Report up to May 31st for the current fiscal year was furnished by the Auditor General for the information of the Legislature.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Hon. member I may say that the Auditor General's report for the six months mentioned is not yet in my possession.

MR. SCAMMELL — Mr. Speaker, might I ask that in the absence of the Hon. member that the question might be left on the Order Paper?

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Speaker, that is the reply to that question, and it is that the Auditor General's report is not yet in my hands.

(2) MR. SCAMMELL asked Hon., the Prime Minister if he has recently received a communication from the Bay of Islands Board of Trade anent the matter of Parcel Post between Canada and Newfoundland, and if so, to ask if the Government has as yet considered the communication, and if so, what action the Government proposes to take in the matter.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—In tabling the reply to this question, I would also like to say, Mr. Speaker, that the minister reports that a number of the officials in question are not collecting enough to pay half their salaries and the Government is considering whether some of them will not have to be cut out.

(3) MR. PUDDESTER asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to Table a statement of allocations (special or otherwise) made to the District of Bay de Verde between July 1st and October 31st, 1919. State in each case who authorized the allocations, for what purpose they were made and to Table returns received in each instance; also Table original requests received for the expenditure.

Answer tabled.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I also beg leave to present

the answer to question number three on the order paper of March 11th asked by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

(4) MR. PUDDDESTER asked the Minister of Public Works to table statements showing allocations (special or otherwise) made by his department to the District of Bay de Verde between July 1st and October 31st, 1919. State on whose authority these allocations were made and furnish copy of returns received in each case.

Answer tabled.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—I also beg leave to table the answer to question number four on the order paper of March 11th, asked by Mr. Hickman.

Mr. Warren gave notice of question.

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 Act 61, Victoria, Cap. 47, entitled 'An Act relating to the Constitution of the Supreme Court, and the Acts in Amendment thereof,'" with some amendments, in which they request the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion the said Amendments were read a first time, and it was ordered that they be read a second time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act relating to Firearms, and other weapons."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, as I promised honourable members at the last meeting of the House on this Bill, and as the honourable members who have read the Bill have probably observed, the Bill relates entirely to small arms; and the objections raised at the preliminary stages have been removed.

One other point—as regards the permits—the permits are given in St. John's by the Inspector General, and in the outports by the magistrate.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, I do not oppose this Bill, but I had a little to say about it before the committee previously. I said then that the Bill was not a copy of the English Act. I have since looked up the English Acts, and I wish to say now that there is no act like this in England. This Act goes so far as to say that no man shall keep a pistol or revolver in his house without a permit; and I can find no English Act with such a provision. The last English Act is the Act of 1870, which was an Excise Act for the creation of a duty on revolvers, guns, and so on. However, if the Government or the Inspector General thinks that it is going to stop any more murders, I have no objection to it.

While I am on my feet I would like to point out that while section three provides that a magistrate may grant a permit, section three (a) goes on to say that "A firearm certificate shall not be granted to a person whom the Inspector General of Constabulary has reason to believe to be a person . . ." Should not that power also be given to the magistrate.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—That can be altered.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, I would like to know if this Bill refers to all kinds of guns. I notice that it does not refer to shot guns?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—It does not include shot guns. The Act does not apply to them. That was one of the objects of making the amendments.

MR. BROWNE—Might I point out

in connection with section two that its provisions are practically repeated in section seven. Section 2 reads . . . . . And then section seven says . . . . . I submit that section 2 is unnecessary.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Section 7 is the penalty clause.

MR. BROWNE—It recites exactly what is in section 2.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Section 2 is just a general provision. and section 7 refers to the particular articles.

MR. BROWNE—I just thought that I would call the matter to the notice of the honourable minister.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, having one of these weapons myself which I had in the war, I wonder if I have to hand it in now, or otherwise take out a certificate.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Take out a certificate.

MR. CASHIN—Is it absolutely necessary to take out a certificate?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Yes.

MR. CASHIN—Alright—the Inspector General can send up for it when he likes.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I think section 9 will cover your case.

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 an amendment.

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 52 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Egress from Churches, Theatres and other Buildings.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, in moving the second reading of this Bill I explained briefly that the effect of this Bill is to provide internal control in theatres, etc. At present the only control is as to ingress, while there is no control over aisles, passageways, etc. This measure gives the City Engineer—in the city,—and the Government Engineer—outside the city—power to arrange as to proper exits; and also, what is more important, power to the Constabulary to see that the aisles are kept clear. As all have noticed the aisles of buildings here are continually crowded and there is no power to clear them. The second section deals with the increasing of penalties and empowers the Magistrate to deal with the same. Subsection 2 gives the Inspector-General power while a performance is on to say whether an aisle is overcrowded or not. This will depend to some extent on the exercise of ordinary discretion on the part of the police officer. In other words those conducting theatres, etc., will in future not be able to indiscriminately sell tickets for seats in the aisles. Such seats are not sold anywhere outside this country, and the matter here is a public scandal. The real idea of this section is to prevent the blocking of aisles which is highly dangerous and improper. The selling of tickets for such seats will of course be governed by the circumstances and the discretion of those in charge as under certain conditions it may be allowed. The idea is to get some control over putting people in aisles and to give the police power to say when this shall be done. There is a difference between say a wrestling match and a gathering of a sacred character, and

the matter of seating will be to some extent covered by conditions.

MR. DUFF—Regarding assemblies outside St. John's', as referred to in section one of the Bill, I would like to ask how are the Government Engineer and the Inspector General of Constabularly going to control a packed meeting, for instance at Carbonear?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—As a matter of fact you have in Carbonear the most efficient police force for its size than in any other part of the Island.

MR. HICKMAN—Is there anything to be laid down as to what the width of aisles are to be?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—No. The position is, that the whole matter is in the hands of the Municipal Council. For all buildings plans are supposed to be first submitted to the Council, and the State today has no control whatever over it, and no right of prescribing the building regulations. Under the old Act section 4, which is not repealed, says: (Quotes from Act). So that we have not disturbed that section. That is left entirely in the hands of the Council.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the honourable Minister in charge of the Bill a question with reference to sub-section (4). Supposing a party hire a hall and find that they got more people coming to the hall than they have seats for, and they then go outside and borrow chairs or seats on the spur of the moment and the manager or owner of the hall may not know anything about it, who is responsible in that case?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I take it that the occupier at the time is responsible. It is a criminal offence and you can only proceed against the person who has guilty knowledge of it. If a theatre is hired to me for a night and I overcrowd it without the knowledge of the owner or manager, surely I am the person to be proceeded against. The person hiring a hall is the occupier for the night.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, may I ask the honourable Minister in charge of this Bill, if there is any provision under any Act whereby this inspection can be carried out at hotels and boarding houses and such like where overcrowding might occur? I have in mind some places in St. John's where overcrowding often happens. I would like to know if there is any machinery in existence in relation to this matter, and, if there is not, I would suggest that something be done in the way of making this necessary as early as possible.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Speaking from recollection and subject to correction, I think that provision will be found in the so-called Municipal Council Charter; but there is no other law in connection with this thing. I think the provision in the Charter is that the Council may make regulations as to the number of persons occupying buildings, and I am sending now for a copy of the Act. I might say that I think the provision is that so many cubic inches is fixed as a maximum for any one person, as certain honourable members now in the House will remember. I think also it will be found that the point raised by the honourable Colonial Secretary is covered under the Municipal Council Act.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say in replying to the Colonial Secretary that under the Municipal Act of 1921, under that part of the Act concerning the regulations with regard to the building of houses and with regard to the power the Council may have concerning plans and specifications the following will probably remove

the difficulty. Section 355. Page 139.

(Reads this Section)

There are a number of other regulations along these lines.

COLONIAL SECRETARY—But how many people can there be put in the bedrooms? That is the point.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Here it is now. (Reads Section 364).

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 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.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 13 George V. Chapter XXVI., respecting a Tax upon Certain Incomes" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committe of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second reading of Bill respecting Banks and Banking.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Speaker, it is understood that this Bill is simply to remove the taxes in connection with the banks. By the Act. sec. 7 Chapter 209 of the Consolidated Statutes the tax on the banks was as follows:—$5,000 on the Bank of Montreal, $3,000 on the Bank of Nova Scotia and $2,000 on the Royal. This tax is just taken off, that is all.

(Reads the section of the Act.)

MR. HICKMAN—What is the reason for repealing this section?

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—It is the policy of the Government to reduce the taxation on the banks which the Government decided has been altogether too heavy. We want to give the banks an opportunity to do business and this is one of the taxes that was taken off. This is not the whole tax. There are two taxes. One is a fixed tax. The other tax is a half per cent. of whatever is on deposit.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—The idea is to take off the first tax on the banks, a tax which in the opinion of the Government is most unjust. There is no reason, in our opinion, for taxing the Bank of Montreal five thousand dollars and keeping it on for all time, because they might be doing less business now. Sir Robert Bond put this tax on because of the business the banks were doing at that time. Sir Richard Squires' Government put a further tax of one half per cent. on all deposits in the banks. We are proposing to take off this first tax and amend the other tax, so that they may pay on their deposits and on their loan business, thus making the tax more equitable, and falling on all the banks alike. The estimated difference is about 40 per cent. reduction on what is now being collected. The tax will bring in about 127 thousand dollars altogether. Under the new tax the Bank of Montreal will pay thirty thousand dollars a year as against fifty-five thousand today. The tax now is out of all proportion to that on any other business done in Newfoundland, and we think that it is an unfair tax to any concern. We look upon the business of the banks as we look upon that of anybody else doing business in Newfoundland, and that is the reason that we think the banks should be treated as any other kind of commercial enterprise in Newfoundland.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, in connection with this matter I must say that as the Government are taking this magnanimous view of the banking system, they ought also bring home to the banks the fact that the rate of

discount should be made as uniform as possible. I think there is a great deal of discrimination going on as regards the discount charged the outport people, and I think the Government should try and bring about a more equitable arrangement in regard to the people the banks are dealing with. It must be a very great hardship on some of the people who are doing business in the outports who have to pay a high rate of discount, particularly where credits have to be obtained at times for a fairly long period. We appreciate the fact that some of the banks have sustained much serious loss in this country in the past few years, and but for their stability greater loss might have been experienced by business people, but I feel sure that if the banks were to take a more liberal view, particularly in regard to their dealing with outport business people, things would be very much better and a very much better feeling would exist. I hope, therefore, that with this reduction of taxation the people will also receive more favorable consideration from the banks than they are getting today.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Speaker, this is a very delicate subject. I know that you can borrow money from the banks if you have the collateral to offer and that you can get it for six per cent. The Prime Minister informs us that the Bank of Montreal had been paying fifty-five thousand dollars and now will probably be paying about thirty thousand dollars. I wonder if the Prime Minister can tell how the other banks will stand in this matter. I think that the Minister of Finance should have come in here prepared to give the information that would be needed in this matter. It is an important bill and one on which we would like to have some information if the Prime Minister would give it.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I cannot tell the Hon. Leader of the Opposition what the other banks would pay. But it will not effect all the banks in the same way. There are one or two banks that have very little deposit business and are doing a great deal of lending business, and again there are others that are doing very little lending but have considerable deposits. It can be seen that the banks will be taxed more proportionately under the new regulations. Under the present system there is one bank I know that has very little money on deposit, but is lending a lot of money and this bank is not paying very much in taxes. We think that they should pay taxes according to the amount of business they do whether it is lending money or keeping it on deposit. They will pay taxes on their entire turn over. When the other bill comes up it will be seen that provision has been made to include many of the Trust Companies which have money on deposit. These trust companies never paid taxes although they have money on deposit just as the banks have. It is now proposed to tax these institutions. I might point out while I am on my feet that the present tax is one half of one per cent. The Prime Minister of the day when the tax was imposed promised the banks that the tax would not be over one quarter of one per cent. On the last day of the session of the House a bill was rushed through putting on a tax of one half per cent., and when the Premier was asked why he had done it he said that he needed the money. That looks very much like holding a pistol to a man's head because he is rich. The tax which the banks had to pay was suddenly increased a thousand per cent. When that enormous increase was put in force the Bank of Montreal which was paying five thousand dollars had to pay fifty

five thousand without even a by-your-leave, and I think that the banks would almost have been justified in putting up the rate of interest to their customers. What would have would have had to pay for it, because would have to pay for it, because we we cannot go on without these institutions for the accommodation and the handling of our money. We could not get money on better terms in any other part of the world. We have four of the best institutions in Canada doing business in this country. They do business in the same way here as they do in any other part of the world. We have these banking institutions in this country and we should give them reasonable taxation. I think in the cases of the Bank of Montreal and the Bank of Nova Scotia that they will have to pay taxes amounting to about thirty thousand dollars and when they pay this amount I think that they will be contributing their share of the taxes of this country.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Speaker, for the information of the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition I may say that I will have the facts which he desires here tomorrow. I may say with regard to the trust companies that they will have to pay the sum of three sixteenths of one per cent.

Reads.

I may say that it will be very difficult to state what the other banks will have to pay in taxes until we have had some experience of the working of the bill. At the present time we can only estimate what the amount will be.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 209 of the Consolidated Statutes)3rd Series) entitled 'Of Banks and Banking' " was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second reading of Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Terra Nova Sulphite Company Act, 1922."

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, instead of moving the second reading of this bill, I ask that the bill be distributed so that the members of the House will have an opportunity to peruse it, and we will have the second sitting at the will have the second sitting at the next sitting of the House. The main object as will be seen by the bill is the handling of the matter in connection with the works out at Alexander Bay. However we will go into the matter more completely at the Committee Stage.

MR. SPEAKER—The Hon. Introducer of this bill wishes me to inform the House of the fact that the House may take this as a public or a private bill. The House may consider the advisability of referring this matter to a select committee to see whether the rules in connection with the introduction of this bill have been complied with.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, for the information of the House I may say that I do not care whether this bill goes through the House or not. I am not interested in it one way or the other.

Mr. Speaker appointed a Select Committee consisting of Hon. the Minister of Justice, Hon. Mr. Bradley, Mr. Browne, Mr. Hickman, Mr. Warren, to enquire into and report upon the Bill "An Act to Amend the Terra Nova Sulphite Act 1922" in its relation to the Rules of the House.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, speaking to a motion for adjournment, I beg to refer to question one on the order paper. I did not happen to be in the House when this matter came up, and I should like to know

the reply of the Hon. Minister.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Speaker, I may say for the information of the hon. member that the Auditor General's report is not yet in my hands.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, I am sure that if we are to intelligently discuss the financial position of the colony in connection with the expenditure of moneys since June past we should have this report of the money which has been spent under Section 33 (b) of the Audit Act.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—I can assure the Hon. member that there will be no hesitation in tabling the report of the Auditor General. I can have it here in forty-eight hours.

MR. HALFYARD — Mr. Speaker, there is another matter which I wish to refer to. It is a matter of great importance and I take the opportunity to bring this matter before the attention of the Prime Minister and the Government. It is in connection with the bridges of the District of Trinity. These bridges are in a very bad condition. The condition has been outstanding for a long time now and in some cases since last fall. In some cases these bridges were in such a condition that the rebuilding was about to be undertaken about eighteen months ago, but this work had to be stopped because there was not the necessary money, and if the the Government intends to do anything in the matter they should act immediately. If the Government undertook the matter now it may be possible to get the timber for the bridges in some sections of the district. If however the Government does not undertake the matter at once it will be necessary to go out of the district to get the timber for these bridges, if repairs are undertaken during the summer.

I do not want to speak of this for political reasons, but I am compelled to bring the matter to the attention of the Government. No doubt there were pressing necessities in the Government districts which have been met—certainly they have, but so far as Trinity District was concerned, we could not get any money. To give you an instance, the Public Works Department last year sent about thirty thousand dollars to the District of Bonavista, whereas the money that went out of the Department of Public Works for all purposes to the district of Trinity was only four thousand dollars.

HIS HONOUR THE SPEAKER—I do not wish to interrupt the honourable member, but I fear that this discussion is out of order.

MR. HALFYARD—I regret it very much, as this is a very important matter.

HIS HONOUR THE SPEAKER—I can quite conceive that.

MR. HALFYARD—I would like the Government to give the matter their consideration. If they have any moneys to spend in Trinity District they should start to do so immediately; and whether they will confer with the elected representatives of the district to get their opinion as to how and where the money should be spent, that is a matter for the Government.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Prime Minister if the Government is going to bring in the Legislation in connection with the bounty for repairing schooners, to which reference was made in the Speech from the Throne?

HON. PRIME MINISTER — Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I have been in communication daily with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who proposed to have that Bill here today. It is certainly in the course of preparation, and I do

not expect that it will be later than Wednesday in coming in for the first reading.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, March 18th, 1925.

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

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the electors of Heart's Desire on the subject of a road, or repairs to a road leading from Heart's Desire to Heart's Delight. The petitioners set out that the road is in an impassable condition, especially for horses and waggons. The petition is signed by practically all the electors of Heart's Desire, and also by the Rev. Mr. Broughton, the Methodist Clergyman at Heart's Content. The people from Heart's Delight and Heart's Content have occasion to drive over that road, especially the clergymen and doctors, and they find it difficult to get over parts of it. I know from my own experience as I went over it last Spring, that it is in a very poor condition, and if the Government can find money to spend on roads, attention should be given to this section of the district of Trinity, right away. I beg to give this petition my hearty support, and ask that it be referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. RANDELL—I beg to support this petition.

GIVING NOTICE OF MOTION AND QUESTION.

Mr. Ashbourne gave notice of question.

NOTICE OF QUESTION:

MR. ASHBOURNE asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing the yearly gross earnings of the Dry Dock since the Government took control.

(Reply Tabled).

MR. ASHBOURNE asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay upon the Table of the House a statement showing the number of railway ties contracted for during the past winter, the average price, from whose land ties have been cut and whether any stumpage has been or will be paid.

(Reply Tabled).

MR. GRIMES asked Hon. the Premier if it is the intention of the Government to establish competitive examination in connection with appointments to the Civil Service.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—In reply to question No. 5, I beg to say that the Government has not given any consideration at present to competitive examinations in connection with appointments to the Civil Service.

SECOND READING OF COUNCIL'S AMENDMENTS TO SUPREME COURT BILL.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain to the House that these amendments are nothing more than what might practically be called a typographical error. The title of the Bill is altered, but the substance of the Bill is not changed. It is a purely technical alteration, which does not affect the Bill.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Amendments made by the Legislative Council in and upon the Bill sent up entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Act 61 Victoria, Cap. 47 entitled 'An Act Relating to the Constitution of the Supreme Court" and the Acts in amendment thereof, were read a second time, and agreeed to, and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting that body that the said amendments

had been agreed to without amendment.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to Fire-arms" was read a third time, and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 52 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Egress from Churches, Theatres and other Buildings" was read a third time, and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order and on Motion of Hon. 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 Chapter 209 of the Consolidated Statues (Third Series) entitled 'Of Banks and Banking.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition last Monday, asked me what we estimated we would get from the Banks under the new Act which is proposed. It is almost impossible to estimate it, but the total we received from the Banks last year was $127,-000.00. This year we anticipate at least $75,000 to $85,000 under the new Bill.

HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—I hope the Banks will appreciate the generosity of the Government.

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 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.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—I give notice that on to-morrow I will ask leave to move that Supply be granted to His Majesty.

MR. SCAMMELL—Gave notice of question.

HON. THE MINISTER OF CUSTOMS—I beg to table the report of the Auditor-General for January-June 1924.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—I give notice that I will on to-morrow introduce a Bill respecting repairs to ships.

MR. SCAMMELL—I submit Mr. Speaker that as this is a matter of the greatest importance to the country we should have a definite pronouncement on it from the Government. I do not know what the Bill proposes but I think the ships will have to be hauled up for repairs.

HON THE SPEAKER—I have no desire to interrupt the discussion but I fear the hon. member is out of order.

The remaining Order of the Day were deferred.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, March 20th, 1925.

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

PRESENTING PETITIONS.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the residents of Hr. Breton, Jersey Hr., Miller's Passage, Little Bay West and

other places in the vicinity of Jersey Harbor, asking for an improved ferry service between Jersey Harbor and Hr. Breton. It is generally known that there are few, if any, roads in this section and Jersey Harbor is the centre to which the people doing business with Harbor Breton come to before crossing to Harbor Breton. There is only a motor dory in which to cross and as this has to accommodate some 2000 people during the year, it can be seen the accommodation is attended with much risk, and hardship as the result of the weather. Formerly the service was supplied by a dory which was rowed, or sailed when the wind allowed. This was replaced by a motor dory, but even this is not sufficient to meet the demands, and I trust the Minister of Public Works will see that the petition receives the consideration which it merits and that a better boat is placed on the service.

MR. LAKE—Mr. Speaker, I beg to support the petition presented by the honourable member for Fortune Bay. I know the need of the improved service to which he refers as I have occasion to travel in this section in summer time on business. The present service is obsolete and a source of danger to travellers, and I have much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the residents of Botwood and vicinity, praying that the road from Botwood to Grand Falls be repaired. This road is an important one, and at present is very badly in need of repairs. I know the condition of this road as I have travelled over it often. There is a lot of motor and other traffic over it and it is unsafe for travel. The petition asks that the work be started as quickly as possible. With so many people travelling over this road, if the repairs are not made there is likely to be a serious accident very soon. The petition is signed by many business people in the vicinity, and I ask that it be given every consideration and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. GRIMES—I have much pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in supporting the prayer of the petition presented by the honourable member for Twillingate, Mr. Brown. I have travelled over the road in question, and I know that it is in very poor condition. The interest of the people in the vicinity of this road is shown by the large numbers who have signed the petition, and I hope it will receive every consideration and that it's prayer will be granted.

MR. ASHBOURNE—I also wish to support this petition, Mr. Speaker. I hope the matter will be taken up and every consideration given it, as this road is widely used and connects the important sections of Botwood and Grand Falls.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present another petition which is closely related to the one I have already put forward, and in doing so I would wish to thank the honourable member for Burin for the support given me. This one is from the residents of Miller's Passage, and asks for a road from Miller's Passage to Jersey Harbor. The present road of nine miles is only called a road for the sake of euphiny. It is in bad repair, there are no bridges, and a new road would be of great advantage to the people. I recommend consideration of this to the Government when they come to map out the new roads under their Highways policy. This part of the Bay is a great fishing resort and a road is absolutely necessary, and I will take the matter up with the Minister of Public Works and ask him if he cannot help me in this also.

HON. THE MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of North Arm, Holyrood, District of Harbor Main, praying that the sum of $300 be allocated for general repairs to the public wharf there. This wharf is a great benefit not only to the residents of North Arm, but to those of adjoining settlements who come there during the caplin school to obtain caplin for bait and fertilizer. It is well known to the residents of Conception Bay, and in fact all around the coast that caplin is a valuable fertilizer for use by the fishermen-farmers. No matter what we do in our future policy we cannot neglect our wharves and roads which enable our fishermen to carry on their avocation, and to make a living. I think it will be many years before the fishermen will be independent of caplin fertilizer, though we may establish lime-kilns for the production of fertilizer for the land. I am not a firm believer in the constant aplication of caplin as a fertilizer, and I think we should get it from some other source. However, we must keep up our roads and wharves notwithstanding that we all believe in the present Government's Highways policy.

MR. CAHILL—Mr. Speaker, I beg to go on record in support of the petition presented by my honourable colleague.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Chappel's Cove, in the District of Harbor Main, praying that a sum of money be granted for the opening up of a canal between the salt waters of the Harbor and a very large pond, which is five or six miles in extent, and which overflows at certain seasons of the year, causing a lot of damage to surrounding property, completely inundating it. I think that the allocation of a small amount of money will enable the people to carry on this work, and I appeal to the Government to grant, say the sum of three hundred dollars for this purpose.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the residents of Back Harbor and vicinity, asking that a sum of money be allocated to repair a bridge between Back Harbor and Patrick's Island. The condition of the bridge at present is one of grave danger to everything passing over it of much weight, and it is practically impossible for people to get a load of coal or a load of goods of any kind over it without mishap. I would ask that the petition receive earnest consideration from the department to which it relates.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Speaker, In giving my support, I might say that the bridge referred to is in very poor condition indeed, and I thought that it would have been carried away completely.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Speaker. I rise to endorse what has been said by Mr. Ashbourne, and I trust that the Government when making provision for roads and bridges, will include repairs to the bridge asked for by the petitioners from Back Harbor.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker. I ask leave to present a petition from the residents of Burgoyne's Cove and New Burn Cove and vicinity in the electoral district of Trinity, asking for a special grant of $300 to complete a public wharf there. A sum of money has been spent already to build a part of a wharf and the petitioners now ask for money to finish it. I beg to support the prayer of the petition, and I ask that it be referred to the department to which it relates for consideration.

CAPT. RANDELL—Mr. Speaker, I

rise to support the prayer of the petition.

MR. GODDEN—Mr. Speaker, I give the petition my hearty support.

MR. CAHILL—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the residents of Lond Pond West and Fox Trap East in the district of Harbor Main concerning repairs to and extension of a road in that locality known as Dunhill Road. The petition is signed by over a hundred people and I give it my hearty support.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—Mr. Speaker: I beg to support the prayer of the petition. I think it would be money well spent if a thousand dollars was allocated to extend that road into the country and enable the people there to take in some valuable agricultural land in that section and also enable them to reach the forest, which they cannot reach now. The people in that locality have petitioned this house for a number of years on this same matter, but without avail, although the sum of one thousand dollars used to be considered here a mere "trifle." I have no doubt but that the people of Long Pond and vicinity are looking forward eagerly to having this road extended within the next year or two so that they can enjoy the advantages that will accrue therefrom. I give my hearty support to prayer of Petitioners.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker: I give notice that I will on to-morrow move the House into Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions respecting the Dry Dock at St. John's.

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill "to Amend Chapter 172 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Foreign going and Labrador vessels."

Mr. Halfyard, Mr. Godden, Mr. Brown and Mr. Hickman gave notice of questions.

Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs gave notice that he would on to-morrow move the House into Committee of the Whole on Supply.

NOTICE OF QUESTION.

MR. ASHBOURNE asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to lay upon the Table of the House a statement showing: (a) names of officials suspended from Customs Department since June 1924; (b) whether they are still under pay; (c) various amounts paid to Mr. Alex. Robertson, Mr. P. Skirving and any others who have been appointed or temporarily engaged since June 1924 to date.

HON MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Names of Officials suspended from Customs Department since June 1924: L. Chafe, W. Royal, M. Kelly, T. Jackman and H. Ford.

W. Royal and T. Jackman reinstated under pay.

M. Kelly and H. Ford have been dismissed.

L. Chafe has not received any pay since suspension.

The following have been appointed and paid according to voted amounts in estimates:—

Jos. Bishop, Jr., Collector Western Bay in place of L. T. Crummey dismissed.

Jas. Gladney, Storekeeper, Eden's Building.

Wm. F. Wells, Invoice Clerk, Longroom in place of W. Royal transferred to Statistical Department.

Columba Murphy, Coll. Lawn, in place of J. Benning, retired.

Malcolm Chambers, Warehouse Keeper in place of P. Reardon, transferred.

Fred Vatcher, Coll. Rose Blanche in place of J. Payne, dismissed.

Chas. Barret, Coll. Old Perlican in place of James Barnes, dismissed.

P. J. Fahey, Railway Manifest Clerk in place of M. Kelly, dismissed.

Solomon Gosse, Coll. Spaniard's Bay in place of Josiah Gosse, dismissed.

John Westcott, Night Boatman

Saml. Billiard, Tidewaiter, Rose Blanche, in place of J. LeMoine, retired.

Ed. Kirby, Coll. Holyrood, in place of John Wall, dismissed.

John Kennedy, Coll. Harbor Main, in place of Joseph Wall, dismissed.

Mich. Doyle, Coll. Avondale, in place of M. Moore, dismissed.

Frank Tilley, Tidewaiter, Kelligrews in place of Chas. Haines, dismissed.

Jas. Leary, Coll. Conception Harbor, in place of P. J. Wade, dismissed.

John Smith, Tidewaiter, Rigolet, Lab., in place of Wm. Kelly, dismissed.

Rd. Delahunty, Tidewaiter, Calvert, in place of Patk. Power.

Malcolm Jenkins, Coll. Bonne Bay, in place of F. Skanes, transferred.

H. N. Burt, Temporary appointed in Examining Store.

P. Skirving, Temporary appointed in Examining Store.

Alex. Robertson, Temporary appointed in Examining Store.

MR. SCAMMELL—Asked Hon. the Prime Minister if the Government has endorsed and adopted the programme of road building as outlined by the Leader of the Government in the Upper House recently, and if so, what is the total mileage estimated for construction under the proposed scheme and what the Government estimates the cost per mile for construction will be and also what the Government estimates as the aggregate cost of the completion of the whole programme.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, in reply to that question of the Hon. Member for District of St. Barbe, I may say that no detailed programme of road building has been definitely adopted. Construction and reconditioning the roads under consideration at an estimated cost of not more than five thousand dollars a mile would not entail an expenditure over the two million dollars voted for that purpose.

MR. WARREN—Asked Hon. the Prime Minister if any consultation with the sitting members for the constituencies on the South West Coast on the matter of roads was had prior to the adoption of the road programme detailed by the Leader of the Government in the Upper House recently.

(Reply Tabled).

MR. GRIMES—Asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing, month by month: the number of applicants (male and female separately) who registered at the Employment Bureau for work since May last up to the 14th of the present month; (b) a classified list of the various kinds of work sought for by the applicants during the same period giving the number registered under each classification; (c) the number of companies, firms or individuals who registered at the Bureau during the same period as requiring work and a classified list of the kind of work they offered and if any wage specified what were they? (d) the total number of persons (male and female) obtaining employment through the Bureau during the same period, giving the names of the localities and Districts where employment was found; (e) a classified list of the kind of work obtained and the rate of wages received for each kind; (f) what is the total number now registered as unemployed; (g) if any other Government Employment Bureau exists beside the one in St. John's.

THE MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS —Mr. Speaker, I may say in reply to the Hon. Member, that it will take two weeks at least to prepare these answers and I will have much pleasure in laying them on the Table of the

House when they have been completed.

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

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 II George V. Cap. XLV, entitled 'An Act to Incorporate the Women's Patriotic Trust Fund and for other Purposes' and 'An Act to Amend the War Pensions Act 1922,'" without amendment.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 209 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Banks and Banking," was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Colonial Secretary the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Regulate Travel on Highways and the Speed, Operation and Load of Vehicles thereon."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY —Mr. Chairman, when this Bill was introduced to the House a few days ago I endeavoured to explain to the House its outstanding feature and I promised that if there was any information which the members wanted I would endeavour to give it as far as I could do it myself. Since the introduction of the bill there has been a great deal of controversy in this city and we have had a very large and influentially signed petition presented here by the senior member for St. John's West, the Hon. Sir John Crosbie, from all the truckmen and carmen of the town with regard to the regulations of traffic and the rule of the road. It will be born in mind that in introducing this bill I pointed out that it was the universal custom for all traffic to go to the right. The last place to change was Nova Scotia and they altered the rule from keeping to the left to the universal of keeping to the right. And I pointed out the many advantages that would acrue by that rule particularly in the case of the new development and traffice which is to be brought in. I pointed out that the introduction and building of highways on the West Coast with a view to inducing tourists to this country and that the tourists would come from Canada and the United States and find here the rule of the road as they have in the country which they had left. I also pointed out to the Hon. Members that I did not advocate the change of our laws to suit strangers to the inconvenience and the danger of our own people but I was of the opinion that after awhile the change of the laws would be acquired and that in a short time everything would be the same as everywhere else. A very strong feature in connection with the proposed change is the matter in connection with the truckmen and the carmen in this particular part of the country where the two wheeled dray is used instead of the four-wheeled dray or truck which is used in other places. The development of the tourist policy is one which is going to take some years as I already pointed out to the House and I do not anticipate that there will be a great influx of people here for some years because I believe that the development will be gradual and thoroughly done if the work is to be done economically. The Hon. Members on both sides of the House expressed very strong views on

this proposed change, and constituents have awakened to the fact that serious dangers and complications might arise where the people were not ready or had no opportunity to understand the changes and the possibilities of accidents are not at all small. Therefore in view of the fact as I said before of the large and influentially signed petitioned of the Truckmen and Carmen's Union which places every carmen in town and representation has been made from the outlying districts such as Harbor Main and Ferryland and particularly the suburban districts of St. John's East and West it has been decided that under the circumstances and in view of the possibilities of this change not being necessary for some time the Government have decided to change the proposed amendment and the law stands as it is to-day. In other words the rule will be that the traffic will continue to go to the left instead of to the right as suggested. Therefore Mr. Chairman I commend this to the Hon. Members with the assurance that I feel that they will agree that it is better to make haste slowly in a matter of this kind than to do something that may cause confusion and disaster. While on this question I think that it would be appropriate that I should give some explanation to the House in reference to the construction and reconstruction of highways which was passed a few days ago by this House unanimously. On introducing this bill I told the House frankly, fearlessly and honestly all I knew about the bill. The bill was introduced by the Government as part of a set policy to inaugrate the building of highways and main roads and to encourage the tourist traffic primarily and to be in keeping with the bill which was passed last year authorizing a loan of two million dollars for that purpose. It will be remembered by the Honourable members that most of the bill was earmarked for some specific purpose. It that bill two million dollars was earmarked for the construction of tourist roads and highways so-called. The Government since then have not given the policy any further consideration. We have decided to appoint a Commission to take care of the work and the Chairman of the Commission will be the Government Engineer, Mr. Hall.

Mr. Hall is a man well qualified, we all admit, for that position, but we have not considered the matter in any detail whatever. I saw in the public press, emanating from a source that must be considered authentic, that when the Bill came before the House it had not been given the consideration in debate that its importance warranted. I know no reason for such a statement. It is quite true that no hon. members took occasion to fly into the heights of oratory or give any lengthy addresses with regard to it, but I consider that this House discussed that Bill as intelligently, as concisely and as properly as it was possible for that Bill to be discussed. I expressed appreciation to the hon. members on both sides of this House for the courteous and fair way in which the Bill went through this Chamber. It was an important matter.

Every member that sits here this afternoon will admit that we of this country—the people who provide the money and build the high ways, we are responsible to those people for the expenditure of this money. We are responsible to them, and to them alone. We would be derelict in our duty if we did not give that consideration to a measure of the kind to which I refer—that measure in all its phases and all its forms to the people who sent us here.

It is quite true that a great deal of what has been said in the public press has been very much in evidence with regard to matters appertaining to this measure since its passage in this House, but I think it would be unfair

to myself, unfair to the Government and unfair to this House if I did not at once emphatically proclaim that no such programme has ever been considered by the Government of the Country, at least, by the present Government.

In my position as Colonial Secretary I would have some knowledge of such a proceeding, and I do say that I would be long sorry to subscribe to any scheme that would involve this country in very much larger expenditure. I do not want to see any more than two millions spent on the highways. I want to see it done economically and carefully, irrespective of what parts of the country it may be spent in. I want to see it spent in those parts where we will get returns. We have taken an opportunity of discussing, one with another, where we are going to build those highways. We are not going to build them in the wilderness. We are going to build the highways in such places that they will be of use to the people who want to use them, and in such places where they will connect up the traffic in this country, and bring the people to the points of interest, and to bring the people to places where they will have some means of natural comforts and natural accommodations. Hon. members, consequently, will appreciate where the money should first be spent. If we are going to enter on this policy one of the first things to be done is that we must build a hotel in St. John's; from there this policy must radiate over the country. And as we push out and advance we will see where and how and by what means we can develop this. I, therefore, Mr. Chairman, apologize to the House for going back in reference to a Bill already passed. I thought in justice to myself and in justice to the House that I should make these explanations.

The Bill that we are considering this afternoon is one that has many features, and will, on the whole, commend itself to the country. I think by going back and putting in the word "left" instead of "right" we probably have got a long way in assuring the acceptance of the Bill. I therefore propose the first section.

MR. HICKMAN—I am very glad to listen to the Hon. Colonial Secretary this afternoon. I am particularly glad to know that he and his Government have seen the erorr of their ways and have decided to change that part of the Bill known as "The Rules of the Road." In the second reading I had made up my mind that if that rule had tried to pass committee stage, I intended to bring in an amendment. The amendment I was going to bring in is the same as the alteration, so it will not now be necessary. I think it is high time to make changes of this nature when we have tourists coming down here and bringing in their automobiles. As the honourable member has said, the kind of vehicle used here is different from that used in any other countries. They use here what is called a long car, and the drivers have always been accustomed to sit on the left hand side. If the rule of the road is changed, they will have either to change sides on which they sit or else take a chance of their legs coming in contact with the other vehicle passing in the opposite direction.

I was very glad to hear the Hon. Colonial Secretary say that they intend to carry out the road policy without taking into consideration the policy outlined by the Leader of the Government in the Upper House. I think it is high time that the Government should wake up and see that they are being led by the nose in all these things, and that they are carrying all these regulations through without paying attention to what is being done. I state now, as I have stated before, that you will be led by the nose into confederation before

you know where you are, unless you wake up in time.

This afternoon, in reply to Question No. 2 on the Order Paper, the Prime Minister intimated that no programme of road building had been adopted, but he estimated the building of roads costing five thousand dollars a mile would not exceed two million dollars as voted last year when the Act was brought in to borrow six million dollars. The Prime Minister knows very well that he cannot build a highroad at five thousand dollars a mile or ten thousand dollars a mile. When you've got to take into consideration that you are building a road over a new country you have to build bridges, fillers, ditches, etc., in a great many cases it will cost twice ten thousand dollars a mile. That answer of the Prime Minister's does not give us any great impression of the Government. Another thing, in answer to Question No. 3, I noticed the Prime Minister said that the representatives on the South West Coast had not been consulted in connection with the road-building policy. I think all the members throughout the country should be consulted in reference to this policy, because if the two millions are to be spent on the roads, each district should get a proportion. In this way the settlements and villages will be connected with one another, and it will give people an opoprtunity to get about by vehicle. The Hon. the Colonial Secretary told us that St. John's is the centre and from St. John's the road policy should radiate, and that is what we have said right from the start. We've got to have the road building from St. John's and as the tourist traffic increases more money can be spent on the roads. There must be a hotel and the people coming to this country must be put in touch with the rivers, fishing, shooting and every kind of sport that is necessary.

In reference to the remarks made that the present Bill was not debated in this House, I must say that although we did not go into lengthy debate, each member took up a certain part of the Bill, and we on this side of the House were all in accord that while a tourist policy and road building might be all right, a policy which involved the spending of millions of dollars, we were opposed to. In the Bill it was not stated how much money the Government intended to spend, and we do not know whether it will be two or three millions, but when we read a speech made in the Upper House, we have come to the conclusion that this is a policy for spending 20 millions of dollars. This is an expenditure which this country cannot afford. There are a great many things in this Bill which commend it to us on this side of the House, and one is in reference to regulating the traffic and the powers given to the constabulary with which we all must agree, because we know that the traffic has to be regulated. There are so many people driving vehicles for the first time, and unless the powers are given to the police to regulate the traffic, a great many accidents and deaths must occur. We will support the Bill in so far as it is in the interests of the country, and the people. But as I said before, we are very much opposed to the part known as "The Rules of the Road," and I intended bringing in an amendment, but as the Government have seen their way clear to alter that portion of the Bill, we have no amendment to make in reference to this.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, I did intend making some extended reference to the Bill now before the Committee, but in view of the explanation which the Hon. Colonial Secretary has given us this afternoon, and in view of the change of policy which he has outlined, nothing per-

haps remains to be said. There are, however, one or two things that I think ought to bear passing reference. In the first place I want to say that as a member who is sitting on this side of the House, I stand firm for the privilege of the members on this side of the House, and I resent any imputation from any source whatever that the hon. members on this side of the House do not give due and proper consideration to the legislation that is passing through. I may say, Sir, that I was not in the House of Assembly myself when the Highways Bill was introduced, but I was in the House when the Colonial Secretary introduced the present Bill, and I think that all will agree that Mr. Bennett on that occasion gave a very lucid explanation for the change in the Bill which he was sponsoring. And I think that none of us think anything less of the Colonial Secretary for having to come in here and explain as sponsor of that Bill that his Government has had to change their policy. I think that the Government has made a step in the right direction, and the manner in which Mr. Bennett has made and explained the reasons outlined for making this change has given satisfaction to everybody.

To a large extent the detail of this Bill so far as the rule of the road is concerned, does not effect the outport districts, but I can quite understand and appreciate that here in St. John's it may be a very important matter. The Government could not very well overlook such an influential petition as that presented by the truckmen of this city, and we do not feel that the Government has anything to be ashamed of in the fact that they have decided to alter the Bill in this particular. It was the intention of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to introduce such an amendment if the Government had not seen fit to alter the Act in this particular.

I agree with what my leader has said—that this country has had occasion to be alarmed, and to take a very alarming view of the situation as regards the road-building policy of the Government. There have been pronouncements made, and these have been of such a nature as, in a sense, to bring us all more or less to our senses; of such a nature as to cause in our minds grave doubt, and of such a nature that we have to take the position that it is time to call a halt.

In this House last year, we voted two million dollars for roads, and we certainly never thought or never anticipated that the Government had in its mind any proposition other than that which it was proposed the two million dollars would cover. We certainly never thought that the Government proposed to embark upon such a scheme of road building as we have heard discussed, outlined and elucidated from other quarters; and the pronouncement of the Hon. Colonial Secretary this afternoon, speaking, I take it, on behalf of the Government, has done a great deal of good, in that it has put our minds at rest on that score.

The Leader of the Opposition made a reference that if we did not call a halt, we were going to be led by the nose into Confederation. Now, Mr. Chairman, I am not an alarmist as to any question of confederation, but I feel that, had the elaborate scheme which we all heard so much about, been endorsed by the Government, and had it been accepted by the Government, they would have been doing something that the Government of the country, as the Government stands to-day, had no mandate from the electors of the country for. If such were contemplated even remotely, in my humble opinion this matter was one which was of suffi-

cient importance that the Government ought to seek the mandate of the country before embarking upon it.

The Government is content that two million dollars will be enough for their road policy; but with all due respect to the Hon. the Prime Minister and his answer handed to me this afternoon, he will find that he is not going to build roads for five thousand dollars a mile. The Government may estimate that, but by experience in road building—experience will show that five thousand dollars a mile which is estimated, will not be a drop in the bucket when the Government settles down to work out that proposition. They will require a much larger expenditure than that—an expenditure to my mind which the people of this country are not able to bear, or carry the burden of at the present time. I do not suppose there is any difference of opinion on the general principle of building good roads; I do not suppose there is any difference of opinion amongst us that we should do everything we possibly can in a reasonable way to encourage tourists to come to this country; but I am sure that we will all pause before we will give our voice to the expenditure of millions of dollars on such an elaborate scheme of road building as we have been recently reading of through the columns of the daily press.

It looks to me, Mr. Chairman, that everything we have done in Newfoundland is going to be undone; it looks to me as if the Government is going eventually to do away with a great many of our old-fashioned institutions, and a great many of the things which have helped us on the road to progress—and one of these is The Local Affairs Act. I was always a strong supporter of that Act, and I am still a firm believer in it; and I regret very much that I can only read into this Bill now before the House, that at some time or other the Local Affairs Act will have vanished from our Statute Book and that its application so far as the building and managing of roads are concerned, will be things of the past. It seems to me that the intention of the Government as embodied in this Act, is to take such matters out of the hands of the elected representatives—out of the hands of the people themselves who are on the spot, and to place them in the hands of a Commission which will be, perhaps, as far apart from them as the man in the moon. I do not think that is a thing that is going to appeal to the people of the outports, and as a representative of one of those outports, I must express my strong disapproval of any such scheme.

I would also like to say again, Mr. Chairman, that I do not like to have insinuations made against the members of this House, as to our debating legislation which passes through the House, and I think that every member of this House should resent the remarks to which I now make reference. However, as I remarked when I started, there would have been occasion, had this Bill not been altered, perhaps for some very practical discussion in regard to this whole Bill; but in view of the statement which the Hon. Colonial Secretary has made this afternoon that this Bill is to be amended, and that the Government has not endorsed any elaborate scheme of road building, I think that very little remains but for us to proceed with this Bill.

I agree with Mr. Hickman that anything which will be for the general benefit of the country is something that we shall be only too glad to support, and I thank the Hon. Colonial Secretary for the pronouncement which he has made here this afternoon.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, this Bill and a recent Bill which has passed this House, known as the

Highroads Bill, are so closely akin and intertwined that we can hardly discuss one without discussing the other. I did not take part in the discussion of the previous Bill, but I think that I should make some reference to the frank and fearless statement regarding that Bill which the hon. introducer has made in this House. There was, in this House and outside, a considerable amount of anxiety as to the scope and nature of the scheme which would be put into effect by reason of these two Bills, and what the Hon. Colonial Secretary has said this afternoon will go a long way toward allaying that anxiety, and quell any ideas of any extraordinary scheme being brought forward.

I would like also to say a few words about this Bill before the House. I said some time ago that I did not see why we should be made a rubber stamp for the Legislature of Ontario. In case honourable members of this House misunderstood me, I wish to say that I have no objection to considering and discussing any legislation that happens to come from Ontario . On our Statute Book to-day are many Acts which have their origin, not only in Ontario, but in other provinces of the Dominion to the westward of us; but I do most strongly object to being told that because it is a Statute coming from Ontario, that therefore it must be passed by us. That is the position, and that is what I meant when I said that we objected to being made a rubber stamp. Because it is good enough for Ontario, therefore it is good enough for us—that is the position that I have to resent.

I am glad indeed that the hon. introducer of this Bill had announced a change in the intentions of the Government in regard to the rule of the road. That was an objection which had in a short while reached a great height of controversy, and people had almost taken a plebiscite as to whether they were favourable to going to the left or to the right. I feel quite sure that everyone will agree in the long run that the Government was wise in not pressing the change. At first I thought that I would be in favor of the change for the reason that most of the motor cars that are imported into this country to-day have what is known as a left hand drive, and I thought that it would make for safety if we adopted the rule of the road that is law in Canada. But since I have considered the number of other vehicles that are on the road, and I do not think it fair that, for the benefit of the smaller number of motor drivers, we should ask all the drivers of the other kinds of vehicles to change their habits and adopt the Canadian system. Therefore, I think that the Government was wise in not proceeding with the proposed change.

One other point. As I said before, these two Acts are more or less intertwined and closely related to each other—I mean the Highways Act and this Act, and I want to impress on the House that we ought not to get filled up with the idea that everything in future is going to depend upon motor traffic; and in these two Acts we must not be carried away with the idea that we are legislating for motor traffic, and not for vehicular traffic.

The Leader of the Opposition, this afternoon, made the proposition that any money that is raised for highways under the loan, should be divided up per capita in proportion to the districts. I do not agree with him. If that money is raised for a certain purpose, it should be spent for that purpose; and if it is raised for Tourist traffic, I think it ought to be spent on trying to encourage tourists to come here ,and if it is necessary to link up towns and villages, the Government will have to find some

other way of doing it . . .

MR. HICKMAN—What I said was that some of the money should be used in some of the Districts to link up certain settlements, and I thought that was necessary first.

MR. WARREN—I misunderstood the hon. member for Hr. Grace, but have no desire to misrepresent him. I thought he said the money should be divided among the different districts. That is the line I suggest should be taken now. I do not say how or in what Districts the money should be spent, but we must get away from the idea that motor cars are to be the only means of getting tourists here. If we could provide proper hotels even in small number at first, we could do that. We have heard a lot of the fjords of Fortune and Hermitage Bays, and I freely admit that they are wonderful in the beauty of their scenery, but if I were asked what could be done there as to roads for tourists, I would say only one would be needed, that is the road where the Railway was laid from Come-By-Chance to Terenceville. The rails were taken up about two years ago, but the road-bed is there yet, and could easily be repaired, and that is the only one that would be necessary for tourists. There is only one other road in the district and that joins up places which are easily connected with by the Glencoe. I therefore, again urge the Government to forget the idea of motor cars and roads being the only way of attracting tourists, and suggest short roads to connect the different points, as these would afford the visitors much pleasure. I have been struck by reading in the London Times of what other countries are doing to attract tourists. The Times of January 2nd, has this interesting article:

TOURS IN CANADA AND U.S.—INEXPENSIVE TRAVEL.

"The movement to provide facilities for inexpensive travel outside the familiar and well-trodden paths of the Continent has been further extended by the White Star and White Star-Dominion Lines, by whom a series of tours at low rates in Canada and the United States have been arranged. These lines are working in conjunction with the Canadian and United States railways.

In these excursion tours third-class accommodation is provided at sea and first-class on land, and the itinerary from Liverpool covers, among other places, New York, Boston, Montreal, Quebec, Niagara Falls, and Ottawa, the extent of the tour being adaptable to the requirements of the individual traveller. The following is the programme of Tour No. 2, which may be taken as a specimen of the plans that have been made and the amount of time that is occupied in seeing a very large part of the Eastern side of the North American Continent:—

First Day:—Due to arrive Quebec. Accommodation at Chateau Frontenac (meals extra). Second Day:—At Quebec. Trip to St. Anne de Beaupre by electric trolley included. Third Day:—Leave Quebec by river steamer for Montreal. Fourth Day:—Arrive Montreal. Accommodation with meals at Queen's Hotel. Sight-seeing by carriage included. Fifth Day:—Leave Montreal in the morning by train. Arrive Toronto in the afternoon. Accommodation commencing with evening dinner at Queen's Hotel. Sixth Day:—Automobile sight-seeing trip included. Leave Toronto in the afternoon by steamer for sail across Lake Ontario. Connexion is made at Lewiston with Niagara Gorge Railroad for Niagara Falls. Accommodation commencing with evening dinner at Temperance House. Seventh Day.—At Niagara Falls. Sightseeing trip by Niagara Belt Line included. Eighth Day.—Breakfast and luncheon at hotel. Leave Niagara Falls by late afternoon train. Pullman berth in-

cluded from Buffalo. Ninth Day.--Arrive Washington in the morning. Accommodation commencing with luncheon at Hotel Driscoll. Automobile sightseeing trip included. Tenth Day.—At Washington. Eleventh Day.—Leave Washington by morning train. Arrive Philadelphia about three hours later. Luncheon included, also autobile sight-seeing trip. Leave Philadelphia afternoon train. Arrive New York about two hours later. Accommodation commencing with evening dinner at Hotels Earle or Holley. Twelfth and Thirteen Days.—At New York. Automobile sightseeing trip included. Fourteenth Day—Breakfast at hotel."

The question of Dominion tours was raised by Sir Godfrey Lagden in a letter in The Times on February 27, in which he urged the desirability of organizing such excursions as those outlined above.

Many of those would leave a fair amount of money in this country. The Furness Withy Company are already arranging to put a new steamer on this route, and I would like to see something of the nature above mentioned done here. It is true that we have not yet got the hotels but I think with the beauties of our scenery we could arrange some tours of the sort described. These tours make practically no mention of motor cars, and it is my belief that visitors would use the cars we have already here, which would help to keep our garages, and be more profitable to us than if cars were brought in. Later I propose to move an Amendment to the Bill as to the carrying of tail lights on all vehicles which will bring it in conformity with the Municipal Act.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, I wish to take this opportunity to again impress upon the Government the necessity of spending some of this money to link up the various settlements. After the Bill is passed and the House is closed, we will not be consulted as to where the money will be spent, but I would like to throw out to the Government the idea that this would be a good way of spending the money. Now take a district like that represented by Mr. Lake and Honourable Mr. Long. in introducing the Bill the Honourable the Colonial Secretary said that Mr. Lake will shortly be buying a motor car, but at present there is very little road in his district that he could drive on. There are only four miles from Grand Bank to Fortune. A small amount would improve the road from Garnish to Marystown. One man has told me that for a few thousand dollars he would put in good condition the road from Marystown to Garnish, and with a few thousand more the road from Garnish to Grand Bank and Fortune, and from there to Lamaline. Spending the money in small amounts like this is the best way to spend it, and I would like the Government to take notice of what I am saying, and see that the suggestion is carried out.

MR. DUFF—Mr. Chairman, I would like to refer briefly to the remarks of the Honorable the Colonial Secretary. I did not say "rubber stamp," but I do not think we should adopt legislation because another more favoured country has done so. It seems to me that the Government is taking thought, and like the Thorburn Government is trying to do things right, and on a "strict commercial basis." We are changing our methods of spending our public monies for road repairs and getting some value. We know that our roads are not in the best condition, and that in connection with them the money has not been spent to the best advantage. I am not talking of Carbonear, as we have been particularly fortunate, but I believe there are many places throughout the country where no money has been spent on the roads

for years. I would like to see the road-making taken out of politics, and put on a non-partisan basis, and I think we should spend the money correctly. At the same time there are lots of poor people who are expecting work in the way of roads repairing, and it is a very difficult matter to handle. In my District last year was a poor one, the fishery being a failure, and we have some poor people there, who though they do not wish to acknowledge their poverty, would like to see the road-making taken up as soon as possible, so as to alleviate their distress. Now speaking of Ontario of which we have heard so much, I notice that drivers there of motor cars have to pay three cents a gallon on gasolene, which brings in a revenue of three millions for the repair of roads, but if we were to tax the few motor owners on their gasolene to be of any effect we would need to tax them dollars. The Honorable Member for Twillingate in comparing the number of motors here with those of other countries thought we should have a large proportion, but I think what we should have is more wheelbarrows. what we want at the present time is industry and thrift, and not the apeing of the extravagance of other people. Some slur has been cast on my remarks as to the improvement of the fisheries, but I think this is the first step necessary, and we should be able to place our fish in the market cheaper than our competitors. A few years ago the duties were only thirteen per cent, but now they have increased.

The idea of advocating a two million road policy for roads to run alongside and compete with your non paying railway is most ridiculous in a country of a quarter million population scattered along the seacoast. Those of our people who can get away are leaving the country as fast as trains and ships can carry them, and it is a wonder to me the party that conceived this fanciful road scheme did not add to it the bridging of the Cabot Straits, and then we would have found that others who could not pay for transportation would have walked out of the country. Then again we are told it will encourage agriculture. We remember the agricultural policy of a former Government, roads were opened up all over the different districts and a bonus was paid for clearing land. All those roads are now grown over and the cleared land is a commons.

Now we are told that the Government propose to link up the Badger Road. I consider that this is a joke despite what my friend, Mr. Ashbourne has said to the contrary. You can connect your towns, if you like; but what we want is the road over the sea, and that is the cheapest road. I can imagine the politician that advocated the '98 contract and the man who advocated the buildings of branch railways talking in the same optimistic manner, but since these days we should have learnt our lesson.

I am glad, how ever, that the Government has seen the evil tenor of their way and are going to keep to the left, and not copy another country's method of traffic to our disadvantage. In other matters I would advocate them keeping to the right or rather doing the right, and I may add I have not seen much evidence of their intention in this direction.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, this is the section which I purpose to move an amendment to, but I would like to draw the attention of the Attorney General to the wording of it.

Reads Sec. 10 A, page 5.

I don't want to try to be witty. All the English laws provide that either at sunset or one hour after you have got to have a light. You see on almost every calendar the lighting up time. This is very indefinite. Who is going to decide whether it is dusk

or it is not. Our traffic laws at present provide that at sunset you have got to have a light. Our Municipal Act provides one hour after sunset. This Act ought to specify some time like that.

Mr. Chairman, I gave notice that when this stage of the Bill arrived I intended to move an amendment—to move that there should be added to subsection k, the following as subsection 1.

Reads amendment.

I may say that this section provided that after sunset and before sunrise, every vehicle that is on the road shall carry a light, with the exception of two wheeled vehicles. I do not do this—I do not move this so much in favour of the motorists as for the protection of the general public; that those who will not protect themselves will be made protect themselves. We have had several accidents occur here almost entirely because of the absence of a light on the vehicle. I do not refer now to any particular accident which all the members may know about; but I know of lots of accidents of which the public does not hear which have been caused merely because the vehicle carries no light which the driver of a motor car can see, particularly when they are coming round a corner.

This section is practically taken from the municipal Act. At the present time, every vehicle within the city limits has to carry a light an hour after sunset to an hour before sunrise; and this section now provides that every vehicle shall carry a light outside the city limits. I think this section makes for the safety of the people themselves. It is all very well, when a person has been in an accident, for him to say—"I have no light, because I am not compelled to." The law should make him carry a light for his own protection. As a matter of fact, most of the four wheeled vehicles that now ply in the suburbs carry lights of their own accord and for their own protection.

I think we are following other precedents in providing that vehicles should carry lights. There is no necessity to carry a light that is of any particular kind or shape. It does not provide that it shall be a white light, or anything like that, but it merely provides that it shall carry a white light to show the position of the carriage and in what direction it is going.

I commend this amendment to the House, and I think it is worth putting into effect. It will be of great benefit to all concerned, and it may be the means of saving life.

MR. WOODFORD—Mr. Chairman, I wish to add a word in support of the amendment proposed by the Honourable member for Fortune. The majority of drivers between the city and the outlying settlements: I speak particularly in reference to my own district and St. John's and Kelligrews and Holyrood, where there is a large amount of traffic, both motor and vehicular. We have a class of people on the South shore especially, a class who bring meat to town—we call them local butchers, whom I know are very particular in that way, most of them young men, and nearly all of them carry a lantern. But not every person who drives up and down the South shore carries a light on his carriage, but there ought to be some law to compel them to do so. I think the honourable member for Fogo will agree with me in that. I think all members will agree with me that to avoid danger and to give protection to all concerned, that everybody ought to be compelled to carry lanterns, both for the purpose of avoiding accidents, and for the purpose of helping the drivers who have no lanterns. I have seen more than two

carriages going along in a parade—I call it—where there would be one on behind with a lantern and one in front with one, but the middle man would not have a lantern; but out of consideration for the man who did not have a lantern they divided themselves up like that.

MR. HIBBS—I would like to endorse what the last speaker has said as to the amendment, and would even go further. The Honourable Member for Fortune Bay makes an exception for two wheel vehicles, but all spring carts should be compelled to carry lights. If we exempt all two wheeled cars, we will have two wheeled spring carts running without lights.

MR. WARREN—The section does not apply to two wheel carts.

MR. HIBBS—All two wheeled springed vehicles should carry the same lights as four wheeled vehicles—white in front and red in rear. Often you will overtake a vehicle with only a lantern carried in front of the dash board, and no light shown to the car approaching from behind. If we say they shall only carry a light, they will simply carry the one in front which cannot be seen from the rear. If we put in a new section let us provide a regular light, which will not cost much and will be a better protection for all.

MR. WARREN—The Honourable Member talks of the regulations as to carrying lights, but may I point out that there are none applying to outside the city. There are none to say it shall be a red light behind and white in front. I wish to apply merely the same section as in the Municipal Act. That regulation refers only to a lamp or lantern which shows a light in front and is capable of signalling the approach of such vehicle.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Chairman, I think if we make any amendments we should have the white and red light, which would protect the owner from cars coming in any direction, without the red light no protection is afforded. It would not cost much and it is just as well to have the regulation light similar to that carried in all other places outside Newfoundland. The holders for lights are part of every vehicle made, and its merely a matter of the owner buying the regular light.

HON. THE MINISTER OF POSTS—One would cost $15 and the other $6, and we must consider the poor man. Even if the light is carried in front you can always see the glare of it and I would be satisfied if the vehicles carried any kind of light.

MR. HICKMAN—I intended to make the same remarks as the honorable member for Fogo. If we are going to make an amendment, make it for the proper light. It will be embarrassing for the driver of a motor car to come in contact with a person carrying one light as he will not know which side of the vehicle it is on. I think the proper one is that showing the red behind which when seen tells the vehicle is going in the same direction as yourself. If we consider the amendment at all I think we should have the proper light, as it would not be very expensive and would last as long as the vehicle itself.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—The suggestion of carrying a light is a step in the right direction, and I am sorry we cannot see the way to have every vehicle carry one. Long carts are the greatest danger on the roads today and after dark one is taking his life in his hands. I quite agree with Mr. Hibbs and Mr. Hickman that if we are to have a light let it be the proper one. I appreciate the position of the man that Mr. Woodford refers to and who carries a stable lantern which he uses afterwards in putting his horse away. But if we are making a regulation we should make it as perfect as possible provided it is not impracticable. If we say it is to be red

in the back and white in front and we can agree that it is not to be a law that will be honored in the breach, then let us make it so as it will tend to the safety of all.

MR. MOORE—In referring to this matter I am considering the man from Caplin Bay, Witless Bay, Mobile or some other part of Ferryland District. Many of these have had carriages for years and now use lanterns and it would be a great hardship on them to pass this regulation, as I am sorry to say that many of them could not afford to buy carriage lamps. I disagree with the honourable member for Fogo as the purchase of the lights which he advocates would be an undue expense on the people of the outlying settlements.

MR. HIBBS—I do not insist on two lights, but think vehicles should carry one.

MR. MOORE—You can only buy carriage lamps by the pair and while the rule may be a good one it would prove a hardship on the people from outside places who drive to and from town. We cannot consider the motorists alone.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Whilst we know that it would be the ideal condition to have the red and white lights, and also two lights on every vehicle, I think when we come to think of the difficulties which have existed for years, that the honorable member for Fortune has made a good step forward in proposing a light at all. The trouble in the past has been no lights have been carried, and if we can get to the stage now of carrying even one, it will be bridging the trouble to a large extent. The proposed amendment is a step in advance, and I think a great many persons possessed of the waggons referred to by other speakers will equip them with the regular carriage lamps. A certain number of poor people may not be able to reach on the cost of anything beyond a common stable-lamp, but even the use of this will be better than the present condition of no light at all.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Chairman, I am fully in accord with the remarks of the Honourable Minister of Justice. This rule will not alone apply to sections immediately near St. John's, but to every district and to people using vehicles in every district throughout the country, and I quite agree that if we compel drivers of vehicles to each equip themselves with a white light that it is going to be a step in the proper direction. There are people in the district that I have the honour to represent who understand now that there is an act on the Statute Book compelling them to carry a light, but I am informed by the honourable member for Fortune Bay that no such law exists. However, the greater number of people all over the country did not observe this law at all, and so I endorse the attitude taken by the Honourable Minister of Justice and the member for Ferryland, namely, that a white light is sufficient for the time being out of consideration for the man who drives a vehicle in the outlying settlements.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, Section (12) says that all motor cars should carry a mirror. What is the use of that section?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I don't believe that there is more than two per cent. of cars equipped with mirrors.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Apparently the Commission did not give this whole matter the care that they might have given it. I think we will let this section stand over for the present.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, before that passes I don't know where the Government got this act. I suppose it is an Ontario Act. There

seems to be a lot of unnecessary stuff in it. How are you going to prevent smoke from coming out from the back of the car. How are you going to control it in any shape or form. I think it is beyond the means of control. And you must understand that when you make breaches of this law you are open for trouble.

HON. MR. WOODFORD—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say one word in reference to this matter. To some of us who cannot afford a motor car it is a great nuisance under certain circumstances. In driving over the road the driver has no consideration for the pedestrian at all. You can't blame the condition of the road. There is so much dust flying and the road is dry and easily ground up, and it blows into people's faces. I think that every motor car ought to be furnished with some kind of tank in the rear. This has never been considered in this country at all. I have read articles published in the United States where men have been carefully trained in running a car for the purpose of not throwing dust in the eyes of the pedestrians as it were.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Chairman I don't want to take up the time of the committee and perhaps this is hardly the time to refer to this matter; but there are certain roads to which special attention should be given. I hope the new Road Commission will rebuild the road from Mill Bridge to Bowring Park as it is a very important thoroughfare. Something should be done to that road as soon as weather permits. It has been very fortunate for us that practically no accidents have occurred on this narrow and much congested road in the past, but what the people living on the side of that road have to endure in the way of dust is something frightful. There is no road in the country where such conditions prevail. I think, therefore, that road should be widened and properly rebuilt, and a tarvia top put on it to prevent dust, and to afford a good wearing surface for the immense traffic that goes over 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 tomorrow.

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

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 3 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Election of Members of the House of Assembly'" with some amendments, in which they request the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion the said amendments were read a first time, and it was ordered that they be read a second time on tomorrow.

Hon. the Minister of Justice gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill "An Act to Amend Chapter 83 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) and the Acts in amendment thereof."

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

The Hous then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, March 23rd, 1925.

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

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the people of Argentia on the subject of a road between Argentia and Silver

Cliff Mine. The distance is about two miles and now that the Mine is operating it would be a great convenience to the people of that locality if this road was built.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—Mr. Speaker, I beg to support the prayer of the petition.

MR. SINNOTT—Mr. Speaker, I wish to support the petition presented by my colleague.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the residents of Hants Harbour, Trinity District. The petitioners ask for an allocation to make repairs to a road leading to certain saw mills and agricultural land. This road is used by a great many of the inhabitants of Hants Harbour and also by the residents of other places in that locality. I beg to support the prayer of the petition and ask that it be referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. GODDEN—Mr. Speaker, I give the petition my hearty support.

MINISTER OF ARICULTURE & MINES—Mr. Speaker, I have quite a numl er of petitions here to present from various parts of the district of Placentia and St. Mary's' on various public matters, and, with your permission, sir, and in order to facilitate matters so as not to occupy any time of the House unnecessarily, I would like to present the whole of the petitions at the one time this afternoon. The first petition is from four hundred residents of Argentia, P.B., Fox Harbour, Ship Harbour and Red Island, asking that a bridge be erected at Placentia Gut. I understand that this important matter is already receiving the consideration of the Government. The present cost is in the vicinity of five thousand dollars, and I think that the amount capitalized is sufficient to make a suitable bridge whereby a better service can be carried on than the one at the present time. I have much pleasure in giving this petition my hearty support.

The next petition is from the people of Petit Forte on the west side of Placentia Bay asking for the sum of $300 to repair an important breakwater at that place. I beg to endorse the prayer of the petitioners.

The next petition is from North Harbour and Colinet, in St. Mary's Bay, asking for an amount to complete a road. The amount asked for is $300. From my own personal knowledge of it the road is a very important one and the request of the people a reasonable one. This petition also has my support.

The next petition comes from Regina, St. Mary's Bay, and contains two hundred signatures. The petitioners ask for $1500 to erect a breakwater in that section. Such a public utility is very essential for the carrying on of the fishery at that place. I wish to register my support of the petition.

The next petition is from the people of Bar Haven, Placentia Bay. The petitioners ask for a public wharf in that section. At the present moment they have no wharf and so far as I know they never had one. Bar Haven is a growing settlement and the people there are very much handicapped for the want of a wharf with which to land their supplies on. I trust that the request of the petitioners will be acceded to.

The next petition is from Mussel Pond, St. Mary's Bay, regarding the present ferry service. Honourable members will appreciate that a stipend of thirty dollars a year is not sufficient to pay a man to carry on anything like a good service. During the past few years traffic has increased considerably and the people ask that better facilities be given them in the way of a better ferry service. I support the prayer of the petitioners.

The next petition is from the in-

habitants of Dunville, P.B., asking for an amount of money to open a road between Jersey Side and Dunville and further extend it to the famous salmon pools in that vicinity. I do not think that I could add anything further to what the petition says.

(Reads petition)

I might say that on several occasions I had the pleasure of visiting the pools referred to. Although it is not generally known, it is very hard to get access to these pools, and I think that it would be well worth while to have this road opened up, particularly if we expect to get tourists to visit North East Arm, Placentia. I think the Government should give this matter their most serious consideration.

The next petition is from Colinet in regard to telephone extension. On several occasions in the past this matter was brought to the notice of the House by my colleagues and myself and I trust now that the Goverument will grant the prayer of the petition of the people of Colinet.

The next petition is from the inhabitants of Pond Head, Argentia, on the same subject and I trust that the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs will see that Pond Head will be connected by telephone.

The residents of St. Leonard's, P.B., also petition for telephone extension and the request of the petitioners has my hearty support.

The next petition is from Baine Harbour on the west side of Placentia Bay asking for an amount of money to complete a public wharf. For the information of the House I might say that in 1923 the Government allocated $1,000 to erect a public wharf at Baine Harbour. This amount has been found to be insufficient to complete the work and they now ask for an additional amount. I give the petition my hearty support.

The next petition, Mr. Speaker is from the residents of Fox Harbour, Placentia Bay, asking that a daily mail service be given between Villa Maria and Fox Harbour. Fox Harbour is a very important fishing settlement, in fact one of the most important we have, and it is at present getting a mail service only about twice a week. The cost of giving them a daily mail service would be very small compared to the benefit and general convenience to the public, which would be immense. I trust that the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs will see his way clear to accede to the prayer of this petition. I have much pleasure in endorsing the prayer of this petition.

The next is from the residents of Haystack, Spencer's Cove, Harbour Buffett, and several other places in Placentia Bay asking for an allocation of money to complete a road in that section. The road referred to is a very important one. All the places referred to in this petition are on an Island—Long Island. The people on that Island have no connection with the railroad. They ask for two hundred and fifty dollars to try and make the conditions better there than they are at the present time. I have much pleasure in endorsing the prayer of this petition.

I trust that all these matters I have brought up will receive the attentiou of the various departments. On various occasions I have pointed out to this House the unnecessary trouble that is occasioned in having these petitions brought around the districts, and then having men spend hours making elaborate speeches on them in this House, and then as soon as it goes out of this chamber, nothing more is heard of it. I always thought that there should be a committee of this House, consisting of members of both sides to receive petitions, so that time need not be unnecessarily spent, and much benefit may accrue. It is

well known that ninety nine per cent of the petitions presented in this House are never heard of after they leave this chamber. I hope that these petitions will receive the attention of the departments to which they relate.

MR. SINNNOTT—I beg leave to support these petitions presented by my colleague, Mr. Walsh.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the residents of Joe Batt's Arm, in the District of Fogo, on the subject of a breakwater. It is a very important matter, Mr. Speaker, and with your permission, I will read the petitiou as it is not very long.

Reads Petition.

I would emphasise, Mr. Speaker, the necessity of something being done by the Government to remedy this great evil in Joe Batt's Arm. It is not necessary for me to say that Joe Batt's Arm comprises very large settlements of very industrious and independent fishermen. This petition is very largely signed. There are about one hundred and forty signatures on it, which do not represent all the fishermen in Joe Batt's Arm. There is a reef jutting out there on the North side about three hundred feet, and what the petition asks for is a concrete breakwater to break off the sea that comes in there and ruins that particular portion of the harbour. They want to build out a breakwater to meet that reef. I would ask the House, and particularly the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to take this matter into consideration. I think everybody should do all they can to encourage those who try to make an independent living; and the people of Joe Batt's Arm are particularly worthy of that consideration. I endorse the prayer of this petition, and ask that it be referred to the department to which it relates.

I also wish to present a petition from the residents of Main Point, Gander Bay, asking that a telephone service be installed there. I might point out that the people of Main Point are very much isolated. There are a couple of mills there, and the gentleman who is instrumental in getting this petition signed is Mr. French—the gentleman to whom I referred to the other day as having conformed with the Saw Mills Act. He himself pays about eighteen thousand dollars yearly in wages, and that is a great benefit to the people of that place. I would ask the Government to give this petition their consideration, and have the telephone extend from Clarenville to Main Point, and thus accede to the prayer of the petition.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting the petition presented by the honourable member for Fogo. Fogo happens to be my native district, and I know that section around Main Point very well, and I can quite realise the necessity of having the telephone there. The people there are a very industrious class of people, and the community is a very important one taken from either the standpoint of industry or population; and I cannot very well understand why this great boon has been so long delayed. I would just like to add this word to what the honourable member for Fogo has said, and I would like to take advantage of this opportunity to endorse the petition from the residents of Main Point, Gander Bay, and I trust that it will receive the serious consideration of the Hon. Minister of Posts and Telegraphs.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in giving my support to the prayer of the petition presented by the honourable member for Fogo, Mr. Hibbs, in reference to a breakwater at Joe Batt's Arm. I know somewhat of the need of that breakwater to the residents of that place. A large amount of fishing and

other gear has been destroyed there from time to time by heavy seas coming in there on that shore, and the people there have suffered great losses during the last ten or twelve years. I think the people there deserve more consideration at the hands of the Government than they have been getting. These people have been paying into the revenue of this country a large sum of money from year to year, and I think that the only consideration they have ever got was a grant of five thousand dollars, when the Government of Eir Edward Morris was in power. But that was not sufficient for their needs and I think that the Government now should give some consideration to the prayer of this petition. I dare say that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who is well acquainted with that locality, knows the needs of these people.

With regard to the telephone at Main Point, Gander Bay, I know that some of the people there have no means of getting in touch with a doctor, except by going several miles away from that locality. So many places of lesser importance than this have telephones that I think the Government should give this locality the telephone.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, I beg to support the petitions that have been presented by the honourable member for Fogo. I would especially refer to the petition asking for telephone connection with Main Point, and I trust that the Hon. Minister of Posts and Telegraphs will not only be interested in giving a telephone to Main Point, Gander Bay, but that he will, if he has any money to spend on the improvement of the telephone service, complete the circuit in that district. I have had some experience as Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, with the interruption of messages to Fogo District. They have now to get connection by Gambo. The telephone now ends, I think at Frederickton. If it were continued from Frederickton up along Gander Bay, and connect with the line that goes to Beaverton, then you would have a complete circuit, so that you would have two lines to depend upon where you have only one now; especially in the fall of the year when they are getting messages in connection with the trade and the shipping of the fish. That is the reason why I refer to the matter at the present time. We tried to make connections like this when I was the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, and I know that the present Minister is trying to do the best that he can do. This is a very important connection and I think that it should be made as soon as possible, and I hope that the Government will see its way clear to make this telegraph and telephone connection.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Brooklyn, Portland and Jamestown in the District of Bonavista on the subject of a public wharf. The petitioners state here that the bay boat calls at Brooklyn and that there is no wharf whatever for the landing and the taking off of the passengers, and that at the low tide the boats cannot get within a hundred yards of the landwash. This is very inconvenient for the ladies and I hope that the Government will see its way clear to grant the sum of money which I say is very needful.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Jenkins' Cove and vicinity on the matter of a breakwater. Practically every man in this cove is a fisherman and they are petitioning the House for the allocation of a sum of money to construct this breakwater and to show the interest that they have in this work, they say

that they are prepared to contribute a certain amount of free labour for the construction work on this breakwater. On the eve of a storm they have to bring their boats to Twillingate or some other place of shelter or else when they get up in the morning they find them sunk at their moorings. I heartily support the petition and I hope that it will be received and sent to the department to which it relates.

MR. BROWN—I, Mr. Speaker, give this petition my hearty support. The need for this breakwater is very necessary and the sum of money is small, and I hope that the Government will see its way to grant the prayer of the petitioners.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Speaker, I beg to endorse the petition presented by Mr. Ashbourne.

Hon. Mr. Cramm presented the Report of the Select Committe on the petition of the Newfoundland Textile Company, Limited, as follows:

The Select Committee appointed to consider the Petition of the Newfoundland Textile Manufacturing Co., Limited, praying that a Bill be introduced to ratify an agreement between the Government and the said Company, have considered the matter to them referred and report that in their opinion it is advisable to grant the prayer of the Petitioners, notwithstanding that full and sufficient notice has not been given and that the Rules of the House in that respect be suspended and that leave be given to introduce the Resolutions hereto annexed.

Respectfully submitted.

(Sgd.) RICHARD CRAMM,
W. J. HIGGINS,
F. GORDON BRADLEY,
W. R. WARREN,
A. E. HICKMAN.

Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs tabled the Report of his Department for year ended June 30th 1924.

HON THE PRIME MINISTER gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to move the House into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions respecting an Agreement between the Government and the Newfoundland Textile Company, Limited.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 4 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Legislative Disabilities and the Vacation of Seats in the House of Assembly.'"

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act respecting a Tax on Certain Incomes."

MR. SCAMMELL gave notice of question.

MR. BROWN gave notice of question.

MR. GODDEN gave notice of question.

MR. GRIMES gave notice of question.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions respecting the Encouragement of Shipbuilding.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

Committee of the Whole on Resolutions respecting the Encouragement of Shipbuilding.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, in introducing the resolutions in connection with the encouragement of shipbuilding I may say the idea is the encouraging of the rebuilding of ships. We pass annually in this country a bill for the encouraging of the building of ships.

During the last few years due to the small price of fish one will find that the schooners which are prosecuting the Labrador fishery in this country are of a very poor class. It has been admitted by a number of fishermen during the last few years that the number of schooners that are prosecuting the fishery to the Straits of Belle Isle and the Labrador is decreasing. I know from personal knowledge several schooners on the north side of Bonavista Bay, and I have no doubt that there are other schooners in other parts of the country like them, that have been going to the fisheries for the last two or three years, and I am sure that no other men except Newfoundlanders would dare leave port in them. But because of the small price of codfish and the high price of foodstuffs which that class of man uses, they had either go to the fisheries in these vessels or leave the country. For this reason there was a great agitation started during the last twelve months to see if it was not possible that something could be done to help out the fisheries of the country by giving a bonus for the rebuilding of fishing schooners.

All the people of this country are not so versed as to know what it means to rebuild ships. I think I may say that the northern bays of the country are the only ones that know the real meaning of rebuilt ships. They have been rebuilding ships in Notre Dame Bay, Trinity Bay and Bonavista Bay for the last twenty five years. I know that in my own home town where I live, there have been fully thirty vessels rebuilt within the last fifteen years. Some people might say that a vessel rebuilt is not as good a vessel as the vessel built from the keel, and common sense would argue that such is the case. It has been proved without a doubt on the north side of Bonavista Bay and Trinity Bay during the last twenty years and even twenty five years that the vessels rebuilt on the north side of Bonavista Bay have stood just as long as a new one that came right from the stocks. I have in my mind today a schooner that I bought myself twenty years ago at Burin. I ran it for one year then got it rebuilt, and that vessel is eighteen years prosecuting the Labrador fishery, and once or twice it has been down as far as vessels have gone on the Labrador, and during the last couple of years has been plying the coastal trade around the Island, and as most of the people who are engaged in the coastal trade know, you must have good schooners for the coastal trade as well as the fishery. You have to have the vessel running for a longer time, and much later in the Fall of the year than at the fishery. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I have no hesitation in saying that a schooner properly rebuilt is actually as good as one that comes from the stocks with the exception of the canvas and the rigging, but as far as the hull is concerned I can prove within a very short time that we have several schooners on the Labrador that were built twenty five years ago on the north side of Bonavista Bay. A schooner rebuilt probably costs as much as one built new. The only idea, and one of the personal ideas in getting ships rebuilt this year was because we found it was impossible to buy new ships, and another reason for rebuilding ships is, in nine cases out of ten you can put back the spars and the rigging that were on her before, and in many instances they will be found good enough for two or three years more. We will not have to condemn good spars or canvas in rebuilding. These are not the intentions of these resolutions to condemn any canvas, rigging or spars or new material when

the vessel is being rebuilt during the winder under the resolutions that I am bringing forward here. You will find that inspectors have got the authority to examine all the schooners and see what ones should be rebuilt. They have also got authority when they are rebuilt and fitted out for the fisheries to condemn anything not fit for serious work, and if there is anything fit for the coming year they will see that it is put back again, in this way they will save thousands of dollars of expense. As we have been told the Government of this Colony has pledged itself to do all it can afford to do for the advancement of the fisheries of this country. You may say that these schooners could have been bought for the same price as it cost to rebuild them in other countries. I may say for the information of this House that men have been sent to the United States and Canada during the last four months, and they find that it is an utter impossibility to buy any ships whatever. Men have been around this country, to different parts, seeking to buy vessels for the coming season, and have found it an utter impossibility to buy even one, and therefore, there is nothing else left to do for these fishermen who want to prosecute the fisheries next season but to start in and rebuild the old ones. We have, at the present time, somewhere in the vicinity of thirty five vessels getting rebuilt. These resolutions i have brought in here today to ask permission that a bounty of twenty dollars per ton be given on schedule A, fifteen dollars a ton on Schedule B and eight dollars a ton on Schedule C. These vessels will be built under inspection of the same inspectors that have been inspecting new vessels for the last seven or eight years.

The Honourable member for St. Barbe gave notice of a motion in reference to asking if any new inspectors had been appointed this year. I am not saying this for the information of the member for St. Barbe. I will give him that information tomorrow. But I may say that owing to the number of schoooners getting rebuilt we have found it necessary to increase the number of our surveyors. We would have liked to increase the numbers of surveyors to double what it is at the present time, and I think I can explain to this House that by increasing the number twofold we would be saving money to this country and we would be saving a lot of time to the fishermen and others rebuilding their vessels. The vessels, according to these resolutions are supposed to be pulled out of the water so that the inspectors will be able to see their keels, I have got communications from different parts of the country asking why the vessels should not be rebuilt in the water. Now I may say as far as my own knowledge serves me, and I think that I have seen as many vessels rebuilt during the last twenty five years as any other man, I want to say that any vessel that needs to have a good job done, that has to be properly repaired, and in order to guarantee to the people of the country that the money paid for rebuilding these vessels has been properly spent, I feel sure they should be pulled out of the water. I could not argue that it is not possible to rebuild vessels in the water and make a good job of it, but I say that in nine cases out of ten it will be an inferior job. I know of one vessel that was rebuilt down on the north side of Bonavista Bay last year. It was rebuilt in the water and the man who rebuilt her did not not rebuild her to save money, because he could have spent much more than he did and still have lots left; but he had his own opinion that the vessel could be rebuilt in the

water, and he got it rebuilt. I may say here now that after prosecuting the fishery this season he had to get a lot of extra repairs done after it came in prior to lying up for the winter. I have my opinion and also that of Mr. Gulliford who has been inspector of ship for the past eight or ten years, and also Mr. McFarlane. After I had a meeting of the three men and myself we argued out every point that we thought necessary in reference to the building of the vessels in the water, and in reference to the other clauses in the resolutions, and the three men came to the same conclusion that if we allow the vessels to be rebuilt in the water in some instances the Government would be taken advantage of. Therefore, we came to the conclusion and recommended the executive Government that every ship that is going to be recommended for a rebuilding bounty had to be pulled out of the water so that the inspectors could see the bottom. I may say, Mr. Chairman, for the information of this House, and also for the country outside that all the vessels I have seen rebuilt on the north side of Bonavista Bay could not have been rebuilt in the water, because the timber is rotten right down to the water's edge.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am fully persuaded that the paying of a bonus for the rebuilding of ships in this country this winter will mean at least an extra twenty five vessels for the codfishery next summer that would not have been there but for the bounty or part of the bounty paid for rebuilding, and I think that it is a conceded fact to every member of the House that our sailing fleet has been fast dwindling down, and the summer is coming, and the sooner our Labrador fleet gets back to what it was twenty five years ago the better for the country. The men who prosecute the codfishery of this country in floaters, I have no hesitation in saying that unless they get shipwrecked they do not cost the finances of this country one copper for going down to Labrador and coming back, but what do we find? These people dropped out of going down in their floaters, and they are now taken down by the coastal boats, and that way do not give the people the same chance to get their voyage of codfish as they would if they went down in the floaters. In my boyhood days people from Conception Bay who were going down would go in vessels, and if there were no fish above they would go further down the Labrador and bring back a voyage of fish. They go down and get ashore from the steamers, and if there are no fish they can't go anywhere else, and if they can't get fish the Government has to look out for them.

What would happen but for the Labrador fishery. Supposing that 45 of the vessels that went to the Labrador fishery could not go there. Three parts of these men would have been in the lumber woods or somewhere else trying their best to get a living for themselves and their families. They went down on the Labrador Coast and one and all brought enough fish to pay for their summer expenses and keep their families for the winter. Therefore, it is up to us to keep that class of men fishing. Some of the finest fishermen that we have in this country go down to the Labrador in their floaters. I do not say that they are better than those that go down on the land. But they are equally as good. And there are numbers of them in the United States who have been there for the last two years. If they had their floaters and could go down on the Labrador they would be back here and be glad to be out of the burning sun for the coming year.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, of course the position this afternoon

is that we have placed before us merely resolutions that, perhaps, may only mean the authorizing of the Minister of Fisheries to give effect to some scheme of paying a bounty on ship-repairing. Perhaps it is just as well that I should make no lengthy reference now, as we are all interested in this admirable scheme, and will have an opportunity for criticism when the Bill itself is introduced. From what has already been said, and from the Resolutions as introduced, I think there are many points open to criticism. With the general policy of the Resolutions, a bounty for the repair of fishing vessels, I have no disagreements whatever. The idea of granting the bounty is ideal, and I may say I think it originated from this side of the House last year. As I pointed out last summer we hope the Government would have been able to outline earlier the scheme they intended to introduce in this connection. You are coming in now with the Resolutions after the people have done what I pointed out they would do. Many of them have required their schooners and they will now be in a most unfortunate position, if they are not entitled to the Bounty under this Act. I reiterate that there is no need of lengthy discussion now, as I take it the whole House agrees with the principle of paying the Bounty, and when the Bill comes up we will have an opportunity of dealing more fully with it. I now merely wish to express my heartiest accord with the spirit of the Resolutions, and will have something more to say on the matter when the Bill comes before the House.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I also rise to support the principle of the Resolutions now before the Chair, regarding the granting of a Bounty for the repairing of schooners. It is not my intention to speak critically as to the Resolutions, but rather more in the way of an appreciation than a criticism. I notice in the Resolutions that under Schedule B a vessel repaired is entitled to a Bounty of $20.00.

MINISTER OF MARINE—It is now $20.00.

MR. HALFYARD—I do not know if it is in order, Mr. Chairman, but I would like to ask at what date will Schedule B take effect.

MINISTER OF MARINE—From January 1st or for any vessel inspected before that.

MR. HALFYARD—I would like to take this opportunity to refer to the case of a vessel that was re-built during the Winter and Spring of 1924, the vessel owned by Captain Henry Miller of New Bonaventure. He hauled her up and repaired her, and no doubt the Minister of Marine has some knowledge of the work that man did. I think it was a very courageous thing for him to undertake all the expense in repairing the schooner "Melba," of which he is owner and master. When he heard of this Bounty he wrote to me and said he thought it would be an injustice if it did not revert back to 1924. I do not think the Government will have to pay for many vessels repaired during that year. He had spent four or five thousand dollars and I feel sure the vessel was as well repaired as if he had expected the bounty. I just mention this so that the Honourable Minister may take it into consideration, and antedate the time of the Bill taking effect, so as to include the schooners rebuilt in 1924. I do not think this will entail any great expense on the Government, and it will be an act of justice to those who took up rebuilding at a time when almost everybody was afraid to spend money in this way.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, I

would like to refer to Section 6, and call the attention of the Minister of Marine to the fact that the people who now have schooners going under repairs were not aware of the conditions under which the Bounty is to be granted. Some of them did not haul the schooners out of the water, and if they did not, and have gone to much expense they will not be given the Bounty. I think there should be some extenuating circumstance, providing owners who have gone under expense of repairing their schooners to receive the Bounty, as they did the work solely with the understanding of it being granted them, and perhaps many of them could not do it without assistance from the Government. If they have done a good job without assistance from the Government; if they have done a good job without hauling the vessel out of the water, they should receive some recompense. I think the idea of encouraging the repairing of vessels is a good one, as at present there is a shortage of fishing-schooners in the country. I think that Mr. Scammell was responsible for the introduction of this subject last Session. He is a practical man evidently as to the building and repairing of vessels, and his advice has been well taken. I would like before the passing of this Bill that the Government, and the Minister of Marine should give consideration to Section 6 as to this matter.

MR. SCAMMELL—I would like to know if by allowing these Resolutions to go through we are merely admitting the general principle?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—No, the Bill is a duplicate of this as honourable members know.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, with reference to the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition I may say that early last Fall it was broadcasted over the country that it was the intention of the Government to pay a bounty on ships and up to the present time we have received only four letters from all over the country regarding the rebuilding of schooners in the water. Two of them were at Port Union before there was any talk of a bounty being paid and are not rebuilt yet. Now there was no excuse for holding them up, as I told Mr. Russell, the assistant Manager at Port Union about the matter over two months ago. Another letter that I had came from Bay de Verde district and another from Green Bay. I personally think, however, that something should be done to encourage the man who started to rebuild early last Fall. Mr. Halfyard referred to a man named Miller at Trinity. I know of another man named Samson of Bonavista Bay who has built a schooner a credit to himself and a credit to the country. We brought in this Bill I might say for this year only, but so far we have heard of only four schooners being rebuilt in the water.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Chairman, my opinion is that a vessel cannot be properly repaired in the water. She should be pulled out in order to be examined and rebuilt properly. But on the other hand I think that consideration should be given to the men who are having vessels repaired and who intended to make repairs previous to 1925 if they had been given notice to pull them out of the water before November last. In the case of the two vessels at Port Union, referred to by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, probably if this notice had been given in November to them these vessels might have been pulled out of the water. But then it might have been that the Minister was not in a position to give them notice at that time because it did not effect more than a half dozen or so. I am in accord with the principle of the Bill.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman, I am in accord with the principle of this Bill and anyone who has watched how quickly the fishing fleet is depleting will recognise that this is a move to help those who have fishing schooners. With regard to the point so much discussed about rebuilding a schooner in the water or hauling her up to be overhauled, I think that if a schooner is careened or hove down her keel is thrown out of the water and she can be examined thoroughly. All our schooners are examined in this fashion and I claim there is no necessity to haul a vessel out of the water entirely to examine her. I am also of the opinion that it would impose great hardships on some schooner owners in order for them to get a bounty of eight dollars per ton. I have not had the chance of going through these resolutions and examining them carefully. and I would like for the Committee to rise so as to give an opportunity to those interested of looking up the different schedules. Eight dollars per ton might be satisfactory for some schooner owners and it might be money out of pocket for other owners.

MR. HICKMAN—In view of the request made by Mr. Ashbourne, I would ask the Minister if he would be good enough to have the Committee rise today. Evidently he has some information that he wants to look up. Other members perhaps feel the same way. I do not think that there would be much delay in the Bill.

THE MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—What information do you want to get on this?

MR. ASHBOURNE—If you would give us information as to what is required to get the bounty under Schedule D.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—A thinner plank. It is not a matter of tonnage.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman. I want it distinctly understood that I do not wish to hold up the House and I am just as much in earnest as the Hon. Minister as far as that is concerned, and if I can get the information that is necessary I am satisfied to proceed.

MR. DUFF—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that I am in favour of these resolutions. It is an effort in the right direction. I also agree with the gentlemen who have just spoken. Unless the vessels are hauled up out of the water there is no chance of repairing them thoroughly. I am afraid that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will never see the schooners come back to where they were in years past. I am afraid our fishermen in some sections are not inclined to go back to the schooners. They want to be carried in steamers.

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 Resolutions with some amendment and reecommended 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 respecting the Encouragement of Shipbuilding" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 172 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Survey of Foreign Going and Labrador Vessels" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the Bill entitled "An

Act to Amend Chapter 83 Consolidated Statutes 1916 (Third Series) and Act in Amendment thereof" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions respecting the Dry Dock at St. John's.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER— Mr. Chairman, on Thursday last the Railway Commission met for the purpose of deciding, as there were three vessels coming off the dock, whether any further vessels were allowed to go on. We have before us, first, Mr. Crandell's report in which he said that the dock was absolutely unsafe, and the Report from Mr. Mitchell who cam edown as engineer, at our request, from Messrs. W. I. Bishop, and he also reported unfavourably, and finally Mr. Bishop himself was at the meeting on Thursday last, and he practically confirmed all that had been said by the other people. In fact, he gave us to understand that if the dock belonged to somebody else, if it belonged to a private company that we, as a Government should close it up and refuse in the interest of public safety to permit any further vessels to go on it. In view of that, there was nothing else to do but to flood the dock, thus it remains today, and there it will remain unless some step in the matter is decided upon by this House.

I have already announced to this House in connection with the proposition that it was a question of putting the dock back into the condition which it was before, or making a very much improved dock with much better facilities. Under any condition it will be necessary to build a coffer dam and that will put the dock out of commission for twelve months, and consequently it seemed to us that by accepting the lesser expensive proposal we would still put the dock out of commission for a year, and partly for this reason we favour it. Two propositions have been put up. We have Mr. Crandall's and Mr. Bishop's reports before us today. These gentlemen have prepared their reports without knowing of each other's ideas, and Col. Sullivan will be able to explain the technicalities to the House better than I can. The first proposition is from the Crandall Engineering Company and the amount is $242,000 plus 15% for putting the dock back in its former condition, with the same facilities as before. Mr. Bishop's Company for the same proposition figures on $263,000, so that in that case there is a sum of $15,000 in favour of the Bishop Company for the same proposition. In the second proposition of Mr. Crandall's, no renewal of piling is allowed for, and the dock is widened to seventy feet and the estimated cost is $624,000 plus 15 per cent, which is $93,000, and the total is $717,000. This proposal only reduces leakage, and does not provide steel sheet piling. In this case with the cost of unwatering not allowed for added there would be a further cost of $28,000, and that would make the total $745,-000.00. The same proposition from the Bishop Engineering Company giving a dock 600' x 70' x 30' for $896,000 plus contingencies and unwatering and allowing for the bilge blocks which brings the total up to $988.00.

If we deduct $390,000 for the crane, pumping station, capstans, ballards and quay wharf timber, jetty rock heartenings, sheerlegs roadway, the amount will be $598,000 and adding 10 per cent. for engineering which will

be $59,800 the total will be $657,800. This will give us a much larger dock and it will be absolutely water tight. There is a difference of eighty seven thousand dollars in that figure and that given by the Crandall Engineering Company. If we turn to what was tendered for by the Crandall Engineering Company we find that it would widen the dock to seventy feet and that the cost would be $624,000. Mr. Crandall's Company asks for a commission of 15 per cent., while the Bishop Company has asked for $70,000 outside the cost of the operations whether these amounted to $900,000 or a million.

I think that the plans which will be laid on the table of the House this afternoon will show that the Bishop Company has given us a better proposition than the Crandall people. The Crandall people are largely manufacturers of floating docks and they have been very successful, and I have no doubt that Mr. Crandall is a very experienced and thoroughly competent engineer, but the Bishop Company seems to us to have been more thorough in the matter. They say that by deepening the dock they will get down to the bedrock. There is also, they say, a pressure of eight hundred pounds a square foot upward pressure, against four hundred pounds per square foot downwards pressure, and they considered it necessary to make some borings and so relieve the pressure. The Bishop proposition gives a new jetty and a steel wall practically from the Long Bridge right down to the end of the shed, and we would also be getting from them a pier of length five hundred feet, so that we would be able to handle all the coal that we may require. The dock gates will be widened and new gates put in the dock. The dock will also be made longer and wider, and what is more important it will be moved from its present position. The centre line of the dock will be moved six feet further to the north side and reducing the width at the top the new dock would have thirteen feet more space on the northern side. There are also concrete walks provided for round the dock. There would also be a railway carrying a travelling crane which would greatly facilitate the repairs to ships. This proposition would entail the expenditure of about a million dollars and then we would have a dock which would be able to handle anything which could possible come here. I asked Mr. Bishop, who is a practical engineer,whether he thought that our equipment was able to take care of the work which we might have, or whether he thought that it might be necessary to make another expenditure to make the equipment compose with the dock. He was over the dock today and it is his opinion that the expenditure would not have to be very large to be able to handle anw work that might come in.

I do not know if there is very much more that I want to say on this matter just now. I want to place the facts before the House this afternoon, so that the House may be able to give the necessary consideration to the resolutions which we may prepare. As I said a little while ago a more technical explanation in connection with the comparative statement of the two propositions can be better dealt with and better explained by Colonel Sullivan. It did not seem to us that we could possibly get a firm to give us a definite proposition on the dock because they did not exactly know what they would have to do and it did not seem that either company could be expected to do this unless it was at a very increased cost for their own security. We have the best reports of the Bishop Company, it may be remembered that they did their work most satisfactorily on the Humber and elsewhere. They have a good reputation to

maintain and they give us a fairly good assurance that there will be no great increase over the figures estimated. We have brought Mr. Mitchell here but we were not entirely dependen on him. We have also Mr. Bishop who has proved himself an engineer of great ability and besides him Mr. Swan, a world famous engineer in Montreal, have had all the plans submitted to him, so that it can be seen that we have two or three checks on the proposition which we have before the Government and I cannot help feeling that if we can afford to do anything at all if we are to have a good dock in Newfoundland we have to take the present opportunity. It is possible that we could have found somebody else who would have offered to do this work for a smaller commission, but we have got the measurements all checked up by Mr. Joyce and the figures have been gone into very carefully, and the work that has been done has been done very thoroughly, and the Engineers have assured us that we can be content that the estimates will be correct or that at all events they will not be exceeded. We did have a suggestion from the Northern Construction Company that they might come down here and tender for the proposition, but we thought that as we had two engineers down here, already working on it, and since they had gone into the matter very thoroughly, and as the figures were very much alike,, that there was not much of an object in getting a third party down to give an opinion on it. At any rate we have come to the stage where the work must be proceeded with. At first we have to build a coffer dam and that has to be done at once. That work will take at least to next January if it is to be completed, and while we are ready to consider any proposition in connection with this matter we do not think that there is any way to avoid putting the dock out of commission for a year. I simply submit these resolutions, gentlemen.

HON. M. S. SULLIVAN—Mr. Chairman: After having studied the reports submitted by the Crandell Engineering Co. and Wm. I. Bishop, Ltd., we have all no doubt, arrived at the same opinion, namely, that the Dock is in a very serious condition, and the Government, under the circumstances, must at once take immediate steps to make the necessary repairs if the dock is to continue in operation. As it is now, with rotten wood work only supporting the dock gate, on which there is a pressure of 1400 tons, which might cause it to collapse at any moment, neither the Government nor the Railway Commission dare assume the responsibility of allowing any more ships to be put on dock for repairs, and instructions have been given by the Railway Commission to close the dock until such time as it has been put in proper repair. It is possible that the gate might stand for one year or two years, but on the other hand, it might collapse at any moment. If such a catastrophe occurred with a steamer or steamers on dock, the result would be appalling. One can easily imagine the frightful wreckage and damage that would result, entailing great financial loss, with perhaps what would be worse, considerable loss of life.

The Dock situation should be treated non-politically, and we should be very glad to get the opinion of the Opposition in deciding on the best method of deailng with this very serious proposition, and in doing so, we must be guided considerably by the reports submitted by the consulting engineers. We must decide, and decide promptly, what is to be done, because it is only by starting repairs at once, that it will be possible to complete the work by December

1925, otherwise, we would be in the months of January, February and March, and owing to the climate conditions in this country, those months are not suitable to do repair work, and if put off, work done at this season would cost considerably more than if it were done in a milder season. The closing of this public utility is going to entail considerable loss to the country, as well as a great amount of inconvenience to ship owners.

Three of four propositions have been put forward by the firms of engineers who submitted the reports. Which scheme we shall adopt is for the House to decide. There is a further proposition and that is, to close the dock permanently. This, I think, cannot be entertained for many reasons. From 150 to 200 men are employed in connection with work at the dock and around it. Wages paid out in 1924 amounted to $176,000.00. The cost of material purchased and used in connection with repair work on the dock in 1924 amounted to $115,000.00. The indirect revenue to the country from the purchasing power of the $176,000.00 paid in wages and the duty collected on the $115,000.00 worth of material used in connection with the dock repairs, say at 25%, is the equivalent of $72,750.00 per annum. In addition to this, we have, according to the General Manager of the Railway, Mr. Russell, a net profit on the operation of the dock in 1924, of $41,200.00, making a total, direct and indirect revenue of $113,950.00 per annum. From the figures quoted, I do not think we would be justified in closing the dock permanently. We must also bear in mind, that with a modernized dock equipped with machine shops and with improved facilities for doing work, and moreover, situated as we are geographically, there is every reason to suppose that with the improvements suggested, much better results would be obtained.

Now, let us consider the several propositions outlined in the two reports which have been tabled for the information of this House.

The Crandell Engineering Co. make four propositions. 1 and 2 are similar for reconditioning the Dock as it is, at a price of $357,000.00. Proposition No. 3 is to re-condition and widen dock with retaining concrete walls, including concrete gate, at an estimated cost of $624,000.00. Please note that the Crandell Co. recommends that if funds are available that proposition No. 3 has the most to recommend it. Proposition No. 4 is for a new dock, at a cost of three or four million dollars, which I think is not likely to be entertained, and it is unnecessary for me to refer to it any further. The Crandell Engineering Co. offer engineering supervision at 4 p.c. of the cost, or they are ready to undertake the construction on a cost plus 15 p.c. basis.

Now let us consider the propositions put forward by Colonel Mitchell, the consulting engineer for Wm. I. Bishop, Ltd.

Proposition No. 1 deals with repairs to existing dock, as outlined on Colonel Mitchell's report, which does not widen or deepen the dock. This is to be done at a cost of $500,000.00. Proposition No. 2 is practically the same as the Crandell Engineering Co.'s No. 3 proposition, except that considerable work is included in Proposition No. 2 by Bishop, which Crandell makes no mention of, and of which I am supplying details.

Estimated cost of Bishop's No. 2 Proposition, $1,086,000.00. Bishop offers engineering supervision at 4 p.c. of the cost or agrees to do the work on a cost plus basis of 10 p.c. inclusive. Referring again to Bishop's Proposition No. 1, which deals with the renewal of the Dock as originally built, and allowing steel sheet piling for the South Side and West

end of Dock and cut offs at entrance. including—

1. Coffer Dam.
2. Renewal of entrance.
3. Renewal of decayed timber.
4. Grouting under floor to make the Dock water tight.
5. Concrete Toe Wall edge of floor.
6. Clay Puddle.
7. Steel sheet piling (costing about $72,000.00).
8. Repairing Caisson or gate.

Estimated cost of above ..	$285,400.00
Contingencies	20,000.00
Engineering 4%	11,445.00
Contractors fixed fee	28,500.00
	$345,345.00

As against Crandell's estimate of $357,00.00
Balance in favour of Bishop $11,655.00 plus addition suggested in report.

9. Roadway concrete base, granite paving.
10. Travelling Crane, 20 tons, on the north side of the Dock, with a 70' radius.
11. Bollards and Power Capstans and Mooring Rings.
12. Lowering Pumps new suction and discharge ropes.

Estimated cost	$112,500.00	
Contingencies ..	6,655.00	
Engineering ...	4,500.00	
Contractors fixed fee..	11,000.00	
Unwatering.. ..	20,000.00	
		154,625.00
		$500,000.00

Total estimate outlined in report.

Proposition No. 2 covers the widening, lengthening, and deepening the dock in concrete, with masonry entrance and renewal of the upper portion in timber. The Dock will then accommodate vessels 600 feet long by 70 feet beam and entering on 30 feet draught over the sill. This estimate also provides for everything in Proposition No. 1 with the addition of Quay wall 700 feet long eastward from the Long Bridge to end of the present shed. It also includes timber jetty 550 feet long on the south side of entrance, with rock heartening, replacing shorelegs and elevating same and removing from the north side to the south side, moving, replacing and lowering present pumping station, and a new caisson or gate.

Estimated cost of above ..	$896,000.00
Contingencies	60,000.00
Engineering	32,000.00
Contractors fixed fee	70,000.00
Unwatering	28,000.00
	$1,086,000.00

total as outlined in estimate.

Looking ahead, I think it is the general opinion of the Government that it is in the best interests of the country that whatever we do now, should be done with a view to its being an asset to the country, and re-conditioning of the Dock as it was, is not looked upon as being a good business proposition. The type of ships being built now is altogether different from the ship which were built when the present Dock was constructed, and it is necessary that the Dock should be widened and deepened. If scheme No. 2 is carried out, we shall have a Dock which will suit our purpose as good as proposition No. 4, which was estimated to cost between three and four million dollars, and a Dock that will cost very little in repair, as it is only the top portion will be wood. To tighten the Dock it is absolutely necessary that a new concrete bottom should be put in, as it cannot be widened out from the old concrete bottom which is there now. From information obtained, it seems that there was a certain amount of skimping done on the Dock when constructed. The type of dock built at the time the Government Dock was built called for a concrete bottom with a thick-

ness of about 6 feet of concrete at the entrance, tapering off to 2½ feet at the inside end. From investigation made, it seems that there is a uniform depth of about 2 feet of concrete in the bottom of the Dock and necessity for the deepening of the Dock is urgent, because the old Dock is not down to proper foundations. It was thought or assumed at the time that they were down to till. It is true that they succeeded in getting down to till at one or two places but not uniform. It is necessary to get down to solid foundation that is impervious to water. From experiments made by borings at the Dock, it was found that considerable water pressure was acting on this thin concrete floor on the bottom of the dock. This I shall refer to later on in my remarks, but by deepening the Dock as outlined in proposition No. 2 from experiments made, there is no doubt but the proper foundations will be reached.

I shall give you now, a comparison in cost of the two proportions which I think should be considered.

COMPARISON OF PROPOSITIONS

Crandell Engineering Company, Proposition No. 3.

No renewal of piling allowed for and refilling at gate abutments, only figured on widening dock to 70 feet, cost	$624,000.00
Plus 15% contractors fees	93,600.00
Plus unwatering Dock ...	28,000.00
	$745,600.00
Less	12,000.00
	$733,600.00

with reduced leakage only and does not guarantee you a tight dock.

Wm. I. Bishop, Ltd., Proposition No. 2.

The dock to be enlarged and deepened, size 600 feet x 70 feet, x 30 feet cost	$896,000.00
Contingencies and unwatering..	80,000.00
	$976,000.00
Deduct for Crane, Pumping Station, Capstans, Bollards, Quay Wall, Timber Jetty, Rock Heartening, Shorelegs, Paved Granite Roadway	$390,000.00
	$586,000.00
Plus 10% Contractors' fees	58,600.00
	$644,600.00

leaving a difference of $89,000.00 in favour of Bishop, Limited.

No explanation that one can give this House can make clear to you the great difference in the Crandell Engineering Company's Proposition No. 3 as compared with William I. Bishop Company's No. 2 Proposition, as a comparison of the plans submitted by both parties will show. I suggest you compare Crandell's plan No. 324 with Bishop's plan No. 4, which are both drawn to the same scale, and after studying same, I am sure that every member of the House will be unanimous as to which Proposition they will select.

An examination of Bishop's drawing No. 2 shows some of the cavities existing in under the altars at sides of Dock. Drawing No. 1 shows where the four holes were put down and also shows where the leaks are in the Dock. At Bore holes No. 1 and 2 considerable water was found by Colonel Mitchell under the floor, and at Bore No. 2 the water pressure amounted to 800 lbs. per square foot, or nearly half a ton, whilst the weight of concrete only amounted to 400 lbs. pressure per square foot. To make the floor of the Dock safe this

water must be shut off. This can only be done by carrying out the suggestions as outlined in Colonel Mitchell's report.

Plan No. 11 also shows a very serious condition inside the head gates. I refer to the bulges on both sides of the Dock immediately inside of gate. It also shows the position of the proposed Jetty and its relation to the old hulk "Desola."

Plan No. 3 shows proposed widening and improvements such as position of steel sheet piling all around Dock; proposed new wharf and training wall; proposed new pumping house, and track for 20 ton travelling crane.

If the House should decide on repairing the present Dock, without deepening or widening it, it will mean employment for about 100 men, probably for six or seven months. Most of the men employed will be carpenters, as it will be practically all timber work. With proposition No. 2 it will mean the employment of 400 or 500 men for eight months. In addition to the work on the Dock and the new Jetty, it is proposed to build a transit shed for freight not included by either party. To provide labor and keep the money in the country it has been decided to build a shed of re-inforced concrete instead of importing structural steel, and it has been found that a considerable saving can be effected by a building of re-inforced concrete instead of structural steel, notwithstanding the fact that a very low price has been quoted on structural steel. Construction of this shed will give employment to about fifty men for four months.

For the information of this House, I might say the Government instructed the General Manager of the Railway to have Mr. W. F. Joyce. Chief Engineer of the Newfoundland Government Railway, compare the prices as submitted by the Crandell Engineering Company and by Bishop Co., Ltd. As the Crandell Engineering Company's proposition appeared cheaper, he was instructed to estimate the cost of the extra work outlined in project No. 2 of W. I. Bishop, Ltd., and let us know if the extra amount that Bishop Company was asking for was justified. From the brief synopsis which I gave you earlier in my remarks, you will see there is a difference of $87,800 in favor of the Bishop proposition.

For the information of the House, I quote you extracts from Mr. W. Joyce's report dated March 19th. There is a slight difference between Mr. Joyce's figures and the ones that I have already quoted, as there is an amount of $28,000.00 for unwatering in Crandell's estimtae, which Crandell does not include, and other items. Now, to summarize the matter briefly and show you what has been offered by Bishop in excess of what has been offered by Crandell, I shall do so as briefly as possible:

1. Both Crandell and Bishop agree as to the need for immediate and extensive repairs, the dangerous condition of the entrance and the necessity of building a coffer dam to carry out repairs. Both recommend widening of the Dock. Bishop, through his Engineer, recommends deepening, and there is no doubt in my mind that this is a most suitable proposition, because having to build a coffer dam now, it is just as well to deepen the dock as not. If it had to be deepened in the years to come the coffer dam would have to be built again.

Crandell makes two Propositions for re-conditioning the Dry Dock. One and two are similar, and both are less costly than the estimate submitted by Colonel Mitchell for the Wm. I. Bishop Company, Ltd.

COMPARISON OF PROPOSITIONS.

Common to Both.

Coffer Dam.

Renewal of entrance and altars for 100 feet inside gate.

Renewal of Floor Decking, etc.

Repairs to Caisson or Dock Gate.

Renewal of Altars, Cut of Walls:

Crandell—Upper 12 on each side of entrance, in timber.

Wm. Bishop—Upper 15 on each side entrance and along South and West Banks in steel.

Filling:

Crandell—Around entrance only.

Wm. Bishop—Puddle Clay at entrance and all around inside face of Dock.

Piling:

Crandell—Nil.

Wm. Bishop—25% renewal allowed for.

Costs:

Crandell—15% to be added.

Wm. Bishop—Everything included.

Colonel Mitchell, Bishop's Engineer, found water under the floor under considerable pressure. (At Bore No. 2 this amounted to 800 lbs. pressure per square foot or nearly half a ton), which must be shut off to make floor safe, so he states.

Bishop includes in his estimate the following not included by Crandell:

1. Forcing Cement Grout under floor to seal bottom.

2. Concrete Toe Wall, round floor to seal edge and support clay puddle.

3. Lowering Pumps to increase their efficiency and provision of new Suction and Discharge Pipes to replace present ones, which are badly corroded.

4. Paved Roadway all around Dock.

5. Electrically operated Capstans to warp in ships; provision of Bollards and Mooring Rings, the present Mooring facilities being inadequate.

6. A twenty ton Travelling Crane, placed on the North Side of the Dock.

Scheme 3.

Crandell proposes widening only, and using present concrete floor; Bishop proposes widening and deepening and considers present floor unsafe if Dock widened. Crandell provides retaining walls, 12 feet above floor; Bishop provides retaining walls 16 feet above floor.

Crandell provides no cut off walls or sheet piling.

Bishop provides steel sheet piling on both sides of entrance and along the south and west banks.

Coffer Dam included by both.

New entrance Caisson or Gate included by both.

New width of Floor of Dock, in both cases 70 feet.

Bishop's estimate No. 2 includes following not included in Crandell's price for his No. 3 proposition.

1. 20 ton Travelling Crane on north banks, the top width of Dock being reduced to provide accommodation for it.

2. New concrete wharf on North Side of Waterford River from Long Bridge to East end of shed.

3. New Timber Jetty which can be used for the storage of coal.

4. Rebuilding Pump House, Lowering Pumps, and providing new Suction and Discharge Pipes.

5. Power Capstans, Bollards, etc., as before mentioned.

6. Puddle Clay on inside face of Dock, all round to make sides water tight.

7. Deepening Dock, consistent with increase in width and placing new floor.

8. Dismantling and re-erecting Shorelegs on new Jetty.

9. Rock Heartening under new Jetty on South Side of entrance, to act as training wall for River and prevent silting up of entrance to Dock.

ESSENTIAL DIFFERENCES

1. Crandell only reduces leakage; does not stop it.

2. Bishop has traced sources of leakage and provides means for making Dock water tight.

3. Crandell makes no provision for improvement in handling facilities; Bishop provides complete requirements.

4. Crandell widens Dock, using present Floor, with no increase in depth. Bishop considers Floor unsafe if Dock widened; deepens and widens Dock, providing new Floor.

5. Bishop provides new wharfage and modern handling facilities and stops leaks instead of reducing them.

I trust, Mr. Chairman, that the members of the House will find the remarks I have made, somewhat helpful in assisting them to make up their minds as to the best proposition we should adopt, in the best interests of our country.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, this is the first time I have seen these resolutions and I have not yet seen the plans, and therefore I have not yet had an opportunity of giving it any consideration whatever. We have heard the reports furnished us by the Government. I presume that the Government have not entered into any contract already. From the outline of the two propositions by the Hon. Member for Placentia I take it for granted that he and his Government are very much in favour of the Bishop proposition number two. There are a great many things that we have to say in reference to this in the way of pieces of advice to the Government. And as it is not opportune to say it at present. I am going to ask the Prime Minister if he would be good enough to have the Committee rise so that we would have an opportunity to talk it over. I presume that it is the intention of the Government to utilize the amounts voted in the Committee last year. Then you are going to take authority to raise the balance of the money required for the construction of the dock.

Is it necessary for the Government to raise a further loan upon the credit of the country if you have $600,000 provided for and you are going to do work that we suppose will cost a million dollars. We have a much better revenue and at present is there not sufficient increased revenue to take care of the work without making any further loans on the credit of the colony. Does the Prime Minister think it is possible of not having to borrow any money.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—It is quite possible that we may not have to borrow any more.

MR. HICKMAN—Well, as I said before, it is not possible to discuss fully these resolutions and to talk upon them, and I would ask the Prime Minister if he would be good enough to have the Committee rise.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, in response to the leader of the opposition I may say that I am perfectly willing to have the Committee rise. At the same time I want him to appreciate the fact that every day is important, and if we got no further than to arrange with Mr. Mitchell to build a coffer dam we would be that far ahead. If the opposition are satisfied that we could have the question settled one way or the other definitely to-morrow then we would let the matter stand over and take the rest of the Bill through as quickly as possible. This is a very important matter. Naturally we do not expect to keep Mr. Bishop waiting around here for any length of time. I would like if the leader of the Opposition would get his whole party to consider the situation as soon as possible. Our plans are at their disposal and would they let us have their views on the matter not later than tomorrow.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Chairman, before rising I would ask the Hon. Member for Placentia if there has been any negotiations in connection with the new shed to be erected? Whether there has been allowance made for the load that shed is to corry? I understand that it is to be constructed of reinforced concrete. And seeing in Colonel Mitchell's report the difference brought about by the load of copper ore that was in there at one time some allowance ought to be made against anything of that nature happening again. I understand that all the land is made land. There is no rock bottom at all. That will, I think be matter for consideration.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—That has been looked into thoroughly and will be provided for. I don't think that there will be any coal stored there. Provision will be made for the storing of the coal on the new shed.

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 tomorrow.

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

MR. HALFYARD asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the Table of the House a statement of the cost from June 9th, 1924, to date, of the expenditure in connection with the General Post Office, showing in detail the cost of painting, alterations, repairs, fixtures, new desks, and furnishings of all descriptions.

The answer was tabled.

MR. HALFYARD asked Hon. the Colonial Secretary to lay on the Table of the House a copy of the Commission of Colonel Ross, or terms of reference in connection with such a Commission; give the date of the appointment of Colonel Ross; what amount is Colonel Ross being paid daily, weekly, monthly or yearly; when will the Commission of Colonel Ross terminate; also to lay on the Table of the House an interim Report of the Commission.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Colonel Ross was appointed by the Government for the purpose of reorganising the Postal Department. He has been engaged at this work since Dec. 12th last and is being paid at the rate of 500 dollars per month for his services.

It is probable that Colonel Ross will conclude his work within the next few days. He has so far made no report to the Government respecting the matter on which he is engaged.

MR. GODDEN asked Hon. the Colonel Secretary to Table a list showing what persons outside of Major Byrne's Department, were given authority to recommend Relief by Dole; what salaries were paid such persons, and by whom the appointments were made or suggested.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—In reply to the Hon. Member I am not aware that authority was given to any person outside Capt. Byrne to recommend relief by dole.

MR. GODDEN—To ask Hon. the Minister of Justice, what instructions verbal or otherwise did he in company with the Hon. the Minister of Finance, give Officials of the Truckman's Union, regarding the issue of the Dole, and if his Department was justified in punishing certain Carmen who accepted the Dole as a result of the instructions given.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—What I have to say is in line with the answer given by the Colonial Secretary. The Committee was merely advisory to Capt. Byrne He has charge of the issue of these orders. As regards the query whether the Department of Justice was justified in punishing the offenders. I

have but to say the Department of Justice does not punish people. That is done by the court. As to whether the decision of the court was just, that is a matter of the evidence. The proceedings recently taken arose out of the fact that it was discovered certain men were obtaining relief who were at the time steadily employed. These men themselves have been the first to admit that such conduct could not be justified.

MR. GODDEN asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs what amounts are due his Department, as Sales Tax and Business Profits Tax, and who are the delinquents in this respect.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Hon. Member for Trinity I may say that it is never the custom of the Finance Department to issue a statement of the amounts as in this case, but I may assure him that we have found delinquents and that we are taking every opportunity to collect the amounts. I do not think that it would be in the interest of anybody to have these amounts published.

MR. BROWN asked Hon. the Colonial Secretary why was an Inspector of Beetle Ravages appointed and who recommended Mr. Arthur English for the position, and what salary is he paid and what are his qualifications.

Tabled.

MR. HICKMAN asked the Minister of Public Works what amounts from his department have been sent to Cupids since 1st June, 1924: to whom were the amounts sent and for what purpose were they sent.

Tabled.

MR. HICKMAN asked Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs: (1) what is the cost of fitting up the new Telegraph Office at Cupids; (2) what is the Government paying as Rental for the new Telegraph Office; (3) on whose recommendation was Tobias LeDrew appointed to fit up a new Post Office; (4) why is Post Office and Telegraph Office separated; (5) what will be the salary of the Operator; will salary of present Postmistress be reduced.

MR. HICKMAN asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the Table of the House: A statement signed by Mr. H. J. Russell, Manager of the Railroad, giving the amount of Marine Insurance on each of the Government owned steamers at the present time; through whom insured and at what rates.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay the statement on the table of the House. Most of the information has been furnished before at the request of Mr. Scammell, and I hope that it is no reflection on me as chairman of the Railway Commission to ask to have Mr. Russell's signature in this second case.

MR. HICKMAN asked the Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the Table of the House: (1) a copy of the Report made to the Government by Messrs. Read, Son and Watson on the Customs Department during the year 1924; and (2) a copy of the report made on the Controller's Department by Messrs. Read, Son and Watson during 1923-24.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Speaker, in replying to this question I may say that the question of the Auditor's report is not in my department I may say that the decision of Government is as follows:—

(Tables document)

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few remarks about the question asked by Mr. Hickman as to the Auditor's report into the Controller's Department. There has been considerable whispering of late and ever since and during the last

general election in connection with myself in connection with this matter I, first of all have not asked the Government to hold back this report or had anything to do with it. Reflections have been cast upon Cashin and Company, both my father and myself in connection with this matter and as regards this matter of tabling this report I think that if possible that this report should be tabled at once. I can see no reason why it should not be tabled. Last spring when the Monroe party went to the polls to the election I am informed that Mr. Warren, at one time the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice gave this report to the Fisherman's Advocate and that it was used in the election. It was used to considerable effect. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that I am presuming upon my position if I ask the Government if it is at all possible in view of the fact that the name of Cashin has been used in connection with that report that it might be tabled as soon as possible to show the public that these insinuations that have been cast during the last election and since that have been scattered around are false and to show the people where we stand in this matter. I do not believe that Mr. Hickman has any ulterior motive in asking this question. And Mr. Speaker, as far as i can see there is really no reason why the report should not be tabled as the facts have been made public already in the Advocate during the election of 1924.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Speaker, as i have been referred to as having given the Auditor's report to the Advocate I just desire to say that the report was not given to the Advocate by me.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker, the fact is that the report got to the Advocate and it did not walk there itself. I do not want to say who my informant is now. But it got there just the same.

MR. HICKMAN asked the Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to la yon the Table of the House a statement showing why Mr. Levi Chafe, late Examiner of H. M. Customs, is now suspended; if he is still under salary; why he was suspended; and, if it is the intention of the Government to have him reinstated; if so, when; and if not, why not.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Hon. member I would like to say that Mr. L. Chafe has been suspended from the department while this enquiry is being made, and that he is going to remain suspended until the report is complete, and then if nothing has been found against him he will be reinstated.

MR. HICKMAN asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the Table of the House a a statement showing: (1) the amount of goods seized at Corner Brook at the time of his own personal visit there last autumn; (2) on what ship or ships goods were seized; (3) the names of the owner or owners of the goods; (4) if the goods are still in the possession of the Custom House; if so, to Table a list of the goods; (5) if the goods were sold or taken over by the Department of the Liquor Controller; or is it correct that a certain amount of these goods have been returned to the owners; if so, on whose authority.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in passing that over to the hon. gentleman. (Tabled).

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Council's Amendments To The Women's Franchise Bill.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain to the House that this is simply a typographical error that occurred when the bill was going through and we find that by this error we were disenfranchising certain people who might have been out of the country for a short time. It is not the intention to have any change, and with this mistake rectified the spirit of the act has returned to exactly the same position as it was before the ladies applied for the vote. I do not think that the members on the other side of the House need have any objections to these resolutions.

Pursuant to order and on mtoion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Amendments made by the Legislative Council in and upon the Bill sent up entitled 'Of the Election of Members of the House of Assembly' were read a second time, and agreed to, and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting that body that the said Amendments had been agreed to without amendment.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Speaker, with regard to that amendment we understood that it was the intention of the Government to make some change. As it stands to-day it is the same as was put in force in 1919, when it was put in force to allow some men who had been out of the country for some years and so could not stand as a candidate to sit and it was put in force at the last session of the Legislature prior to a general election when he was a member, I think, and this alteration was made so that he could become a candidate for a district in the election. And it was because of this that we thought that the Government proposed some change.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I might explain that we do not want to disenfranchise any body who may have gone to North Sydney to work for a few months and then come home just before the eve of an election. With regards to the matter of men who have been out of the country coming back to stand as candidates, I do not think that we need worry about that. We will not have many candidates coming back to stand for districts two or three days before the election.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, it is the irony of fate that the Prime Minister has to endorse the acts of the Upper House. It is humiliating that legislation should be rushed through this House without having been given any attention whatever. I was held up to ridicule and was accused of delaying the House when the Election Act was before the Committee, and I asked the committee to rise. Some one told the Prime Minister that there was no necessity to have certain words in section 49 of the Election Act, and because someone told the Prime Minister that, and that person did not know what he was talking about, and when I drew the attention of the Prime Minister to the Election Act of 1919 and asked if it was really the intention to repeal the Election Act of 1919 altogether so that a person could not contest a district unless he had been in the country for two years next proceeding the date of the election. Now we have to submit to the humiliation of having to be told by the Upper House that we do not

know what kind of Legislation is coming up. If we ask when a new bill has been introduced for the first time and just been distributed, and the introducer has moved the second reading, that the members be given time to consider the matter, we are told that we are holding up the business of the House. In my opinion the Upper House has justified its existence for once in its life because of the attention which it has been giving to the legislation which has come before it. We treat matters here too carelessly and there is always some excuse why we cannot rise the committee and consider the bill the next sitting. At the same time we allow the bill to go to the Upper House and then it comes down here again and we eulogise them for their attention. It should be a lesson to us to give some attention to the bills that are introduced in this chamber and not allow them to pass through the second reading or the Committee or the third reading and then be sent to the Upper House, and then have them sent back again for correction, and for the Upper House to rightly say that the proper attention is not being given to the business of the House.

Income Tax Bill.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to ask that that bill be removed from the order paper, and in explanation I might say that this bill has been reconsidered, and we are doing away with the income tax entirely, and I gave notice of a bill today covering this matter.

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the Bill "An Act to Amend the Act 13 George V., Chapter XXVI., Respecting a Tax upon Certain Incomes" was stricken from the Order Paper.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Prime Minister if he is in a position to name the Highway Commission?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I may say that I am not in a position to do so.

MR. SCAMMELL—May I ask the Hon. Prime Minister if we understood him correctly to say that the personnel of the Highroads Commission would be entirely non-partisan?

HON. PRIME MINISTER—I do not remember saying so.

MR. SCAMMELL—I understood the leader of the Government in the Upper House and the Prime Minister here to have said it would be non-political and non-partisan.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—It is a wise man that can understand all that is said in the Upper House.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, I pray the privilege to refer to the official synopsis of the debates in this House of Assembly. I presume there is someone regarded as an official to prepare the synopsis for publication in certain papers in the city, and elsewhere. If there is a paid official to compile the official synopsis of debates in the House of Assembly, I trust that the Internal Economy Commission will see that he does something to earn his salary.

I refer now to the official synopsis as published in the Newfoundland Trade Review. It is copied completely from the Daily News, and in the Daily News it is not put in as the official synopsis. It says that I spoke for about three hours, and the synopsis of my speech for three hours is put in ten or a dozen lines; and three or four of those lines are taken up with saying that I spoke for about three hours. At the same time, Capt. Winsor, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries who replied to me at much shorter length has about a column taken up in a synopsis of what he said. It is much better for nothing to be said. Certain remarks I made, of course, were just as well left un-

said, but they make a point of publishing those in the official synopsis. It is ridiculous in the extreme; and I trust that the Prime Minister will, on behalf of the members of this House, give his attention to this matter. We do not expect the Daily News to report us members of the Opposition without a political or partisan bias. That is characteristic of Opposition and Government newspapers in reporting what is said in the House of Assembly. But when we come to the Official Synopsis, that is another thing, and it is most unfair that they should compile the synopsis in this way; and I think the official synopsis writer should do better than copy his matter holus bolus from the Daily News.

MR. DUFF—Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak on the same subject. In speaking on the Highway Bill when it was last before the House, I mentioned that in Ontario motorists were charged three cents on a gallon of gasolene, and got three million dollars from it for repairing roads; but I said that if we were to do that in this country, it would cost a dollar a gallon, but I did not, as was reported, suggest that we should put a tax on gasolene. I have been reported incorrectly on several occasions, and it would appear as if it was intentional, and I would call the attention of the Prime Mniister to this method of making a synopsis and ask him to arrange to correct them. I would like the Prime Minister to take notice of that and correct these things.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, March 24th, 1925.

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

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the residents of Logy Bay in the District of St. John's East asking for an improved launchway and a winch. In asking that this be referred to the Marine Department I would like to point out that this place is, with probably the exception of Pouch Cove, the most important fishing settlement in this section and this aid to the people is badly needed. I therefore ask the Minister of Marine give this petition Minister of Marine to give this petition provement asked for is granted.

NOTICE OF QUESTION.

Mr. Browne gave notice of question.
Mr. Godden gave notice of question.
Mr. Warren gave notice of question.
Mr. Scammell gave notice of question.
Mr. Hickman gave notice of question.
Mr. Brown gave notice of question.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions respecting an Agreement between the Government and the Newfoundland Textile Manufacturing Company, Limited.

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Puddister took the chair of committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I may say that these resolutions are only covering the usual agreement with a company of this kind when starting business, and the concessions are the same as given to the Knitting Mills a few years ago with the difference that the Knitting Mills were given a guarantee of 5% on their capital stock but in this case there is no such guarantee. This

company expects to begin operations in 5 or 6 months and at the start will employ from 50 to 60 people and eventually double that number.

MR. WARREN—I would like to ask who are the people interested in this company.

Hon. THE PRIME MINISTER—I only know the people whose names are signed here.

MR. WARREN—What is the amount of the capital.

HON. MR. CRAMM—The capital is $50,000.

MR. WARREN—Is it subscribed.

HON. MR. CRAMM—I do not know.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, I think that the Government is taking a rather long step. Here you are giving the permission to import all the material that they might want to manufacture free of duty, and if you do that you will have a demand from all the factories in town to be allowed to import their goods free of duty also, and I do not see how you can answer them. This is going a long way. You are giving permission to import all woolens, clothes, flannels and anything else they may wish to get in and at the same time you have in the country clothing factories which have not the same protection at all and you will have to take the duty off all the clothing material that is brought into the country. They may employ fifty or sixty people or even a hundred people but there are other factories in the country which pay their taxes and duties on their raw material and I feel that if this bill goes through the House it will be necessary to accede to the request of these people to have their materials come in duty free.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I think that there is considerable point in the position taken by the Hon. Member for Fortune and I would suggest that the commmittee rise until we give the matter some further consideration.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

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

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

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 4 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of Legislative Disabilities and the Vacation of Seats in the House of comse" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to morow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, the Bill entitled "An Act respecting a Tax on Certain Incomes" kas introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

QUESTIONS.

MR. SCAMMELL asked the Prime Minister to lay upon the Table of the House a statement showing: (a) the amount paid to T. Hollis Walker for his services and expenses in connection with the conduct of the Enquiry heid by him last year; (b) the amounts paid to each of the lawyers representing the Government and to each of the other officials.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I beg to table the information. There was an expenditure of thirty thousand dollars.

MR. BROWN asked Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing: (a) the number of poles contracted for by his Department for the purpose of repairing the line from Gambo to Musgrave Harbor;

(b) give the names of the different contractors, the number of poles for each contractor and the price paid per pole whether rinded or unrinded; (c) state whether the poles have to be put in piles by the line or at some other selected site; if so, has the Minister information from the different line repairers that the poles have been so placed?

HON. THE MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay that information on the table of the House. There were no contracts awarded.

MR. BROWN asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing: (a) what changes, if any, have been made in the Deputy Surveyors of Shipping; (b) if any new appointments have been made, give the names of the persons appointed, the date of each such appointment, and the salary paid each appointee; (c) have any appointments been made as Surveyors of repaired schooners or schooners that are being repaired, if so give names, the date of each such appointment, the salary paid each such Surveyor, also state whether expenses are allowed in addition to salary or not, and also whether each such appointment is temporary or not.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay that information on the table of the House.

MR. GODDEN asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs if his Department has any men employed as detectives along the waterfront or elsewhere, other than the regular Customs officials; if so, give their names and state what remuneration is given for their services.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE --Mr. Speaker, In reply to the hon. member for Trinity I would like to say that there is nobody employed in the way asked by the hon. member. But I think that there are lots of people around who seem to be acting as detectives and we are getting all sorts of anonymous letters telling us what to do. Perhaps there is somebody about here who knows something about that. But I know about nobody except Tobin.

MR. GRIMES asked Hon. the Colonial Secretary if he is aware that medical officials, in receipt of salaries from the Government, are assessing and collecting fees for their own enjoyment from patients treated at the General Hospital; if the Board of Governors have discountenanced this procedure and have been backed up by the Governor-in-Council; to produce any correspondence in this connection.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY —Mr. Speaker, that information is in the course of preparation. I may say that it has been referred to the Governors.

MR. GRIMES asked Hon. the Colonial Secretary, who constitute the Board of Pension Commissioners for Newfoundland and what in each individual case is the amount of salary and any emoluments paid individual members of the Board.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY --Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay that information on the table of the House.

MR. GRIMES asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs if it is his intention in the adjustment of the Customs Tariff to recommend to the Government that a preference be given to goods manufactured in Great Britain over goods manufactured in countries foreign to Great Britain and imported into Newfoundland.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE --Mr. Speaker, In reply to the hon. member what my intentions are with regard to this matter. I have not made any decisions.

MR. HICKMAN asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs if Mr. Josiah Gosse of Spaniard's Bay, (late Customs Officer in that place)

is receiving a pension; if so, how much.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE —Mr. Speaker, I beg to say in reply to the hon. member that the pension of Mr. Joseph Gosse of Spaniard's Bay is $560.00 per annum and is provided for in the estimates.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, before beginning to explain the different changes in the Estimates, I should like the House to understand that most of the apparent increases appearing in the departmental salaries are not real ones.

In many cases new appointments appearing this year are actually old appointments in the proper sense. These officials have been paid from Contingencies and other votes, some of them for years.

The policy of this Government is to place such amounts where they properly belong, in the salaries lists of the Departments and not hide them away as has been the custom too often in the past.

This is particularly noticeable in the Department of Posts and Telegraphs where, in many cases, offices have been opened for years but no particular salary provided for the officials in charge of them.

In fact, some officials who had passed away were still on the Estimates, and no care seems to have been taken so far as the Estimates were concerned to give the actual facts.

FINANCE DEPARTMENT.

Interest on Public Dept increased $200,000. This is to provide the Interest on four million dollars raised under the Loan Act, 1924 at five per cent.

The salary of the Minister of Education has been dropepd at the request of the Prime Minister. He acts as Prime Minister and Minister of Education at the one salary. This is a decrease of $4,000.

Printing and Stationery Finance Department increase of $250. Provision made for the printing of the Auditor General's Report. Increase in cost of telegrams $175. The Deputy Minister of Finance estimates will need this amount. Increase in sundry Contingencies, $141 is made on the basis of last year's requirements. It is quite possible that we will have credit balances on these three accounts at the end of the fiscal year.

The following salaries have been increased in the Auditor General's Department: First Clerk and Customs Auditor (Mr. E. F. Taylor) is increased $200.00; Second Clerk (J. P. Luscombe) increased $200.00; Third Clerk (K. J. Carter) increased $200.00; Fifth Clerk (A. J. Ivany) transferred at a salary of $1,500.00. Salary of fifth clerk last year was $1,000.00. Clerk-Stenographer increased $228.00; Messenger increased $100.00. Travelling Auditor is a new appointment. Mr. L. Crummey who holds the appointment was transferred from the Railway audit. The explanation of these increases is that a pre-audit has been established in some of the Departments, causing increased responsibility to be placed on the officials concerned. It was found that a Travelling Auditor was absolutely necessary, and as the Government Railway audit was no longer necessary, Mr. Crummey was transferred to the main office.

Starting with Joseph LeMoine, Tidewaiter, Rose Blanche, will be found the list of pensioners added to the list. This represents an increase

of $18,357.41. On Page 10 we have increased the pension of Richard Lawton, Sub-collector at King's Cove, by the sum of $199.34, as it was found he had been unfairly dealt with under the Pensions Act. This makes a total increase of $18,556.75. As against this there were decreases brought about by the deaths of several pensioners, which amounted to $3,158.74, making the net increase to the Pensions list of $15,398.01.

In the House of Assembly estimates there is an increase in Members' Sessional Pay of $250.00 to each member. This brings the Sessional Pay back to where it has been for three or four years past. Means $9,-000.00 increase.

Printing, binding and gazetting Acts is responsible for an increase of $1,500.00 on this page. It was short voted last year, so Mr. Keating tells me, he will need all of $3,-500.00 to fill his requirements.

COLONIAL SECRETARY'S DEPARTMENT.

The salary of the clerk at Government House is increased by the sum of $152.00. This man (Mr. Cake) has been in the service for years, having been transferred from the Audit Office in the Bond Government. His work is of a confidential nature and $1,700.00 is little enough for the nature of the service performed by him.

The Secretary to the Prime Minister is increased from $2,200 to $3,-000.00 He has had perquisites annually in the past which brought his salary up to this figure, but the present Prime Minister decided to make the salary a straight one and cut out all extras formerly paid Mr. Carew.

The Assistant Secretary (Miss Bolt) has been reduced by the sum of $240.00. She is a new appointee and inexperienced, and received the $1,200.00 originally simply because it was in the Estimates for that amount. The salary for Filing Clerk of $720,-00 has been dropped, and one of the Messengers at $744.00 per annum has also been dropped. The net result of these decreases and the one increase to the Secretary works out at a decrease in the Prime Minister's Department salaries of $904.00. The Contingencies of the Department, also, have been reduced $500.00, making a total reduction of $1,404.00 for the Prime Minister's Department.

The salaries of the Colonial Secretary's Department show one increase only. Mr. Sterling, the Assistant Deputy, goes from $2,400.00 to $3,-000. This is really not an increase as it commutes all perquisites hitherto received by him just as in Mr. Carew's case to which I have referred.

A decrease occurs in the case of Census of $10,000.00. This amount will not be needed during the coming year.

Under the heading of Militia, there is an increase of $5,000.00. The Government were approached by the Newfoundland Patriotic Association for this grant. It appears that as a private body, this Association has been functioning on post-war cases of distress. They still have a number of needy cases on their hands, and their funds have reached low water mark. The Government decided to help them out for the next four or five years by the sum of $5,000 annually to carry on the good work. It is thought by that time the grant will be no longer needed.

As the recapitulation will show, the Department of the Colonial Secretary works out at a total decrease (net) of $5,652.00.

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT.

In the Department of Justice salaries on page 25 there is an increase of $400.00 to the Secretary to the Minister, and at the bottom of the page last item, an increase of $500.00

for Deputy Sheriffs in Outports. The first increase is made on the recommendation of the Minister of Justice, who is of opinion that Mr. Godden should be paid a straight salary instead of the pernicious extra system year after year. The second increase is to cover actual requirements.

On page 26 will be found an increase to Mr. Maddick, the Deputy Registrar of Deeds, of $360.00. The Registrar, Mr. Adams, has been suffering from ill-health for a long time past, and as a result Mr. Maddick has to deal with a lot of increased work. The Typist is also increased $120.00.

On page 27 the Harbor Grace Bailiff is increased $100.00.

On page 28 there is an increase in Magistrate's salaries, caused by the appointment of a Magistrate at Oderin at $750.00 per annum. There was always a Magistrate at Oderin until recently, and this is merely the revival of a necessary appointment.

There is an increase of $6,000 in the Vote for Civil and Criminal Prosecutions and $500.00 for Magisterial Enquiries. Judging from the expenditure on these accounts in recent years, the Minister of Justice thinks the increase advisable. He says they always have to take supplementary supply for these services annually, and sometimes for considerable amounts.

Further down the page under Constabulary Salaries there is an increase of $3,040.00 for first year Constables. This means four new first year Constables at $760.00.

On the next page under same heading, there is an increase to the two typists, one at Headquarters Office, the other in the Superintendent's Office of $132.00 each. They go from $468.00 to $600.00 each. It is thought that $50.00 a month is a fair rate for these stenographers.

On the same page, under the heading of Miscellaneous, the following increases occur: Uniforms, Accoutrements, etc., $600; Lodging Allowance, $480; Rent Outport Barracks, $586; Printing and Stationery, $100; Telephones and Telegrams, $100. The first two increases are naturally the effect of the increase in the force of the first constables above mentioned; the rent Outport Barracks for new barracks rented; and the last two items are to fill depleted stocks of stationery and cost of telegrams short voted last year.

The Police annuities show a decrease of $762.50 due to the death of two of the recipients.

By the recapitulation it will be seen that the net increase for the Justice Department is $13,140.50.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION.

Coming to the Department of Education, there is an apparent increase of $700.00 (for Mr. Butt, the Accountant), but this is not so in fact, as he has had perquisites to that amount which are now commuted, and he will be paid a straight salary without any extra remuneration. The Messenger (Charles Hamlyn) gets a slight increase of $144.00 to put him on a par with other messengers in the service. There is an increase of $900.00 for Travelling Expenses and $500.00 for Printing and Stationery, which I am informed is required to bring the vote up to the actual requirements of the Department.

In the same Department (Education) on Page 37 the Grant for Augmentation to Teachers' Salaries is increased by the sum of $15,000.00. Last year this money was taken from the Surplus Trust Fund and placed to the credit of the several denominations in the Departmental books, but it is now felt that a regular vote of the Legislature should be taken to cover the service. The cost of this service increases according to the

length of service of the several grades of teachers on an upward scale.

As in the case of Augmentation, the vote for Teachers' Pension Fund was supplemented by a cheque from the Educational Trust Account of $10,000. We are now putting the amount in the estimates in the regular way, as I do not agree with placing amounts to the credit of a Trust account when the proper course to pursue is vote them in the Legislature. As a matter of fact there are now no less than three Trust Accounts in the Department of Education, as follows:—

Teachers' Pension Fund, which shows a balance in Bank on June 30th, of $4,576.68.

Minister of Education Trust Account which showed a balance in Bank on June 30th, of $12,516.41.

Special Augmentation Trust Account showing a balance in Bank on June 30th, of $6,501.78.

Or a total credit in the Trust Accounts of the Education Department totalling $23,594.87.

We are adding a vote of $10,000.00 for the Normal School and Newfoundland Memorial College. As this institution is now functioning, the above sums will be required to meet current expenses for the year.

The Departmental Recapitulation on Page 40, shows a total increase for the Education Department of $41,239.00.

PUBLIC CHARITIES.

The next increase will be found on page 48 under the title of Charitable Societies. There are three increases under this head as follows: R.N.M.D.S.F. (Royal National Mission to Deep Sea Fishermen) Hospital at Pilley's Island, granted $2,000 instead of $1,000; Grace Maternity Hospital for which we have added a new vote of $3,000; also a new vote of $10,000 for the Notre Dame Bay Memorial Hospital at Twillingate. These are all well deserving objects, and the Government are of opinion that it is money well spent. Moreover, it will save expenses of transportation of patients from these centres to St. John's.

Under the heading Public Health Salaries, the Meat Inspector, Mr. Courtney, is increased $200 per annum. The salary was $1,300 and is now $1,500. This was done in order to level the money up to the other Inspectors in the service. Under the same heading, Mr. Lewis Bartlett is raised from $1,509.30 to $1,800.00 per annum. Mr. Bartlett is Hospital Clerk, has to look out for sick patients from all parts of the island and is in a position to cost the Colony a lot of money should he neglect his job. His services have been eminently satisfactory, and the Government thought he was worth the increase.

The total increase on account of Public Charities as will be seen by the recapitulation on page 50 is $14,490.70.

MARINE AND FISHERIES DEPARTMENT.

Coming now to the Marine and Fisheries Department, we find the following increases and decreases under the head of Departmental Salaries:

The salary of Miss Calpin, the Secretary to the Department, has been increased $220.00; from $780.00 to $1,000.00. She has been years in the Department and this is a replacement of a cut in salary made by the late administration three years ago. There is an additional typist at $720.00, but further down will be seen a decrease of a typist of $780.00. The Quarantine Officer, who is paid $5.00 per ship from the Customs Department, has had an adidtional amount from the Fisheries Department of $845.00. Dr. Campbell enjoyed both

emoluments but didn't look after the job as per visiting every vessel. This $845.00 is now cut out of the Estimates. The $5.00 fee is now paid Dr. Arch Tait from the Customs Department from Quarantine fees which fees are collectable from the ship owners and costs the Colony nothing.

On the same page will be found an increase for the Inspector of Lighthouses (Mr. Rogerson). Under the Bond and previous Governments this position ranked with the Deputy Minister of the Department or nearly so. And I may add, properly so. When it is considered that the direct superintendence of $218,500 of the $395,700 expenditure of the Department comes within the personal supervision of this official, the justification needs no further comment from me. The Minister of the Department will be able, no doubt, under question, to satisfy any doubts as to the position.

Another additional vote on Page 53 is the provision for two Herring Inspectors at $1,080. It is proposed at the next Session of the Legislature, probably, to pension one or two of the old Inspectors who have served an honourable term of service. These officials are too old for the strenuous winter work required in the outports to inspect the proper export of herring. Whatever blame has been attached to the export of herring, cannot be laid at their doors, but it was impossible to send aged and disabled men to the outports on this service. So that this increase will not be a permanent increase in the accepted sense of the word. Provision is made for a Telephone Exchange Clerk, who will attend when arrangements are finalized, to the communication requirements of the whole Customs Departmental Building, at $720.00. She has been there two years without vote.

On Page 55 will be seen an increase in the Protection Service of the Game and Inland Fisheries Board of $5,000. This is to pay for the service of Game Wardens, and is really not an increase in Estimates actually, as the expenditure last year on account of this service was $23,000.

Another amount on this page, under the heading of Protection, is the sum of $2,000, a new vote providing to pay the salaries of two Inspectors.

This new vote has been put in at the request of the Trade, who were complaining about the lack of proper statistics in connection with the fisheries. One Inspector is for the North the other for the South Coasts. Besides supplying statistical information to the Marine and Fisheries Department, they will see that the Fishery Rules and Regulations generally are faithfully carried out.

On the same page, under the heading of General, there appears a decrease of $885.00. This is made up of $845 for the Harbor Master's Boatman who has been dismissed. Capt. Winsor informs me that there is no need of a boatman; the other $40 was divided as a sort of perquisite for the Customs Boatman. This is also cut out of the Estimates.

Further down the same page is an increase of $30,000 on account of Bounty on Ships built and in course of rebuilding. It has been felt by the Government that some encouragement should be given our fishermen in the matter of rebuilding, repairing and re-classing of local ships. The ultimate idea of course is to benefit or aid the fisheries, as it is the set policy of the Government to do everything possible for the promotion of our staple industry.

Yet further down the same page is an apparent increase of $21,000.00 for dredging.

This is another of those cases in which the original vote taken last year was not at all sufficient for act-

ual requirements. The amount provided for dredging in the 1924-25 original estimates was the small sum of $4,000.00. But this vote had to be largely supplemented, as the actual expenditure for the Dredging service was $27,000.00. As I had very little time last year to prepare my own estimates, I had to take the estimates prepared by my predecessor holus bolus.

Under head of Contingencies of the Fisheries Department, we have made a reduction in estimates of $800.00. It is felt by the Government that $1,000.00 will fill the requirements of this service.

The Maintenance of the Blockhouse (see Page 56) is increased $70.00, and the Ammunition Account for the Noon Gun on the same page is gone up $120.00.

The following will show the increase and decrease as they occur in the Lighthouse Accounts of the Department:

Salaries Lighthouse Keeper, Coachman's Cove Increase $100.00 (new).

Salary Gull Island Light Keeper increased $100.00.

Salary Gull Island Light Keeper Assistant increased $50.00.

Salary Gull Island Alarm Keeper decreased $500.00.

Salary Long Island Courier (new appointment) increase $40.00.

Salary Sturgeon's Cove Head Keeper decreased $500.00.

Salary Bacalhao Assistant (new appointment) increase of $500.00.

Salary Steering Island and Green Island Keepers (new) increase $100.00 each.

Salary Cabot Island Light and Alarm Keeper decreased $350.00; but an Assistant appointed to help him at $750.00; net increase $400.00.

Salary Gull Island (B.B.) Keeper (new light) increase $120.00.

Salary Western Shag Keeper (new light) increase of $100.00.

Salary Gooseberry Islands (new light) increase of $100.00.

Salary Cape Bonavista Light Keeper is reduced $100.00; his Assistant is reduced $50.00, and the Cape Bonavista Alarm is cut out of the estimates at $1200.00, making a total cut in the Cape Bonavista vote of $1,350.00. Captain Winsor informs me that the present staff is sufficient to run the light and alarm at Bonavista safely and efficiently.

Salary Ballyhack Light Keeper (new light) increase $100.00. There is a small increase on this page for the Bacalhoe Courier of $2.50 from $97.50 to an even $100.00. And Carbonear Light Keeper is increased by the sum of $660.50; but this is really not an increase. It was proposed by the late Minister to put an acetyline light at Carbonear, for the operation of which $100.00 would be sufficient. But this was never done and the difference between $100 voted and the $760.50 really paid was charged to the maintenance vote for Lighthouses. We are now putting it in its proper place by charging it to salaries. As a matter of fact many of the increases in salaries as appearing in these Estimates, are not increased expenditures. It simply means they are being charged to the proper account by the present Government and not hidden away as has been the custom in the past.

Salary Point Verde Light and Alarm Keeper is reduced $500.00 and an Assistant is appointed at $500.00. Grand Bank is reduced $300.00 and St. Jacques is reduced $200.00.

Salary Burgeo-Flat Island is increased $40.00; and Woody Point is increased $20.00.

Salary Double Island and Assistant shows a decrease of $50.00. Domino shows an increase of $150.00; and Indian Tickle a decrease of $50.00.

Salary for Lightkeepers at Cape North, Pack's Harbor, Cut Throat, Winsor's Harbor, Manuel's Island,

Cape Harrigan and Ford's Harbor all show an increase of $150.00 each, making a total increase of $1,050.00.

Salary Lightkeeper for Coachman's Cove (new light) is increased by $120.00.

There is a fog alarm now at Fox Island instead of an acetyline light. The salary for the latter is only $80; while the former calls for a salary as provided, $1200. This is an increase of $1120.00.

The lights on this page have to be maintained; they are all new lights as per appointments in the Salaries list which we have just gone through and are as follows:

Steering Island increased estimate of $100.00.

Green Island increased estimate of $100.00.

Western Shag increased estimate of $100.00.

Gull Island, Cape Freels increased estimate of $180.00.

Gooseberry Island increased estimate of $100.00.

Chain Rock, St. John's (new appointment) $100.00.

Argentia Light and Alarm called in the Salaries List Fox Island Light and Alarm (new) $1,400.00.

Lighthouse Supplies shows a decrease of $1,000 which Mr. Rogerson thinks the service can stand.

As will be seen from the Re-capitulation on the bottom of Page 71, the total increase in Estimates on account of the Department of Marine and Fisheries will be $62,128.00.

AGRICULTURE AND MÌNES DEPARTMENT.

Turning to Page 75 and considering the salaries of the Department of Agriculture and Mines:

First therein is an evident increase in the salary of the Cashier and Accountant (Ryan). On looking up the Salaries List, I find that Ryan receives $1,600.00 instead of $1,500.00, so that the increase is $200.00 instead of $300.00. The history of the Department in this branch will explain the increase.

The 2nd Clerk (Mr. McLellan) has been years in the Department and from Mr. Walsh's recommendation, he has been increased to $1,750.00; and on the same recommendation Mr. Summers, a junior clerk advances $70.00 per annum. The Historiographer, Mr. H. F. Shortis, who is doing important work in his branch, is increased from $300.00 to $766.66.

Next, on the same page, are the Surveyors. In this list comes the Frst Surveyor and Assistant Deputy Minister who acts in the absence of the Deputy (Mr. William Noel). He is increased to $2500.00 in accordance with the position. Increase $500.00.

A 3rd and 4th Surveyor (new appointments) at $1,200.00 each are added. Increase $2,400.00.

And additional surveyors and Assistants account for another $1,000.00.

In addition to the above, on the same page appears what looks like a new appointment to the Government Laboratory, namely, a Messenger at $700.00 per annum. This is not a real increase, however, as he has been paid from the Contingencies of the Department last year and we merely put him where he should be,—in the Estimates. Increase $700.00.

On page 76 there is an increase for repair to Instruments of $500.00, but as this is deducted from sundry Contingencies, it does not affect the total.

There is an item of $6,000.00 added to Supplies for Surveyors in the field. Increase $6,000.00.

An Inspector is added under the Logging Act at a salary of $850.00. Increase $850.00.

The sum of $1,500.00 is added under the Head of Refunds so that all revenue shall go into the Exchequer account in gross instead of net. Increase $1,500.00.

And $15,000.00 is added for the Encouragement of Agriculture.

The next amount is really not an in-

Geo. to S. Capt.

crease as it has been paid from Contingencies in the past, viz: $400.00 for the St. John's Poultry Exhibition and $250.00 for the Bell Island Exhibition. From the above it will be seen that the net increase on account of Department of Agriculture and Mines is $29,-686.66.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

First there is a small increase of $10.00 to Miss Phelan, Stenographer, which makes her salary $900.00.

Next is what looks like an addition in itself, namely Secretary to the Deputy Minister. But this is not so as reference to the total increase in the Departmental salaries will show. It is proposed to transfer Mr. Manning to the position vacated by Mr. Kelly, who is on the Pension List. Manning will act as Paymaster and also supervise the Secretarial end of the Department. The salary of the new appointee is to be $900.00.

On the same page further down, is an increase of $600.00 to the Architect and Superintendent of Public Works, Mr. Wm. Churchill, which is really not an increase in fact. Mr. Churchill has had perquisities for drawing plans for some years past equal to the increase. If professional architects had been engaged, they would have been paid on a commission basis. This increase is intended to commute all future payments in this respect.

Vote No. 18 a little further on reduces the Messenger from $900.00 to $500.00. The present Messenger, (Mr. McGrath) is being promoted; he was compelled to give up inside work by reason of ill-health, but now that he is well again we are moving him up and appointing a young boy in his stead. This gives a decrease of $400.00.

On Page 82 it will be seen that the Contingencies of the Public Works Department are decreased by the sum of $1,200.00. The Head of the Department thinks that $8,000 will be sufficient to carry them along.

The Insurance on Public Buildings is increased by the sum of $681.91, caused by new insurance effected.

On this page also will be seen a small increase of $400.00 in the Fuel and Light votes for Government Buildings. The details are shown and the increase is petty.

The details of Keepers, Cleaning, Taxes of Government buildings are shown on pages 83 and 84. Cleaning Government House, $150; Night Watchman Departmental Building, 70.20; Telephone Exchange Operator, $720.00; a Night Watchman Museum Building, $30.00; and an Emergency Employment Account of $250.00 very nearly cover the total increase of $1,-126.97.

There is an increase in the several votes of the Court House, St. John's, of $165.75. This vote has been carefully considered and the increase is a small one considering the many items appearing thereon.

As against this increase there appears a decrease on account of Constulary Barracks of $1,400.00.

On the other hand the Fire Department shows an increase of $3,050.00 mainly caused by the necessary repairs to barracks of $2,400.00.

The salaries of the Penitentiary show an increase to the Deputy Superintendent (Mr. Theo. Thompson), of $156.00. He is a long service man; a good official.

The other votes (same page) show a decrease of $475.00.

The Outport Court Houses and Goals on this page show an increase of $1,620.00; and an account entitled Emergency Employment Account adds $150.00 to the increase. Increase $1,-770.00.

The Fuel, Light and general upkeep of the Colonial Building shows an increase of $200.00.

This brings us to the Institutions established for humanitarian and charitable purposes:

In the salaries of the Insane Asylum, there is an increase of $512,78, the bulk of which is incurred through Vote 258, the employment of nurses; which is responsible for $400.00.

The upkeep of the Institution, such as Fuel and Light, Repairs and Supplies is responsible for the balance of the increase $13,450.00. (See page 91).

General Hospital Salaries. Vote 275 and 276 are cut $132.50 each bringing the salaries from $1,032.50 to a straight $900.00. Decrease $264.00.

Vote 279 providing the salary of the Secretary to the Board of Governors is reduced $306.50 but vote 280 Mr. Rennie's Stenographer is increased $266.67.

Vote 281 for Superintendent of Nurses (Miss Myra Taylor) is reduced by the sum of $264.00 which brings the vote to the actual salary paid.

Vote 285 provides for a Matron at $720.00 per annum.

Vote 291 reduces the Cook's salary by $66.00.

Vote 292 increases the Assistant Cook by $66.00.

Vote 297 provides for an additional kitchenmaid at $204.75.

Between Votes 301 and 302 there is a reduction of $350.00 for additional help.

The Seamstress is cut out making a reduction of $360.00.

Vote 304 Housekeeper Nurses Home is increased by $120.00.

Vote 308 for first year probationers is cut from $7,500.00 to 5,500.00. Decrease $2,000.00.

In last year's Estimates the Maintenance Vote was lunched in one sum at $81,500.00.

This year the Maintenance account is subdivided into five accounts 319 to 323 totalling $74,300.00; a decrease of $7,200.00.

Vote 314 to 318 for Contingencies shows an increase over last year of $1,400.00.

Votes 324 to 326 for Fuel and Light shows a reduction of $950.00.

Votes 327, 329 for Repairs shows an increase of $3,000.00.

Vote 349 on this page provides for a barber for the Sanatorium at $120,-00 per annum.

Vote 355 provides for a Seamstress at $240.00.

Vote 357 provides for a Charwoman at $220.40.

Vote 360 to 365 for Contingencies of the Sanatorium shows a reduction of $30.00 as against last year; $550 now $520.

Vote 366 to 371 for Maintenance shows a decrease of $16,500.00.

Votes 372 and 373 for Fuel and Light of the Sanatorium shows an increase of $1,100 over last year's Estimates.

Votes 374, 376 shows an increase of $8,600 for repairs of the Sanatorium over last year.

The last item on this page Twillingate Hospital has been transferred to the Pepartment of Public Charities and is really not a decrease of $137.50 as it would seem.

Votes 377 and 378 taken together shew an increase for the Superintendent of the Poor Asylum of $125.00.

On the same page, Votes 381 to 385, provide for an additional attendant at the Poor Asylum at $760.00.

Vote 389 provides for two new Laundry attendants at $600.00 each. Increase $120.00.

The Maintenance of the Poor Asylum is covered by Votes 395 to 399. Increase over amount voted last year of $950.00.

The Fuel and Light Votes shew a decrease of $350.00 and Repairs votes shew an increase of $500.00 which I understand will be required during the coming year very badly.

The Attendant Physician at the Fever Hospital is increased from $243.75 to $780.00; an addition of $536.25.

Votes 413 provides for two additional nurses; two at $783.00 each Increase $1,566.00.

The Carpenter (last year voted at

$1200) is replaced by a General Purposes man at $958.50. Decrease $241.50.

There is an apparent increase in estimates on account of the Smallpox Hospital; but this is not really so. This $1773.00 Salary and Board allowance paid to Michael and Ida Winslow from Maintenance Vote Fever Hospital last year, are now being included in regular estimates under the head of Salaries.

Under the heading of Fever Hospital Contingencies, there is an increase over last year of $2,287.75. This will be readily understood when the small sum voted last year is considered, namely $200.00 which vote has been heavily overdrawn.

As against this increase, the Maintenance of the Fever Hospital shews a decrease of $3,200.00. See votes 431 to 435.

The Fuel and Light Votes (436-437) shew an increase of $1,050.00. The total increase for the Fever Hospital is little over $100.00.

On this page from Vote 441 to 450 there is an apparent decrease of $796.73 on account of Sudbury Salaries, but this is not so in fact as the officials referred to only received $6,-532 and not $7,328.73 as in the 1924-25 column.

The Contingencies vote of Sudbury Hospital is reduced $30.000. See votes 451 to 455.

The Maintenance Vote is increased $1320.00; from $7760.00 to $9080.00. See votes 456 to 460. This is necessary in order to meet actual expenses.

Fuel and Light Votes for Sudbury is increased $305.00. Short voted last year.

Votes 464, 465 and 466 for Repairs to Sudbury shew an increase over last year of $1350.00. This was also short voted last year.

Vote 467 at the foot of this Page is a new one and has never appeared in the Estimates before, viz: Emergency Employment Account giving an increase in estimates of $3,150.00.

On this page there is a decrease in the grant for Roads of $10,000.00. This was the Statutory grant, a cheque for which was issued in favour of the Road Commission annually.

On page 106 the New Harbor-Trinity Halfway House is cut out; a decrease of $25.00, but $250.00 is added for the general repairs and upkeep of halfway-houses, making a net increase of $225.00.

The Ferryman from Deadman's Bay to Ragged Harbor is increased $125.00; Ferryman from Shambler's Cove to Greenspond increased $100.00 a new ferry established at Sydney Cove, Round Harbor and Paul's Cove at $100.00.

Ferryman West Side to Trepassey is increased $100.00; Ferryman St. Vincent's to Peters River increased $100.00; Ferryman Marystown North Side to South, now two men at $540.-00; formerly 1 at $960.00. Increase $120.00. New Ferry across La Poile increase of $250.00.

At the bottom of page 100 there are four new ferries at $80.00 each making an increase of $320.00.

In the Motor Ferries, page 110, a new ferry is provided for Sweet Bay to Southern Bay calling at Charleston at a cost of $200.00.

Further down Page 110 a reduction on the Harbor Grace Ferry will be seen from $2400 to $2250. This means a decrease on Motor Ferries of $150.-00.

Under the heading of Telephone Booth Rentals there is a new vote of $150.00 for Telephones at Flat Rock, St. Philips, Maddock's Cove and Petty Harbor.

There is also a provision made for an emergency employment account of $200.00.

A reference to the summary of estimates Public Works Department on Page 112 will show that the net increase works out at $6,720.43.

POST AND TELEGRAPHS DEPARTMENT.

Coming now to the Posts and Telegraphs Department which starts Page 115, the following increases occur:—

Inspector's Typist, Rd. Ryall, a new appointment, increase of $420.00.

Private Secretary to Minister, a new appointment (Wm. O'Neill), increase of $1,500.00.

Stenographer (Anita Curtis) is increased $180.00 to level her salary with other typists in the service, i.e. $720.00.

Assistant to Chief Clerk (Wm. Coultas) gets an increase of $36.00 per annum, bringing his salary up to $720.00.

Clerk to Cashier (H. Wylie) an apparent increase of $500.00 but this is not the case, as although not voted he was paid this money last year. He is now being voted in the proper manner.

Expenditure Clerk (Miss Maud Thorne) receives an increase of $160.-00, bringing her salary to $1000.00. This is a particularly good official and well worth the salary.

The Assistant Expenditure Clerk (Miss Taylor) gets an increase of $60.00, bringing her salary to $720.00, the standard rate for stenographers.

The Messenger at $360.00 per annum is cut out as the post boys can attend to the work. Decrease $360.00.

On the same page under Vote 3 is the appointment of a Dead Letter Clerk (Mr. Samuel Ryall) at $1.000, new appointment.

Under the head of Store, Vote 6, the Store Keeper, Mr. Thomas Bambrick, is increased to $1440.00. This official has been years in the service, having served in all its branches. He has been put in charge of the Postal Stocks. This is an increase of $240.

In the Money Order Salaries, Vote 8, is what would appear a new appointment; but as a matter of fact this was omitted from the Estimates of last year. (The official's name is M. J. O'Mara). Increase $375.00.

There is a new appointment under Vote 9, Registration Branch, making an increase of $420.00. (The official's name is John Murphy) and his duties are opening mail bags and other general work in the Department.

Under Vote 10—Parcel Post—the foreign despatch clerk received an increase of $118.00. (The clerk's name is William Newbury).

Another addition to Head Parcel Posts is one clerk at $480.00, but this will reduce the additional help by an equal sum. (The official's name is Edward Hurley and his duties comprise making out notices re parcels for the city of St. John's).

Additional help in the Parcel Post Section is reduced by the sum of $720.00.

Vote 11 shows several increases and two decreases as follows:

One Assorter reduced from $912.00 to $664.00.

One Assorter increased from $846,-00 to $1035.00; another from $791.00 to $912.00.

One new Assorter at $846.00.

Chaffeur new Assorter reduced from $1200.00 to $846.00.

Two new clerks at $480.00 and $684.00 respectively and additional help (new vote), $200.00.

The vote for Stamp Clerks is reduced from $1824.00 to $1000.00.

The vote for Carriers is increased from $7944.00 to $8652.00.

The vote for Fireman under Head 12 shows an increase of $548.80. This increase is given because the Fireman has also taken over the Caretaker's duties. (Levi Froude is the official's name.)

Under the same Head 12, $234 is added for Charwomen and $960.00 for a new appointment of Orderly to police the Post Office. (T. Morrisey is the Orderly appointed).

Vote 14 Travelling Post Office. The Superintendent salary has been drop-

ped, and the total vote works out at a decrease of $60.00. (S. Bradbury is the official that was acting in the position of Superintendent.)

In Vote 15 (Sydney Branch) one of the Assorters Gaudin DuTot receives an increase of $120.00.

Vote 16 Outport Postmasters.

The net increase on this vote amounts to $2,032.54.

The motor Express Service $1,000.00 is cut now in the 1925-26 column, and the chauffeur now acting as an assorter.

The Contractors for Courier services are increased from $107,487.00 to $120,000.00. This is not an increase as it was short voted in recent years.

As against this the last three items at the foot of the page are cut out.

The Courier Service Vote 18 shows a net increase og $5,313.00.

Winter Postal Routes and Camps is increased $300.00. Stamping machines $300.00.

Rents is increased by $2,200.00 being short voted last year.

Canvas Bags and Seals is also increased by $2,000.00 being also short voted by last year Estimates.

Postal Contingencies is increased by $5,000.000 being short voted.

Bay of Islands Subsidy is increased by $8,750.00. This amount was not voted.

Fortune Bay District is increased by $5,000.00 which was not voted in last year's Estimates.

Port aux Basques and Placentia is also increased by $40,000.00 this was as in the case of Fortune Bay, not voted last year.

Notre Dame Bay is decreased by $7,000.00; Placentia Bay is decreased by $6,552.00; Battle Harbor and Humbermouth decreased by $7,000.00; Bonavista Bay by $7,000.00.

The Postal Recapitulation on page 148 shows a net increase over last year by $49.122.34.

We now proceed to the Telegraph end of the Posts and Telegraphs.

Assistant Deputy Superintendent (Acting) increased by $1750.00. This is not a new appointment as it was not voted last year.

The accountant also shows an increase of $1728.00 as in the case of the Deputy Superintendent this amount for the accountant position was not voted last year.

Vote 22 shows the Senior Operator's position not voted last year therefore it is not really an increase. (The official's name is M. Hackett) and his salary $1380.00.

The Typist, Miss M. LeGrow's salary has advanced from $540.00 to $600.00. This is made to place her on even footing with the rest of the typists in other departments.

As will also be seen the messengers vote has increased by $600.00.

Operators, Telegraph Outside shows a net increase of $8,260.10. The reason for this increase is that several offices which were opened a few years ago had not been voted.

The Repairers' vote has also increased $724.00. As in the case of several stations this is not really an increase but short voted in last year's Estimates.

Vote 28 Telephone. Salaries and upkeep outport telephones is increased by the sum of $10.000.00. This vote has always been short voted, and did not meet with the requirements of the department.

As will be seen by the Telegraph Recapitulation on this page the net increase for Telegraph Department is $21,229.90.

CUSTOMS DEPARTMENT.

Turning to page 169, it will be found the following changes in the Customs Department. They have been made with due deliberation and are consequent upon the enquiry held last year.

Provision has been made for an Inspecting Auditor whose business it will be to go into all Departments at

any moment without notice. He will have to see that everything is punctually checked, that the work of the Department from a routine standpoint is not being neglected as it has been in the past. It is a necessary appointment and I have selected Mr. F. C. Brien for the positicn at $3,000 per annum. This is an increase of $3,000.00.

Further down the page appears an increase to the Cashier, Mr. Smith, of $120.00, bringing his salary to $2,160.00.

The next item is an increase for the Manifest Clerk, Mr. White, from $1584 to $1800. Increase $216.00.

Owing to the state of the records in the Bonded Warehouse Department it became necessary to appoint a Warehousekeeper. Since the four months' bond (formerly accepted) has been replaced by the payment of cash, the work in this Department has increased so much that this appointment became imperative. This is an increase of $1,500.00.

The Clerk to the Landing Surveyor (Mr. S. Winsor) is advanced from $1344.00 to $1500.00, an increase of $156.00.

The third Statistical Clerk goes from $1248 to $1440 apparently, but really this is no increase as Captain Marshall has received the larger amount since his appointment.

The fourth Statistical Clerk is a new appointment at $1440.00. The work of this Department has been falling behind and I find it necessary to make this increase in order to have statistics ready promptly.

The Registrar of Shipping, (Mr. T. R. McGrath) is increased from $1,728 to $2,000 an increase of $272.00.

The Clerk and Surveyor of Shipping (Mr. Crocker) goes from $1150.50 to $1300.00 an increase of $149.50.

On this page it will be noticed that the Assistant Examining Officer, (Mr. Carter) and 2nd Assistant Examining Officer (Mr. Gibbs) are increased $52.00 each bringing the salary to $1600.00. Increase $104.00.

Further down is a new appointment, that of Outport Appraiser, (Mr. Jeans). This is an increase of $1,400.00.

Immediately afterward a 3rd Storekeeper (Mr. Gladney) at $850.00. Since taking over the Edens' Building as a Warehouse and Examining Store, this appointment was found necessary. Increase $850.00.

Under the Head of Gaugers, Tidewaiters and Boatmen, there is a decrease on this page of $2,505.00.

From pages 172 to 176 will be found the salaries paid to the Outport Collectors of Customs. Formerly there was a scheme to pay our Outport Collectors so much salary and supplement the salary with Commission on Duties with the provisio that the total payment was not to exceed a stated amount. I have abolished the payment to Collectors of this Commission on Duties and raised each salary commensurate with the amount lost by each Collector. This means an apparent increase of $17,647.25, but the vote in the Estimates for Percentage on Duties not now being needed, it pretty nearly balances out even. This commuting of percentage on duties has been carefully done so as not to deal unjustly with the Collectors concerned.

There are two increases to Tidewaiters in the Outports on Page 177. The two men at Bonavista have been slightly increased from $480.00 each to $550; and the Tidewaiter at Grand Falls goes from $824 to $1,100, making a total increase under this Head of $516.00.

On page 178 there is a decrease on account of percentage on Duties of $13,500.00 to which I have already referred. The balance left of $1,500.00 is for percentage on Light Dues.

A reference to Page 181 shows that the net increase in votes of the Customs Department works out at $10,456.75.

There is one increase only in connection with the Department of the Tax Assessor; the second clerk, Mr. Griffin goes from $720 to $1,000.00; an increase of $280.

On page 195 there is an increase of $104 for the Assistant Filing Clerk and Messenger (S. Crane).

On page 196 the Naval and Military Pensions have been reduced by the Board $34,000.00.

I may say that the only other thing I want to refer to is that the Government has decided to increase the Old Age Pension amount to the fishermen. One hundred and seven thousand was voted last year. After due consideration the Government decided to increase the Old Age Pension to one hundred and twenty thousand.

I don't intend, Mr. Speaker, to proceed any further with the estimates this afternoon, and ask now that the Committee arise.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that last year we asked the Government to include in the Estimates the Railway, and this year on the opening of the House, I intimated to the Prime Minister that this year we expected that the Government Railway (the Government institution being like any other institution), they should have the estimates put before the House of Assembly and voted upon. Now, in looking over the Estimates given us yesterday, these are not included. To-day I asked the Prime Minister for a list of all the employees of the Governemnt through the administration of the Railway Comimssion, and until such time as we can get that we are not fully prepared to proceed with the Estimates.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—I don't think, as far as I am aware, there has been any consideration of laying the Estimates of the Railway before the House, and I may say that if they have as much trouble to get them ready as I have had, we will be here until next August. However, I am merely speaking for myself.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions respecting the Dry Dock at St. John's.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, in reference to these resolutions I want to say that on this side of the House we are very much opposed to giving the Governor-in-Council authority to enter into a contract in reference to the Dock or any other public work. The House of Assembly is in session at the present time, and the object of the session is to carry on and ratify contracts and do the work of the colony. This House being in session, and likely to be in session for the next two or three weeks, I cannot understand why we are asked in these resolutions to give authority to the Governor-in-Council. Why should not the contract be made in this House, laid upon the Table of this House, and if accepted, ratified here? Now, during the last session which was the first session of this Government, the Prime Minister and his colleagues had a good deal to say about the Minute-of-Council Government. Reference was made to the Government of the past with which I was not connected, but they had a good deal to say about business

being done by Minute-of-Council, and they as good as told us here, on the floors of this Assembly, that they would not carry on the business in that way. They would do nothing by Minute-of-Council, but lay everything before the Legislature, and everything would be done and ratified in a right and proper manner. Now, between the last session and this session a good deal of money has been paid out on Executive authority, and a good deal of business has been done through the Governor-in-Council, and I say that the Prime Minister and the Government are very inconsistent when they come in here to this House of Assembly and talk about doing away with the Minute-of-Council, and then ask the House in session to give authority to the Governor-in-Council to make a contract with some party or parties with the intention of repairing the dock. Now they also ask in these resolutions to give the Governor-in-Council the permission to borrow money on the credit of the Colony for whatever sums that may be necessary for the reconstruction and repairing of the dock. Now if the Government is about to make this contract, which I suppose they are, as the Prime Minister in his speech spoke of the necessity of getting legislation through the House so as to be able to start work on the dock, as it has already been closed for some time, they should be in a position to tell us how much money they need for the repairs to the dock in addition to the $675,000 which they have set aside, less the sum of $30,000 which are intended for the construction of a concrete warehouse. Now I say that the Government should be in a position to tell us how much money they need and how much they are going to borrow, and they should have the contract finalized right here in the House of Assembly during this session. As to the estimates for the repairs of the dock, I cannot say very much. I am informed that the dock when it was built, cost $360,000. Including the excavation, building and completion, the cost was $360,000. And at the present time you come in here and ask us to consider estimates up to a million one hundred thousand dollars, to broaden the dock 20 feet and deepen it five feet and put a new gate and new abutments to the gate. I do not know what the reason is for the extra cost, but I presume that there must be some reason, and it must be a pretty correct one, as the two contracting companies made the same estimate. However, I contend that it is too much money to be paid out for the dock, and the proper thing to do is to put the dock in a sound condition so that there would be no chance of its caving in and then leave it as it is until such time as you can get some company to come here to take it over and work it and be able to accommodate steamers and give the same facilities that can be had in the neighbouring doubt the system of repairs at the dock is the same as it was years ago, and that syetem is one in which the that nothing would come in her unless cost of the repairs have been so high they were injured to such an extent that they could not get along to a farther port.

Now I understand that the system in vogue at the dock at the present time for ships that come in for repairs is that a number of men are put to work that when the repairs are completed a bill is given to the shipowners of so many men and so much material and then a percentage added on to that. There is no provision for the rushing the repairs or helping the ship in any way. Last year the Government asked us to pass a bill enabling them to borrow six million dollars and in that bill they had made

provision for fifty thousand dollars for the repairs to the dock. I presume that they must have had estimates from somebody to believe that that amount would be sufficient for the making of the dock safe or else they would not have included it in the bill before the legislature. Now we find that the cost of the repairs would be about one million and one hundred thousand dollars, and the contractors ask for seventy thousand dollars commission for the work which is twenty thousand dollars more than was voted for the repairs for the dock at the last session. Now I do not know with whom they are going to enter into the contract. From the speech made by the Hon. Member for Placentia yesterday I take it for granted that the Government intends to make the contract with the W. I. Bishop Company. We on this side of the House are satisfied to have the dock repaired and put in a safe condition but we do not like to give the authority to the Governor-in-Council to make the contract and we do not feel like giving the authority to the Governor-in-Council to borrow the money for the repairs to the dock without knowing what is the amount they are going to borrow. Now our geographical position is one which should entice a great deal of ships to come in here for docking but we cannot take ships under the present circumstances, because ships cannot very well get in through the Narrows and as I said before a very necessary thing for the Government to do is to see that the entrance of the Narrows is made safe for large ships to come into the port. There are some rocks that can be taken out and the port would be made safe for large steamers to enter and take shelter and when that is done and we have the facilities for fuel such as oil and coal and the repairs done as efficiently as they can be done in other places then we would have no trouble in getting somebody to take over the dock and put it in good shape by rebuilding it and take the responsibility of running it because no Government can run a thing like the dock whereas a private company would be able to earn a good interest on their capital. The Hon. Member for Placentia told us the other day that the dock had earned the last year $41,000. We have his word for it and we presume that he is correct but we would like to have this thing shown in full and all the charges deducted and laid before the House. Now the Government also had this plan in the proposition which was laid before us yesterday. They are talking about putting a granite walk around the dock. Now I cannot see why the Government wants to go to the expense of putting a granite walk around the dock. It is alright to have a crane to lift heavy articles such as propellors and rudders and such articles but why the Government should go to the expense of putting a granite road around the dock I cannot understand. It looks as without any consideration at all they are taking everything that is laid before them and this is not the thing to do in this country where we have such a heavy national debt and we cannot afford to spend any money on unnecessary things and I am sure that a granite roadway is unnecessary. Now I would like to ask the Prime Minister since the dock is closed for twelve months what are the men who are employed at the dock going to do and the men who are employed in the machine shops in addition to the men employed in the dock itself. In connection with the dock we should have a foundry. There should be a foundry where large castings can be made so that when a ship comes in for repairs they would not have to send to England to get what ever they want done and so result in a great loss of time for the ship and the dock. We will not be consulted by the Government with

reference to the contract when it is to be made. It is up to the Government to make what they think is the best contract but as I said before we will have to vote against these resolutions because we cannot give power to the Governor-in-Council to make a contract while the House is in session and we cannot vote for the raising of a sum of money unless we know about the amount of money which is to be required.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to delay the House but I want to make a few remarks about the position raised by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, not intentionally, I am sure. He states that the Opposition only votes against these resolutions on the grounds that they are brought in whilst the House is in session, and members opposite will not empower the Executive Government to enter into a contract which is not made public to the House. Now, in the first place the Exeecutive Government could enter into a contract and then come down to the House with it as a party measure and put the hon. gentleman in the very position which he is in now. In this case it is not what has been done at all. The Government has gone to work and put the whole matter before the House as to the condition of the dock. It has been made absolutely clear that the dock had to be closed. No person can attempt to take any other position with regard to it and it seems to be sheer schoolboyish to ask what is to be done with the men on the dock. Of course we cannot do anything at present with the men up at the dock unless we start them swimming around in the filled dock, but as soon as possible the Government proposes to put these men at the one thing that they know about, their own avocations at the work of the dock. The Government says that the dock demands immediate attention and places all the information possible on the table of the House.

It seems to me that if ever there was a case where the Government has gone out of its way to particularly tell the contract that is going to be made, and the arrangements that are going to be carried out, it is now. What ordinarily happens is that the private members of the House hear nothing of this sort of thing until the closed deal is brought down by the Executive Government. In this case the opposite procedure is taken. In other words every possible source of information has been tapped, and laid before the House, which is told that the only arrangement here that the Government can suggest is this idea of making some contract or agreement with the people with whom we have been dealing. Everyone knows that it must be done with one of these two people, because they are the only people who have been asked about it, whom we have had down here examining the dock; and the Government comes in and says that this firm has told us—"all right, we will do this dock, and our fee is seventy thousand dollars. It does not matter to us whether it is going to cost you half a million or a million—that is our fee for doing this work."

If that is the position, what contract can the Governor-in-Council enter into? Nothing but the contract which the members of this House know we have got to enter into. And what is the difference between going into the Executive Rooms to-night, drawing up a contract and signing it, and then coming in here and laying it on the table of the House, and saying—"here is our contract—pass that." What is the difference? I certainly do not see any. But the position would be different in this case—now the Governor-in-Council has come down, and is asking power to make arrangements,

after having laid all the information that it has, before this House. There can be no doubt in the mind of anyone as to what is going to happen. We have got to make the arrangement, and fix its terms quickly. There are two reasons for doing so; and one of these is one which the honourable gentleman himself brought forward in his speech, when he asked what we were going to do with the men who were employed at the dock now. This is surely a case where we are going to get a profitable public work done, that is going to afford a considerable amount of employment at a time when it is most required, first to those now on the dock and next to other city labour. I understand that the second proposition will give employment to between five and six hundred men for eight months. Surely, if we can get in St. John's today employment for from five to six hundred men for the next eight months giving a total earnings for these men of about half a million dollars—surely there never was a case in which a Government was more justified in saying that we ought to lose no time in doing that.

What benefit would result in the other case? Suppose we should go out and draw up a contract, and we can draw one up overnight, and then come down here and pass it. What is the difference. The great difference in this case is that under the power that is now sought, you probably will have ever so much better results than you could possible get under the ordinary procedure—the ordinary case of a contract which is brought down here, and which you are made swallow holus bolus. No such attitude has been taken by the Government in this case, though they might well do it.

As regards the point taken by the honourable gentleman as to the amount that the Government will need to meet this proposed work. It is true that certain amounts were voted, and set aside in last year's loan Bill for this dock; certain amounts were specified for this purpose. That amount will be used on this work, but there will be a balance over and above that amount—and the Governor in Council will have to go out and borrow the money to meet that balance. What is the difference between that and what was done last year, when the Governor in Council was empowered to go out and raise six million dollars

There is nothing unusual or remarkable in such a procedure. As a matter of fact it is the other way about. The only thing that is remarkable about this present proposition is that it is the first time in my recollection where a Government has come before the House in advance, and gives the members of the House all the knowledge that it has itself, so that every member of this House is possessed of as much knowledge about the condition of the dock as the Prime Minister himself. There is nothing that the Government has got in the way of information that the humblest member of this House is not aware of. Surely that is a departure that ought to be encouraged. That is a considerable improvement upon the idea of the Executive Government going and making a contract, and then coming in and saying to the House—"this is a Government contract, and as a Government contract it is a Government measure, and as it is a Government measure we are not at all concerned what view the Opposition takes of it." I think the honourable members opposite ought to be, and I am sure they are, satisfied that we have placed before them every possible information that we could possibly give them. They

have as much information, I know, as has ever been given me.

As regards the fitting of the dock for the class of trade that we are likely to get—I must say, as a lay man, that I was very much impressed with the attitude that was taken by the engineer who made the report for Bishop's on that very point. In his report he said that he recommended the second proposition, because, in his opinion, it covered the largest class of steamer that we are going to get to come here; and he supports that by giving actual instances of steamers which have been here. He practically says that it is the wisest course because, apart altogether from what we might do if we had two or three millions to spend upon putting a new dock there, if we wanted to, our harbour conditions are such, and the entrance to the harbour is such, and the swinging room in the harbour is such, that you cannot get larger steamers to come in here than those of the "Metagama" class. He says that if we build a dock of this extent, we are building a dock that will meet all traffic to the limit that we are ever going to get here in St. John's harbour. I admit that for those reasons, I think that that is a very safe line for us to take. I personally support the position that the Railway Commission has recommended to the Executive Government as regards the second plan, for these reasons.

It seems to me that to go and put the dock back in the same condition that it was before is not justifiable, in the light of the very great comment that we heard a little time ago, when certain steamers came here it was stated that we could not accommodate them, because of the size of the bottom of the dock. If we can increase the size of the dock by this extra amount, we will have a dock that will be able to handle a vessel of the largest size that is likely to come here, and I think, in view of that, the Country and the Government should avail of this opportunity to do it.

I think also that when we consider today the direct earnings that are made at the dock by the men working there, whose wages amount to a considerable sum in the course of a year; and when one considers the contribution that comes to the revenue from the importation of the material used at the dock, that we must all see that we are justified in spending one million dollars on the dock. The interest on that one million dollars, at five per cent, would amount in a year to fifty thousand dollars, but that fifty thousand dollars is more than made up by the direct revenue to the country from duties out of the earnings of those who have been employed at the dock.

As to the permanent result, I may say that the feature which has the strongest appeal to me, is that idea of the amount that will be expended on labour—that out of that million dollars nearly one half goes directly in wages to the workmen and the people here in St. John's; and surely there never was an occasion when a Government, and indeed an Opposition, would be more justified in availing of the chance of having this work done—surely there was never such an occasion to do that as we have today.

I do not think there will be any difference of opinion in this House that the expenditure of five hundred thousand dollars on labour in connection with the work at the dock will make a very considerable difference in the conditions of the working people in St. John's. The honourable gentleman asked what the Government was going to do with the men who are now employed at the dock? What can we do with them?

There is certainly one thing clear—we have no other dock to put them working on in Newfoundland; and whatever value that dock may be now, there is one thing which is absolutely certain—if the permanent employment of those men who are working at the dock now is dependent upon the conditions surrounding a dock, then that dock has got to be kept going if these people are going to find a means of living.

I think that the honourable member, upon reflection will see that this position he takes that we are returning to minute of council Government, is not quite worthy of a business man like himself. Surely he must see the way in which this matter might have been handled by the Government, if they were going by minute-of-council Government. They could have made that contract before ever this House knew anything about the dock, and with a majority in the house, they could have passed that contract regardless of the wishes of the Opposition. But that would not be the business way to do it. The Government is doing it in a business like way—the Government comes in and says—"here is all the information we can give you—here are the reports of the best men that we can get. There will be a certain amount of money required for this, and there will be certain terms to be agreed to, and we want you, gentlemen, in advance to send us off as a delegation to make the best deal we can." Is not that the business way of doing it?

I will go further and say that if it was possible for the Government always to go through this procedure before it entered into any contract like this, we could not have a better procedure; but it is not always possible. If it were possible to have such a procedure that the Government of the day, before it entered into any contract at all, could come down and give general ideas such as we have done today to the House—would not that be true Government? Is not that real Government? Is not that quite the opposite to the kind of minute of council Government that it is said we are reverting to. The minute of Council Government which caused comment was a very different thing—moneys were paid out—and when the money was spent the House was asked to vote it. This is different. We have here a valuable dock, and we have people here whom we can get to repair it. No money has gone, but we ask you now to give us that money. Of course, if you want to have no dock, it is perfectly simple for you to have none; but if you want to have the dock, and want to have work for the men you can now give us authority to go out and make the best deal we can to get that for you. That is just the opposite to what we call Minute of Council Government.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word in reply to the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. He asked why we estimated last year that repairs to the Dock would cost $50,000.-00 when it is calculated they will cost over a million dollars now. At that time we were not aware of the true condition of the gate, and the estimate of $50,000.00 was made because the bulges near the entrance appeared to be the only trouble, and we thought it could be remedied at that figure. Mr. Hickman has asked how the men employed on the dock are to be employed at present. The Boilermakers will have work for several months in constructing the new pontoon, which will be necessary under this new agreement. That will take care of them and the general laborer employed on the dock will still be engaged there, as the Honourable the Minister of Justice has already pointed out. I am painfully surprised to

hear Mr. Hickman say the Opposition have not been consulted as to the facts of the case. We have brought down every particular available, and suggested that the only way to ascertain the cost was to secure the services of engineers, find out the amount, and have the work done to the best advantage to us. I do not think that we could do better than enter into what I may term a gentlemen's agreement with W. I. Bishop & Co. I say Bishop & Co., because their tender is lower, and that's why we favor them. If Mr. Hickman had said that we should not have given the contract to Bishop & Co. without knowing more about them than their work at Main Dam, there might have been some reason in it, but to get up and say that there should be no contract before laying it before the House is not worth considering. We have put every available fact before the House, including the reports of the experts, and have told you that the necessary work would cost from a million to one million two hundred thousand dollars. We cannot enter into any definite contracts as the Company is not prepared to do so, and even if we did it would be no more advantageous than now. The present proposition is a good one, the estimates have been checked up by competent engineers as all the work will be as it goes along, and as long as we are dealing with such a reputable firm as Bishop & Co. we will get a good job.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few remarks in reply to the Honorable the Leader of the Opposition. He states that the building of the old dock cost $350,000.00, but he does not know if that is correct or not, as there is little information on that point. Since that dock was built wages alone have increased by 400 per cent., and does he think he could do the work now for the same price as the old one. He compares the dock which cost $350,000.00 40 years ago with one that is proposed to be rebuilt now at a cost of about one million dollars, and seems to forget that there are a lot of extras included in the new dock which were not included in the old dock. But if he would compare the costs he would find that we are getting a much cheaper bargain today. As I mentioned in my remarks yesterday, owing to our geographical position we should be getting a lot more work for the dock than we are at present. Mr. Hickman said we would get it if we could do the work economically enough. Now we lay the proposition before you, which under proper management it would possibly do repair work as cheaply as it can be done at Halifax or St. John, N.B.? We are building a dock practically of concrete, and with every facility for doing economical work. In the old dock there was wooden-sheet piling, but now we propose to have steel sheet piling. The Honourable Prime Minister has already told what will be done with the men who are at present engaged on the dock. Some of them will be engaged at the making of the caisson, others at work in connection with the railway, and still others in the general construction of the dock. Now it is absolutely necessary to deepen the dock to reach the proper foundation, and that is one of the strong points why the Dock should be deepened. We have to get down to a proper foundation, or we will have the old trouble from water all over again. This proposition has been handled in a business-like way, and I am surprised at the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition. I was formerly on the Opposition side of the House, but I used my own opinion, and if a good proposition were brought forward by the Government, I backed it. I think Mr. Hick-

man will find men sitting behind him who have the interests of the country at heart, and who will vote for a good proposition, even if it comes from this side. If they are convinced that Bishop's No. 2 proposal is the best one I do not believe they will oppose it as a unit simply because it is brought forward by the Government.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, I have listened with much interest to the addresses of the three Honorable Members on the other side, and absurd as my statements might appear to them, as theirs appear to me, I am not going to take back anything that I have said. The situation is that the Bill is on the table of the House and we see it for the first time. If it seems that we are merely obstructing, I am sorry, but we have had no time to see it. The Honourable the Minister of Justice says that by a minute of council the Government could have brought in an already signed contract. I agree they could have, but I fail to see the difference now. If you got a contract laid on the table of the House, let us see and discuss it, and then go ahead and sign it. I did not say we were in disagreement with the contract with Bishops or the other Company. The Honourable the Prime Minister seems to insinuate that I said something against Messrs. W. I. Bishop & Co., but I did not. What I said—and it was no reflection on Bishop & Co.—was that last year it was said the repairs would cost $50,000.00 while today it is proposed to pay a man $20,000 more to oversee the work than the whole cost was estimated at last year. That was all I said as to Bishop & Co. Why do we not get local men to build a cofferdam and find out what is needed Last year one was built in connection with the repairs to the Metagama, and it was done well and satisfactorily by our local men. That is what should be done now; get local men to build a coffer dam, dry out the dock and see what repairs are needed. But you simply hand us a lot of diagrams and how are we to know where the bulges or other damage is. A lot of this talk is only supposition.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Yesterday I mentioned that the damage had been found.

MR. BROWNE—What is to be the advantage of the cofferdam?

MR. HICKMAN—It is the first thing spoken of being built now in connection with the repairs.

MR. BROWNE—Yes, for the use in the execution of the repairs, not to find the damage.

MR. HICKMAN—But we are having the cofferdam now, and it could be built by local men. Now we do not say that we will not support the contract which may be laid on the table of the House, but our contention is that the contract should be here. I agree with the Honorable the Minister of Justice as to the necessity of providing labor, but a bargain to fix the dock is something different. I know that labor is required very urgently, but the making of a deal to ge this job done well, and as cheaply as possible, and the giving of employment are two things that should be considered differently.

Now the Honourable Mr. Sullivan seems to have become an engineer all of a sudden and he seems to have all the knowledge with reference to engineering and dock building and all the rest of it. I really do not know where he gets all this information he has given us. However, what I want to know is this: If the Governor-in-Council now have power to make a contract, as the Honourable Minister of Justice has said, what do the Government want authority from us for?

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—We thought

you would like to be consulted.

MR. HICKMAN—I would like to see the contract, if you wish to show it.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I know the contract I am going to tell the Government to sign is to go and get the work started on the dock as quickly as possible. That is the only contract—no contract at all. I know if the honourable Leader of the Opposition was Prime Minister tomorrow he would say "go ahead Bishop and start that work."

MR. HICKMAN—Perhaps the honourable gentleman is right and that the Resolutions are wrong, and perhaps you do not want it recorded here that we are in favor of the Resolutions.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Pardon me, we do. We want to get authority to go out and raise money to complete the work.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, as there has been considerable debate already in connection with the subject matter now before the Chair, I want to assure you that it is not my intention to unduly delay the Committee, but, as a member of the Railway Commission, I think it is right and proper that I should make a few observations. First of all I might say that I do not want to go so deeply into this matter as my colleague, Hon. Mr. Sullivan did, because I think that all any ordinary layman has to do is to read over the reports submitted by the contractors to enable him to come to a conclusion, and the conclusion I have come to is that the proposition submitted by Colonel Mitchell is THE proposition to accept. The next thing we got to get to is this. Is it going to be profitable to the country to accept and undertake either one of the propositions? Let us take the first proposition which runs into approximately five hundred thousand dollars. That puts the dock back to where it was forty years ago when it cost, according to the Leader of the Opposition, three hundred and sixty thousand dollars. Bishop asks for five hundred thousand dollars to repair it; but we must remember that the cost of living and the cost of everything else have increased considerably within the past forty years. Forty years ago workmen could be had for forty cents a day or eighty cents at the most; today he is paid forty cents per hour.

However, the question is, will we take the one million dollar proposition, the one that I am going to vote for and the one that I am prepared to stand or fall by, and the one that will likely be a commercial asset to Newfoundland; or on the other hand will we take the dock and close it up? Personally, I think that the repairing and reconditioning of the dry dock is absolutely essential for the proper operating of the railway, as it stands today, owing to the fact that the Government own several coastal boats, which have to be drydocked and attended to from time to time, and, if the dock was operated by private interests, monies would have to be paid out of railway earnings to meet the dock expenses incurred by the boats; whereas on the other hand, if we spend one million dollars on the dock and have it last for the next forty or fifty years, we will get something for the money expended. And I would go further than that and make an additional expenditure and put the machine shops in some kind of decent shape. Last year it was thought that fifty thousand dollars would repair the dock. I was one of the individuals who said at the time that this amount would scarcely buy enough nails to fix the dock. But, of course, at that time the Government were not properly informed of conditions up there; I had

been going around the dock for quite a few years and had made a study of how things were running up there. I contend that the dock taken over and managed efficiently and properly can pay. Today it is not being managed efficiently and I feel sure that the Government or the Railway Commission, will, within the next few months, make the necessary investigation and find out what has been going on in connection with the dry dock. Personally I think that neither the dock nor the railway are being operated as they should be operated. In my opinion we should have a real man in charge of the mechanical arrangements both of the railway and the dock. There are men going around in Newfoundland today, even in St. John's, who, in my judgment, would be first class officials to put in charge of the railway or dry dock mechanical department. If I was given a gift of the railway or dock tomorrow—and I believe the Government would gladly give them to me —the man I would put in charge of the mechanical end of the business would be Commander Howley, a gentleman, who, in my opinion, is second to none in Newfoundland in that line of business. Take the C. P. R. for example. There is a dry dock in New Brunswick today controlled by the C. P. R. It is eleven hundred feet long and will take the largest liners afloat. That dock is not paying and has not paid since it was built. It is in two divisions and will take two ships at a time. The C. P. R. have spent millions on that dock. But they have it there for their own convenience because New Brunswick is a terminal for their railway and the dock is used by them for their ships in winter time, so that they operate the dock in conjunction with their railway. I think that their money has been well spent; otherwise they would have to pay out considerable moneys from their exchequer by having to put their ships in other docks. Getting back to the question of our own dock again, I would be of the same opinion as the Honourable Minister of Justice, namely, to tell the contractor, whoever he may be, to go and start work on the dock right away, as the work is absolutely essential.

I have merely risen, Mr. Chairman, to give my support to the Resolutions now before the Chair and I feel sure that within the next forty eight hours, at least, something will be done to start this work at once, whoever gets the contract, whether it is Bishop or Crandell, but I think that by the look of the figures Bishop should get it. I do not think that Mr. Bishop needs any further credential as his reputation in Newfoundland or Canada is too well known.

MR. RANDELL—Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is any doubt in the minds of any members of this Assembly or in the minds of anybody in connection with the shipping business in this port as to the necessity of having some repairs done to and some money spent on the dry dock, or of having it closed up because it is pretty generally known it is not in safe condition to carry on the usual work there in regard to the repairing of ships. But, in my opinion, I cannot agree with the Government respecting the way they have gone about getting figures and given their report on the dock because I think that it should have been found out first of all what repairs were exactly needed there. You should probably have brought in somebody who is actually independent or get a report from people who are absolutely disinterested in any repair job. That is the way I look at it. Now I am not reflecting in any way on the gentlemen or the firms these gentlemen are connected with and who were brought

in here by the Government to report on the dock; but I think it would be better to have some one come here and report who have no connection whatever with anyone interested with repairs. I have not the least doubt but that there should be a lot of money spent to put the dock in good shape and the question arises, of course, as to what is the best scheme and the best proposition?

There is a difference of opinion, of course, as to what should be done to put the dock into repair. We have heard various suggestions made. We have these reports made by the two gentlemen invited to come here and look into the matter. Now the question arises as to whether it would be possible to put the dock from its present shape into first class condition, or whether it would be best to spend a lot of money on it. In my humble opinion, sir, the dock, as it is now in size, can take care possibly of almost all the shipping that we are going to get perhaps in this country or this port for the next fifteen or twenty years. Of course when the dock was built, it was built for a class of ships that does not exist today. I am referring more particularly to the cargo boats. As far as passenger liners are concerned, we have had very few of those in the past. Not, I think, because there are so few ships getting into trouble, but because there are so few of those large ships, the proportion of big liners that need repairs are so small that I don't think that the Government will be justified in giving them any consideration. We had two ships apparently since the dock has been built, come into this port that we could not dock. Those were, I understood, the Grampian and the Metagama. Is it right to consider that class of ship, and spend a million dollars in the hope of getting ships like that to come in here? I have been very much interested in the two reports as a matter of fact just put forward by the two gentlemen investigating the conditions of things at the dock, and I just want to say that I feel that Mr. Mitchell has not had all his facts and figures that have been supplied to him correctly given or else he has made some mistake with regard to the draughts that he has given. He tells us about the class of ship that has a greater draft than can be handled by the dock at its present size, and he speaks of the "Empress of Scotland" and the "Empress of France" and other ships of that class as being so large that we cannot very well handle them. Well he is in error with regard to the draft because he has given the Corona here a draft of forty feet and the "Empress of Scotland" a draft of fifty feet two inches. Well, I think that may have been a typographical error, but I don't see how that could be because the printer of this report would not have sufficient knowledge of ships and shipping to make a typographical error of that sort. Now, here we have the "Empress of Scotland" with a draft of fifty feet, two inches, that is ridiculous, because although I do not know the dimensions of the ark there never has been a ship built that sails on the five oceans that had a draft of fifty feet two inches. The Mauretania has a draft of thirty six feet three inches and that ship is one of the largest afloat. When she is light, as far as draft is concerned, she could be docked on our dock as it is today.

MR. BROWNE—That is as regards draft.

MR. RANDELL—Yes, draft, not width. The beam as far as I can see is correct, but the draft of that ship here, that is given in this report, I think it must certainly be depth and not draft. The gentleman referred to the four ships that came

here could not be docked on account of the draft and beam. The Grampian, the Metagama and the Clara Camus. As far as the draft of the Metagama went she could have been dock. She could not owing to her width. The Seapool could have been especially docked and discharged in this port. We had no facilities for discharging her cargo of grain. That also applies to the Clara Camus. But I am not referring to those ships in particular because in my opinion it is not absolutely necessary to have that dock deepened. And the deepening of the dock is going to mean a large proportion of the expenses of repairs. It might be claimed by some people that it would not be worth while repairing the dock without making a thorough job of it and making it fit for shipping. Of course there is a difference in the class of ships being built within the last 40 years. And I think that if the dock could take care of anything coming in during forty years that it can take care of what we are likely to get to-day.

Then again we have to consider our narrow entrance getting into this port. As has been stated it is very difficult for ships of a size say of 20 thousand tons to manoeuvre into this port. Especially if they are deeply laden and want to get to the bottom of the harbour where the docks are. That being so I cannot see why we should make provision for any ships that are larger than those we have already handled. Of course the dock, I believe, should be wider. That is if we are going to make a good job of it. But it is questionable whether we will get the work that will justify that. If you deepen and widen the dock it is going to be very much more expensive. It is going to be very much more expensive in handling and putting the ships on dock. We have a fleet of ships of our own that are more or less small. And to put three or four schooners on that dock after it has been increased in size and start to pump it out you are going to be up against expenses anywhere between 30 p.c. and 50 p.c. more; such a large volume of water will have to be pumped out.

MR. BROWNE—Would you explain in what way, please?

MR. RANDELL—If you are going to widen it and deepen it you are going to have 50 p.c. more water. And undoubtedly you are going to be up against much greater expense than ever you had before. And also if you are going to spend a million dollars you will have to pay the interest on that million dollars. That will be about $50,000 a year I suppose. The question arises as to what is the proper repairs to give to the dock. I believe that that dock can be repaired for $100,000 and last for 10 to 15 years as it is now. That is at its present size. Of course, that is the point that we have got to consider. Is it going to be a commercial asset to this country if we spend a million dollars on it? Are you going to get commensurate returns? That is the point to consider. Under the Government management I am afraid not. Now I don't propose to say much about the repairs and the construction work because I know very little about it. But I think that the bunkering and cargo handling facilities should be left to private enterprise. There are any amount of big docks where there are no bunkering and cargo handling facilities. Therefore in my opinion, sir, it is a question whether it is going to be economical.

There is an opinion amongst the greater number of shipping people here that the dock should be repaired at its present size and made efficient, and then that will be able to take all the ships that you are going to have here during the next fifteen or twenty years. That ex-

pense it is thought would amount to $100,000. The opinion may be right or it may not be so. If that dock in the year 1924 had an earning of $41,000.00 I do not see how you are going to make much money out of it by spending that large amount of money on it. It is a public utility of course. It would be just as much a public utility if it were rebuilt in its present shape. As I said before if you have money to spend, then by all means go ahead and do it, but when it is the case of borrowing the money for the reconstruction I think that you should look at the economical side of the matter before anything else. I presume that the Government will go ahead as they have outlined in their plans and if they intend to go ahead they are going to have the dock deepened, and then by all means do the job well. They should put concrete wherever possible, because concrete is a substance that will last as long as anything that can be put there. So I think that the Government would be well advised to reconsider the matter and leave the dock as it is. There is one thing that I should like somebody to tell me about. I do not know much about construction jobs. I should like to know what is the life of steel sheet piling when it is placed in a position where it is sometimes wet and sometimes dry and would be likely to rust. If the Government intends to make a good job of the dock I think that they should consider the matter of putting concrete where it is intended to put this steel piling. I should like to put myself on record as saying that in my opinion the dock should be repaired as it is at its present size and shape. But if the Government intends to go ahead and spend a lot of money on it, then by all means do the job well.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, it is certainly with a feeling of surprise that we read the report of the Railway Commission on the dock as submitted by Col. Mitchell. There is an erroneous statement with regard to the draft of steamers. If the mistake was made in connection with one steamer we would say that it was a typographical error, but evidently as the learned Captain Randell has pointed out, there was a mistake in preparing the draft of all the steamers. Now this is one part of the report of Colonel Mitchell that can be intelligently discussed by this House because we happen to have as a member of the House a man who understands all about the draft of steamers. If we had some engineers here it might be that this whole report would be torn to pieces. And since we know that there have been mistakes made by the learned engineer, no one can criticise us if we are inclined to be suspicious, of the correctness of the other statements which are contained in this document, but as we are ignorant in that respect we have to accept the report as being a fair estimate of the condition and the cost of the repairs to the dock. If the Government had made up their minds to be consistent and live up to their statements which they made with regard to Government by Executive Authority they would be prepared at this time to lay the contract on the table of the House. Last July or August resolutions were introduced to raise a loan on the credit of the colony for certain public purposes and an amount of fifty thousand dollars was voted for the repairs to the dock, and therefore we cannot plead ignorance of the condition of the dock when that money was required. We know that they would not take authority to enter into any contract without submitting the contract to the Legislature. It is against their principles. It is something that would

not be considered by them. It is disgraceful for the Executive Government to enter into a contract without having it tabled in the Assembly. Is it possible that the Government have realised that the statements they made about certain actions of past Governments are not correct.

Have they realised that the Government cannot be carried on without executive government assuming some authority or responsibility. It is another instance of the Government acting contrary to their own pronouncements. The learned Minister of Justice said that in the past money had been spent and then the Government had to come down to the Legislature and get the money voted. Well, now I understand that money has been paid out for relief to the extent of about ten thousand dollars a week and where are they getting the money? I am sure that it was never voted in this House. And this Government will have to be indemnified for this expenditure that was not anticipated last year. The necessity for spending money on relief, by executive authority is nothing in comparison with what obtained in this country during the years 1922 and 1923. We were held up to ridicule because we spent money for the relief of the distressed and then asked the Government to indemnify us for it. The conditions re employment in this country are not as good as might be desired. The proposed employment at the dock and the railway will relieve the situation in this section of the country to some extent, I venture to state that there are thousands of people in this country living from hand to mouth, last year they managed to earn enough to keep them through the winter months. Now they have left their homes in their hundreds and have gone to the Humber areas only to find that they cannot get employment there and have to return home again. That applies in Trinity District where dozens of men, as I have been advised by the relieving officers, have borrowed the money to pay their passages to the Humber. They wandered around Corner Brook for a fortnight in search of employment and then they had to return to their homes and what will be done for them I do not know.

That is the condition that is going to exist from now until the fishing season open. There may be reason for finding employment for our people at the present time in this country, but here we are asked to give the Governor in Council authority to borrow an unlimited amount of money, which in my opinion is altogether unnecessary.

One thing we are determined to do, and that is to give you that authority by statute. We have not sufficient confidence in the present Government with regard to the spending of monies or the borrowing of monies to authorise them by an Act of the Legislature to borrow what monies they like. The short regime of your Government has not created confidence in our minds or in the minds of the electors in general as to your method of spending monies. If we had, or if we knew that the country had confidence in you, of course there might be some excuse for this legislature to give you authority to do as you please. Of course you can do as you please, but do not ask the Legislature to pass a special act for you. When you come in with such a proposition, do not think that you can expect members of the Opposition to fall in with your views in that matter. It is nearly eight or nine months since we gave the Government authority to borrow money to do certain public works, of which amount there was fifty thousand dollars voted for repairs to the dock, and now, when the work should be going ahead, the first thing that

should be laid on the table of the House when it opened was a contract for repairing the dock; but now when the Government makes up its mind to do something, it has the printers up over night getting a bill ready, and they cannot sleep until that bill goes through all its stages in the House—and if that is not rushing legislation, I do not know what is.

Mr. Chairman, the loan resolutions of last year provided that the Governor in Council should have power tc apply . . . Reads . . . . . and to any other essential purpose. Of the amount of six million dollars raised by that loan, one million six hundred thousand dollars to meet the deficit. I presume all that was spent?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE – One hundred thousand dollars more, I expect.

MR. HALFYARD—Then for rolling stock for the railway and a new steamer for the Gulf of St. Lawrence —four hundred thousand dollars. I suppose the steamer will cost all that four hundred thousand. There will be no balance left of that. It cost more, I understand. Rolling stock for the railway—three hundred and fifty thousand dollars. I do not know whether you will supply all the rolling stock required for that, or not. The estimated cost of re-railing the railway is eight hundred thousand dollars. I suppose if you go ahead with these undertakings in connection with the railway, and the steamer that is being built now, that vote will be well spent. I suppose the only vote where there will be a drop balance, or money not expended, will be the two million dollars for roads. Now you can take authority to use the whole or part of this two million dollars for any other public purpose. I would suggest that you would take two hundred and fifty thousand dollars for roads this year, and apply the balance to the Railway, and to repairs to the dock. There is no necessity at the present time of getting a loan. I do not think that this country at present can afford to assume the burden of the additional interest. But you have that two million dollars for roads. You could not spend that two million dollars on roads this year. When I say you could not I feel quite sure that you will not spend that amount. So that you will not abolish your road policy altogether, take a quarter of a million dollars, and then you have $1,750,000.-00 left for other necessary purposes —one of which is the dock, and then there will be no necessity of borrowing any more money.

You will have the support of the country if you use that money on what is considered a public utility. We must have a dock for ourselves. We must have a dock to carry on the the work in Newfoundland, outside of the tramp steamers that happen to come in here for repairs, and we have to repair the dock. Whether the dock is under government ownership or not, I presume that it will be of greater value when we can make some arrangement with a private concern to operate the railway and the dock, if we spend about five hundred thousand dollars on it now. It will be an asset, whereas now it would only be a liability to anyone who would take it over.

We cannot afford financially to spend any money, and it is a pity that some arrangements cannot be made whereby the Government will get clear of the dock and the railway. I do not know what the Government has been doing in this respect. It was certainly considered by the outgoing Government, and every possible attempt was made to get some private concern to take over the railway; and the dock is now regarded as a necessary adjunct of the

railway, since the whole transportation system by railway and steamers is under one management. I do not say that the Government cannot successfully carry on just as well as any private concern. A good many people think that Governments cannot do that. That is only a matter of opinion, but I think the majority in this country, legislators and others, have the idea that it would be better for the railway to be clear of Government control, even if we had to give larger subsidies than we do at the present time. However, that is only a matter of opinion. These last couple of years I cannot see where a private concern would have done any better under Newfoundland conditions in running the railway and steamship services than has been done by the Government.

Our debate on these Resolutions will not do any harm. It is a pity that we did not take more time to express our opinions. We are pleased to hear from the members of the Government, who have been, some of them, in a position, to have more knowledge of the actual conditions that obtain with regard to the dock, and who have been in touch, no doubt, with those who have given their reports; and, without prejudice, I am sure that we were all glad to hear the remarks of Col. Sullivan yesterday evening, regarding these reports, which were given in a lucid and clear manner. The others who have spoken have interested us, and have also given us some information; and I do not think that we should consider that the time was wasted in considering these resolutions.

I am sure the Government cannot reasonably expect the opposition to take any other attitude than that they have taken in the debate on these resolutions.

One point I would make is this— that there is no need of asking this House to authorise the Governor in Council to make a contract; and with regard to authorising another loan I do not think that the Government should take from this House that authority. I really think the Government should make up its mind not to borrow any more money than they are authorised to borrow at present. Of the six million dollars authorised to be borrowed only four millions have been raised, and so they still have authority to borrow two million more, so there is really no necessity for them looking for authority to borrow more.

For these reasons I cannot support these resolutions. I support the principle of repairing the dock, and doing the best possible we can.

Mr. Chairman, it is now 6.30 I shall leave the chair until 8 o'clock.

The House adjourned until 8 of the clock.

MR. HALFYARD — Mr. Chairman, before recess I was speaking to the Resolutions before the Chair. I may say, the Dry Dock is a public utility, and as we are a seafaring people; depending on the sea for the major portions of our revenue, the fisheries being our main industry, and so many of our people engaging in them, we must have vessels propelled by sail or steam, therefore, we must have some place where those vessels can be docked for repairs. Arguing from that viewpoint, we would all conclude that there is nothing else for us to do but make provision for the repairing or rebuilding of the dock, which we now have. But the plan of proceedure is what should interest us at present. Estimates have been tabled by those who are supposed to know what they are talking about, and without any engineering experience I am inclined to think that the dock is unsafe for further operations. It behoves us now to consider ways and means to put the dock in a condition to care for the work that we have to get

done. We do not want to go outside St. John's or Newfoundland to get our vessels docked for repairs. It should not be necessary to have any lengthy debate or any controversy that would in any way reflect on our good judgment in the matter. There is no occasion for it, but in the meantime we have to consider our financial ability as a House and country. It has been stated in the reports submitted that the dock can be re-conditioned for about half a million, and put in practically the same condition as when first completed, thirty or forty years ago. No doubt a dock re-conditioned in that way would suit all requirements for the vessels of Newfoundland, but we are going outside in this project to try and get people in here, and when tramp steamers and others become lame off our shores, we should have a dock of sufficient size to repair them. So I think it is wise on our part to consider something that will meet our own requirements. Captain Randell, who has a good knowledge of shipping, expressed himself this afternoon as being of the opinion that possibly a dock of the size of the present one would meet our requirements for ninety per cent. of the ships that will come here for the next ten or fifteen years. Now whether it is wise to only spend four or five hundred thousand on the dock is for the Government to decide. As I have already remarked, we have to consider our financial abilty before undertaking large expenditures of moneys, although certain utilities are very necessary, but, as I said this afternoon, we are not altogether out of the woods financially. Still we find in the Estimates submitted today that the Government thinks they can find anywhere from four hundred to five hundred thousand dollars more. The Estimates show an increase of $438,000 in expenditure. It has been said that some of that money had already been spent. That may apply to some extent, but there has been large expenditures outside of that and probably we shall have something more to say about that when the Budget is presented. It is proposed to reduce the Bank tax from which we will lose from fifty to seventy thousand dollars. The Income Tax, from which was derived revenue to the extent of $300,000 is to be cut out, and then we have repeal of duties on different things which will mean perhaps another loss of $300,000, so that I think that another million dollars more or less will have to be found to keep the country on an even keel and balance our accounts at the end of the next fiscal year. It is proposed in these Resolutions to give the Governor-in-Council power to enter into a contract for the repairing of the dock, etc.

Mr. Chairman, we are asked to authorise the Government to enter into a contract and we would like to know the nature of that contract. What the contract really means, and I hope the Government will be in a position before the Committee rises to give us all information on that point. I don't know whether the Government has been asked to pay Mr. Crandell and Bishop & Co. for giving the reports as to the dock, and what it will cost to put the dock into condition under this scheme, but my opinion is that the Government Engineer, Mr. Hall, and the Railway Engineer, Mr. Joyce, should give us sufficient information for us to decide whether the dock should be repaired or not, and they could have told you just what is required and after that then the Government could have interested themselves in getting a competent engineer to come here and do the work. Mr. Joyce is competent now to take up the figures and give an opinion as to what the different items will cost. Therefore, he must know something about the

cost of engineering in connection with the dock. The question was asked why we did not get him to survey the dock and get a report.

(Reads from paper) Prime Minister said, etc.

Well, if the Government really intend to ask for tenders for the building of the dock, I think it would have been worth while to get the third party. The Government decided not to ask for tenders, but to makee an agreement with someone to superintend and build the dock, and they would find the money.

Mr. Chairman, as I stated when I rose to speak, I did not intend to speak very long, but I would like for the Prime Minister to give us all the information we can in connection with the nature of the contract. What returns are we going to get for that seventy thousand, and again I would exhort the Government before the Committee rises to delete Section 3. There is no object of my taking up the time of the House any further. It should be a national question, and I hope you will consider the subject, and the spending of any further moneys from that viewpoint. Certainly you will have to consider our financial conditions, and I feel quite sure that the country will be rudely shocked if they hear that the Government intends to borrow any more money. The Prime Minister smiles at that remark, why, I do not know. It is said that "Nero fiddled while Rome burnt." It is something the country did not expect from this Government, therefore, they will be disappointed, and rudely shocked, and all their expectations will have gone to the four winds. We cannot afford to be increasing our debt. The incomes of our people are not such that they can afford to pay any more taxes. We are labouring under a load now that we cannot properly carry, and if you borrow money you are increasing that load. It is not temporary, it is constant. It will be with us for all time. It is not like spending fifty thousand dollars or a hundred thousand dollars this year, and there it ends, it will go on from year to year, and if we can treat the matter of finances and the matter of public debt as lightly as that, you are false to your charge. When anyone refers to the national debt it causes the Prime Minister to smile, silly smiles, that is not good enough.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Most of us like to see the comedian playing "tragedy."

MR. HALFYARD—It is a "tragedy" to hear you try to sidetrack the issue. It is a tragedy in this way that the majority of the laborers of this country find it so difficult to provide for themselves and those dependent upon them, that if they could get away from the country they would go. It is very unfortunate for them that conditions are bad in this country, and in a great many countries they are no better, they cannot help themselves. Therefore as Legislators, we should not try to burden those people more. I do not want to be a financier to find out what we are heading for. You cannot reduce taxation while the expenditure is being increased. You cannot do it and continue solvent. I am told that the first proposition in connection with the loan resolutions of last year was for $15,000,000.00; later it was decided to bring in Loan Resolutions for $6,000,000.00. This shows that they do not want the money. They could do without it. Only the other day the Government borrowed four millions. Now they are having authority to go to the money markets and get two million dollars, and they only want one million dollars to repair the dock, in fact they only want $375,000.00, and, therefore, it is bordering on "tragedy" when you have the Government ask in this House to give them authority to borrow a fur-

ther million, and they don't know what to do with it.

That is the chief objection I have to these Resolutions, and I trust that the Government, before these Resolutions are committed to a Bill, will see their way clear to delete that clause. As I stated before recess, you have authority to borrow six million dollars. You have borrowed four and you can go and borrow two millions more. If you have to spend one million dollars on the dock, you certainly can take some of that unspent money provided in the Resolutions of last year. I feel sure that the Government will consider this and delete clause three of the present Resolutions altogether. With regard to clause one again. I would not be a party to voting to the Executive Government any more power than they can already assume. Now I did not really have time to study the speeches of the Prime Minister and Hon. Mr. Sullivan; but one thing I notice is that the Crandell Company asks for a commission of fifteen per cent., while the Bishop Company asks for $70,000 whether the cost of operations amounted to nine hundred thousand dollars or a million dollars. I would like to know what service will the Bishop Company give for that $70,000.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—They will bring in their own machinery to do the work and they will employ local labour.

MR. HALFYARD—But the Government would assume all liability in connection with the transportation of all machinery in the country no doubt. But what service will the Government really get for this $70,000. If I understand the position correctly the idea is to make some kind of an agreement with the engineering concern to supervise or oversee the expenditure of one million dollars for the building of the dock. Then again what is the nature of the contract that you propose to make. That is another question. If these people would take a contract to build a dock according to certain specifications laid down, and when it is built and surveyed and passed upon they would be given a cheque for one million dollars plus $70,000. Is that the position? If that is the intention of the Government there is no need of a contract, but simply to write out an agreement. And then we were told that no projects should be started which can be regarded as liabilities to the colony without the ratification of the Legislature. Where the consistency is I do not know. Mr. Chairman, I am anxious to get a reply to these questions and to get further information as to what the Government really intends to do, and I trust that the Prime Minister or the Hon. Member for Placentia and St. Mary's will afford us the courtesy of replying and telling us what the Government really intends to do about this contract.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the question of the hon. member as to what service will be given and what is the nature of the contract that will be given, I would like to say that the nature of the contract and the service are similar to the same kind of contract that was given by the Armstrong Whitworth Company for the building of the Main Dam on the West Coast. We understand that the case was simply the cost price plus commission with the guarantee that the commission would not exceed a certain amount. It is exactly the same proposition with us.. They are not asking for ten per cent. If the cost of the work were one million they would not get a hundred thousand dollars, but seventy thousand dollars, and if the cost of the work is seven hundred thousand dollars they are still getting seventy thousand dollars. For that they are supervising

the work and are giving their services for what they think should be paid. Mr. Crandell's proposition was for 15 p.c. commission of the work that they did. In this work they will supply their best men and see that the work is done to the best of their ability. They will probably bring down their own machinery and charge us hire for it. The Hon. Member has suggested that Mr. Harvey or Mr. Joyce could have drawn up as good a proposition as this. Both Mr. Joyce and Mr. Harvey said that they were incapable of deciding as to what should be done. They said that they were not sufficiently experts on the work and advised that somebody else should be called in to give an opinion. We got Mr. Crandell, a very expert engineer, down to give us his opinion. Then we got Mr. Mitchell's opinion, and we compared the two and got Mr. Bishop along to confirm the position, and Mr. Bishop did this, and I think that we have got all the information that we could possibly have got from an engineering staff. As we go along it may be advisable for us to get a contract price per square foot of concrete work or at any rate we will have all the figures checked up by our own men. We will follow the work and all the expenses in connection with it. We would have the work checked up even if we did not think that Mr. Bishop and his associates were giving us a square deal. We are satisfied, however, that they have a great reputation to keep up, and they cannot do otherwise than give us the best service that can be given for the undertaking and their commission will not suffer if they give the best and quickest possible job that can be done. The only other point that has been suggested by the Hon. Member is the deletion of section three. The object of this section is the borrowing of the money. It is only an ordinary rule of thumb to see that if you have $500,000 put aside for a coal shed and another $100,000 left after building the shed, it can be seen that there is $600,000 for the enterprize, and if the expenditure that is involved is a million dollars then it can be easily seen that you are $400,000 short. A child could see that. And if we are $400,000 short, then we want the power to borrow it. It is most pathetic to see the tears almost running down the hon. member's face at the idea of borrowing $400,000. He was a member of a Government that borrowed fifteen million dollars in three years and have not one single thing to show for it. Fifteen million dollars borrowed and nothing to show for it. We have got the permission to borrow six million dollars, and we show the country that the money is to be used in the pursuit of a regular policy. In other words we are going to give the country something to show for the expenditure. We are going to spend two million dollars on the roads and we are going to see that the money is well spent. Again we are going to spend money on the railway. And we are going to spend money on the dock, and everything is properly earmarked and is of a onstructive nature, and so I say it is pathetic to see the attitude of the Member for Trinity. He could show no returns for the fifteen million dollars his Government borrowed, and now he sheds tears over the borrowing of four hundred thousand dollars for the completion of a job costing a million dollars, and for which we have only six hundred thousand dollars on hand. Now, gentlemen ,if we considered that we could construct this dock satisfactorily for $500,000 we would do it. We do not want to waste $500,000. We want to see a dock that will be a credit and a lasting credit to the country and be able to handle the ships that may come in here, and then I think we will be able if we wish to get

some good company like Vickers to take the dock and run it. We do not necessarily want to run the dock or the railway. We cannot sell a dock when we have not got a dock. You might as well talk of selling the St. John's street railway. We were told that we could have the St. John's street railway for nothing if we would run it. The company that has it today can manage to run it because they have the electric light with it, and they can make up what they lose on the railway with what they make on the electric light. It is the same with the dock. We could not sell a dock unless we had a workable dock. It is absolutely valueless as it is today. We could close the dock up for twelve months and fix it up for five hundred thousand dollars, but we have the opinion of the experts that if we spend the million, do the work properly, we would be working in the best interest of the country. The Opposition have not offered any suggestion that is constructive. They simply tell us that the dock should have a new gate and they have not made one constructive suggestion. Even Captain Randell from whom I did expect some good proposition in connection with this had nothing to say except that we should not deepen the dock, and that we should widen it, and from what he said I could not understand what his policy in connection with the dock is at all. The Government has given every consideration to this matter. They are not experts but they are common sense men, and they have followed the best advice that can be got, and that is the very best thing that common sense men can do, to get the best advice and follow it. That is the policy of the Government tonight and that is the reason that we want to get to work on the dock as quickly as possible. Now the general plan which has been sketched out by Mr. Bishop has been considered very necessary, and when completed satisfactorily the dock will be a credit to Newfoundland. In our geographical position it is almost essential that Newfoundland should have a dock that can be used by ships in distress from the Atlantic. We are constantly getting distressed ships along the coast, but they never come in here if they can get elsewhere. If we had a new dock properly run with the suitable machinery, and the work done reasonably cheap, I believe that we would get twice as many vessels to come into St. John's as we do at the present time.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I am very much surprised at the reply of the Honourable the Prime Minister. He said that the services we would get for seventy thousand dollars would be that these people would superintend the construction of the dock. At the same time I presume they would be paid a salary for their services. This would be over and above all expenditure.

The Hon. Prime Minister ridicules my suggestion that they should take four hundred thousand dollars from moneys that they already have; and that it was pathetic to hear the suggestion that I made in connection with this country not undertaking another loan. But I assure the Prime Minister that the pathetic part of it will be for those who have to pay increased taxes in connection with this further loan. There is nothing, I contend, unreasonable in the suggestion that we could get that four hundred thousand dollars from some other sources rather than undertake increased taxation necessitated by another loan. Then to back up his statements, and make my remarks appear more pathetic, the statement was made that the Government I was associated with borrowed fifteen million dollars, threw it away and got nothing in return. If the present Government had to go through the

same conditions that obtained during the years 1922 and 1923, they would have borrowed twenty five million dollars, judging from their actions and what they are doing now. You are borrowing money now, and you have to look around and try to find a way to spend it. It is a statement unworthy of the Prime Minister, to say that the outgoing Government spent fifteen million dollars and got no returns for it, as if it were a pleasure for anybody to have the responsibility of handling the affairs of this country, and have to borrow money and spend it without getting any returns for it.

We kept people alive just as you are doing at the present time, you are giving out the dole at the rate of ten thousand dollars a week, and getting nothing for it. Why do you hold up the past administration or any person connected with it to ridicule, because they borrowed money, and had to give it out, and did not get full returns for it.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—There is this much improvement—that it cost seventy thousand dollars this spring as against two hundred and fifty thousand last spring.

MR. HALFYARD—Who was party to the expenditure of money during the Warren administration in St. John's?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I was just drawing your attention to the figures.

MR. HALFYARD—I am drawing your attention to your own expenditure. You had as much to do with the expenditures in 1923 as anyone connected with the Government.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—You pay us a very great compliment—we were in Opposition.

MR. HALFYARD—You could do more when you were in the Opposition than you are doing now when you are in the Government.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—It is a great compliment.

MR. HALFYARD—The Prime Minister wanted to treat you decently. He promised you that anything that would be undertaken by the Government for the relief of the people in St. John's would be done after consulting the representatives of the districts.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—What I am trying to show you is that as a result of observation and experience it has been possible to improve the method of relief.

MR. HALFYARD—I submit you have not improved it to any extent. The conditions that obtained in the Fall of 1924 and January of 1925 certainly were not so bad as those months in the preceeding year. You are spending the money and getting no returns. It all proves that members of the present Government who were members of this House during those trying years, should not suggest that this present Government is getting any returns for the relief they are giving. The conditions are altogether different today.

Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Prime Minister would hold me up to ridicule for the spending of monies during the years 1922 and 1923. I would respectively draw this matter to his attention. During the months of July, August, September, October and November, for about five months the sum of forty thousand dollars was spent in Bonavista district last year.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—We got good value for it.

MR. HALFYARD—I submit that it is impossible for you to know whether you got good value for that money or not.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—I saw it

MR. HALPFYARD—You could not. Mr. Prime Minister, with all due respect to you, it was impossible for

you to know whether proper returns were given for that money or not. I have a list of places taken in nearly every nook and corner of Bonavista District, where money was spent and how can you know whether good value was given in each of these places.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—Can you tell me anywhere where it was not spent well.

MR. HALFYARD—I am not raising that point. But if you are going to spend forty thousand dollars every five months in each of the eighteen electoral districts, it will cost $720,-000.00—and that is practically what you will have to do if you are going to give a square deal to all. And then we have been ridiculed because we have spent money.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—You spent forty thousand dollars on a hole in the ground in Bonavista, which was not worth anything.

MR. HALFYARD—It depends upon the people of Bonavista as to the utility of that expenditure. Bonavista is one of the largest fishing outports, and it has one of the most unsafe harbours in any part of the country. Some attempt has been made by all governments to give them some sort of safety, and as to whether the money was spent wisely or not I do not know. I do know that it is only fair to make some attempt to give Bonavista a harbour.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—It all depends, in your opinion, upon who spends the money.

MR. HALFYARD—Evidently that is the opinion of the Government at the present time. But if the present Government is going to congratulate themselves on the administration of affairs during the past few months with regard to the expenditure of monies and the proposed reduction in taxation, they will have to go some other place outside of Newfoundland to get the people to believe it.

I contend that we should not borrow any more money. The statements published in our daily press showing an increase in our revenue is erroneous if we still have to borrow money. You are having increased revenue, and still you cannot rebuild the dock with the extra amount of four hundred thousand dollars, but you must go on with this crazy scheme of spending two million dollars on roads and highways.

It has been proposed to build roads all over the country. If the Deer Lake and Badger Roads were not built, the leaders of the Government in this House and outside of it would use the necessity of such roads as the chief reasons for borrowing money. I do not know what the actual cost per mile for these roads was, but certainly there were some returns got for the building of these roads. I know these roads. I travelled over the road from Deer Lake to Bonne Bay. I drove over some parts and walked a great part of the way; but with the expenditure of seven or eight thousand dollars to fix some bad places in these roads, you could drive the whole way over that road in a motor car. Of course, some sections of that thirty mile road are just as good as the road from here to Topsail.

The road is too wide. It is wide enough for two roads. That is where the mistake was made. There are some parts of that road which are in perfect condition, and therefore, we have got some returns for the money spent in that district at any rate. The same applies to the Badger Road, no doubt. And you have to consider the conditions at the time that those roads were built, and the state of mind that the people were in at the time.

Mr. Chairman, I am fairly well acquainted with the personnel of governments during the past few years, and I find that men are pretty

much alike. I have not come across a superman yet. I am perfectly sure that if the present Government had to go through the same conditions, they would have spent money just the same way as was done then; and yet we are accused of borrowing money, spending it and making no returns, and we are accused of squandermania. I would have expected better than that from the Prime Minister.

While I hold a seat in this House I will protest against such statements as those made by the Honourable the Prime Minister tonight. The spending of money in this country was only similar to the spending of millions and billions in other countries, for which they got no returns. Millions of pounds were spent in Great Britain, and are being spent there today. Millions of dollars was spent in Canada, and billions in the United States in 1920-1921, and every people and country did the best under the circumstances, just as the neighboring province is doing now while the strike is on at the Sydneys. Somebody will be here after the present legislature goes out of power and talk about the monies thrown away by them, and say they got no returns. It is ridiculous and silly, and not worthy of the calibre of the Honourable Prime Minister, as he cannot justify the statement that we threw away fifteen million dollars, and that it is pathetic to hear us talking now about increased expenditure. But we should all cut our garment according to our cloth, and be governed by the existing circumstances, and if it is necessary to borrow the money to keep people alive, then do so, but do not borrow it under any other circumstances whatsoever.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to intervene in this discussion, because after seeing the reports in connection with the dock, I was convinced there was only one course for the Government to pursue—to make the best of a bad job, and if they spent a little more they would be justified in doing so. The Leader of the Opposition has raised the point which has bought me to my feet, that is the advisability of giving the Governor in Council a blank cheque as to the amount to be spent on the dock. It is in the recollection of every member present that for four or five years there has been an outcry by one section of political thought about the spending of money by minute of council. To some extent I confess I was concerned in that spending, but I do not think I was wrong, and can justify any part I took when I say that the Government was justified at the time. As the Honorable Member for Trinity has pointed out the circumstances were exceptional, and exceptional steps had to be taken. I agree that there may be some justification in the criticism of us for doing so much, and therefore, I am jealous of the idea of giving the Governor in Council the power to spend millions without reference to this House. A contract of this sort is governed by rules of the House, which are statutory and provide that any contract extending over a term of years, and calling for the payment of some of the money shall be ratified by this House and also by the Legislature. These rules were framed for the safeguarding against the making of contracts by the House without submitting them to the judgment of all the Members. Those on the Government side represent only one side of the public, and those on this side are entitled, if not to defeat a motion, to criticise and subject it to scrutiny. It is most unusual to give a Government of today which after all does not possess the confidence of the whole country, the power of Attorney to make a contract of that sort. Therefore, I had to consider what position I was to take in case

of a division of the House on this point. Some years ago a Bill like this came before the House. There are a few bills of this kind, and I do not remember any to come before the Government with which I was associated giving a blank cheque to the Governor in Council. But in 1919 there were two bills passed giving power of this sort—one to make a coastal contract with Bowring Brothers, which was never entered into and the other with the Avalon Telephone Co. The objection to this sort of thing is apparent from the position of the Avalon Co. When a Bill comes before the House we all know what the contractor is expected to do, or just what are their rights. There is difference in respect to an operating company, but this Bill provides only for the repairing of the dock, and ceases when the work is done. I, therefore, tried to ascertain why the Government brought in a Bill of this sort, and asked for a blank cheque, and I must say that I am satisfied. There are two positions, either the Government to make a contract with whom they like, and submit it to the House, or put a Bill like this through. Before making a contract with any company, calling for an expenditure of over a million dollars, the Government should be sure of its position, and not only seek legal but expert engineering advice. Though it is imperative that the dock be repaired, I do not think the Government would be justified in passing this Bill and going ahead irrespective of the rights of either party to the contract. The Government must be guided by the best available advice, and though it may mean the closing of the dock for a time, the Government would be justified in not making haste too quickly. I am convinced that the Government is not in a position to table such a contract as is proposed. Therefore, I support the Government in this. The Resolutions provide for the raising of a loan for the work, and my opinion the section dealing with this is loosely drawn. The mere fact giving the Governor in Council power to raise a loan is not wrong, but in this proposal there is no limit to the amount and I suggest to the Honorable the Prime Minister, so that the public may be satisfied, that he fix the sum. The Government should not be given power to raise the loan without fixing the limit. We must be careful, as I am surprised to learn that of the last loan 62 p.c. was left on the hands of the underwriters, only some 30 p.c. being subscribed to the public. We should limit our borrowings, but I support the Government in this matter, and it is not necessary to argue the necessity of the repairs which we must have instead of patching up the dock, and having to do it over again in twenty years time. I, therefore, suggest to the Honorable the Prime Minister to insert something in these Resolutions in the way of saying how much money should be expended.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman: It is not my intention to take up the time of the House unduly but I would like to ask the honourable introducer any suggestions made from this side of the House will be considered?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—We would like to hear suggestions.

MR. ASHBOURNE—As the proverb says "In the multitude of counsellors there is safety." The Crandell report was first brought down and then Bishop report was brought down and now some people seem satisfied because the two reports are here. I think myself that the Government have gone the wrong way about this matter altogether. Who knows but that some other engineering firm was prepared to come here and give a lower estimate still. About August of last year the sum of $50,000 was voted here to repair the Dry Dock. I would like to

ask the Prime Minister on whose recommendation that amount of money was allocated? Still between August and sometime in February of this year we find that the Government did practically nothing in this matter except get reports from a couple of men and then they expect us to give our sanction at 48 hours notice, after having done nothing themselves for five or six months. I say, Sir, it is not good enough in view of the fact that every man, woman and child in this country will be called upon to pay $4 each on this hugh expenditure. Therefore, we are perfectly within our rights to stand up here and urge that this thing be gone into throughly. We have been discussing recently the question of tourist roads and which we have been told is a capital investment. The question in my mind is whether or not we are to have a dock. At the present time the dock is a liability and the question is whether or not it is a necessary public utility. I think that practically everybody agrees that it is necessary to have a dock in St. John's. The question then arises as to the extent of the dock. Whether it is to be the same size as the present one or whether it is to be enlarged. Then are we sure that we are going to benefit by going to this large expenditure of one million dollars and incurring a debt of four dollars on every man, woman and child in the country? If we are, then we shall have to be satisfied that the revenues which will accrue from that invested money will be such as to warrant this expenditure; but personally I have not seen any figures to lead me to believe that such will be the case. In fact, as I said before, the Government has gone the wrong way about this proposition. In my opinion they should have brought down here an engineer who could be independent of any construction company and make a report. In saying this I am not reflecting on either of the companies mentioned in this House, but it is natural to expect that either the Crandell Company or the Bishop Company would come down here and make such reports as would tend to show the necessity of immediately repairing the dock. Now we have here in the country a Government Engineer, Mr. T. A. Hall, and I think that it would have been wiser to consult Mr. Hall about this matter. I learn from the Prime Minister that Mr. Joyce and Mr. Harvey said they were incapable of reporting on the dock. I would like to know what man the Government proposes to have to superintend the construction of the dock because we do not want to open up a credit for a company to spend one million dollars without having somebody capable of superintending the construction work of the Dry Dock. The next question is what size the dock is going to be and is the present dock sufficiently large to look after the requirements that will be needed in this country. We are told this evening that only a couple of steamers had to pass this port on account of the size of the dock. If that is so, we should go slowly in this matter and see that this thing is gone into thoroughly before you try to convince us that we will get commensurate returns from this big outlay of a million dollars. Reference has been made of interest at the rate of at least five per cent. which would be $50,000 a year but we must also reckon on depreciation of the dock at the same rate of 5 per cent. To my mind this is a thing that should not be forgotten. The dock will deteriorate at least five per cent. per year and we should see that the profits arising from this dock are put to a sinking fund to take care of this large amount of money. In my opinion I would suggest to the Government that they should get some expert engineer in addition to those they have consulted at present and then ask for tenders to repair the dock. I think such a method would probably save

the country a couple of hundred thousand dollars. Then again they have docks at St. John and Halifax and what guarantee have we that we are going to have more ships coming in here in the future thn in the past for repairs. Within the past few years fewer accidents have occurred due to the aids to navigation in wireless direction finding, fog alarms and other ways and the number of accidents on the high seas is diminishing yearly. However, I think myself that the dock we require is a suitable dock to look after our coastwise shipping. As I remarked before, we should go into this big question of dock construction thoroughly otherwise you probably will pile on another huge amount to our national debt and thus leave a heavy burden of debt on those who will come after us. I would like to ask the Prime Minister if the Bishop Company is going to operate our dredge or a dredge of their own?

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—They will certainly use our dredge.

MR. ASHBOURNE—And this means that our dredge will have to remain in St. John's for the next eight or nine months, does it?

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Yes, if it is needed. But it is not likely she will be needed longer than one month.

MR. ASHBOURNE—If the coffer-dam is built the dredge will operate inside I submit.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—That is a new way. What would you put the dredge inside the coffer-dam for?

MR. ASHBOURNE—We are asked by the Government to let them have any suggestions we may have.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Your remark would make anyone laugh. How could you have the dredge inside of where the cofferdam would be built?

MR. ASHBOURNE—It has been said here that the original cost of the dock was $360,000.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—The contract for the old dry dock made in 1883 was $600,000. The honourable leader of the Opposition made the same statement that it cost $360,000. That is not correct.

MR. ASHBOURNE—As I said before we must view this thing apart from politics and as a sound business proposition and the fact that it is going to cost 5 per cent. per annum for interest and a further 5 per cent. for depreciation and unless you are satisfied that the revenue that will accrue from this will be sufficient to provide a sinking fund I think that we should go very slowly and try and see whether or not we can draw up some plan.

It might be possible to save $500,000 by getting tenders. I have nothing against the Crandall and the Bishop Companies. They may be particularly good companies. But we are taking thing on broad principles. I think the Government is all wrong. You have called in two companies. Why not call in another. We have here several propositions. One calls for $260,000, another $300,000 and we have here in this report $500,000 and a million as the different contracts. And if you give the Bishop Co. the contract with carte blanche how do you know but it is going to cost 3 million dollars. There is no amount mentioned here and I would like to impress upon the Government the necessity of stating a limit so that we could know and so that we might have some idea as to the amount that we are going to be asked for. Also I would suggest Mr. Chairman that if the Government is convinced that it is not expedient to wait any further time before repairs are commenced we should be shown the contract. Because the Co. that is prepared to take $70,000 is no reason to say but that it might not accept $50,000 rather than lose the work. It has been mentioned about the dock being sold. I don't know that I would be in favour of giving the dock away for nothing or selling it. The dock is

a public utility and there might come a time when it would be a national dock. The Prime Minister has spoken about some propositions that might be concluded with the Vickers Co. or the British Admiralty or some other company. I think that seeing that we have such a strategic position as the Gibralter of the North Atlantic, that it is a good plan for the Government to hold on to the dock unless they can get someone to take it off their hands at the present time. The idea of spending millions of dollars on the dock and then turning it over to a private individual would be ridiculous.

Now as I said before if a contract is to be given to any company we should have a capable engineer to superintend the work. We want to have someone who knows his business to see that we are getting good value.

I agree with the Hon. Member for Fortune, Mr. Warren when he says that any agreement concluded with a private individual should be brought in here, if the legislature happens to be sitting, for ratification. There is no reason why we should give the Government an open check to go and raise any amount upon the finances of the country in order that this proposition should be gone into and concluded. Furthermore at the present time we should cut our garment according to our cloth. We are a small country down here. It is all very well for an Hon. Member to get up here and say that a half of million dollars will be spent in St. John's amongst 5 to 600 people $1000 a piece. He must remember that St. John's is not everything. The whole country has to pay for this.

MR. BROWNE—But the whole country will benefit by it.

MR. ASHBOURNE—I don't deny that. It may, but that is a poor argument. We must not be carried away by this idea. Because you are going to give a half million dollars to the people in St. John's is no argument why a million dollars of the country's money should be spent. I think that we should know the nearest amount or the limit that is required by the company before we should vote to give the Government-in-Council power to go ahead and get any loan.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that the suggestion made by the Hon. Member for Fortune and supported by Mr. Ashbourne seems to be a very reasonable one. That is that we should put an amendment in clause 3 which would limit us to some expenditure. And I would suggest that it might be inserted, and the line would read "such further sum or sums not exceeding 500,000 dollars." I mentioned $500,000 because the report proposes the expenditure of nearly $110,000 and we have only raised $600,000 towards it. The round sum of $500,000 would be a sum that would not be exceeded.

MR. GODDEN—Mr. Chairman, I had no intention of offering any comments on the resolutions now before the chair, and it would perhaps be presumption on my part to criticise the technical aspect of the building of the Dock. But there are several things that have been said with regard to the cost, and as to what is the best proposition. The Prime Minister has said that up to a little while ago, no real suggestion has been offered that was worth while by any of the previous speakers, also that the opinions of everyone in the House would be welcomed, so I intend to at least give my opinion, whether I have any suggestions that are worth considering, will be for the Prime Minister to judge. But this I do say, at this time, that during this session there have been several Bills put through this House, passing the first, second and third readings, and when they have been brought to the attention of the Up-

per House for the confirmation of that august body, they have criticised them and literally torn them to pieces; they have seen fit to reject some of them altogether, others have been found to be wrongly composed, and altogether the attitude of the Upper House reflects very discreditably on the ability of this Chamber to legislate wisely. Regarding criticism, I have only been a member for a very short time, and I am young and inexperienced in parliamentary procedure, but I have noticed that all the criticism in this House has been left entirely to the Opposition, outside of the introducers of the Bills, none apart from this side of the House have attempted to criticize, with the exception of Mr. Browne, member for the West End, who has seen fit to offer some comments, and rightly so. I claim that everything that is brought in here for the consideration of this House should be criticised not only by the Opposition members, but also by the members of the Government, everything should not be passed through this House simply on the plea that it is a Party measure.

But I do not want to detain the House by any remarks other than on the question in hand. There was one remark made by Capt. Randell this afternoon, which appealed to me as a business man. He said, referring to the repairs of the dock, "is it going to be a commercial asset?" That is one phase of the dock question that we have to consider carefully. As I understand it, the dock in its present capacity has been profitable as a business concern. Of course, if its returns are united with the railway, there would be probably nothing on the profit side of the Ledger, but as a dock itself, it has been a profitable business. Now I have been struck during the discussion on the question of the Dock, that of the various schemes that have been suggested by the Crandell Company and Col. Mitchell, only one proposition has been seriously considered. The Hon. Mr. Sullivan has dealt at length on the technical aspect of the propositions, and he went into them very thoroughly, for which the hon. member is to be congratulated, although his remarks struck me as being more a question of Mitchell vs. Crandell, rather than what was for the good of Newfoundland as regards the dock, and his favor evidently lent towards Colonel Mitchell's report.

Now the dock has to be, and we will admit that it has to be reconditioned, it must be made safe, and the Government thinks that extra money is required for that purpose in the vicinity of half a million dollars. What we have to consider then is shall we be justified in making this extra expenditure in view of the returns which are only probable, and the dock, it is generally admitted, is quite suitable in its present capacity but it is not wide enough; but I understand that under Mitchell's scheme No. 1, it is possible to widen the dock to a certain extent so that it could be made large enough to take care of all ocean traffic that may come this way. Referring to the dock under scheme No. 2, we are told it will cost over one million dollars, and will the result be that we shall have sufficient vessels and steamers that will come to St. John's, and dock for repairs to justify this extra expenditure? I do not think so, supposing we do get from ten to fifteen per cent. more ocean-going traffic, will that extra business pay us, when we consider the extra expense pertaining to a larger dock, the expense must necessarily be greater, and also we must take into consideration the interest on the additional loan. And so I say that the proposition as outlined under Mitchell's scheme No. 1, has not been given sufficient consid-

eration. I think that that particular report should be gone into much more thoroughly before the Government commits itself to any particular proposition.

The Government says that they must have the authority to borrow the money for this work. I was under the impression, Mr. Chairman, that the Government already had the authority to borrow six million dollars, and that only a certain portion of that six millions had been earmarked for certain purposes. . . I thank the Minister of Justice for his explanation, but I have not the necessary legal mind to understand it. But now that we are on the loan subject, I notice that Section No. 2 on the resolution paper calls for a half million dollars for the building of a coal shed at the dock, is that for coal sheds only or for bunkering? . . . . It is for coal sheds and bunkering in connection with the dock. It is not necessary that the dock should have a bunkering station connected with it, that can be a separate business by itself, and I know various business men of the city who have considered the advisability of erecting a bunkering station, and it is not necessary for the Government to do so, unless they think they should enter into the business of bunkering and fuelling vessels. A large amount of money for extra machinery will be required under scheme No. 2, but under scheme No. 1 all the machinery that is necessary for the dock is provided for, and I want to emphasize to-night that I do not consider that scheme No. 1 has been given the attention it deserves, and I hope that the Government will not decide to enter into any contract under No. 2 scheme before giving further consideration to No. 1 scheme, because, as I have suggested previously, I believe it advisable that the dock should be and also could be sufficiently repaired under No. 1 scheme. The drawback at the present time is that the Government have been all considering the one proposition only. With regard to the offers made by The Engineering Companies, I take it that their representatives have based their proposals on what they think would be accepted, as good salesmen they have sounded out their prospect which is the Government, and sounded them out as to how far they were prepared to go, and certainly, if they thought that a million dollar proposition would be accepted, they were not going to propose a half a million, and so I uphold the suggestion of a previous speaker that someone else should be invited to give advice. I do not know of anyone in this House with the exception of Capt. Randell and Col. Sullivan who have any technical knowledge of the matter, and they are not experts, because they have not had very much experience in matters like this, so I think we should get some independent party down here to give us advice. And when all reports are considered, I would ask the Government to accept the report which is for the best interest, not only for St. John's, but for the whole country. I believe that the dock should be reconditioned according to its present capacity, and be made suitable for any traffic that we can conveniently handle, and it is my opinion that a sum of money over and above a quarter of a million dollars is not necessary to do this.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Mr. Chairman, in reference to the remarks that have been passed by the member for Trinity, dealing with my address here yesterday making comparisons of the two propositions outlined in the reports tabled, the hon. gentleman has made some insinuations that I had some interest in featuring the Bishop Company in preference to the Crandell people.

MR. GODDEN—Mr. Chairman, I did not make any insinuations.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—I can assure the House that it is in the best interest of the country in having the Bishop proposition No. 2, in preference to the Crandell proposition, No. 3. The report of Col. Mitchell is done more thoroughly than the Crandell one. And the recommendation that I came in and made here was made after careful study of both propositions and in the best interests of the country. The hon. member for Trinity wanted to know if consideration has been given to Proposition No. 1. We have gone into everything, and that is why we are here to ask you people which we are to decide upon. It is my idea that we should take No. 2 because it is the best one. It will be found out to be the best one. No. 3 Proposition suggests the widening of the dock but the dock cannot be made tight unless it is deepened down to the solid foundation. I made that statement three separate times here in this House. It has to be deepened three, four or five feet. The reason the dock has to be widened is that the type of vessels which we are to accommodate to-day is not the same as was in vogue at the time the dock was built in 1883. No. 1 Proposition does not include widening or deepening. It does not provide the facilities that are necessary to have a thoroughly modernized dock. It does not include the building of the shed. It does not include the jetty and the pier that we are to have. If we were to recommend the spending of five hundred thousand dollars now, in another twenty-five years we may have to deepen the dock, and since we have to have the dock closed for some considerable time it is just as well to have the thing done properly now instead of having it done again, in fifteen or twenty years time. I am of the opinion and there are a great many other people of the same opinion that this No. 2 Proposition is the best one to take. The Bishop No. 2 Proposition is the same as the Crandell Proposition No. 3 with the exception that the Bishop Company will deepen and widen the dock and other extras, besides placing about twice the quantity of concrete in the side walls as provided for in Crandell's estimate. Now there were some references to the six million dollar loan. Out of the six million dollars there were $1,600,000 earmarked for the payment of the deficit which was left to us by another Government, and instead of the $1,600,000 we find that it is now $1,700,000. We are not responsible for it. Still we have to pay it. So that we have practically only four millions left out of the loan of last year. There is a remark of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that the dock cost originally $360,000. That is not correct. The hon. gentleman was misinformed. The money that was voted for that dock was six hundred thousand dollars. There is a classified specification in existence somewhere that shows that $550,000 was the amount that was paid for the construction of the present dock. At the time that the dock was built, the price charged for plans, specifications and engineering was $24,470.00. That was for plans, specifications, and engineering. There is $550,000.00 accounted for out of $600,000.00 by the different work classified in the prices fixed in contract.

Take the Coffer Dam. That cost $28,810. In 1883 the coffer dam cost that amount of money. That was when timber was probably about $30.00 a thousand. At that time cement cost four dollars. Yellow pine, beech, birch, elm and maple cost $35.00 per thousand. For the information of the House, I may say that we are not giving anything away when it is decided to enter in agreement or a contract with the Crandell

Company or the Bishop Company, or any other Company; and we will take steps to see that there is a proper supervision over the job, to see that everything will be as well done as it possibly can be. If a definite contract is going to be made it would mean that plans and specifications would have to be drawn up. Proper surveys would have to be made. It is very doubtful that we will be able to get any contract except on a cost plus basis. If it is decided to enter into a contract on a cost plus basis, there will have to be engineers of the Government to keep tab on the contractors, to see that everything they have undertaken to do will be done, and there will be an auditor, who will see that every payment is proper, and will keep a check on the contractors.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Chairman, in say a few words regarding the dock I do not intend to hold up the House very long. In the first place, I wish to say that I think the Government has acted wisely in closing the dock. In my opinion that dock should have been closed two years ago; and I am surprised that more accidents have not occurred. The dock was almost dangerous for those who had to work around the ships, and I think the Government has done the wise thing in closing it.

Regarding the dock, Mr. Chairman, I might say that I would be in accord with the widening of the dock, if it is to be rebuilt, but I cannot say that I would be in accord with the deepening of the dock. The honourable member for Placentia, Colonel Sullivan, has pointed out that it is necessary to deepen the dock. That may be. I think the report speaks about the deepening of the dock being necessary for ships which were in years gone by built like the Sachem—narrow and deep. That is alright, but to-day they are built in most cases with more beam and less draught, so that, in my opinion there is no necessity for the dock being deepened. The dock at the present time, I understand is twenty five feet deep, and you will not get any ship, I do not think, that will go in that dock that will draw anything near to twenty five feet with no cargo in it. Therefore, there is no necessity in my opinion for deepening the dock.

Now, regarding the engineers who have given their reports on this dock. There have been two companies whose engineers have given these reports; and I think it would be right if we had a disinterested party make a report. I do not think it is fair to have engineers come from any company or firm and make a report, when their company or firm is likely to tender for the contract of rebuilding. I do not think it is fair. If you had got a disinterested party to report, then you could have called for tenders, and you would be in a better position.

Regarding the building of a new dock, Mr. Chairman, a lot can be said on that point. If you are going to build a new and up-to-date dock in Saint John's, you must also put in up-to-date machinery, and that would cost you at least $150,000.00 or $200,000.00, if you outfitted that dock to-day as other docks that I have seen in many parts of the world are outfitted. We have no machinery here. Take the Sachem, which was in here lately to have her rudder post repaired. All the castings for her had to come from the Old Country, or from New Glasgow, and she had to wait here until those castings came. If you built a new dock, you would be called upon to put in first class machinery, so that all parts can be turned out there at the dock premises.

I quite agree that the Government is making a right move in repairing the dock. It certainly should be done. But if the dock which was there to-

day was a wooden structure which lasted for forty years, why can't we put just as good a wooden structure there now that will last for forty years more. At the end of that forty years it will be for others to supply another dock, and by that time we may be in a better financial condition, if Canada does not own us body and soul. I think, Mr. Chairman, that a wooden structure would be alright; and if we put one forty years ago which has stood till to-day, why can't we put in one to-day that will stand for forty years more, and then there is no need to come and ask us to vote a big sum of money for repairs to this dock. It is in need of repair, and if you build a dock the same as is there to-day, without deepening and widening it more than it is, it will take almost any ship that we will get to go there. In the report it speaks of a ship of fifty feet, two inches.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—That was a mistake in the report.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Chairman, I am quite in accord with the need of repairs to the dock, but don't let us borrow any more money. If we want to do the repairs, let us use up some of the money that was borrowed for roads, and keep from borrowing any more. I am not speaking now because my leader has told me to speak like this, but this is my own opinion; and I think that a wooden dock will very well do us for forty years more, and by that time I hope the country will be in a better position, financially.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, I think the Government has reason to be grateful to the House for the way in which they have received this measure; and I also think that the Government has reason for congratulation on the procedure which they have adopted in regard to this matter.

As one who has been identified with this matter from the start, both as a member of the Railway Commission, and as a member of the Executive Government, I might say that I have watched very carefully and closely the development of this whole position. As one who had an opportunity in years gone by of seeing the construction and opening, and the many years of working of the old dock in the West End of this town, naturally one looks back and wonders whether the people forty years ago had sufficient perception of the future; and I claim, Mr. Chairman that the dock which we had in St. John's has done good service. I think I am correct in saying, Mr. Chairman, that when Simpson & Sons built that dock in 1883, the only guarantee they gave was for twenty years, and it was allowed to run for forty. In 1885, the Tenados was the first ship to enter the dock, and it has been working continuously ever since. It has not received the repairs or attention that it should have, and, particularly, in these last few years, it has become defective and decayed. The Railway Commission immediately, as soon as it had an opportunity of investigating affairs in connection with the dock, made the discovery that the dock was in a dangerous condition; and immediately got in touch with a firm of dock, or marine, engineers. Crandell and Company sent one of their engineers down here, and we had a very exhaustive survey of the dock made, and we received a report. But the Railway Commission was not satisfied with the report of one firm, but wanted some one to corroborate or check all the figures or specifications that were put forward. We were fortunate in having in this country a firm of engineers, who have done excellent work on the Humber, and the construction and finishing of the Main Dam will be an everlasting memorial to the efficiency of the W. I. Bishop Company, who are naturally interested in Newfoundland, and I am glad to say that they want to continue their interests here. They were ask-

ed if they would help the Government in this connection, and we were fortunate in having such an eminent engineer as Mr. Mitchell come down here to examine the Dry Dock.

The report laid on the table of this House, I think will show that the Government and the Railway Commission wanted to take this House into their fullest confidence. It is an unusual procedure, and I have never known in my experience as a member of this House, of resolutions of this nature ever being brought in prior to the passing of a bill or the making of a contract. But we wanted to get the benefit of the assistance of the members of this House, and I think the debate has been conducive to that end. The point that is to be decided is an economic one. The question that we have to decide to-night is whether we can afford to rebuild the dock; and whether the funds of the country will warrant an expenditure such as is proposed to make. We have got to decide one of the two things. We have either to abandon the dock—and throw it in the junk heap, or we have to rebuild it. Now what is the position? What would a business man do if faced with the same position, in connection with his house. Wouldn't he repair it so that he might still continue to have comfort for the remainder of his life. It is true a large sum of money is involved and the Government fully realizes it. We are well aware that the country is put to its utmost at the present time to meet its obligations and the times are not as flourishing as one might wish. But we got to look at this matter from an economical viewpoint and we have to decide whether we are to abandon the dock or rebuild it. That is the point. I have not yet heard a single member on the other side of the House say that we should not continue the dock. And I would be surprised if he did as it is an absolute necessity and we simply cannot do without it. No dock? why the whole trade of the country would be paralyzed if it were abandoned. Again there is the matter of dealing with the large number of people employed there. What would we do with the engineers and the labourers if the dock were closed down permanently. Therefore from an economical standpoint the dock must continue to operate. Now I have carefully gone into the plans submitted by the experts in connection with the dock. I saw the Crandell and Bishop plans and I also asked Mr. W. F. Joyce for his opinion on them. He made his deductions from them and his report has frequently been quoted in the debate here since it was tabled. He has no interest in the matter beyond Newfoundland's interest and I have not the least doubt but the report of Colonel Mitchell is the best as it is the most thorough and we would do the best by working under his specifications. We have here a dock that is not surpassed except by those of the very largest ports. The dock at St. John, N.B., is a different type—it is a double dock, but the one here is able to meet the requirements and is sufficient for our needs. If it cost $600,000 in the first place, then it is not a great jump to a million dollars for which we will have a brand new one that will be larger and better in every way. Under the Bishop plan we will have better piers, better piling and better facilities all round. At present the dock gate is leaking thousands of gallons of water an hour and it will never be tight or as it should be unless the repairs as now proposed are carried out. Therefore this House should realize that we do not want it to be going abroad that we are undertaking this merely to benefit the Bishop Co. We are not jumping to accommodate Bishop & Co. or anyone else. I hold no brief for Bishop or Colonel Mitchell in this matter, and I certainly do not want such an erroneous impression go abroad. I

am inclined to think that the Government will decide on Bishop & Co's No. 2 proposition, and I am convinced that if we accept it the dock will be properly rebuilt, as Bishop's have a high reputation which they will endeavour to maintain. The proper re-fitting of the dock to give more employment than ever, as it will be the means of bringing more damaged ships here, and with up-to-date machinery installed in the shops, there is no reason why we should not perform repair work here as cheaply as in any port in the world, and no reason why we cannot induce such ships to come here. If we are to do more business, we have to get up-to-date machinery, and reference has already been made to a big crane which would be an essential piece of apparatus. The proposition means the outlay of much money, but such expenditure is justified, and we will get better returns than from the old dock. Not alone will the new dock bring more ships to the country, but it will also bring extensive trade, as the crews and others who may be on board will be living in St. John's for the time being, purchasing all kinds of goods, and therefore proving a source of great revenue. The money so left here will amount to a very considerable sum in the course of time. As one of the representatives of the Railway Commission I claim we have been perfectly frank in connection with the whole situation; we have taken the House into our confidence, asked approval of the scheme which we deem is in the best interest of the country, and if there are any justifiable criticisms, we would be glad to hear them. It is clearly evident that the House is unanimous in the opinion that the dock must be repaired. We have adopted the proposition which from every viewpoint is the one most desirable in the interests of all, and that is the one which we recommend for approval.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Chairman, I think we all are agreed that the dock must be repaired. The one there now is falling to pieces, and I concur with the hon. gentleman that in its present condition it is unsafe. But the question now is whether we shall repair it as it stands at present, or take advantage of the opportunity to make it more modern in every way. I do not propose to take up much of the time of the House, because to be candid I have no technical knowledge of such matters as dock-building, but speaking in a general way, I know something of the need of repairs, and of the economical side of the question. One thing we should ask ourselves at the beginning is if there will be any considerable number of damaged ships coming here, if we have up-to-date facilities for repair work, instead of going to St. John, N.B., or Halifax. It has been said that only a few ships that have come here that were too large to go on dock. But that is no criterion of what will hapepn in the future, as I think that most of the Atlantic shipping if they knew we had proper accommodations, would come here when damaged. The next question is, can we by making the dock a modern one attract shipping that would not otherwise come here. Like everything else there are things we are not certain of, but in dealing with which we have to build on faith, and use common sense. I have always been of the opinion that situated as we are geographically, if we had the facilities here for repairs, ships if damaged nearer here than Halifax would come in here. That appears to me to be a common sense view of the matter. Now a dock or anything else that was built forty years ago must now be becoming obselete. This applies perhaps more to a dock than anything else, as I have already pointed out, the present dock cannot accommodate ships of wide beam, such as are constructed at the pre-

sent time. It occurs to me, to be frank about it, that if we spend one and a half millions to improve the dock, and have reason to think that we can attract more shipipng than comes here now, it will be the most economical plan.

Take the financial side of it. I am sure that the Prime Minister and every member of the Government, particularly the Finance Minister, would deplore the fact of having to seek another loan. I wonder how much money the Government have to-night left out of the six million dollars that was authorized to be raised by load last year. You earmarked at that time, I remember, two million dollars of that loan for the building of roads—a policy that I concurred in. At the same time I understand that you are not going to spend all that money this year. Now I merely throw out this suggestion that might prove profitable. If you have two million dollars earmarked and you are not going to spend it for the next three years, as previously outlined in this House, why not take temporarily $411,000 from this road money. I understand that this $411,- added to the $675,000 that you raised last year for repairs to dock, cost of building sheds and repairs to pier, St. John's West, and estimated cost of construction of plant for coal and fuel, etc., is what you require to meet the present dry dock construction proposition. Of course, I can readily understand that there is going to be a lot of employment given out on roads, re-railing of the railroad and on other erections and your expenses will increase accordingly.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—What about a bounty on fish?

MR. HIBBS—If you do that you would only be redeeming your promise. As I was going on to point out, Mr. Chairman, the Government could take part of that two million dollars for roads and refund it again, as, no doubt, the Finance Minister will have surpluses for the next few years that will enable him to make a refund in connection with the road scheme. It is not my desire to knock the present scheme of the Government, and perhaps I might be thought crazy to attempt to do so. I know that you have to rebuild the dock, and then the question arises as to whether you should repair the dry dock as it is now, or to widen it. I daresay the Government has made up its mind as to what their programme is in that regard, although we are being given an opportunity to discuss it. Personally, I cannot say that I do not agree with the re-conditioning of the dry dock. If the Government is convinced that there is a certain number of ships passing this port every year that should have arrived here, then there is a necessity of widening the dock and with that idea I concur. With regard to deepening it, I do not know. As far as concreting the bottom or sides of it is concerned, I do not think there is any question about the necessity of that being required, even at the risk of differing with some of my colleagues. Any structure to-day made of concrete is more permanent and lasting than a structure made of wood. But, in my opinion, the Government has to do more than equip the dry dock in order to attract shipping here. First of all you must make up your mind that you must be in a position to cater to foreign shipping here and afford them the same facilities here as are afforded them in other parts of the world, otherwise they will scare shy. Not only have you got to give them the necessary docking facilities but you got to give them as good a treatment with respect to harbor charges and light dues as they get elsewhere, and certainly not in excess of what they get in Halifax. I understand from some nautical men who visited here that they were not

treated as generously as they might have been. Then,again the most important question of all is, after you get your dry dock built and equipped you are not going to attract any more shipping here and ships used to coming here are not going to continue to come here unless you are prepared to repair them as cheaply and as efficiently as they are repaired in Halifax and St. John, N.B. I heard stories which I am not going to repeat now, because it must be recognized that the staff at the dry dock here have not got the modern machinery with which to work as are available at docks elsewhere. I feel sure that the work of repairing ships here can be done as efficiently as cheap, and as expeditiously as in any other place; but without reflecting on the staff of workmen here, I think that honourable gentlemen will agree with me that there has been criticism made about the work done at the dock, so that unless you have the proper supervision of a first class mechanic to see that every man fits in on his work and then sees that the work is done as cheaply here as it is done in Halifax our dry dock will be boycotted by outsiders. I was struck by a remark made by the honourable Mr. Sullivan in reply to Capt. Randell. Speaking of the earning power of the dock he said that the net profit was $41,000 a year. If it is to be regarded more as a public utility than as an earning proposition, then I do not know if the Government is justified in spending a million dollars upon it, and I think it would be just as weli to repair it as it is now. I do believe that, if we have the dock properly equipped with modern machinery and put in condition to handle all the shipping that is likely to come here, secure the proper man to superintend it and give good harbor treatment, the dock will be a paying concern. As I have previously mentioned, I have no technical knowledge of the subject matter before the chair, and I do not wish to discuss the matter any longer; but, as I have outlined a few minutes ago, if you could borrow money from one scheme and put it to the credit of the other, you might be able to obviate the necessity of raising a further loan, but of course that will depend on the amount you have on hand now. If you have this money raised and you are paying interest on it, of course there is no reason why you should raise another half million dollars. But I have to say, that, personally, without any good knowledge of the subject, I would support No. 2 proposition in preference to proposition No. 1.

MR. W. J. BROWNE—Mr. Chairman, As I happen to be one of the members who have the honor to represent the constituency of St. John's West, where this dock exists, and as the hon. member for Trinity (Mr. Godden) has seen fit to remark my interest on this subject, I feel that I ought to explain a little more fully, though not at any unnecessary length, my opinion on this matter. The dock is in the West End, where I belong, and which I have the honor to represent; and I have known it ever since I was a child. I have played around the place and am familiar with conditions there, and I don't know on looking back, when that dock was in a safe condition. The hon. members talked about the length of the dock. They have spoken about putting it into first class condition and about putting it in a "safe and sound condition," as if it is only a matter of words to do that. I don't remember when there was not a leak in that dock. The report of the Prime Minister has shown, after an investigation, that there have been leaks there of considerable magnitude for some time, and reports show that one of these at least, was observed

shortly after the completion of the dock. This was due apparently to lack of supervision on the part of the Government when the dock was built in 1885.

Honorable members who have studied the reports,—although I was sorry to see from the discussion here that evidently certain honorable members did not give it the attention which they merited,—particularly Colonel Mitchell's, that there has been serious damage done to the piling around the dock, and within the dock itself. This is obvious. It has been there for a considerable length of time. I remember very well two years ago when the hon. and gallant member for Trinity, was in the Government, and sitting on this side of the House, when he was approached by an hon. member of the Opposition at that time he was an authority upon the state of decay into which this dock had fallen. He has more recently said that if he had been consulted about the Government's taking over the dock, he never would have voted for a transfer. He knew almost two years ago that the dock was in a very unsound condition. I don't think that the hon. member can now refuse to support immediate and drastic action to put the dock in good modern condition. What do we want this dock to be? The hon. and gallant member for Ferryland said it should be a national asset. I agree with him. It is one of the best things we have. St. John's should be the repair ship of the North Atlantic. How often do we not read in the papers of such a steamer passing by, and going to St. John, New Brunswick, Halifax, or Boston to be repaired, when it would have been just as easy, or easier to come here if we had the facilities to give them? Those persons who possess technical knowledge of this matter know that when that dock was built, it was built for a different kind of ship than is in use to-day. It was built for ships of greater length and lesser width and lesser depth in proportion than any in use to-day.

The Government has wakened up rather at a late time, I must say. There had been criticism upon the urgency of the matter, although some persons thought that some great catastrophe was going to happen in the West End. The Government, after giving the matter consideration and consulting the authorities that they had at their disposal, the Government Engineer and the Railway Engineer, decided to invite some outside authority, a specialist on dock construction, to investigate and ascertain what was the matter with the dock, and what was needed to put it in good condition. Therefore they did the right thing. Mr. Crandell came here in February under winter conditions. He went to work as well as he could, and made an estimate of what he thought was necessary to do this work for. They sent later for Colonel Mitchell, because the Government thought it would be advisable to bring in some other person and have his opinion on it. Colonel Mitchell is an authority on this work. That is what I thought after reading that report.

I must say that I have a little knowledge of engineering. I spent four years in the studying of civil engineering. I know a little about a report of this kind and I must say that it is only one engineer in a thousand that could write a report of that kind. I trust—and this is the only recommendation that I have to make to the Government—that they will see their way clear to recommend to the Bishop Company or demand from W. I. Bishop that Colonel Mitchell be kept here to superintend the progress of the work. Now the Government has brought down two experts to ascertain the extent of the repairs that were necessary. They got several

propositions put before them. The hon. members on the other side have no reason to complain that these were only brought up here yesterday. It was a matter of public knowledge for several months that something was going to be done at the dock. We have got these reports. Now which are we going to adopt. Are we going to put the dock back to where it was forty years ago? You might just as well try to put the clock back. We have to try and make facilities in this port compatible with the demands of the shipping of to-day. We can't do that if we are going to put the dock in the same condition that it was in 1885.

In Mr. Crandell's report there was no provision made to prevent damage through the leaks which to a large extent have been responsible for the state that the dock is in to-day. There have been many serious leaks. Consequently we have to try and get some scheme that will eradicate the causes of the old damage, and that scheme is number two proposition of Colonel Mitchell which calls attention particularly to the damage done to the dock by those leaks.

We are going to have the dock partly built in concrete—that is the bottom part where the more serious leaks are, and that proposal which will tear up the old floor seems to me to be the best one suited for this country. Now as to the dock, I don't know whether the honourable member who introduced these resolutions was speaking from information that he had received or speaking off-hand when he spoke, as I thought rather depreciatingly of the Crandell engineering scheme. But no doubt there was a great deal in what he said. The Crandell Engineering Co., did not apepar to consider the leakage at all. They did not seem to know about that at all. Perhaps it was because they made their investigations in the winter time when the conditions were more unfavorable that they had to work under. Perhaps they did not make allowance for those things. Still I don't think that his proposals are so bad as the hon. gentleman described them. Both gentemen are experts on work of this kind, and this scheme of the Bishop Company—Proposition No. 2 gives us what we want. It enlarges the dock, lengthens and widens it. The chief thing that is needed for large steamers is to have a dock sufficiently wide, particularly at the entrance for steamers of that kind to enter. Now we can't very well widen it without considering the effect of the change of width and the condition of the banks on both sides. Colonel Mitchell has recommended that by widening the dock it will be necessary to make considerable alterations in the floor of the dock and this will entail the deepening of the dock and the construction of a new concrete floor and a retaining wall around the whole structure. I think that is the proper thing to do. That bad floor must be torn up since with the pressure of water now acting on it, a mere extension will suffice. You will see that he has done a good job by widening the dock. We must also deepen it, because we are widening it, and therefore we have to put a retaining wall all around the dock and I think that will come up to a height of 16 feet and from that the sides will go up at the same angle and will narrow the dock on top. That accounts to a great extent for what the Hon. and gallant member for Trinity means by the increase of the volume of the dock. I don't think that there will be a great increase in the volume of the dock. I think that if the Hon. Member was wishing to be convinced on this point he could have given us more figures to show where the difference was. I have tried to find where the difference is and cannot find any reason for it. And

what with the more efficient pumps we will be able to empty the dock more quickly than it is done now.

Now there is one point more which I wish to refer to and that is that certain objections have been made to the cost of the dock. I think that some hon. members on the other side of the House showed more than a slight trace of jealousy this afternoon when they made unnecessary reference to St. John's West. That district is a very important one to this country. It is a district comprised to a great extent of the men of the industrial class, and these men have been getting their employment from the dock, and it is only right that they should do so, and I do not think that it becomes Hon. members of this House to criticise and say that it is merely relief. We have been giving the dole and it has been suggested by Hon. Gentlemen inside and outside this House that we might have the men working, manufacturing the stone for the dock, and they mention that we might get the concrete pourer during the winter. Now that we have started a scheme which is not relief, but a practical business proposition there is not much room for criticism. It will not be only St. John's West that will benefit by this, but the whole country. It is the people of St. John's who get their living directly from the dock, and it is but right that they should, the increase in business and decrease in unemployment will benefit the whole country. The Hon. Member for Harbour Grace brought that point out very well, though briefly. I do not think that the sum of a million dollars is going to be so great an expenditure as to make it a burden on the people of this country. If the earnings of the dock were forty one thousand dollars in its present condition, I think that if it were enlarged with a greater capacity and more efficient, its earnings would be increased more than twice the amount of what they are at the present time. In conclusion I would like to say a word of appreciation of Colonel Mitchell. I have met a great number of engineers, but never one of the type of Col. Mitchell. The men that I have met have been rough and ready men. You do not often meet men of the class of Col. Mitchell, in the engineering profession. They are generally men without any literary ability, but he appears to me to be a man of great ability, and I hope that the Government will consider the advisability of retaining him here. While the construction is going on I would like to have a careful checking up by our own engineers of the weekly records of the work showing the cost of the work, to see that the specifications have been carried out at the estimated value.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the leader of the House if he would be prepared to raise the Committee and have the discussion on the resolutions continued tomorrow. There are other members who would like to discuss them.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I think that there is no reason why we should delay.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman, in connection with the resolutions, I would like to say I am not in favor with them for two reasons. The first is because I consider it improper for this House to give the Executive authority for making an arrangement for the rebuilding of a dock, when we have already been informed that the arrangement has to be made as early as possible in order to have the work done this year.

If we are to accept this, then the Government can make the arrangement and present it to this House for examination, seeing that the House will be in session for three or four weeks longer. The House

should be fully informed. Any other course is contrary to the spirit of democracy. Every member of the House is elected for the purpose of caring for and protecting the interests of the country, and he will be derelict in his duty to it, if he fails to carry it out, which he does when he permits the Executive to do that for him.

The second reason is that there is no justification for the House to give authority for the raising of another loan of $500,000. We are heavily burdened with taxation today and instead of making the burden heavier, a business Government is supposed and expected to make it lighter. It was largely on this issue that the present government came into office—the reduction of expenditure and taxation. It is not only the members of this House that are concerned with the proposed loan, but every man, woman and child in the country, who are already loaded down with debt, which makes it extremely difficult to meet the demands of present day needs. We should hesitate to enter into any obligation which makes it more difficult for the bread-winners of this country to satisfy even the common wants of those dependent upon them.

Last year authority was given to raise a loan of six million dollars, adding $300,000 yearly in interest charges, and bringing the debt of the country up to sixty-six million dollars, or thirteen hundred dollars per family. Out of that loan, two million was provided for building highways, a sum out of all proportions to the very limited means of this country, particularly when we know that we will never see the returns of it during the lifetime of the present generation.

Remembering this loan, and knowing there are other needs of greater importance, and the dock is one of these needs, you should divert $500,000 from these highways to the rebuilding of the dock, if that sum is required in addition to the $675,000 you are diverting from the sources you provided for last year. You have therefore the means at your disposal without asking this House to give authority for another $500,000 loan.

It is indeed surprising that a party elected to power, calling itself a business government and loudly proclaiming itself as desirous of establishing economy in public expenditure, is pursuing the very opposite course, and plunging the country deeper and deeper into debt.

One of the reasons given for the hastening of the rebuilding of the dock is .the relief of unemployment. It is a late time for the Government to wake up to such a need. Ever since last July it was known that the dock required prompt attention, also that there would be large unemployment during the winter season, yet the government did nothing to provide work for the unemployed either on the dock or elsewhere, and we have the authority of the member for St. John's West, Mr. Browne that a thousand men in St. John's were getting able-bodied relief this winter from the government.

The last government was denounced in the bitterest terms for expenditures on the public roads, which it did to give employment, and from which, it was claimed, there was no returns, but we have a worse spectacle shown us today by Mr. Brown, that the present government gave no employment, but satisfied itself with giving doles to a thousand men, costing thousands of dollars, and getting nothing in return either in labour or in the making of a road.

The present Government has eclipsed the last in this misuse of public monies, that brings only shame and discredit upon it. These men who received this dole were not wanting charity. They wanted work. You

disgraced them when you forced them into the shameful act of taking doles. The Government could have provided employment to the extent of the money spent in giving doles, and helped the people to maintain a spirit of independence, which was their wish. I repeat, the Government knew about the condition of the dock last July, and the need for repairs or rebuilding, and it is only now, after the long winter is over, that they start to give employment to the people of St. John's.

MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Don't you worry about the people of St. John's.

MR. GRIMES—They are my countrymen as well as yours, and are entitled to better treatment than they received.

MINISTER OF JUSTICE—They are quite satisfied with the measures taken to relieve them.

MR. GRIMES—There are numbers of them, I know, who feel otherwise. They have told me so.

MINISTER OF JUSTICE—They will talk to you in that way, knowing who they are talking to.

MR. GRIMES—These men are capable of giving an honest opinion.

HON. MIN. OF JUSTICE—They all can. You don't have to go to the outports to get an honest opinion.

MR. GRIMES—But you said just now that it was only natural for them to give an opinion that would meet with the political views of the person to whom they were speaking.

MON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—If a man goes around with a long face looking for sympathy and advice, he will usually give the opinion that will please him. Why should he fall out with your opinion. You are looking for something to say against the Government, and he will say "Sure this is a terrible Government."

MR. GRIMES—The honourable gentleman knows that the people of St. John's are quite capable of giving a straight opinion.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Yes, and they did it pretty effectively last election.

MR. GRIMES—And in return they got a dole. Do you think it would be fair or would you consider it a business proposition for any person or company, if they saw there were repairs necessary for any plant that they had to do with, for someone to come in and say—"We are able to effect repairs to this plant that will cost one million dollars, we want you to give us one million dollars " You would say "No, we are not going to consider any such proposition. We must first know the repairs to be effected, the plans on which you are prepared to do it, and the cost, and if alright we will contract with you then." That would be the more correct position to take. Instead we see no contract for the doing of that work which is unnecessary at the dock, and we have no idea what it is going to cost the Government. We say, we want you to make that arrangement and lay it before the House, and then we can better deal with it.

HON. MIN. OF JUSTICE—The man is not yet born who could give you more than an estimate of the cost.

MR. GRIMES—I think the Minister of Justice will agree with me that it is only fair that we should see the contract and know its terms before we go any further.

HON. MIN. OF JUSTICE—The point that I think the Hon. member will appreciate is—that all we can get is an estimate, of what the people believe these repairs will cost.

MR. GRIMES—Then do you not propose to enter into a contract with this firm? Are you going to take their mere word?

HON. MIN. OF JUSTICE—No, we will not take their mere word. We

shall make some arrangement with them for the repairs.

MR. GRIMES—Then go and make the arrangement with them and bring it down to this House where we all may see it.

HON. MIN. OF JUSTICE—It is down now.

MR. GRIMES—No, that is not a contract.

HON. MIN. OF JUSTICE—That arrangement is before you now.

MR. GRIMES—That is a mere estimate.

HON. MIN. OF JUSTICE—That is all we can ever get.

MR. GRIMES—The Hon. Prime Minister said that he would be prepared to accept a suggestion to make five hundred thousand dollars the limit of the loan that may be required. I repeat that it is not necessary to give authority for raising more loans. Take five hundred thousand dollars out of the Highways Allotment, put it towards the construction of the dock, if it is necessary, and carry out the work without borrowing. The people of this country today are shouldering a very heavy debt. A debt of about sixty-six million dollars, the annual interest charges of which cut a big hole in the earnings of the people, and the Hon. Minister of Justice thinks that another four hundred thousand dollars loan is only a fleabite.

HON. MIN. OF JUSTICE—As compared with some of the things that I have seen done.

MR. GRIMES—That does not justify you. What you want to do is to set an example. If you confine yourselves to the money that you borrowed last year, then there is no necessity of another loan at all

HON. MIN. OF JUSTICE—You have heard the Hon. Prime Minister say that unless that loan was required it would not be raised.

MR. GRIMES—Yes, he said that.

HON. MIN. OF JUSTICE—I have that much respect for the statement of the Prime Minister, that I believe he means what he says.

MR. GRIMES—The Prime Minister may mean well, but it is another thing as to whether he is justified in further expenditure. You have sufficient authority by the "Loan Bill" of last year to get sufficient money to pay for the dock, and I think that there is no necessity whatever for raising more money.

What I intended to say was that this country, today, is saddled with a heavy expenditure. The people of this country have been looking to you to reduce taxation, but instead you are increasing it. The people in the past have been chastised with whips, but now you are going to chastise them with scorpions.

HON. MIN. OF FINANCE—You did your part to bring the debt to sixty million dollars. You brought it up by twenty-five million dollars during the past few years.

MR. GRIMES—And by the Government that you were associated with, and you are going to outdo them according to the progress that you are making now. In 1908 the public debt of this Colony was twenty-two million dollars, and now it is up to sixty-six millions, an increase of three hundred per cent., while the earning power of the people has not increased to anything like the same extent. There may be a few getting more money in wages, but the purchasing power of their wages is not within fifty per cent. of what it was in 1914.

HON. MIN. OF JUSTICE—That is a fact which is admitted all over the world. It is not confined to Newfoundland.

MR. GRIMES—That is all the more reason why we should be very careful of how we spend out money, and not add to the burden of the people whose income is not increasing in

value, but is going in the other direction.

HON. MIN. OF FINANCE—Do I understand you to say that the dock ought not to be rebuilt?

MR. GRIMES—No. I am saying that you ought not raise any more money on loan. You ought to use the loan that you got last year.

HON. MIN. OF FINANCE—I have a letter that you wrote, in the Dept. If you will come down to-morrow morning I will read it to you, in case you have forgotten it.

MR. GRIMES—Alright, I shall be glad to go down. But that does not alter the fact of what you are doing today. It does not alter the fact that the people of this country today, are bearing more than they are able to bear. There are many people in the country who are living just a bare existence, and the Government proposes to make it still harder for these people. Every loan that you raise, means added interest charges on the people, which they have got to carry, and the longer you go on with the raising of loans, the worse it will be for the people and for yourselves. It brings the day of reckoning sooner or later.

HON. MIN. OF FINANCE—We are reckoning with it now.

MR. GRIMES—And you evidently are not learning a lesson. You want to make it still harder.

HON. MIN. OF FINANCE—Well, you say you are not opposed to rebuilding the dock—unless you can show us how we are to rebuild without money.

MR. GRIMES—Are you going to spend two millions on motor roads?

HON. MIN. OF FINANCE—We are going to have a look at it.

MR. GRIMES—I think you should devote some of the loan money for motor roads, which will make it unnecessary to provide for new loans.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the position that I take is this, first, that we have a right to see the arrangement to be made, and the second is, that the the House should be assured that no new loan is going to be raised. If the Government assures us of those two things, then we might be prepared to consider voting for these resolutions; but as they are now, I cannot vote for them.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, the hour is getting very late, and the question before the House is a matter of such importance, and as the members of the Government side of the house seem to be in a lethargic condition as regards their attention to the matter, I would like to move that the Committee rise. I would ask the Prime Minister to be good enough to assent to that motion.

HON. PRIME MINISTER — Mr. Chairman, I think I have explained that it is the plan of the Government to go through with this. This is a very important measure that we want to get through, but if we can be shown how we can get any further by adjourning to tomorrow, we shall give it our consideration. We have a Motor Traffic Bill that we want to get through as quickly as possible. We do not wish to hurry any legislation, but on the 1st April the Municipal Council has to start collecting the taxes on motor vehicles, and if we cannot get that Bill through before April 1st we cannct begin the new system of collecting those taxes through the Commission. That is one of the reasons for debating this subject tonight.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, on the motion to rise the Committee the Hon. Prime Minister has impressed upon us the importance of the Legislation that is now before the House. He has often emphasised the position that he does not wish to rush legislation. As has been remarked here this afternoon, no men here are supermen. We have no supermen today. We are not capable

at this late hour of the night of giving to this important legislation the attention which it ought to deserve. I maintain that this matter is of sufficient importance. If this matter merits the importance which the Honorable the Prime Minister attributes to it, I think the House would adjourn now, and we could come again tomorrow with fresh minds and discuss it to better advantage. Nothing would be lost, and much would be gained by acceding to the motion to rise the committee, at this stage. The object of the Honorable the Prime Minister is obvious. Despite the protests of the Government Members and of the Honorable the Prime Minister that there was no intention of rushing through this Legislation, this afternoon he brings in one of the most important subjects for Legislation ever introduced or dealt with in the annals of the country. He comes in today with these Resolutions to which by the arguments advanced we should give a blank cheque, and at a quarter to twelve in the night, despite the Honorable the Prime Minister's previous statement, he thinks the minds of Members of this House are clear, and we are able to carry on and discuss the matter after dealing with it for hours. The Honourable the Prime Minister may be a super-man, but if so it is only tonight that I have discovered it. Now that he has decided to go on with these Resolutions tonight, I wish to place myself on record, as totally opposed to them. I do not care if any Member of the Opposition, the Opposition as a whole or any single Member of the House votes against those Resolutions I am determined to do so. I will go on record as against them, because in my opinion you are asking the Legislature to go too far. I realize fully that any remarks of mine since the Government has decided to carry out this dock policy, will only amount to so much breath wasted. I am also reminded of a few lines of poetry,

Full many a flower, is born to blush unseen,
And waste its sweetness on the desert air;

and I think the atmosphere here, judging from the conduct of the Government side, is that of nothing but a desert. In his cross-firing with Mr. Grimes, the Honorable the Minister of Justice said that he was satisfied with the ballots as cast in St. John's East, but I wish to say that a difference of only four hundred would have altered the status quo and it might have happened that I would now be on that side of the House and he on this. I do not support the Resolutions, because I do not agree with the principle of passing any contract that the Government feels like making. I think you ought to place the contract on the table. The Government claim that they need not have brought in these Resolutions at all, but could have passed the contract without consulting us, but I doubt if there is any sound argument for doing even that. They claim they have done us the courtesy of bringing in the Resolutions, and giving us a chance to express our views on them. But what is the use of extending a courtesy or asking advice of a person if you are not prepared to accept and act upon it. There is no doubt but the Government have made up their minds to put this Legislation through, no matter what we may say. Now as to the widening of the dock, and other such matters, I cannot speak as one qualified, because I have no technical knowledge of the work, but I wish to place myself on record as opposed to giving the Governor in Council power to enter into a contract, and expend whatever money they like as implied under these Resolutions. The Government knows despite all that has been said that they will make the contract,

and I am convinced that the doors of this House will not be closed fifteen minutes before it is signed by the Executive, if it has not already been discussed and signed by them. Now, when I was on the Government side of the House, it was said we did things that were wrong, and in the last election we were defeated on these things.

How, therefore, can you now condone the very thing which you claimed was wrong for us, and which defeated us. If minute of council Government was wrong, as was made an issue in the last election, and we were put out of offie for it, is not the Honourable the Prime Minister now in the position of repeating the mistake which we made. It may not be critically correct that this present contract is being put through by minute of council, but it amounts to the same thing, as you are giving power to the Governor in Council to spend whatever money they way wish. The Honorable the Prime Minister has impressed upon us the urgent need of passing these Resolutions, and also his desire of doing the best for the country. But he might have delayed the matter of making the contract for a month, and there is no argument against entering into it, and placing it before this House. If the contract had been arranged we would be in a better position as to knowing what plans are going to be made. The Government must think we are very credulous if we do not oppose Section 3, which gives power to the Governor in Council to raise any more sums that may be needed on the credit of the Colony. This is going too far, and the Honorable the Prime Minister does not credit us with even common sense, if he thinks he will agree to it. We agreed last year to the raising of a loan of six millions, and the country was flabbergasted when the news was learned. There is $675,000.00 in these Resolutions earmarked for special purposes, and he now asks to take it for the Dock. As to the Government having the authority to spend it, we do not question, but we do claim that they have no authority whatever to raise more. The Hon. the Minister of Finance states there is a deficit of $100,000.00 greater than was expected last year, but there is no explanation as to how it is to be made up. It may be a moot question as to whether the figures are justified by the facts of the case. If they are justified by the report of the Auditor General it is alright. Now you say there is another $100,000.00 short. Despite all this we are asked to give authority to borrow more money, a thing we could not dream of. Two millions were allocated for roads, and a certain man in a certain place has stated that the road policy will not be developed in one or two years. Therefore, the Government could easily take $500,000.00 of that money to embark upon this scheme, which apparently they have fully decided to adopt. If I were one properly qualified to discuss such technical matters about the Dock as contained in the Resolution, and to which others have done justice, I would try to do the same, but I am not foolish enough to enter into a dispute without the necessary technical knowledge. I would not however be fair to the people whom I represent if I did not voice my strongest opposition to these resolutions. As I have already pointed out the contract should be brought down here, and there is no argument against the delay of four weeks. I also wish to place myself on record as protesting against the raising of another loan on the credit of the Colony. How this matter affects St John's is no concern of mine, but when I come to face the people of my district I will make my position clear to them in connection with these

resolutions as I have endeavoured to do here tonight.

MR. DUFF—Mr. Chairman, I quite agree with the contention of previous speakers that the dock is a necessity in a country such as this, and to be of any value it must be in good condition. I have no technical knowledge as to dock building or repairing, and what I may say now may not be considered of much value. But the only trouble to my mind is in connection with the raising of this money, and I agree with the idea of Mr. Grimes as to the taking of some of the money allocated for the building of roads for this purpose. The raising of loans only brings the Colony further into debt, and I hope the Government will endeavour to avoid this. Unfortunately the dock became out of condition just as they came into power and the fact that it ought to be repaired cannot be questioned.

There is one thing that appeals to me in connection with the giving of the contract to Bishop and Company, and that is that Bishop and Company are operating their business under the British flag, and, after all, they should be given the most consideration. With regard to the question of raising more money by loan, I would like for the Government to consider this matter seriously. I would suggest that they take a part of that two million dollars earmarked for roads and use it for a more useful purpose—the repairing of the dock. Take the harbour of St. John's which is now almost blacklisted as far as foreign shipping coming in here is concerned because it is generally known that ships coming in here have been salted. Those of us who are closely identified with the shipping business know full well that ships have been overcharged no matter what part of the world they go to and we know that St. John's is no exception. Then again we have no facilities at the dry dock here for forging and rolling plates, and the least bit of machinery or material required there for repairing ships have to be sent away for, often causing great delay and expense to ships. I hope also that when the Government decides to begin work on the dry dock they will make arrangements whereby master and owners of ships that come here from outside will get a different impression than they now have of the town of St. John's. But the main point I want to make is that we should consider the dollars we are wasting and put the money to this useful purpose.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, it seems that it is the intention of the Prime Minister to have these Resolutions pass the House at this session, and that it is his determination to empower the Governor-in-Council to enter into a contract or arrangement with any responsible person, firm or corporation for the repairing of the St. John's Dry Dock and all such extensions, building, repairing, installation of machinery, labour and work whatsoever as may be incidental thereto or necessary in connection therewith and including the building of sheds and repairs to pier. In the discussion that has taken place here there has been quite a diversity of opinion on the subject matter of debate. I am at sea myself to know exactly what the Government intends to do, and I would like to know from the Prime Minister if it is the intention of the Government to employ an engineering concern to oversee the construction of the dock at the Colony's cost?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—It is the intention of the Government to let Bishop's engineers take charge of the proposition and carry out the work according to the schedule and according to the cost of the work, and it will be checked up by other engineers.

MR. HICKMAN—You do not intend to enter into any contract with any concern to do the work.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—There will be no definite contract. There cannot be one.

MR. HICKMAN—You are going to pay seventy thousand dollars to have the spending of one million dollars supervised. That looks to me like an outrageous proposition. Why in the name of common sense should any construction company come in here and, after we paying their bills, charge us $70,000 for supervising the spending of one million dollars of our money. If they have to bring in some machinery that they have in the Humber district it may be alright because the Government are in a position to bring it in free over our own railroad.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—This is no more ridiculous than that in connection with the main dam at Deer Lake.

MR. HICKMAN—I am not conversant with that dam, but it is ridiculous to pay $70,000 to this company for supervising the expenditure of a million dollars of our own money, I repeat, but I doubt very much whether the Government ever tried to realise that fact. I cannot see anything in any shape or form to justify such an act. The Prime Minister has told us that it is not the intention of the Government to enter into any contract which would tend for cheaper work. Now I think that this job of constructing the dock is going to cost a great deal more than a million dollars. I got some illuminating figures to night from the Honourable Mr. Sullivan. He tells us that the dock originally cost $650,000, with profits, or $550,000, and he tells us the reason why it cost that amount. That amount had to cover the cost of excavation as well as the actual building of the dock. He tells us also that at that time cement was $4 a barrel; well you can get cement landed here today for $3.77 a barrel. He tells us that lumber then cost $30 a thousand feet. You can get the same kind of lumber today to build cribbing for concrete work for $30 a thousand. Sand can be bought today for $2 a ton and that is much cheaper than when the dock was first constructed. Further, the Government could utilize today by the mere paying for the hauling of fifteen thousand tons of broken rock that they have on their hands in the East End of the city. Basing my argument on the facts and figures submitted by the Honourable Mr. Sullivan, the Government does not need to spend one million dollars to do the dock what is outlined in number two proposition. I am very glad to have from the Prime Minister's own lips that it is not the intention to give anyone the contract of reconstructing the dock at this figure of a million dollars because I contend it is not going to cost that amount unless all the members on the Government side of the House satisfy their friends and supporters with jobs. I know there will be no opportunity for members of the Opposition to get jobs for any of their supporters, and certainly it will look like everything else a pure political work. Now we all agree that something has to be done with the dock, but the question is what is the most economical way of handling the situation. The profits of the dock the Honourable Mr. Sullivan says is $41,-200 per year, but he does not know if that included interest charges or not. If such was not included it should have been. After the dock is completed and the same amount of work is carried on there each year as in the past with the same amount of profits that would leave us in the hole $40,000 because we have to figure on at least five per cent. for interest. For instance take off $20,000 last year after deducting the interest on $600,-

000 and you are $40,000 in the hole on the operation of the dock for last year.

There is not much extra business in slight for this dock after all. We have two cases here. We have the two steamers that came into our port here. They could have been docked only there was no place to discharge their cargo. Another expense in connection with the dock is the pumping out of the water. It is going to take about seven or eight tons of coal to pump out the dock after it is widened and deepened. Figuring that out at seven dollars a ton that would be 56 dollars. Now the dock as it is at present is all right for docking small schooners. I have often seen two or three on the dock with an average tonnage of 70. Now the dock receives 25 cents a ton for putting schooners on the dock. That is about 40 or 50 dollars. And it is going to cost 50 dollars to pump the dock out. So under the circumstances every schooner of that class that goes on the dock it is going to cost more to pump the dock out than the revenue that the dock will derive from the schooners. But if the dock is to be constructed for the accommodation of schooners and large steamers, then it will be necessary for the Government to provide a slip to enable schooners to be taken up and repaired without going to the expense of putting them on the dock. And the only benefactor under that scheme will be the British Empire Steel Co., who sends the coal down to be burnt. I claim that we have here in Newfoundland a capable man, a man who is just as well able to fix and repair the dock as any stranger that comes here. We should utilize our own local engineers and our own local men to do this work without going to the expense of having this country pay somebody outside to oversee the repairs to the extent of 70,000 dollars. Now these people never expected to get $70,000. As I said before, you never took the trouble to reduce the amount.

Now in connection with another point. A considerable amount of money is to be used in the construction of the roads. Two millions have been put aside for that purpose, and as you are not going to spend two millions this season why not use that money and then if you have a deficit afterward at the end of the year when the House is open next session why then you can come and raise a loan if necessary. It is not a difficult matter to get a temporary loan from the Bank of Montreal, if it is needed. But it is still hard to ask us to permit the Governor in Council to raise further loans upon this already overburdened country. A country that has no resources in sight and depending more or less on the fisheries how can they bear such a burden. As it was said at the opening of the House in August; the Prime Minister stated on the floors of this House and so also did the Minister of Finance that from now on we were going to live within our means. And before the session is over the Prime Minister comes in and asks us to give him permission to borrow six million dollars, and not only that, but the intention was to borrow ten millions.

I can't understand so much borrowing of money, at the present time, when the revenue is increased and we ought to try if at all possible to live within our means. Now if it is the intention of the Government not to make a contract in regard to the construction of the dock, then there is no necessity for the word contract in these resolutions. If it is the intention of the Government to employ a concern to oversee the repairs of the dock why there is no contract to it. You say go ahead and construct it and we will give you the 70,000.

If the Prime Minister intends to make an agreement during the time we have been debating the subject

an agreement might have been drawn up by some of the men on the other side of the House and placed on the table, and we could be discussing that instead of these resolutions. There is no contract to be made. We have the Prime Minister's word for that. All you want is an agreement for some people to oversee the construction or the widening of the dock.

Now I do not want to be a party to giving the Governor in Council authority to borrow money upon the credit of the colony, and no necessity whatever for the clause put in this to give the Governor in Council authority to enter into a contract and agreement. Now the Prime Minister and his colleagues must not be offended at our giving due criticism to the Bills that come before the House. We have already, as it has been said here before, had insinuations thrown out from the Upper House that the Bills down here are not properly debated. We do the best that we can on this side of the House to point out what may be good or what may not be good in these Bills. And as I said before, if anything comes before the House that we think is in the interest of the country we will give it as great support as the members on the other side. It is our duty to the people that we represent. We represent constituencies just as important as those on the Government side and it is our duty to do our duty to these constituencies and look out for their rights in connection with any resolutions or bills that may be brought before the House of Assembly.

We have had bills before this House before this session, and when they have passed this House they go to the Upper House and then they disappear altogether, and there is no wonder why the Upper House should criticise us because we are not giving any attention to these bills which come before us. They should not be able to pass this committee stage here and then go to the Upper House and have to be corrected and criticised up there in the way that they are. All the members on this side of the House have said that they are in favour of repairing the Dock, but they are not in favour of giving the Governor in Council the power to enter into an agreement without laying the contract on the table of the House because that is what the House of Assembly is for and the agreement could be drawn up in a few days and we could get through with this measure in a very much quicker time. As to the accuracy of the report that we have before us I cannot say. It was pointed out today by Captain Randell that on page twelve the draft figures given there are altogether wrong. This report has been gone over and sent down here for the House of Assembly, and then we find that there are errors of that kind in it, and we are not in a position to say whether there are more in it or not. Captain Randell discovered this one and it shows that there is no great trouble taken with it. Now if the Hon. Member for St. John's West wants to have anything to say he can do so when I am finished. I say that the Government has not given sufficient consideration to that report. It has not been submitted in a practical manner. Anyhow we have not as much faith in the report as if we had not found it. Of course, if the Government intends to expend a million dollars on the widening of the dock and deepening it there is nothing that we can do about it, under the circumstances.

I think that the Government ought not to ask us to pass these resolutions unless they are prepared to tell us what the seventy thousand dollars is for. The company will not have more than one engineer here in St. John's for the construction work. Might I ask the Prime Minister what this Company has to do to earn this

seventy thousand dollars, particularly when we consider that last year the Government was going to vote only fifty thousand dollars for the repairs to the dock. We do not see the reason of supporting Number 3 of the resolutions and we do not see the necessity of passing Clause No. one under the circumstances. So we think that if the Government is really in earnest and want to do the right thing they should try to have the agreement made as soon as possible for the supervision of this House. I would like the committee to rise until we get this agreement, and then we should be able to go on with this business in a very short time.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I wish to place myself on record as voting against Section three of these resolutions, and I think that sufficient reason has been given by those speaking on this side of the House to convince any right thinking person who has any knowledge of the situation at the present time that the undertaking is not a good one. There is no necessity for us to undertake the rebuilding of the dock at a cost of a million dollars. The provision already made in the loan bill last year for the two million dollars for roads was bad enough, but now the Government is coming in here and asking that we give them authority to borrow another million for rebuilding the dock. It is all camouflage to say that the loan of six million dollars was earmarked for other purposes. In the loan resolutions of last year there is the following provision:—

(Reads)

We have not got that two million dollars spent, and I do not think that anyone will find fault with the Government if they spend that money on the building of the dock at a time like this when such a large amount of money is necessary. I think that it would be a much better thing to do to spend this money on the dock than on an experimental thing like highways. It is not because the suggestion comes from this side of the House that the Government should not act upon it. There is no reason why clause three should not be deleted. We all agree that the dock must be fixed. If we thought that the best way to go about the work would be the manner outlined in the Section three then we would give the Government the power to go ahead and do what they want to do. But I think after all that it would be wiser on the part of the Government to rise the Committee and give the members of the House the opportunity to think over these resolutions and give the matter more consideration.

It is only small politics; it is not statesmanship to turn down a proposition because it has been made by the Opposition. If you will accept the suggestions of the Opposition you will accomplish the work that you want to do much more quickly. You will have the support of the people who have to supply the revenue if you would delete this section three and spend this two million dollars that you have for the highways.

Mr. Chairman, I would again ask the honourable introducer of these resolutions as to what position he will take now after hearing the opinions as expressed by the members of the Opposition.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—We have heard the members of the Opposition on this subject, and apparently they have made up their minds definitely to vote against these resolutions. We had no new matter put before us to induce us to change our minds in regard to these resolutions, and now we propose to put them to the House. It is in no way a reflection on the members of the Opposition—but we cannot get very much further by

rising the committee this evening. The Opposition has told us definitely that they are going to vote against these resolutions, and we as a government have staked our reputation on these resolutions; and we believe that this is the correct way to approach the matter; and therefore we propose to go ahead with them now.

MR. SCAMMELL—Did I understand the Prime Minister to say that a contract will be entered into?

HON. PRIME MINISTER—Of course—but a contract or agreement cannot be entered into until we start to talk about it. We want to start talking about it. We have told you that we are not going to enter into a contract, but into an agreement, and now we want power to start entering into an agreement.

MR. HALFYARD—But the clause in the act mentions entering into a contract?

HON. PRIME MINISTER—Or an agreement.

MR. HALFYARD—Or an arrangement?

HON. PRIME MINISTER—It is all the same.

MR. HICKMAN—What is the necessity of having the word contract in there if the Prime Minister states that they are not going to enter into a contract?

HON. PRIME MINISTER—Possibly we may have to enter into certain contracts for certain concrete work, in connection with this arrangement.

MR. HICKMAN—That is a different thing altogether. I asked you if you were going to enter into a contract for the dock, or for any part of the dock . . . .

HON. PRIME MINISTER—You did not say anything about any part of the dock . . . . .

MR. HICKMAN: . . . . and you said no. Then I asked you if you were going to employ anyone to oversee the spending of our own money, and you said yes. Then there is no necessity for having the word "contract" in these resolutions.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—We think there is—that is all.

MR. HICKMAN—There should be an agreement as we said before—and that agreement should be on the table of the House.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

And it being now past twelve of the clock, midnight.

WEDNESDAY, March 25, 1925.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and had passed the said Resolutions with some amendments.

On motion this Report was received.

On motion for adoption of the Report Mr. Halfyard moved and Mr. Scammell seconded, in amendment, that section three of the resolutions be deleted.

Whereupon the House divided and there appeared in favor of the amendment:

Mr. Hickman,
Mr. Halfyard,
Mr. Grimes,
Mr. Scammell,
Mr. Brown,
Mr. Randell,
Mr. Duff,
Mr. Godden,
Mr. Ashbourne (9)

and against it:

Hon. the Prime Minister,
Hon. the Colonial Secretary,
Hon. the Minister of Justice,
Hon. the Minister of Finance,
Hon. Mr. Sullivan,
Hon. Mr. Long,
Hon. Mr. Cramm,
The Minister of Agriculture,
The Minister Marine & Fisheries,
The Minister Public Works,
Mr. Cashin,
Mr. Moore,
Mr. Lake,
Mr. Sinnott,

Mr. Power,
Mr. Puddester,
Mr. Cahill,
Mr. Linegar,
Mr. Browne, (19)

so it passed in the negative.

Whereupon, on the original motion for adoption of the Report the House divided when there then appeared in its favor:

Hon. the Prime Minister,
Hon. the Colonial Secretary,
Hon. the Minister of Justice,
Hon. the Minister of Finance,
Hon. Mr. Sullivan,
Hon. Mr. Long,
Hon. Mr. Cramm,
The Minister of Agriculture,
The Minister Marine & Fisheries,
The Minister Public Works,
Mr. Cashin,
Mr. Moore,
Mr. Lake,
Mr. Sinnott,
Mr. Power,
Mr. Puddester,
Mr. Cahill,
Mr. Linegar,
Mr. Browne, (19)

and against it:

Mr. Hickman,
Mr. Halfyard,
Mr. Grimes,
Mr. Scammell,
Mr. Brown,
Mr. Randell,
Mr. Duff,
Mr. Godden,
Mr. Ashbourne. (9)

so it passed in the affirmative and was ordered accordingly.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, March 25, 1925.

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

Hon. the Minister of Justice presented the report of the Select Committee respecting "The Terra Nova Sulphite Act 1920," as follows:

The Select Committee appointed to consider the Bill to amend the Terra Nova Sulphite Act, 1920, have considered the matter to them referred, and report that in their opinion noawithstanding that full and sufficient notice has not been given, that the rules of the House in that respect be suspended, and that the accompanying bill be adopted.

(Sgd.) W. J. HIGGINS,
W. J. BROWNE,
F. G. BRADLEY,
W. R. WARREN,
A. E. HICKMAN.

March 24th, 1925.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, I would like to have that bill read the second time on tomorrow. Members will have a chance to consider the matter before then, and copies of the bill might be distributed now. Shortly, with regard to the bill it is in connection with the A. N. D. Company and having taken over the rights of the Terra Nova Sulphite Company at Alexander Bay the expenditure that was to have been made there is now to be made at Grand Falls. The timber that was cut at Terra Nova will be sent to Grand Falls and manufactured there. I would suggest that the bills be distributed now.

On motion it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

Mr. Grimes gave notice of question.

Mr. Duff gave notice of question.

Mr. Ashbourne gave notice of question.

Mr. Ashbourne gave notice of question.

Hon. the Prime Minister presented the report of the Select Committee appointed to consider the Bill entitled "Of the House of Assembly," as follows:

March 25th, 1925.

To the Honourable
The House of Assembly,

Your Select Committee appointed to consider the Bill to amend an Act entitled "Of the House of Assembly," beg to report that they have considered the Bill, and several suggested alterations and additions to the terms thereof, and now beg leave to report to your favorable consideration the draft Bill hereto attached, containing several amendments which, in their opinion, should be made in the Bill referred to them.

Respectfully submitted,

(Sgd.) W. S. MONROE,
W. J. HIGGINS,
T. J. POWER.

While I agree with the principle of the bill I assume no responsibility for the proposed division of the present electoral district of Fortune Bay.

Respectfully submitted,

(Sgd.) W. R. WARREN.

On motion it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they have passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 25 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Light Dues,'" with some amendment, in which they request the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion the said Amendments were read a first time and it was ordered that they be read a second time on tomorrow.

(1) MR. BROWNE asked the Minister of Agriculture and Mines: (1) if he is aware of certain alterations which were made to long established boundaries of certain properties on the Thorburn Road, near St. Philip's, or of errors made by officials of his Department in laying out same; (2) if the alterations were made contrary to the wishes of and in spite of the protests of the parties affected; (3) if any compensation will be given by his Department for damages done thereby; (4) if he is prepared to order that where errors have been made by officials in his Department, compensation will be given and the mistakes rectified.

Reply tabled.

(2) MR. GODDEN asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing in detail how the amount of $11,074.92 as referred to in the Auditor General's Report (under Section 33 (b) of the Audit Act) and classed as miscellaneous, was expended.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Speaker, the answer to that question is in the course of preparation and will be ready tomorrow.

(3) MR. WARREN asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay upon the Table of the House a copy of the Report made by Messrs. Price Waterhouse Co., to the Squires Government a few years ago.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay that statement on the Table of the House. I would like to ask the Hon. Member not to take the book out of the House because it is the only copy that the Government has.

(4) MR. SCAMMELL asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the Table of the House a detailed statement showing how the sum of $6599.91 was expended and classed under the heading of 'Labrador Fishery Commission Account' as referred to in the Audit General's Report un-

der Section 33 (b) of the Audit Act.

(5) MR. HICKMAN asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay upon the Table of the House a list of all employees of the Railway, Government steamers, Dock and every other branch under the Railway Commission. To give the names of the employees and the salaries paid; to lay upon the Table of the House the Report of the Railway Commission from January 30th 1924 to December 31st, 1924, showing the earnings and expenditure.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—That question will take about ten days to complete. The railway officials tell me that they have begun to prepare it.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Colonial Secretary, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Regulate Travel on Highways and the Speed, Operation and Load of Vehicles thereon."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

Order of The Day

Committee of the Whole on Supply. Deferred.

Committee of the Whole on Textile Company Resolutions. Deferred.

Committee of the Whole on a Bill entitled "An Act to Regulate Travel on Highways, and the Speed, Load and operation of vehicles thereon."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, were not some questions left over for decision when this Bill was under discussion last?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—There may be more as we go along, so we will come back to them all at the end of the reading.

MR. WARREN—Since the House was last in Committee on this Bill, I have given it some consideration, and I want to say that, while I agree with the bill in principle, there are parts of this bill that are totally unnecessary. It is all very well for us to take a bill that is applicable to cities like Toronto, or Montreal or New York, or places like that, and apply it to a little country like this, but the result is in some cases ridiculous and absurd.

Let me give you a few instances. Under this Bill if you happen to be going somewhere with your car, and you do not happen to be fortunate enough to have a chauffeur to take your car away for you, you have to leave your car outside wherever you may happen to be with all the lights on. That means that you will have to get your batteries charged every two or three days; unless, of course you like to go to a motor agent and buy a stop light and affix that to your car. It is all very well to have that sort of thing in a busy city, where traffic is very heavy and very dangerous, but if I point out a few cases which might happen in St. John's I think you will see how unnecessary these provisions are in St. John's.

Suppose you happen to go out to your club and bring your car with you. You have to leave your car outside. If you go to the B. I. S. you will not be troubled because you have a courtyard outside, to which you can get from Garrison Hill, and as you are not on a highway you can leave your car there without lights on. But take some of the other places. Take the Knights of Columbus, for instance. Every night you will find three or four cars outside there, with an electric light right opposite. There is no necessity to have the lights on a car parked opposite the Knights of Columbus. Then take the City Club —you have Baird's Cove there, where the men as a rule park their cars but this Act says that if they park their cars there, they will have to

keep their lights on. Such a position is absolutely absurd.

I think another part of this Bill provides that you have to park your car facing in the direction in which you are going to go. Think of the cars which are left outside the Masonic Lodge, or the Masonic Club. Under this Act you would have to park those cars facing down towards the Museum. If you have to do that, you will find some of those cars in the Museum some day when you come out. The practice now is to park the cars facing across the road, but that will not be allowed under this Bill.

There are many things in the Bill which are very necessary, such as rules of the road, but there are a whole lot of unnecessary things in the Bill which will, if passed, make the Bill unpopular, and will only result in putting motorists to unnecessary trouble and expense. We have already passed one section, which I propose to move that we reconsider, and that is the section referring to the lights.

I refer now to subsection (f) of section 10, which reads:—

"A motor vehicle while standing "upon any highway at such times as "lights are required by the provisions "of this section for such vehicle may, "in lieu of the lighting equipment "specified in this section, show one "light carried on the left side of the "car in such a manner, etc. . . . ."

That provides for this new light that every motorist will have to buy, unless he cares to use all his lights when his car is standing still. Section (a) might be amended so that it will provide that every car will have to carry the regular lights only when in motion.

Take the position that is going to occur when someone is down on Water Street with a motor car shopping you happen to park on the left hand side above Baird's, and you want, when you are finished at Baird's, to go across to Gray and Goodland's, you have to go away up to the Bank of Montreal in order to turn and come down to Grey and Goodland's, so that you may be facing in the proper direction, facing east. These things are all very well for big cities, but for us it is as the Minister of Justice says, putting the trappings of a Rolls Royce on a Ford.

Therefore I beg to move that subsection (f) and subsection (a) of section 10 be reconsidered, and stand over with the other sections that are to have reconsideration.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Section A is just the same as the law today. I presume that you do not have all your lights lit when you are stopped. Section A provides for carrying of lights when the car is in motion, and when you have a subsection providing for the lights to be carried when the car is parked, it is obvious that section A does not apply to that.

MR. WARREN—No, subsection (a) provides for the lights that are to be carried when the car is on a highway, no matter whether it is in motion or not. Section (f) only provides for the light that may be carried instead of the lights mentioned in (a). This stop light may be put on instead of the ordinary lights.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—It is obvious that it must only refer to cars in motion, because later on you have a special provision for cars that are stationary.

MR. WARREN—Subsection (a) only provides for the lights to be carried and makes no mention of parking. It simply means that when a car is on a highway it has to carry these lights.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—But the provision is made later on for the lights to be carried when the car is parked.

MR. W. J. BROWNE—That is only what may be carried instead of the other.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—It is obvious that it does not refer to parked cars.

MR. W. J. BROWNE—I had already drawn attention to this particular section when the bill was last under discussion; and when I drew attention to sub section (a) I was informed that that subsection applied both to cars in motion and parked cars. I remember that distinctly, because I brought up that point.

MR. WARREN—Whether the car is in motion or not when on the highway, it must carry three lights.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I agree as to parking in the City, but I think that cars parked on the side of the country road should have a light shown.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—It is my belief that the great trouble will be in connection with motors in town. The whole object of the Bill is the safeguarding of the lives of citizens. It may have been done under a Municipal Regulation, which I think was well thought out and which is a good idea, as otherwise the cabs might be a menace to the safety of the public. I think also that a light may be found to use on motors that will not burn out his batteries as quickly as the Honorable Member seems to fear. A change in this matter of carrying lights may result in one motor becoming a danger to others, and I would not like to see the alteration made. I quite appreciate that the Bill is a lengthy one, and perhaps somewhat complicated, but it is drawn up mainly to safeguard the public. Of course we are open to suggestions, and it will be remembered that at first it was proposed to change the side on which the car should be driven, from the left to the right, but when it was pointed out that this would be an inconvenience to many, and representations were made by truckmen and others, that it would impose a hardship on them, it was changed. That is one important alteration that has been made in the Bill, and I think that any other reasonable change will also be made, as we want to make it workable. I must say I appreciate the Honourable Member's suggestion, as it is made in good faith, but still I am loath to make the proposed change.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, all I can do is to repeat my objection to this section, and I think we should put in an amendment covering cars when outside of St. John's. But here in the City I think this section would entail unnecessary expense, as there are lights everywhere. One can often see the Honorable the Colonial Secretary's car standing in front of his door almost directly beneath an electric light.

MR. BROWNE—The Municipal regulations provide for the very thing the Honorable Member object to. If a car is left standing without lights, the owner is infringing the Municipal regulations.

MR. WARREN—Under these circumstances, I withdraw the proposed amendment.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Chairman, am I to understand that any car standing still on a road outside St. John's is to keep three lights burning?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—That is provided for in Sub-Section F.

MR. BROWNE—Mr. Chairman, Section 17 Sub-Section A reads "No person shall operate or drive a motor vehicle on a highway unless licensed so to do, and no person shall employ anyone to drive a motor vehicle who is not licensed." I think that in previous discussion it was suggested that tourists coming here would employ non-licensed drivers.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—The addition of another subsection will cover that matter.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, that is one of the sections to which I refer. Of course it may be necessary in big centres like St. John's and Toronto to have these regulations, but in little places like London, where there is a small amount of traffic they are not the rule. You do not have to turn around to park your car there. It is a dangerous thing to do to have the rule put in to park the car in the direction in which you are going. I think that it is a dangerous thing to do and I am not going to vote for it.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSION—I do not agree with the hon. gentleman about what he says about London. As far as London is concerned you are not allowed to park the car at all.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman, with regard to this section, I understand that it is the intention of the Government to allow places outside St. John's to incorporate municipalities, and the chances are that the Bill will come up at this session of the House. I would like the Hon. Colonial Secretary, if he sees fit to let this section stand over.

We have on the Twillingate Islands six motor cars, and I think our case is rather a peculiar one, as we shall probably be unable to transport our cars in order to enjoy the benefit of the tourist roads; and I think that some provision should be made now, in case Twillingate Island should not become incorporated into a municipality, that the Road Board should be allowed to get some part of the fees that would be collected for licenses under this Act. At present we have to pay for a driver's license. We have to pay it to the Municipal Council office in St. John's, so that we may get a license to drive in Twillingate. While up to the present time we have not to pay license fees for the car itself, we have had to pay a license fee for driving.

There is another point that I would like to bring up to the house. At the present time it is imperative that a driver's license should be renewed each year, and I would urge that when this matter comes before the Commission they would give attention to the question of considering that. Perhaps we are in a peculiar position in Twillingate, and I hope the Commission will give us all the consideration they can.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I may say in reply to the honourable member that I do not see how that comes under this section at all.

This is merely a provision made for places where municipalities are established, they would be allowed to collect fees in the municipality under their jurisdiction. As regards road boards that is a question for the people of Twillingate to decide for themselves.

MR. ASHBOURNE—May I point out that we have no municipality there, and the administration of such affairs is in the hands of the road board.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—This is merely making provision for what may be done in the places where municipalities are established, but where no municipality is established it would not apply, and your case would not apply until such time as you establish a municipality. It is up to yourselves to have a municipality. By virtue of the Bill coming in, any section of the country can do so by a vote of the people in that section. It is entirely a matter for themselves, and all the rights of citizenship will be conferred upon them by this Bill. I am not quite sure whether it is going to come in this session or not. Is it, Mr. Prime Minister?

HON. PRIME MINISTER—Yes.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—With reference to his contention about taking out licenses. Licenses are not taken out every year. He first passes

an examination, and then he gets his license. Then after that he merely pays his fee, and get his license re newed.

MR. BROWNE—Mr. Chairman, I would like to refer to the section dealing with the making of arrests. I think the principle is new to this country and to every other, that any person may arrest one committing a breach of the motor act, and give a right to every individual that he should not have. The police are the proper authorities to make arrests, and there are other officials appointed by the commission to carry out the act. Therefore, I think we should not allow the introduction of such a section. I believe it should be dropped, or the wording changed to read "Every police-officer, or person appointed by the commission to make an arrest." I never heard the like of such a proposal before, as the giving of the power to a civilian to arrest another, and I must ask that it be immediately withdrawn from the Bill.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Chairman, I may say the Honourable Member for St. John's West has drawn attention to the matter of giving the ordinary power of a policeman to anyone who knows another has committed a breach of the act, that it is not to my liking. I do not like this idea of arrests by private parties at all. If the police can arrest without warrant, I think it would be sufficient for the private party to draw the attention of the commission to the breach of the act. I do not see the occasion for the making of arrests by private individuals. As a matter of fact it will result to a large extent in that it would only be a scrapper who would take on the job. I do not think the Bill would be hurt by dropping that sub-section. It gives too extensive powers to the private individual, and would only result in rows on the road.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—I agree with both the Members for St. John's East and West, as to this matter of arrests. I think it is somewhat absurd, and agree to have it stricken out.

The two clauses that are in abeyance sub-section J of section 10 which refers to Spot Lights. (Reads). In connection with that, the use of the spot light really depends on what side you are driving on. For a left hand driver the lights should be on the left hand. It would be on the right hand for anyone driving on the right.

I propose to strike ou the words "To the left" in that section.

Reads Subsection J Section 10.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, I think that so far as this is concerned if the driver of the car does any damages the owner of the car will be responsible civilly so that in that respect there is nothing new. (Reads section.) The idea of the section is that the owner of the car would be liable for criminal breaches of the Act for the acts of the driver. That does not go so far as to say that he would be held responsible for manslaughter. (Reads) The rule is a stringent one. If the owner is sitting in the car and the driver is speeding along the highways the driver of the car is not going to speed along if the owner is not agreeable to his doing so. The owner should be liable. There is no owner of a car today who is sitting in his car whose driver exceeds the speed limit without his permission. I think that it is a wise provision to have in the bill. It is the only way to protect the lives of the pedestrians, and there is no other way to do it unless you make the owner of the car liable. It does not mean that the owner will be proceeded against criminally. In the present act if a car does damage to a person's property then that person

could take action against the owner of the car for the damages. As far as I can see there is no reason why the section should not be left as it is.

MR. W. J. BROWNE—Mr. Chairman, I cannot agree with the Hon. Minister of Justice if he is referring to Section A. Sub-section 8 says that—Reads Sub-section 8. Unless the car is in the possession of somebody other than the owner without his consent. That is unless someone takes the car away from the door or steals it out of his garage. But now suppose he loans the car to somebody or suppose that the Hon. Member's wife or his children were in charge of the car, is the Hon. member liable because they go on the wrong side of the road. If the Hon. member's chaffeur goes on the wrong side of the road should the Hon. member be liable for it? I suggest that the words "without the owner's consent" be left out. Why should a man be liable for a man who has a license in the proper form and who has passed the very severe examination that is given by the commissioners and then comes to that man with the certificate from the commission. It is not that man's fault that the commission did not find out that he is not a competent chaffeur. The Hon. Minister of Justice says that the owner of the car cannot be proceeded against in the case of manslaughter. I think that he can be proceeded against if this section is retained.

(Reads.)

If a man goes down to the Department of Justice he will be punished for the offences of his chaffeur, and I do not think that it is right, and I am not going to vote for it.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, Section 75 provides punishment without the option of a fine. Now take the case of a woman who has employed a chaffeur. He has come to her with a good recommendation, and then this chaffeur when he is driving this woman becomes intoxicated, and then the woman has to be punished with imprisonment without the option of a fine.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, I agree with what has been said by the member for St. John's West. I intended to make the same remarks only they would not be with the same legal phraseology. It holds the owner of the car responsible for everything that happens in the car and also holds him responsible for the chaffeur's actions. Both the owner of the car and the driver of the car are held responsible for the car, but most of the responsibility rests on the owner. I do not think that he should have that responsibility. I do not think that the owner should be responsible for everything that the chaffeur does when he has the car out. I think that it is something that the owner might have to regret. Even the Hon. Minister of Justice might have cause to regret it.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and had passed the said Bill with some amendment.

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Encouragement of Shipbuilding" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Second reading of a Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 172 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series)" entitled 'Of the Survey of

Foreign Going and Labrador Vessels.'"

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker, in regard to the Bill that is now before the House, I would like to say for the information of this House and the country at large, that in the present seal fishery there has been quite a difference of opinion as to whether we could have an inspection of the ships that were going to prosecute the seal fishery or whether we could not; and it was the opinion of a number of people that the Government could call upon the owner of the ships in this country to have a special survey made before those ships went to the seal fishery, but after going through all the different rules and regulations referring to the seal fishery, we found that that was not correct. According to the law of the land, a ship, if inspected once a year and granted a certificate of fitness to go to sea, that ship can go to the seal fishery or anywhere else, and therefore I have brought in this Bill to protect the sealers of this country, and not only the sealers, but those who are dependent upon the sea for a livelihood.

I have been going to the seal fishery for the last thirty eight years, and I do not consider that any old ship is fit to prosecute the seal fishery. I do say here that if some amendments were made to the law as it is now in force, it would be possible in future to see that the ships that went out to the seal fishery were safe to go out to prosecute that industry; and I am surprised that some law to that effect has not been introduced before.

We have in this country a number of men—a class of men who go to the seal fishery, and they are prepared to go out in any vessel as long as they get out there, and I am sorry to say that I myself have been one of them. That is a bold class of men who know no fear, but if the government then allowed them to go out then, it is my privilege now to bring in a bill that will offset these things. I am now asking the House of Assembly to consider this Bill.

I have been placed in a very awkward position during these last few weeks, because I was trying to carry out the laws of the land and at the same time safeguard the sealers of the country. Therefore, I have brought in this Bill which provides for a special survey to be made on all ships going to the seal fishery, and I think as a practical sealer that this ought to go through. I consider that we have ships in this country today that are good ships. They are as good ships as you will get to go out and keep clear of the ice floes. But we have ships in this country at the present time of such a kind that they are not fit to take a number of men out to the seal fishery to prosecute that industry, or if they get out there, are not fit to bring them back safe to the land. Therefore this Bill will enable a special survey to be made of the ships that are going to the fishery.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, I understand that Chap. 172 of the Consolidated Statutes is the authority under which the Minister of Marine has undertaken the survey of vessels prosecuting the sealfishery at the present time, and I understand the Minister has had occasion to look up the matter. I agree with him that it is time this act was amended as to the survey of sealing vessels. Now in the case of the surveyor under Chap. 176.

MINISTER OF MARINE—An amendment to that will be brought in in a few days. As it is now there is only one surveyor and he may take sick and I am inserting a clause providing for a deputy.

MR. HALFYARD—That is reasonable as there should be someone else.

Under Chap. 172 this was not certain. I may say that I agree with this bill.

MR. HICKMAN—I would like to ask the Minister of Fisheries if there are any regulations as to sheathing, etc., of sealing vessels by which the Inspector is to be guided.

MINISTER OF FISHERIES—None that I know of.

MR. HICKMAN—Then the whole matter depends on the discretion of the Inspector. Surely there should be some rules as to the strengthening, etc., of the vessels. The Bill will come before the House in committee in a few days, and if anything of this kind suggests itself to honorable members now, I think it ought to be dealt with now.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Speaker, as to the general principle of the Bill just outlined by the Minister of Marine & Fisheries I am in accord, but I think the point made by the Leader of the Opposition is well taken. As far as I can see the Inspectors have large discretionary powers, and it is now proposed to extend these powers so that they may say whether a vessel is to sail to the seal fishery or not. Therefore I think the point raised by the Leader of the Opposition is all the more forceful. Did I understand the Minister of Marine to say that he had difficulty in discovering the powers of the Inspector at present.

MINISTER OF MARINE—They were discussed in connection with vessels engaged in deep sea fishing.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Speaker, coming from the North, as I do, I am interested in this Bill. Last year our firm had vessels to the sealfishery. With regard to the surveying of schooners I am in thorough accord as I think it would take the responsibility off the owners if anything happened on the voyage. Does this Bill provide that every schooner going to the Labrador must undergo an annual inspection?

MINISTER OF MARINE—No, unless she carries extra passengers.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—For the information of the honorable member for Twillingate I may say that schooners taking passengers are inspected by the Customs officers.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Will this Bill apply this year?

MINISTER OF MARINE—Not till it passes and receives the approval of His Excellency the Governor.

Pursuant to order and motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 172 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Survey of Foreign Going and Labrador Vessels'" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the St. John's Dry Dock" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill to amend Chapter 74 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Old Age Pensions.'"

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, March 26.

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

HON. COLONIAL SERCETARY — Mr. Speaker, I crave the indulgence of the House to have the Motor Traf-

fic Bill read for the third time before proceeding with the Order Paper. I ask to have this done because the Bill comes into operation on April 1st, and I ask that it be read the third time now so that the Upper House may have time to discuss and pass this Bill so that it may be completed before April 1st.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Colonial Secretary, the Bill entitled "An Act to Regulate Travel on Highways and the Speed, Operation and Load of Vehicles thereon" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Biill 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.

PRESENTING PETITIONS.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Kitchuses, a part of the harbour known as Conception Harbour. The petitioners ask that a sum of four or five hundred dollars be granted for the rebuilding of the main road running through that settlement, known as Kitchuses Road, which is in very bad condition, and could be put in good condition with the sum of money asked for. I think this is a very humble request sir, and I give this petition my hearty support, and I hope and trust that when I bring the matter before the Government later on that myself and my colleague will endeavour to secure the grant of the amount asked for, or to get as much as we can for the good people of that place. They are a very industrious and thriving class of people—fishermen farmers, and I would like to give them all the encouragement I can. This petition is largely signed by all the people of that locality and also by the people of Conception Harbour. I beg that this petition be referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. CAHILL—I beg to give this petition my very hearty support.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY — Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay on the table of the House the answer to the question of Mr. Grimes—number 6 on the Order Paper of March 24th. This file of correspondence is taken from the report of the Hospital Commission, and is comprised maintly of original copies, and I would ask the honourable member, though he is not present at the moment, if he would be good enough to return it to me after he has had an opportunity of taking what notes he desires.

GIVING NOTICE OF MOTION AND QUESTION.

Mr. Duff gave notice of question.

Mr. Scammell gave notice of question.

Mr. Hickman gave notice of question.

Mr. Warren gave notice of question.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE laid on the table of the House the answer to the question of Mr. Hickman on the Order Paper of Fel ruary 23rd.

NOTICE OF QUESTION.

(1) MR. GRIMES asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries how many vessels will be proseecuting the Bank Fishery from the South and West Coasts the coming season.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker, in reply to the honourable member for Twillingate district I may say that I do not know of any vessels clearing for the Bank Fishery yet, and I may say that it would be impossiblee for me to give any information on this matter until about the end of June.

(3) MR. ASHBOURNE asked Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs to lay upon the Table of the House a copy of the Report submitted by Colonel Ross.

MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—Mr. Speaker, in reply I beg

to say that we have no report yet, but we expect to have a report later on.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES laid on the table of the House answer to question of Mr. Scammell on the Order Paper of March 25th.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS laid on the table of the House answer to question of Mr. Brown on the Order Paper of March 25th.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 74 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Old Age Pensions'" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrw.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend an Act entitled 'Of the House of Assembly.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER— Mr. Chairman, since this Bill was before the House a committee was appointed to report to the House on it and they have brought in their report. It is signed by myself, the Hon. Mr. Higgins and Mr. Power. Mr. Hickman did not sign it, but Mr. Warreu did with some reservations in connection with his own district—a suggestion that Garnish be taken into Burin District, and while the people there at first consented they afterwards demurred, because they could not take their member, Mr. Warren, with them. Therefore he did not feel like committing himself. I understand from the Leader of the Opposition that they consider there is no hurry to pass this Bill, as it will not come into operation for three years, and they see no reason why it should not be considered by a committee out of session. With regard to the amendments mentioned by the committee, I may say they are hardly worth referring to, as they are merely descriptions of the boundaries to definitely decide which a surveyor was sent from the Mines Department to several districts. In the District of Harbour Grace we received a protest from one place, Tilton, which wanted to be taken into Bay Roberts, instead of remaining in Harbour Grace, where it formerly belonged. As the people decided they wanted to be in Bay Roberts, and it divided up the districts better numerically, Tilton is now included there. There are one or two other districts in which the alignments of the boundaries have been somewhat altered, but these are the only changes made since the Bill was previously before the House.

MR. HICKMAN — Mr. Chairman, what the Honourable the Prime Minister has told us in reference to the stand of the Opposition is more or less correct. We have had a party meeting or two, principally on this Bill, and we have come to a conclusion which we think is right, and any fair-minded man will agree that this is an important matter, and as it will not come into effect till the next General Elections, three years hence, it should be referred to a Select Committee, who would sit out of session of the House to deal with it. It affects in many ways the denominational standing, and the people throughout the country have had no chance to consider it or offer any suggestions in connection with it, and that's why we think it should be given to a Select Committee, enlarged if necessary, and who would meet out of session of the Legislature. If it is rushed through, as is evidently the intention of the Prime Minister, judging by the fact that it is brought up before important legislation, there seems to be some ulterior motive, because while this Government may divide the country as they see fit, other Governments will

later have to make changes, particularly if the denominational division is not satisfactory. When the Honourable the Prime Minister dealt with this Bill before, he told us that the Honourable Mr. Morine had been working three years on it. Therefore, I think the least we can do is give the people one year in which to consider it. This Bill will make for much greater expense in the carrying out of elections, as there will be more districts, more Returning Officers and more members. Instead of increasing the membership of the House of Assembly, I think it should be reduced. It now takes thirty-six men to conduct the affairs of a country with a revenue of eight or nine million dollars, and I agree with the statement of Commissioner Walker that the business of this country should be done after hours. Therefore there is no excuse for making the membership of this House forty instead of thirty-six. I would now ask the Honourable the Prime Minister if he would be pleased to have the Committee rise so that proper consideration may be given the Bill, as it is too important to be rushed through under the circumstances, and in view of the explanation given by the Honourable the Prime Minister.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, it appears to me that in connection with every proposition brought before this House, the Opposition have one set policy, that is, to give it a hoist, asking for delay, and claiming there is no hurry about anything. There is no good reason why this or any other Bill should be delayed. The Leader of the Opposition says there is no hurry, and we should take time to consider this measure out of Court, but we generally find that out of Court there is very little work done. He speaks of the Honourable Mr. Morine giving this Bill consideration, but that gentleman is not the only one who has given it attention, as the Government have been dealing with it for months. They have considered it from every viewpoint, gone into the matter of alignments, and except from White Bay, from which place we have not heard in full, there has been nothing but plaudit of the Bill. Even if we are increasing our membership, which we all deplore, how are we going to continue the denominational and parochial interest by changing the districts any more than at present. I do not think this Bill can be improved upon, and even if the Opposition had two years to deal with it, I don't believe theirs would be as good. Mr. Hibbs thought that he could bring in a scheme which would be better, but I think that he himself is satisfied now that he could not do so.

We do not know whether we will be in power for four years. We think we will be, but there are a great many changes and turmoils in public life in this country and we believe that if we were to go out of power to-morrow that the proper scheme for the redistribution of districts is the one we bring before the House to-day. We think we should take no risks and we think that this Redistribution Bill should go into force right away. If we are of the opinion that it is good legislation, why postpone it? Even the honourable Leader of the Opposition, I do not think, has abandoned all hope that another general election is going to take place within the next three and a half or four years, and I think he has got an idea that he is going to break up this Government before that period expires. But if a general election does take place, why not start now and see that the different electoral districts are properly served. Take the district of St. George's, which is represented by Mr. Power. We have now the Humber region adding an enormous number of people to St. George's district represented by one man; whereas we have two men

representing the district of Ferryland with about half the population of St. George's. The same anomaly obtains throughout the country. We have had a rehash of this thing here for many years and the fact remains that we want a redistribution of seats, and why not have it now. I cannot see any sense or any object in the Opposition asking to have this thing shelved for the purpose of having it considered by a Select Committee while out of session and to report back to the House at next session, because that would not bring us any further ahead than we are now. For that reason and with every due respect to the Opposition and with every intention of meeting them in any proposition they will put forward, we are, as I have already told them, going to have this legislation put through the House at this particular session. I believe that the Opposition members have had ample time to consider this Bill. They had the proposition put before them, as it was thought they might be able to improve upon it. In fact the member for Fogo thought he could improve upon it, but he is now satisfied that he could not. It did not take Mr. Morine all of three years to work out this scheme, although it may have taken him three years before bringing in any suggestion to the Government; and while Mr. Morine was considering this scheme for three years I want to tell this House that Sir William Coaker was associated with Mr. Morine the first time he considered it, and Sir William Coaker gave the scheme great consideration and was very much in favor of it, and, I have no doubt, the members of his party have also given great consideration to this Redistribution Bill. This is not a new matter that is being heard of for the first time. It has been a question of many years standing, and if other people had their views about it why did they not bring it to a head before this. They had the same opportunity as Mr. Morine or anybody else had. The Government has carefully considered the alignments of the boundaries of the different districts, and from what we can learn the people generally throughout the country want to see this Bill go through at this session of the House because they are perfectly satisfied that it is good policy and good legislation.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, the Prime Minister has already spoken on my attitude to this Bill and I merely rise to emphasize my position because of the report of yesterday's proceedings in this morning's paper and I presume a similar report will be in this evening's papers. I was on the Select Committee to deal with this Bill and I attended the meetings of the Select Committee and I signed a report on the terms, namely, that whilst I agreed with the principle of the Bill I was unable to assume responsibliity for the proposed division of the District of Fortune Bay. The Prime Minister has stated in very complimentary terms why I have not been able to assume that responsibility. What I did say was that I was in favor of the principle of the Bill and no man who is a member of any district west of the district of Placentia and St. Mary's could do otherwise than support the Bill. I do not claim that the District of Placentia and St. Mary's is what we call on either the South West or West Coast, because it is more or less on the Peninsula of Avalon. I again state that I only put my signature to the report for the reason that Garnish do not want to go into Burin District now, but at first they did want to be connected with Burin district. I am entirely in favor of the Bill, and every member west of the District of Placentia and St. Mary's must support the Bill. As a matter of fact in the year 1919, when the Government that I was associated with was in power there was a

loud cry from the people on the South West Coast for better representation in this House. Even in this Bill now before the House they are not getting the representation that they are entitled to, but, after all, I suppose "a half loaf is better than no bread." It has been suggested by the Leader of the Opposition that this Bill be referred to a Select Committee to sit out of session and to report back at the next session of the House. I am opposed to that suggestion, because I believe that if anything turned up in the meantime the South Coast will not get what they are entitled to. Let me say that from Rushoon—which is the boundary line between the District of Placentia and St. Mary's and Burin District—to Cape Ray there are 32,500 people with four representatives, my own district representing 11,272 people; while on the other hand the districts of Port-de-Grave and Carbonear with a population of one-third of that number are represented by one man each. Take the district of Harbor Grace, which has a population of only 300 more people than Fortune Bay, is represented by three members. Then there is the district of St. George's with 9,200 of a population represented by one man, so that from Rushoon down to Bonne Bay you have 41,700 people represented by five members, whereas the rest of the island have more members than they are really entitled to. Consequently, those of us who represent the South and West Coasts have no alternative but to support the Bill, and whatever imperfections that might appear in the Bill now can be rectified when the different districts get the proper representation in this House that they are entitled to. As regards referring the Bill to a Select Committee, I might say that there is a great deal in what the Prime Minister has said. I know that nearly everybody in my district heard of this Bill, and I have heard of no adverse comment about it. On the other hand they want it. In 1834 the District of Fortune Bay was the District of Hermitage Bay, the only difference being that when it was Hermitage Bay District it ran from Point May, the nearest point to St. Pierre, around to Bonne Bay. The change was made on account of the French Shore Question. But I really think that we should dispose of this Bill right away, as I think it is a step in the proper direction. And, after all, the way to look at it is: if this Government is not going to be in power at the next session of the House or the session afterwards, then I am anxious to see that the West Coast gets its proper representation as soon as possible. Therefore, I want to have this Bill passed at this session. But if the Government is in power at the next session and the session afterwards and then any discrepancies are found such as any particular member have been injured by the Bill or that any particular district has not been properly treated, I feel quite sure that the Government will take the earliest opportunity to remedy any such discrepancy by bringing in an amendment to make the Bill more perfect. Even now we on the South Coast are entitled to another man as compared with Conception Bay. Look at Conception Bay including Bay-de-Verde, Bell Island, Bay Roberts, Hr. Grace, Hr. Main, Carbonear, Port-de-Grave and the outlying portion of St. John's West. The total population of these places is 52,800 people with nine members representing them. Whereas Burgeo, Burin East, Burin West and Fortune Bay with a total population of 32,500 people are only represented by five members. So that in the same proportion either the West Coast is entitled to another member bringing it up to six or that Conception Bay is only entitled to

eight members. But, as I said before, that may be altered in due course. It cannot be done now, but I do say that so far as the West Coast is concerned, if they want this Bill they are entitled to better representation than they are getting at present; and further that this is the reason why I have subscribed to the report of the Select Committee, but the main point so far as my own constituency is concerned, is that I assume no responsibility.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I have not been able to give this Bill much attention. This is the most important Bill that has been brought before the House this session. It is one of the most important Bills that can be brought before any legislature. I am not here to speak on this Bill to-day, because yesterday afternoon when it was proposed that the Bill be submitted to a Committee of the Whole, I asked that the Bill be distributed, and the Minister of Justice was good enough . . .

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I would like to explain. I thought the Bill was distributed until just now. We agree that if this Bill was not distributed this notice would be given.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I want to say further that even if the Bill had been distributed, Mr. Halfyard would have asked for another day's delay. We are not trying to hurry the Bill but we object to considering the Bill out of session. If any member wants more time to consider the Bill we are only too pleased to give all the time he wants.

MR. HALFYARD—I thank you very much. Perhaps it is just as well to take advantage of the point that has just been made, by mentioning that the Prime Minister has made reference to the change made in Hr. Grace District. He said that Tilton had been attached to Bay Roberts instead of Hr. Grace District. Hr. Grace being so near St. John's there is an example of a change that has been made since the Bill has been distributed.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—On the request of the people concerned.

MR. HALFYARD—Yes, on the request of the people concerned, and I feel sure, quite sure the people in the Eastern Districts have not had an opportunity to discuss this Bill. They might not know what it means,—the majority of the people,—some few might. I would mention that this has been a great argument in favor of the proposal made by the Leader of the Opposition that if there was sufficient time given for the people of the country to become acquainted with all that this Bill means. But I feel that if the Bill is put through the Legislature now, some section of the country will ask, "Why did you not ask for the Bill to be deferred for some time so that the whole country could have an opportunity of discussing its merits or demerits?" Now, as the hon. introducer of the Bill has no intention of going on with it, I will say nothing further, but an opportunity will be given tomorrow or next day.

MR. HICKMAN—Before the Committee rise, I would like to say that the Prime Minister evidently thinks that there is some personal reason of mine for standing up here and talking as I do, but the responsibility simply falls on me as Leader of the Opposition, to make a movement in these matters, a movement in the interests of the country, in the districts which we have the honor to represent. Districts just as important, as I said the other day, as those represented by the members on the other side of the House, and when I am making a motion to have the Committee rise in order that further consideration be given, I am

simply voicing the sentiments of those behind me.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion this Report was received and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on to-morrow.

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 Encouragement of Shipbuilding."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask the honorable Minister of Marine and Fisheries if he will be good enough to have an insertion put into this Bill. I think the proper place would be in No. 6 (C) we will call it "C".

Reads "C".

That is the subject that was discussed here the other day, and I think to which the honorable Minister must agree. He must give it some consideration, because after all the word was given out last Fall that a bounty was to be given on vessels repaired, and the Act has not been drafted, and nobody knows exactly what the act just contains. The vessel owners who went to the expense of repairing their vessels and did not take them out of the water understood they were going to get the bounty. The fact of the matter is they never would have undertaken repairs unless they felt quite sure that the bounty was forthcoming, and therefore it was a great hardship to any man who had gone to the expense by using his own money or perhaps by having to be supplied by us merchants to the extend of the repairs to have to bear all that on his own shoulders. Now I have no particular reason. There was no merchant or fisherman of mine who ought to be favoured with the bounty, but I think, on the general principles, it is a great hardship, and this amendment which I propose does not affect the Bill in any way except to empower the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to pay the bounty on vessels which are now under repairs.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the Leader of the Opposition in reference to Section 6, I think that I very plainly declared the other day that personally I am not going to give any man a bounty for repairing vessels in the water without their being pulled out. My opinion has not been based on last year or the year before, but there have been many vessels repaired during the last thirty years, and I have seen as many as any man in the country, being repaired. I made up my mind years ago that whether they were given a bounty or no bounty they should be pulled out of the water to make a good job. I am still of the same opinion that it is a bad thing for any Government to encourage people to rebuild old vessels without being pulled out of the water. When you repair vessels in the water you not only cannot see the bottom, but you cannot see whether the timber is good or bad, and it would be a bad job in nine cases out of ten. As to those who are repairing vessels in the water this year we had communications from three or four, but since then I find at least two pulled their vessels out of the water. I have had no cry from any part of this country that the people are repairing their vessels in the water to any great extent. It is not the idea of this Bill to save vessels that are worn out as far as the top sides and un-

derneath the water line. If they are worn out they should be properly constructed.

The idea of this Bill is to insure that the vessels are properly built so that the country will have an asset. These ships will be an asset to the country. They will be as good as new except the rigging and sails. Therefore, I am sorry to say that I cannot agree to paying a bounty on ships rebuilt and repaired in the water. I doubt if you will find very many vessels being repaired in the water today. As I stated before I don't know of any except the two at Port Union and they can very well haul them up as well as any one else if they want to. I think that it will be a greater hardship for anyone who has hauled up his vessel a couple of years ago and has given her a thorough rebuilding and spent a great deal of money on her than to the man who started this year and I doubt very much whether every city man has not heard that there was going to be a bounty on rebuilding ships for the last two or three months and have known perfectly well what the requirements are going to be. I sent out two hundred copies of a letter telling the men who are interested about this and I was talking to most of the Northern fishermen during the months of October and September and practically every merchant on Water Street rung me up and asked me if there was not going to be a bonus on rebuilding vessels and I told them that as far as I was concerned there would be and that I understood from the Government that there would be a bonus. I also told them that they had to be built out of water. I told them word for word as this bill is before the House now. Personally I would never be prepared to pass a bill paying the bonus to vessels that are rebuilt in the water.

CAPT. RANDELL—Mr. Chairman, the few words that I intend to say on this matter are rather looking for information than giving any to this House. I would like to know the extent of the repairs that are necessary for a man to get this bonus. I believe that the bill is that the ship must be built "brand new." But the bill before the House does not seem to me to state as to how much the repairs must be. As far as I can see the vessel just has to be hauled out of the water and the owner can get the bonus. I may be wrong but according to the Schedule A or B or C it looks to me that the amount of the repairs is not stated. As far as I can see the man who gets his vessel repaired from the streak up gets the same bonus as the man who only does a much smaller repair. I may be wrong to take that view of the matter but that is what the bill looks like to me. I would like to get some information from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, I think that the matter to which the hon. member for Trinity refers is answered in Schedule B and section 8. That is the very reason why Mr. Gulliford, Mr. Moss, Mr. MacFarlane, the Newfoundland Government surveyor and myself came to the decision that we did. We thought that any man who was going to make repairs would not get a ship built at the cost of a couple hundred dollars and undergo the expense of the breaking of ropes and all the other expenses unless the repairs were to be worth while. He would not take the ship out of the water for the sake of the Bounty unless he had to make considerable repairs. Mr. Dobbin was in my office and we found that the sixty ton vessels had cost from four to six thousand dollars to rebuild; the forty-five ton one cost three to four thousand dollars; and the twenty ton ones cost from eight hundred to a thousand dollars to rebuild. I do not believe that any man is going to take his

vessel out of the water for the sake of a few hundred dollars bonus. Suppose he took the vessel out of the water he would have to stand the expense of the handlines and the ropes that would break and if the extent of the repairs was only say six hundred dollars then the bonus would be one hundred and twenty dollars under the first schedule or ninety under the second. Surely no man is going to take the spars out of the vessel for the sake of that sum. The owner of the vessel has to satisfy the surveyor that the timber is as good as it should be and that it will do as long as the surveyor thinks necessary and it is not until he has received this certificate that he can get the bonus. I have no other information that I can supply to the hon. member.

CAPT. RANDELL—I do not see anything in this that compells a man to take the spars out of his vessel when he is going to have her repaired. You can repair a schooner and still have the spars in her. Then again in answer to the comments made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries I feel that there should be some limit to the amount stated in comparison to the value of the schooners. If a man wants to, he might very well go to the expense of hauling the vessel out of the water at say a cost of about two hundred and fifty dollars and he can then make whatever amount of repairs that he thinks necessary and as little as he likes while another man strips the schooner right down and then he gets the same as the man who just does as I mentioned and both of them in the case of a sixty ton schooner with the bonus at twenty dollars a ton get twelve hundred dollars. I think that there should be some limit put on the valuation of the repairs that the owner must make.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, I have to say that during my life I have seen a great number of schooners repaired in Newfoundland, I daresay as many as any other man. I have never seen a vessel rebuilt without the spars having been taken out because as far as I can see the spars will not stay in the ship if the beams and sides have been taken out of her and sometimes the head and the stern with them. With regard to one vessel casting more than another, I agree with Capt. Randell that there is a great deal in what he says. The Board considered this matter and we found that it was unfair as far as the men themselves were concerned.

It would cost the colony twice as much to do what Captain Randell suggests. I know two cases in my own harbour where two men repaired their ships and one cost fifteen hundred dollars more than the other even though the vessels were both sixty tons. That was because one man came up to the city and bought the planking for $130.00 per thousand and seventy-five dollars a thousand for decking. The other went to Carbonear and paid thirty dollars a thousand for his decking and then he went into the bay and got the planking. After taking all things into consideration the Board thought that as the country would be called upon to pay ten or fifteen thousand dollars a year under the other system that it would be best to go under the manner described in this bill. But I cannot conceive why any man in this country should go to the trouble to haul up his vessel and then make a very small repair because the bonus would not pay him. He will not get enough out of the bonus. I believe and I am prepared to say that if you go around the country for the next ten years you will not find a vessel repaired with the spars in her. There is no fisherman going to the expense of building a slip for his schooner when she does not want the spars taken out of her.

I should like the members of this House to be able to see the vessels that are being built at Goose Bay.

We are trusting a good deal, no doubt to the surveyors, but these surveyors, as I have said, are men that have themselves built schooners, and rebuilt vessels. It was not of my choosing that they were appointed. They were appointed years before I went there, but I found that they were good men, and I still held on to thm, and I feel sure from what I know of them by speaking to them and by the correspondence that I have had with them, that these two men are doing their duty to the country. I know of one instance where one of these men had pressure brought to bear on him by some one in the outports to have a certain thing done, but he did not think it was quite right to do it, so instead of giving in to him, he came back here to the Board and told them about it, and he carried out the instructions given him by the Board. Therefore I am quite sure that the vessels that will be rebuilt under this new Act this winter will be inspected by the inspectors appointed for that purpose, and they will be a great asset to this country, and to the Government, and to the people interested in the cod fishery. Therefore I cannot see anything that should be put in this Bill which would benefit the country at large; and as fas as the amendment of the Leader of the Opposition goes, I can see no object in putting that in.

MR. DUFF—Mr. Chairman, I just want to say a few words in regard to this Bill. Under certain conditions it is not an expensive matter to haul schooners out of the water. At Hr. Grace and Burin, for instance, it is quite inexpensive, when they have marine railways to do this work, and where a vessel can be hauled cut cheaply and only requires, perhaps, a new bolt streak and two or three other streaks of plank on the top sides to re-condition her, the owner would be entitled to $20.00 per ton bonus or $12.00 for a sixty-ton schooner, and another party who has a vessel that needs to be thoroughly overhauled and costs very much more money obtains only the same bonus.

And as regards the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries remarks regarding the necessity of taking out the spars, I cannot agree, as I know vessels that have recently had new decks and deck beams, stanchions, etc., and where, as in the position of the Hr. Grace shipowners, it certainly would not be necessary to remove spars, as they have all the facilities to take a vessel out of the water complete; and with a small amount of repairs and expense, as compared with other schooner owners not so conveniently situated, I understand they would be entitled to the full bonus. I am of the opinion that there should be something in the Act to provide for the bonus being paid on a certain expenditure, and I suggest that this point be considered.

The reference to the quality and cheapness of Carbonear lumber, by the Minister, is just as it ought to be, and no doubt he will recommend the purchase of some to his friends.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Chairman, a few days ago when I was speaking on the resolutions in connection with this Bill, I stated that I was absolutely in accord with the princ[illegible] of the Bill, as regards the pulling up of vessels before they were repaired. I repeat now what I said then. But for the people who are to-day repairing vessels, who did not pull them out of the water, and did not know that the Bill was coming in in the form that it has, I would ask that they should not be excluded from getting this bounty. I do not think it is fair that they should be ex-

cluded. These people should get something. I myself have had letters, the names of the writers of which I do not for several reasons think I ought to disclose, saying that the people were not notified regarding the kind of legislation that was going to be brought in, but the Minister has made a statement that he wrote about two hundred letters to various people . . . .

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I did not say I sent letters, I sent copies of this Bill . . .

MR. BROWN—Perhaps you would not mind giving the names of the people that you sent them to . . .

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Certainly . . . .

MR. BROWN—So that we can refute any statements that have been made in regard to it. There are several vessels in this country that are being repaired but have not been pulled up, but are being repaired in the water; and the owners of these ships are surprised now to find that they will not get the bounty. I do not think it is fair. Speaking on behalf of those people, I think that they should get a bounty, and some provision should be made for them.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, I want to avail of this opportunity to record my support of the principle of this Bill, and also I want to say that I am in total accord with the amendment proposed by the Leader of the Opposition. There is not much use in having any repetition on this point. The position we take is that there are schooners being repaired in the country to-day that are not hauled out of the water, and the owners of those ships did not have any idea that the Bill was going to provide that the ships had to be pulled up. And this is so despite the fact that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries says that he sent out two hundred coipes of the Bill. I am almost sure in the case of Port Union at any rate that they were not informed in time that they would be required to haul their vessels out of the water. If they did get that information it was not until January, and after that it was very difficult to get the vessels up, even if they might have been prepared to undergo the expense. I do not wish that this section should be incorporated in the Bill permanently, to remain there as part of the Bill, but that it should be put in now to cover such cases as those to which I refer. I want to go on record as sympathising with those people who, having repaired their schooners are going to lose the bounty if this goes through, because they did not pull their vessels out of the water.

There is another objection to the Bill which I would like to point out. The Minister stated that in the reports which his deputy surveyors had sent in, the average amount of repairs required on a sixty ton schooner would be about four thousand dollars worth. I maintain that the bounty is altogether out of proportion to the cost of repairs. If a man has to do four thousand dollars worth of repairs on a sixty ton schooner, I do not see that twenty dollars a ton will be sufficient encouragement for him. Therefore, I think that there should be provision made for some greater amount. On account of these two suggestions, I have to record myself as in favor of the amendment proposed by the Leader of the Opposition.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, in reply to Mr. Duff, I may say that the repairs to which he refers would not be regarded by the surveyors as repairs at all. Therefore that ends that question.

In reply to Mr. Brown, I would say that I would be much obliged if he

woud give me the names of these people who are repairing vessels in the water this winter. I mention that because, as I have said, no one has ever written to me about it, with the exception of one man at Old Perlican or New Perlican, I am not quite sure now, but I can find out; and a man named Snow at Harbor Grace. He has spoken to me about it, and I just told him that that was the law that was going to be brought in, and that we did not think that it was a good policy to encourage people to repair schooners in the water, because we did not think it was a good practice; and he agreed with me. He said his schooner was quite heavy, and he did not know if he would be able to get her out of the water. Then there was a man named John Curran who had a very large vessel, and he thought she should not have to pull her out of the water, but after we had some conversation, he practically agreed with me, and said he thought he would leave the repairs until next winter, when he would pull her up.

Mr. Scammell says that he doubts whether Port Union was notified in time about this; but I think Mr. Russell will be man enough to say that I did tell him, and that I was good enough to go up and tell him . . . .

MR. SCAMMELL—In January?

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—In the first part of January, if not in December, and after I had spoken to Mr. Russell, I could come to no other conclusion than that the people who had left those schooners to be rebuilt—that they were under the impression that the schooners were going to be rebuilt. I did it out of loyalty to Mr. Russell, so that he could get a chance to get the schooners pulled up if he wanted to. The same applies to the sending out of the two hundred copies of the Bill. In a way I had no right to do it, because it had not been passed, but I felt sure that the Prime Minister was going to do what he had promised in that matter as well as in all others.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Chairman, it is just possible that some schooners have been repaired in the water, and I ask the Minister if such be the case to recommend to the Government that the owners be given the bounty. There are some places where there are no launchways, and the schooners cannot be hauled up, and must be repaired in the water. I agree with the principle of the Bill, but ask that this privilege be given any who have gone to the expense of repairing in the water.

MR. ASHBOURNE—As the Minister himself has stated there may be isolated cases, perhaps not many, where schooners have been repaired without being hauled up. He says it is expensive to take the vessels out of the water, and I think if the Government insists on this being done, it will entail much expense and hardship on the fisherman. In very many cases vessels can be examined as well by being hove down as by being taken out of the water. I think the Minister will agree with me on these grounds, and also that repairs very often are necessary only between wind and water, as the schooners bottom may be in good condition. But according to the law she has to be hauled completely out of the water, and rather than injure those who have gone to expense already, or debar them from the privileges extended under this Bill, I think the Government should go out of its way to see that such a vessel owner is not unjustly treated. What has been done to encourage the fisheries, and there are only thirty thousand dollars given for bounty on schooners, and if there are any cases where repairs were made without the vessel being hauled up, I think the bounty should be given. I have heard of one schooner at least from Twillingate District which is

going to be repaired, or may be under repairs even now, and I think it would be most unfair to bar this man from the benefits of the bounty, particularly under the circumstances as mentioned by the Minister this evening. I agree with the principle of the Bill, but think that the bounty should be given this year even if the vessels have not been hauled up.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, I am as much in sympathy with the fisherman as anyone in the country, and will do everything in my power to help him. I am prepared when I find out from the surveyors, and make sure that the people who have repaired their vessels without hauling them out of the water were not aware of the Bill, to assist them. But if we extend the privilege of the bounty this year, without full consideration of the cases, we will have to be altering the Bill again next year. I do not think that any blame can be attached to me for what I did in notifying the people, as I only wanted to help them and took the word of the Honorable the Prime Minister that the Bill would pass. Every merchant and their dealers had heard of this early in October, and knew the Bill was to be brought in, though they may not have known its details, and in deference to the Honorable Members on the Opposite side of the House, I am prepared to ask the Government as long as we know the schooner owner is not getting the upper-hand of us to give him assistance.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear the view taken by the Minister, as he has admitted the principle of our argument, and evidently sees the justice of our claim. Now as he has gone so far I think he could put the proposed amendment in. It does not mean the drafting of a new Bill and will save him the trouble of going back to the Government, and asking for the Bonnty for those who repaired their schooners in the water. I know he realizes the difficulties of the poor fisherman in connection with the repairs to their vessels, and believe that if he puts in this amendment everything would go on without a hitch.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, in defence of the Minister of Marine, I wish to say that it leaves loopholes for trouble if the bounty is given now for repairing vessels in the water. As the Minister has pointed out a schooner cannot be properly repaired unless she is taken out of the water. If she is hauled up a surveyor can see that the work is done properly, and that new material replaces the old. But he cannot see this, or the condition of the bottom, unless the schooner's keel is out of the water. Therefore, we cannot acced to this request. As far back as October last the Minister of Marine was approached by merchants and fishermen as to what the Bounty was to be, and he gave them to clearly understand that there would be no bounty granted for vessels repaired in the water, and unless they were hauled up. Consequently no one has been deceived, and no one has been given to understand that they would get the Bounty if the vessel were not hauled up. I can see no necessity for treating the man who repaired his schooner out of the water this winter any differently from the man who repairs her next year, according to the regulations.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Marine bas been on his speech several times and each time he revealed his soul, which I may say is bigger than that of the Honorable the Prime Ministers. The Minister of Marine recommended that those who have repaired their schooners in the water should get something.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I said I would recommend it if we were satisfied those repairing

schooners did not know of the regulations.

MR. HICKMAN—Well, we put it your way that they would be given something if they didn't know the vessel had to be hauled out of the water. That speaks well for the Minister, and shows that he has something in him. But after the Bill passes he will not be able to recommend anything, because it states in the Bill that the vessel must be hauled out of the water, so that the keel may be examined. So whatever good intentions he may have of helping the men who were not in possession of the facts of the regulations, I do not think he can do anything after the Bill passes. In bringing in the Amendment, I have no personal interest, but my object is to help the poor man who was not aware of the rules and started to repair his schooner in the water. I take it there are no supporters of the Minister repairing their vessels in the water, as he had the chance to give them information. But if there are one or ten vessels being repaired in the water, the owners should get some compensation, as every vessel repaired will be an asset to the country. As to whether it is necessary to haul the vessels up for repairs, I leave to the Minister, as he is a practical man, but Mr. Ashbourne says the keel can be seen by vessel being hauled down or careened as well as out of the water. The member for Carbonear has told me of an instance in Trinity Bay where a schooner was hauled out of the water, and it cost $590.00 to get her up. That is a lot of mony for an ordinary fisherman. A vessel of fifty or sixty tons is a very heavy weight, and a lot of tackle is required to take her up. We agree with the principle of the Bill, and in fact urge the Minister to bring it in, as we wanted to get this matter of repairing vessels finalized.

We are not against the principle of paying the bounty for the repairing of vessels and I am of the same opinion as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that a vessel repaired is an asset to the country. I might say that I had no knowledge of what the conditions were going to be like in the Bill. Several people were speaking to me about this matter but I was unable to give them any information, as I was unaware of the conditions of the Bill, but I think that some provision should be made in the Bill whereby those repairing vessels could avail of the bounty without having them hauled out of the water. I merely suggest this to compensate the men who now have vessels under repairs. However, it has been emphatically pointed out by the Prime Minister that it was not the intention to accept this amendment of mine. Consequently, there is nothing left for me to do but to withdraw the amendment because the Bill is purely a party measure and the majority is on the other side of the House to vote it through, and I will let the Prime Minister and his Ministers assume the responsibility for the Bill as it is.

MR. RANDELL—Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that the Government is giving a lot of power to Surveyors in putting this Bill through. Take for example a man who has spent several thousand dollars in repairs to a vessel. He will get $20 a ton bounty on the recommendation of the Surveyor; while another man who would only spend a thousand or fifteen hundred dollars on a vessel would get the same consideration. I think there will be a lot of dissatisfaction on this account.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHIES—Who are you going to trust if you do not trust the Surveyors?

MR. RANDELL—Well they are only human you know.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, as the Government has decided not to accept the amendment proposed by the Leader of the Opposition I thought

that possibly some amendment on another line may be accepted by the Government and I would therefore move that there be added to the Bill the following section: "That this Act shall apply to all vessels repaired during the year 1924 and in conformity with all the sections herein contained."

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—What about those that were repaired in 1922 and 1923? Where are you going to draw the line?

MR. HALFYARD—We cannot go back as far as that. Here is a case in point of where a vessel was repaired in 1924. Captain Harry Miller of New Bonaventure, T.B., owner and master of a vessel, pulled his vessel out of the water in January 1924 and started to repair her. He was hoping against hope that something would be done so that he would get a bonus on the work he did in connection with that vessel. He is hoping still and that is why I am speaking now. There may be other such cases that I do not know of.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—There are scores of others.

MR. HALFYARD—Do you think there were scores of vessels rebuilt in 1924?

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—No, but as far back as 1920.

MR. HALFYARD—I am speaking of 1924, which was a period in this country when it was a courageous act to spend four or five thousand dollars, as Capt. Miller did, on rebuilding his vessel and then taking the risk of supplying her for the Labrador fishery. Surely a man like that deserves some consideration. Men of that class are the wealth producers of this country and this country will not amount to a great deal if we lose this class of man. I do not think that it would amount to a great lot of money if this Bill would include vessels rebuilt in 1924.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — Mr. Chairman, I would like to explain to honourable members that we are not trying to throw down every amendment brought in by the other side of the House, but at the same time the honourable member who has just sat down will be able to see that the whole Bill will need to be altered in order to conform with the requirements of his amendment. To begin with, the Surveyor has to see the vessel three times while she is in course of repairs. That could not be done on vessels repaired during the period he mentioned and we would have no proof that the work was done and no proof to justify the paying of a bounty. We would only be able to assume that the vessel was repaired according to schedule and that new wood was put in to replace old wood; but you could not get any definite information for that other than that given by the man who owns the vessel. I think that the suggestion of the honourable member is probably the outcome of some firm that thinks it was hard hit. At the same time it is not very different from a gentleman in the Legislative Council who has been pleading to members of that Chamber because, after he had imported a lot of pork and beef, the duty was taken off these food commodities by the Government and he thinks he did not get the proper protection prior to the Act being put in force. It is quite possible that he was hard hit. I know that our firm was hard hit too. Somebody has got to be hard hit when things of this kind happen. I would like to say that Captain Randell's suggestion is a very reasonable one and I quite agree with him that a great deal of power is being given to the Surveyors, but then we have to consider who else can we give the power to if not to the Surveyors. After all, if you made all the stipulations possible to protect yourself you are still in the hands of the Surveyors. They can go around and

pass anything they like if they choose to do it; but I think, as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has pointed out, and I agree with him, that we have had good Surveyors and there will be nothing wrong about the carrying out of the Act. The Surveyors are men who have been in office for a considerable time now. They are good men and know their business as shipbuilders and I feel quite satisfied that the surveying of the vessels will be done thoroughly and well. However, if there is an infringement on this Act it is easy to have it altered afterwards and if it is found that there are any loopholes in the Act it can be made thorough next year. At the same time this is the best we could do. There were members of the Executive who thought we ought have a stipulation whereby the cost of a vessel's repairs had to amount to a certain percentage before it could get a certificate for a bounty, the idea being to prevent any person from hauling up a vessel merely to make himself eligible to get the $20 per ton bounty; but Captain Winsor pointed out to the Executive that it would mean a certain hardship on people keeping accounts of their repairs.

One fisherman comes along and gets his lumber at a hundred dollars a thousand and another at one hundred and fifty dollars. In any case in order to make the labour Bill sufficient to enable him to get the fifty dollars bounty he can put on a lot of extra labour to make up the expenses. Consequently it would be difficult to check up. I believe it is best to leave the Bill as it is at present to safeguard all concerned and I am inclined to take their word for it.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, in reference to the schooner built at New Bonaventure I don't know whether she was hauled out of the water. It was placed in the stocks in 1924. Now all that I require is that this Bill should be effective and include the year 1924. And I think that the Surveyors or the Deputy Surveyors know all about the schooner Melba of New Bonaventure as to the way that she was built. The timber that was put in her—they might not know this by actual inspection. And I also think that they were quite convinced in their own minds as to the bounty that the owners should get.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, I have to agree with the hon. member for Trinity. There is no date in this Bill from which the repairs must start to enable the men to get the bounty. Now we infer from what we have heard from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that the date is Jan. 1st, 1925.

You will find that most of the vessels had their repairs started last fall, in November and December, and in accordance to this law or act that nobody must get the bounty except those who started repairs after the first day of January, 1925. In that event there are very few in Bonavista Bay entitled to the bounty. What is going to happen? They are not entitled to the bounty but they are going to get it. While you have got this Bill before the House you should make this clear. Everything possible should be specified. If you cannot make it retroactive from the fall of 1924, certainly you must go back to the date at which repairs have been commenced. Now the Minister of Marine and Fisheries tells us that he does not know of any schooners under repairs that have not been hauled out of the water. That makes it all the more easy for the Government to have some consideration for the two or three who have had due regard for the law and who, under the impression that they were going to be compensated, started to reconstruct their vessels whilst in the water. If there are four vessels and they cost

a thousand dollars a piece that is only four thousand dollars. That is what the Government calls encouraging the fisheries. The Government can see their way clear to outline a project to build roads all over the country, costling millions and millions of dollars, and when it comes to a small matter of encouraging the fisheries and producing an asset to the country that will not cost more than 3,000 or 4,000 dollars. We should give some consideration to the fisheries and make this Bill retroactive for 1924, so that the man who had no knowledge of what this Bill entailed should be able to get at least what they expected. We have not objected to most of the Bills. We helped out the Lobster Fishery Bill although we felt that some parts of the country were not being properly treated by closing the lol ster fishery. And now when after some people have suggested that they are going to help those who are prosecuting the fisheries they do not see their way clear to take this suggestion. However, if the Government do not feel that they should take this suggestion which we think is in the interest of this country the only thing left is to take it up as a party measure and carry it through as they intended.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, the Leader of the Opposition this afternoon came in here to propose an amendment to this Bill, and he made some suggestions to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries who has not seen his way clear to act on the suggestion, or otherwise we have not put up a sufficiently strong case in behalf of the amendment. He has now withdrawn that amendment. It would be, it is, useless on our part to oppose brute majority. He has brought in another amendment now asking that this legislation be made retroactive in order to give those who went to some expense last year the opportunity of qualifying for this bounty. Mr. Halfyard dwelt upon those cases and pointed out that in the district of Trinity, Capt. Harry Miller, last year, of Bonaventure, had gone to considerable expense to effect extensive repairs to his schooner. The Prime Minister stated the other day that he was aware that some of the Samsons of Flat Islands had also spent considerable money in repairing their schooner last year. Capt. Harry Miller is one of the ablest fishermen in this country. He is independent and is a man who has done much in building up this country. And I feel that last year, had he known that this year we were going to pass this legislation, he would have seen his way clear to delay the extensive repairs that he made to his schooner.

I think this country and this House owe it to the men of the type of Capt. Harry Miller that they should receive some consideration at the hands of this Legislature. The Government says it is trying to do everything possible to advance the interests of the fishermen of this country. If so, here are two cases where they can do some good. These cases have been cited, and I have no doubt that the members can tell of others of their constituents in their districts who have repaired their schooners during the last year. Why are not all of these men given an opportunity of benefitting by the bounty? I maintain that these men are an asset to the country and that there is a very good reason why they should. We would not be asked to give any great deal by this, as there have been only one or two outstanding cases that have been mentioned, and I should like to take this opportunity to express the hope that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will give every consideration to the amendment or the late amendment

which was proposed by the Leader of the Opposition. Mr. Halfyard has cited, as I said, two cases, and as I pointed out that there are other cases which I am sure that other members of this House are aware of; other cases which should be attended to, if the Government wishes to confirm its policy of doing everything toward encouraging the fishermen, and this amendment accepted. The fishing classes are after all the backbone of this country. The Government can spend all the money it likes on tourist traffic; we can have all the Humbers and all the Ganders we like, but we want to keep the independent class of fishermen. We want to keep them in this country. These men are now preparing for the fishery of next year. Most of them are fitting out their schooners and getting their codtraps ready for the fishery, indeed a great deal earlier this year than last year. I do not think that it reflects any credit or kudos upon the Government that they have discriminated against these men. I would ask the Government in all fairness to accept the proposed amendment and give those fishermen referred to an opportunity of getting some compensation for the schooners which have been recently repaired.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman, with the other members of the House who have already spoken in favor of the amendment, I also wish to give it my hearty support. It will give courage to the producers concerned with the main industry of the country—the fishing industry.

Boot and shoe industries, clothing industries, flour, paint, and other industries, which thrive because of the fishing industry, get all the concessions they want from this House. If they are entitled to receive concessions, how much more entitled to a like consideration is the fishing industry, which employs over 45,000 persons engaged in productive work.

There is no industry to compare with it for the amount of employment it gives. There is no industry to compare with it in developing pluck, perseverance, courage and daring, which qualities are possessed by the average Newfoundland fisherman to-day. We therefore cannot neglect or ignore any proposal such as is embodied in this amendment, which seeks to encourage not only the maintenance of the present position of the fishery in the industrial life of the country, but to advance it beyond its present confines.

There has been much to discourage the prosecution of the fishery the past few years. With the exception of last year very little has been derived from it by the average fisherman, so as to provide him with income to maintain his family decently. Were it not for the development of the Humber industry, even last year would have had the same hard story to tell, of having toiled all summer and having failed to get returns to provide for the family's needs. The Humber industry saved this situation by withdrawing a number from the fishery, and giving the opportunity to those who remained to secure larger catches and better prices. With less fish caught, better prices were obtained.

The acceptance of the amendment will do much to encourage shipbuilding on a larger scale, for the amendment, while it concerns only the repairs of fishing vessels, will give a double assurance to every fisherman wanting a vessel of his own, that, not only can he expect a bounty on the building of a vessel, but he can look forward with confidence that when there is need of rebuilding, he will have some financial assistance toward the cost. If they can be assured of this, there can be

no doubt it will prove a tremendous impetus for the creation of a fishing fleet like that of old times.

What a contrast the fishing industry presents to us to-day, as compared with the good old times. Think of the banking fleet, the Labrador fleet, both together comprising about six hundred vessels, and when you think of the banking fleet to-day with less than fifty vessels, the Labrador fleet with less than two hundred, surely it ought to awaken us to the serious condition, which is in our power to remedy.

The proposal of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, good in so far as it goes, does not go far enough, and he should be willing to assist in the restoration of the banking and Labrador fleet. The amendment has it in the germ of restoration, and the Minister has the power to give it growth.

What interests me most is the encouragement it gives towards creating more producers. It is the producer upon whom the prosperity of the country is built. Its permanence depends upon them, and in all matters of legislation they should have the precedence for they are the real wealth producers.

Three or four hundred more vessels means, not only employment in building, but constant employment for riggers, sailmakers, blacksmiths, and more employment in the prosecution of the fishery.

It is these considerations that lead me to support the amendment which I trust will be favorably considered by the Government.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I think that I should read Captain Harry Miller's letter to the House. It was sent to me in the month of January, 1925, and I have no doubt that what he says in this letter could be reproduced by many other men in this country who own vessels.

(Reads the letter.)

Captain Miller is in the same position as several others in this country and his letter will show the situation better than any words of mine. He explains the position well. He has put the savings of his life into his vessel and risked all on the fishery to the Labrador. I think that the Government would be doing the right thing to have the bonus paid to the men who had vessels rebuilt in the year 1924.

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 without amendment.

On motion this Report was received.

On the motion for adoption of the report Mr. Halfyard moved and Mr. Hickman seconded in amendment that a new section 11 be added to the said Bill, viz., 11 "That this Bill be retroactive for the year 1924."

Whereupon the House divided and there appeared for the amendment:

Mr. Hickman.
Mr. Halfyard.
Mr. Grimes.
Mr. Scammell.
Mr. Brown.
Mr. Rendell.
Mr. Duff.
Mr. Ashbourne. (8)

And against it:

Hon. the Prime Minister.
Hon. the Minister of Justice.
Hon. the Minister of Posts.
Hon. Mr. Sullivan.
Hon. Mr. Long.
Hon. Mr. Cramm.
Hon. Mr. Bradley.
The Minister of Agriculture.
The Minister of Marine & Fisheries.
The Minister of Public Works.
Mr. Cashin.
Mr. Moore.
Mr. Lake.
Mr. Sinnott.

Mr. Power.
Mr. Puddister.
Mr. Cahill.
Mr. Browne. (18)

so it passed in the negative.

Whereupon on motion for adoption of the report there appeared in its favour:

Hon. the Prime Minister.
Hon. the Minister of Justice.
Hon. the Minister of Posts.
Hon. Mr. Sullivan.
Hon. Mr. Long.
Hon. Mr. Cramm.
Hon. Mr. Bradley.
The Minister of Agriculture.
The Minister of Marine & Fisheries.
The Minister of Public Works.
Mr. Cashin.
Mr. Moore.
Mr. Lake.
Mr. Sinnott.
Mr. Power.
Mr. Puddister.
Mr. Cahill.
Mr. Browne. (18)

And against it:

Mr. Hickman,
Mr. Halfyard,
Mr. Grimes,
Mr. Scammell,
Mr. Brown,
Mr. Randell,
Mr. Duff,
Mr. Ashbourne, (8)

so it passed in the affirmative, so it was ordered accordingly, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a third time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the St. John's Dry Dock." Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

Committee of the Whole on a Bill relating to the St. John's Dry Dock.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, there was an amendment made to section 3 of this Bill when it was in the form of resolutions that the sum of five hundred thousand dollars be named as the sum to be raised on the credit of the colony.

I do not know if anything can be gained by any lengthy debate upon the Bill, as all the members on this side of the House gave their reasons for not supporting the resolutions that were being considered, and the Bill is practically the same as the Resolutions. But really I was hoping that the Government would upon further consideration have been convinced of the wisdom of not asking for any further loans upon the credit of the Colony. Section 2 gives the Government power to apply to the said purposes as set forth in section one the amounts of fifty thousand, one hundred and twenty five thousand, and five hundred thousand dollars. Now really you should go a little further and also include the estimated cost for the rebuilding of highways. If you did not feel like putting in the full amount of two million dollars, you could have got five hundred thousand dollars from the vote for highways, and apply that sum of five hundred thousand dollars for the purposes of this Bill; and I think you would have the support of the whole community—of the whole community.

There are numerous reasons why we should hesitate to increase our debt. The estimates that have been submitted show that we are not reducing our expenditure. We will have to find nearly half a million dollars next year more than the year before, and as there will be a remission of certain taxes will result in a decreased revenue; and when you have an increase of expenditure and then attempt a decrease of revenue, I do

not know what the end will be. Nothing but bankruptcy.

The spending of large sums of money on the rebuilding of the dock will give employment, and indirectly some of that money will come back to the revenue during the next fiscal year. Unfortunately the condition of the country is such that most of the men who would work on the dock would find it difficult to find remunerative employment from any other source, so therefore it savours of providing a public utility. But you are finding money to relieve unemployment. The Government has not admitted that, and from what has been broadcasted, one would imagine that we were living in prosperous times, and there is no occasion for the Government to undertake work of a non-remunerative kind to relieve the unemployment situation. But I believe that the Government must have at the back of their heads that they will want the five hundred thousand dollars to find employment for the people of this country during the next year. If that was admitted I would never vote against a loan that was to give employment to keep them alive; but if the conditions of the country are such that we can in any way do without any further loan, we should certainly not add this extra burden to an already overburdened people.

I am of opinion that the Government will act very wisely if they do not spend that two million dollars on roads during the next year, and from remarks made by the Hon. Colonial Secretary I would gather that it is not the intention of the Government to spend two million dollars next year, or half of two million dollars—that being so, there will be a surplus amount on that vote. Why not take five hundred thousand dollars from that and devote it to the dock. There is nothing unreasonable about that proposition. And if you should find that you require more money do what other Governments have had to do. Go to your bankers. Go to the Bank of Montreal, and they will be only too glad to give you a temporary loan. The very essence of this clause three anticipates a necessity to borrow five hundred thousand dollars. This is contrary to our expectations. It is not consistent with the statements made by the Finance Minister showing an excess of revenue over expenditure from month to month. That being so, from every line of argument, there is no necessity for any further loan, unless the Government intends entering into expenditure that we know nothing of.

From what has been said in the Upper Chamber we are inclined to believe that the Government anticipates guaranteeing the expenditure of money in connection with an hotel; and that is not a personal opinion this time, because the leader of the Government has stated, and it is published in the newspapers, that he is speaking officially, and this is not his private or unofficial opinion, as it was when he was speaking of making miles of roads. This time he has said that he was authorised to enter into negotiations with monied people outside this country to get them interested in an hotel project; and he states that the Government is prepared to guarantee capital or assist them financially in some way.

If that is so, before the House closes of course, we will hear more about it; and if you want five hundred thousand dollars then, lay your cards on the table, and say you want five hundred thousand dollars for an hotel project, and then we will be able to debate the Bill from that point of view. But as I see it, Mr. Chairman, there is no necessity of clause three in this Bill relating to the St. John's Dry Dock, unless the

honourable introducer of the Bill can give us some further enlightenment as to the necessity for this direct authority to borrow five hundred thousand dollars.

I therefore move, Mr. Chairman, that section three be deleted.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, I wish to point out that there is no other course left open for us but to find ourselves in agreement with the proposal of Mr. Halfyard. I think it was made clear from this side of the House when we were debating this Bill the other night that we saw no necessity for borrowing any other sum to be expended on this proposition. I do not think I am violating any confidence when I say that the Hon. the Minister of Finance has stated privately that there is no necessity of the country borrowing any money extra. It is patent from the utterances made — utterances that have the semblance of authority on the Government policy—that the Government is not going to spend Two Million Dollars earmarked for road construction all at once. If that be so, and the repairs to the Dock are so urgently needed, why not take $500,000.00 of that amount and devote it to that purpose. There has to be a limit somewhere to this matter of borrowing, and the idea that has gone throughout the country that the Government is seeking to borrow more money unnecessarily will not improve their position in the eyes of the people. But that position is of their own making, and the Honorable the Prime Minister has said that he is prepared to stake everything on the dock proposition. You are going to engage in a large undertaking in connection with the dock, and you will have a number of supervisors and officials of one kind and another to oversee the work done. I would like to make a suggestion this afternoon on behalf of one who is well known in Newfoundland, and who in my opinion should be given every consideration when you are looking for supervisors for this work. If there are to be officials there to see that the money is spent in the interest of the country, then give him some attention. I refer now to Mr. M. E. Hawco, who perhaps is not a friend of the Government, and as a matter of fact in the last election was an opponent. But it is a long cry since then, and it is my belief that he probably has no political affiliations now. By the fact of his training he is worth consideration. He has had vast experience in matters pertaining to dock construction, and before he returned here a few years ago from Canada he was drawing $5,000.00 a year from a large construction firm there. I would like to throw out this suggestion to the Government and hope it will not be treated with contempt because it comes from this side of the House. I remember that a few years ago when the Government of which I was a Member, was appointing a Railway Commission, the suggestion was put forward by the then Opposition who was not connected directly with the Government. The Administration of the time were big enough to accept this suggestion, and they appointed the Honorable Tasker Cook, who may have been termed a Government Nominee. Now if Mr. Hawco has the necessary credential, as there is no doubt he has, and moreover he is a Newfoundlander, he should be given some position in connection with this dock building. I feel that if the Government need a representative up there he would be able to give first class service in any position to which he might be appointed. Now reverting to the Bill it has to be made technically correct in this House if we are not to be brought to book by the Upper Cham-

ber. Section 3, I may point out, does not say whether the five hundred thousand is to be pounds, dollars or francs, and I would like to see the word dollars put in, so as to make sure of the amount. I would further like to reiterate Mr. Chairman that there is no substantial argument in asking us to give authority to borrow more money as we are already deeply enough in debt.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman, I arise to support the amendment or suggestion put forward by the Honourable Member for Trinity, and wish to reiterate that the Government is acting unwisely in keeping this clause in the Bill. It has been stated that two millions have been cut out to be spent on motor roads, and I would suggest that a half million of that amount be ear-marked if required to complete the dock. My own idea as to the proposed raising of another loan, is that if you get it, there will be many demands not calculated on now that will be made on it, whilst if you do not raise it you will be safeguarding the interests of the country. As I have pointed out already, the tax-payers of the country are now overburdened, and this new loan would be only increasing the burden. The income of the ordinary man is not increasing in proportion with the cost of living, and when you ask for authority to raise a further loan you are doing something that will make the burden of the average man still heavier. As far as I can learn flour is going up, provisions of every kind are advancing, the same applies to clothing, and when you consider all these increases in the cost of living, what do you think the people will get in return for increased taxation. You ought to be endeavouring to lighten the burden of taxation, and I admit some progress has been made in this direction, but not in proportion to the increase in the cost of living. Supposing you have reduced taxation by half a million, that is only two dollars a head for the people, but the cost of living in the last twelve months has gone up more than that, and I venture to say that if the figures were tabulated correctly it would be shown that it costs every man now fifty dollars more than formerly each year to provide for his family. Flour has increased from fifty to seventy-five cents a barrel, not to speak of the other articles which have also gone up in price. When we take clothing we find that it has increased from ten to twenty per cent., cotton goods about twenty per cent., and woollens fifteen per cent. since last year. I cannot understand the Government which professes to practise economy in expenditure, asking for authority to raise this loan when the cost of living is going up, and we are not reducing taxation in proportion. I admit that it is not very easy to arrange the finances for a program of that kind, but you are increasing the burden of taxation, when you raise another loan, and you will have demands made on it which may not be apparent now. The Honorable Member for Fortune pointed out the other day that sixty-two per cent of the last loan had been left on the hands of the Underwriters, and I think that is a very serious matter for the House to consider, and remember when dealing with the present proposition. It shows that our boast of prosperity is not so great as we would like to see it. I hope we are on the turn of the tide, but it does not seem to outside investors that Newfoundland is in such a position that they can take up her bonds as readily as they would those of Canada and other places. I think these things ought to be seriously considered. We are a long suffering people, and apparently the Government is taking advantage of them

when it refuses to keep within the loan of last year.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Chairman, when last I spoke on this measure I stated I was in accord with it, and I agree with the idea today that the dock should be repaired; but I am against spending such a large amount of money that the Government proposes to spend on the dock. I claim that a dock built of wood such as the dock at the present time is good enough for the next forty years. Then why should we want to spend the money asked for in these Resolutions. It is not a question of whether the dock will stand 40 years or 100 years by such a large expenditure; but the question is are we in a position to pay it? My main objection is that when the dock is rebuilt with this large amount of money we are asked to vote the next thing some future Government will be bringing in is a Bill asking for money to purchase machinery to equip the dock because at the present time there is not machinery there to do any work worth while, and to install new machinery there would mean a further outlay of another couple of hundred thousand dollars. Regarding the money to be spent on roads, I understand from a man that he has the contract to build a road from Grand Falls to Badger. That is something that I am strictly opposed to.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—He is building that in his mind.

MR. BROWN—I am glad to hear that, because such a thing is a waste of money. The road today between Grand Falls and Botwood is worthless and if you put a road between Grand Falls and Badger you wont get any returns either. The Government has already been petitioned this year and asked for $15,000 to repair the Botwood road. I think the Prime Minister has stated that whatever bills the Government brings in they are opposed by the Opposition. I do not oppose bills merely for the sake of criticism, and if the Opposition do not criticise they are not worth being here. It is not my policy to offer opposition for the sake of criticism. I am against the spending of this money for the dock because in my estimation a wooden dock would serve us at the present time just as well as a stone dock or a concrete dock, and I am not in favor of the borrowing of any more money.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I would like to occupy the time of the Committee for just a minute or two to reply to some of the observations made by members on the other side of the House. They have belaboured the Bill, covering the same ground as they did the other night, and have not got any further. Some members, particularly Mr. Grimes, suggests that if we borrow more money and it is not wanted for the dock, some other interests would be after us. This Bill clearly points out that $675,000 apportioned for other purposes is to be used for the dock, and we take power to get another $500,000, if we require it. I quite agree that it is not likely we are going to use up all the money we have earmarked for roads this year, but the very fact of the money for roads being earmarked is sufficient proof that we cannot use it for any other purpose. We could borrow it from Roads Account and pay it back to Roads Account, if need be; but if we find that the dock is going to cost $1,100,000—and we have got $675,000 already—there is nothing extraordinary about asking for the additional amount required to complete the work. I may say that I had a talk with Mr. Bishop and he assured me that this sum would not be exceeded. Mr. Bishop said that Mr. Swan, who is a world wide famous dock builder, had gone through the figures and checked them over carefully and that

after Mr. Swan has approved the plans in connection with this project the Company are perfectly satisfied that what they put on paper will be lived up to. He said that he may be able to surprise us as the work goes on in the reduction of expenses. On the other hand, he pointed out that if the Government were going to put on everybody they liked, the job was going to cost a couple of hundred thousand dollars more than the estimate. I assured Mr. Bishop that such would not happen; although I would not say that the members for St. John's would not be asking them to put on some men. It is only reasonable to suppose that members of the Opposition would ask to have some o f their friends and supporters put on to work, but I told him that the work would be done entirely under the contractor's jurisdiction. As I said before, we are getting a proposition as good as could be got for the money to be expended, and the amendment offered by the Opposition, namely, that we should not borrow five hundred thousand dollars but go in debt and come here by and by and look for money to meet any deficit that might be incurred, is ridiculous.

Somebody has said that the money is all there and it has to be spent. But in this case we are not going to spend any more, and we are not going to borrow any more than is actually required to pay the Bishop people and whoever he may arrange with to do the work. Now I quite sympathise with Mr. Brown's views on this matter. He takes the hard and fast stand that the dock is good enough, and we should not raise so much money. Everybody has given consideration to it. Now what Mr. Hibbs said entirely disagrees with that. He says that if you are going to build the dock build it in comfort. The general concensus of opinion has been that we should make a concrete dock and make a good job of it while we are at it. He, I think, still calls the concrete work essential to have a good dock. That is the reason why we propose making this arrangement. There was one other point brought up by the member for St. Barbe. He said that we ought to employ Mr. Hawco to superintend the dock. I don't know whether he meant he should take charge of the work, but at least he thought that Mr. Hawco should have a very important position. He may be a very excellent man, but I would not care to leave the superintendence of the dock construction to Mr. Hawco or any man of his experience. The only work I know that Mr. Hawco was the supervisor of was at Old Days Pond, Bonavista. Mr. Hawco was a year or more in charge of that work. I don't say that he was to blame, but there was a proposition to carry ships into a pond that was 10 or 12 feet above the sea level. When the channel is cut from the pond to the sea the pond will empty out and another pond has then to be dug. I say I don't know that Mr. Hawco was the engineer, I don't think that he was, but it is doubtful if the best expert advice on engineering was obtained in this connection. In Mr. Bishop we have got a good reliable engineer and contractor. He will give us the same deal exactly on the dock as he gave to the Armstrong Whitworth Co. The Leader of the Opposition laughed at the idea of entering into a proposition of this kind. Contracts covering costs of eight million dollars have been carried through by these same people, and under the same arrangements as we propose to make with them.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, before the bill passes I want to give my support to the resolutions of Mr. Halfyard that number three of the

bill be deleted. There are a great many reasons why this should be. We were told yesterday by the Member for Fortune Bay that 62 p.c. which this country had underwritten of the loan was still in the hands of the underwriters. If that is the case it looks as if the Newfoundland Government loan will not be much sought after by the public. There are a great many corporations and individuals who are looking for investments to-day. And usually the issue of a Government or a municipality it looked upon as the best security for money. And the fact that two and a half million of dollars of that loan is still in the hands of the underwriters shows that this country is not looked upon very favourably in reference to its securities. Now the result is going to be this. If the Government decides to raise another loan of five hundred thousand dollars the first difficulty it will have is that the brokers and the underwriters will not want to underwrite the loan, and if you do induce them to underwrite it they will do it for about ninety or ninety-two. If this is underwritten for ninety that will mean that if the Government borrows five hundred thousand dollars they will get four hundred and fifty thousand dollars on which they will have to pay five per cent. on five hundred thousand. I know a concern in Canada that had some money to invest. This was an insurance company that invested five hundred thousand dollars in utility bonds. When a concern like an insurance company invests five hundred thousand dollars of its surplus capital in a utility and leave Newfoundland Govt. bonds out of the market it looks as if we are not in a position to float another loan. Now according to the estimates that we have placed before us by the Minister of Finance and Customs our bonded debt at the 30th of June, 1925, is $66,404,000. Practically sixty six and a half millions and if you intend to borrow another half a million that will make the debt 67 millions. Then there is the two millions for the roads which you have yet to raise and that will make the loan $69,000,000 plus ten million guaranteed to the Humber project. That is in the vicinity of eighty million dollars which the people of this country will have to shoulder. The population of the country today is about two hundred thousand men, women and children, and that means over $300 per head for every man, woman and child that is in the colony of Newfoundland. There is no necessity to take the authority for raising this loan. It is stated here that the amount of two millions is set aside for the construction of highways during the next one, two or three years, so why not take authority to transfer some of that money for this matter if you need it. If you say that it is already earmarked for roads it is a quite easy matter to make it so that you can utilize any sum that you require out of the two millions and save the trouble of raising another loan and save this country the humility of having to place a loan on the market and sell it far below the value. Now some of the cities of Canada have five per cent. loans that they raised at par, and the Newfoundland Government bonds cannot be sold on the market at several points below par. Now all the property which is in this country is responsible for the debt which is held by the bond holders, and it is a serious matter when we come to continue to borrow on an overburdened people. We have not any resources that we can expect to develop and make an addition to our revenue. Our per capita debt is not larger than some other countries, but as I said before these countries

have their resources. Lots of room for people to come to their countries to produce things. After all a country's wealth depends upon the things that are produced.

It is no difference how small the thing might be. Every egg that a hen lays helps to improve the value of a country. Everything that is produced is what goes to make the success of the country. A country like Canada has a bigger field for development, and therefore the debt that looks large to them looks nothing as large as it looks to us, as we have nothing in sight to develop that we can depend upon to increase our revenue. As far as the tourist policy goes other countries have developed a considerable amount of revenue from it and it has been good value to these countries and provinces of Canada, but the tourist traffic is a thing that has to be worked up. Nobody can tell whether the tourists will come to this country or not. It is all very good to go and spend two millions of dollars on roads, but it is a venture that any country might take if it can afford it. It is not a venture for Newfoundland to take. We have to go slowly to see what the result will be. Everybody who comes to this country has to come by water and our country is different from other countries where people go for pleasure and rest, because in most of these countries there is a certain climate that can be depended upon. If a man goes to Florida or California he knows what kind of weather he is going to get for two or three months, but if he comes to Newfoundland he might find a summer like I have seen here where scarcely a day for the season can a person go out without an overcoat, and then it rains two or three days every week. When the tourists once come here and find these conditions they go away and they tell others what the weather is like and these will not come here, and that is the big drawback. I would like to tell the Hon. Minister of Justice that the climate of Bermuda is better than Newfoundland. If the Hon. Minister of Justice wants to make some remarks he will get the opportunity when I have finished. I am really serious and I am surprised that the Hon. Minister should say what he has said here tonight. He says that the climate of Newfoundland is equal to the climate of Bermuda. Was the Hon. Minister of Justice ever in Bermuda? No? Well I was.

Now this is too nonsensical to talk about as Bermuda has a climate where there is not a day during certain seasons but the sun shines. Of course they have a rainy season, but you do not catch tourists going there when that is on. There is a certain period there when the sun shines every day for months. Now I am only stating facts as we are going into this venture. Now if a man has ten thousand dollars to spare and goes down on the Stock Exchange and loses it is gone and that is all there is about it. But if he has borrowed the money and lost it, where does he stand? If a man borrows money and invests in say C. P. R. stock and it goes down, he loses. That is just what we are doing now. If we had two millions to spare I would say, yes go on and spend it, but when we have to borrow it, it is a different matter. I am talking about this money for highways, but it is relevant to the matter before the Chair, and when I come to the question of the Dock I will give some further information on it. I will say right now that I think we can get a contractor to do the job for $500,000. As I was saying, we cannot gamble this two millions as a venture, and it should be included in the Bill that some of the amount be taken for the work in connection with the Dock.

If you are going to build a dock such as spoken of this evening, with deepening and widening, you will have to get improved machinery for the making of repairs. The steamer Snyg was here yesterday. A few weeks ago she was damaged and put into St. Pierre and the underwriters had to get a steamer to tow her to Halifax to have repairs made. When she got to Halifax it was found that the propellor she had on board would not fit and a new one had to be cast. It was cast right there on the dock. Now if that happened here the ship would have to wait till the propellor was cast in England or New Glasgow and brought out here. Now if you spend one and a quarter millions in enlarging the Dock you will have to go further and provide equipment, and so will want more money. The Honorable the Prime Minister said this afternoon that the estimate by Bishop & Co. was a reasonable one. I have been trying to figure it out as well as I can with practical people, and I cannot discover what is going to cost $1,200,000. Now the first thing to be built is a coffer dam to dry out the dock. I understand that when repairs were being made to the "Metagama" a coffer dam was fitted tight to her side, and it cost only $20,000. If you lay that amount out you have that part of the job completed. Then you got to take up four or five feet of earth, and I think the present concrete floor could be blasted out and the whole taken up by the dredge. That will not cost many thousands, then take the earth away from the sides in connection with the concrete work, and all you need do is put up the cribbing and pour in the concrete. The lumber for the cribbing will not cost any more than $30.00 a thousand and will take about forty thousand feet. Now take the extreme amount of cement say five thousand barrels at $3.00 a barrel, which would be brought in duty free, $15,000; three thousand tons of sand at $2.00 a ton, and ten or fifteen thousand tons of stone, which you have already broken up, and which can easily be carted up to the dock. All this will not cost much more than $100,000.00. Plenty of ordinary labour can be found at $3.00 per day, and it would take a lot to cost a million and a half. The steel sheet-piling is estimated at $72,000.00 and still we are a long ways short of the million and a quarter, and the tiling is one of the most expensive of the lot. But still you are giving $70,000.00 to Bishop & Co. for merely overseeing the work. My contention is that local men can do the job as efficiently as any other, because after all there is nothing much to it. It is nothing more to put concrete into the side of the dock than into a house. Supposing it even cost $28,000.00 for the coffer dam, you have still a long way to go to make up the million and a quarter. I think it is a big mistake on the part of the Government to bring in two engineers who are strange to the country, and know nothing of the existing conditions and ask them to make an estimate. It may be alright to ask them to give an estimate, but the Government ought to go further and ask local men to figure on the job. We have men here who will have to do the work after all, while the other is merely supervising, and is not so capable, and will not be on the job half the time. I claim now that before the Government enters into an agreement to pay this $70,000.00 they should give some consideration to practical local contractors like Mr. John Taylor, or Mr. Butler, who can do the work as efficiently as any engineer you may bring in from outside. I feel sure that a contract could be entered into to do the estimated repairs for at least $500,000. Who is getting the rest of the money? A

strengthening of the place at a cost of $25,000 is quite sufficient for this country to undertake at present. The whole thing savours of squandermania.

When you think it over it is something worth while considering. You are going to pay seventy thousand dollars to a man for overseeing a job of this kind when you can get hundreds of extra good men who could well look after the same work for ten thousand dollars. So I think that the Government should consider well what they are doing before rushing into an agreement—it is no contract—with Bishop and Company to spend our money. The Government simply says to Bishop and Company, if you think you do not want as much as $1,200,000 to do the work, go ahead anyhow and spend it, it is our money and when you have the job through we will hand you out your $70,000 for overseeing the work. Then you come along and in this Bill you ask us to give you authority to go out and float another loan for $500,000 to complete the job. Now if you would let that job out on contract to-day I feel quite sure that you would get people to undertake it for $500,000 and glad enough to get the opportunity, and would make money out of it, but to give a stranger who comes here a blank cheque to spend $1,200,000 of our money to repair something that originally cost $600,000 is ridiculous. In view of the condition of our country's finances abroad, and in view of the fact that sixty two per cent. of the loan already raised this year is still in the hands of the underwriters, I think that the Government ought think well before they decide to put another loan on the markets, because they would be up against great difficulty of finding brokers to underwrite it, and if they did get another loan underwritten they would not get any more than 95, in view of the two and a half millions that are still for sale, and for which there seem to be no buyers. I am offering this to the Government in all sincerity, and I believe that the dock job can be done very much cheaper than is estimated, so that there is no necessity of incurring a further liablity on the people of this country by seeking authority to float another loan.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, just a few words more for the purpose of an apology for the Leader of the Opposition than anything else. As one who has sat in Opposition for several years, I can understand the viewpoint from which an honourable member on that side speaks, and on this occasion the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition are a bit too transparent. It is all very well for those of us who know, but strangers coming in the House might not appreciate the part being played by Mr. Hickman, who is such a well known sound business man, and might not know that he was not at all serious, and the best proof that he was not serious is the vein in which he spoke. As a matter of fact he did not touch the main point of the subject under discussion at all, but merely, by way of a painful duty, registered his opposition to the Bill. When the House was in Committee on the Dry Dock Resolutions he recorded his strong objection to this idea of encouraging the raising of money and predicted all the desperate things that were going to happen if a further loan was raised, because we are not going to follow out the custom that has prevailed within recent years, namely, of going out spending the Colony's money, and, having spent it, coming back looking for authority from this House. The honourable member was not quite serious when he dished out this kind of talk and this bemoaning tale about the frightful climate in

this country. As it is quite possible that such a statement regarding our climatic conditions might get into the newspapers, when the actual facts are quite different, I think a word by way of explanation is due.

MR. HICKMAN—There are no papers that publish what we say.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Therefore, there cannot be anything in what the honourable member says. He admits himself that no paper will publish what he says. I remember when some of us sat on the Opposition side of the House for five or six years and it is a funny thing about it that, although not having the Government, two papers in the town used to print what we said. But I do feel for the honourable member seeing that his own paper will not print what he says.

MR. HICKMAN — Prior to the last session of the House the newspapers were paid to publish all the debates.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Not the Opposition papers. They were never paid; and no paper was ever paid to publish the daily synopsis, as that was done by the daily papers themselves. However, I do think that, in justice to the Opposition, a little enterprise ought to be shown by the paper that I thought was supporting the cause of the Opposition in getting together the important remarks of the Leader of the Opposition this evening for publication, as I have no doubt that they would be very interesting reading for the huge number of Newfoundlanders in Boston who are arranging to-day to have an "Old Home Week Excursion" to their native land this year and who, I am sure, will be delighted to know that our climate has become so changed. If there is any one thing I am strong on it is this. Whatever else we may lack we certainly have a climate that cannot be improved upon during our summer season.

MR. HICKMAN—You are strong on drawing red herrings across the trail. That is one thing I know that you are strong on.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—That is not to be wondered at because I feed largely on herring at this particular season; but yet when the question of tourist traffic is borne in mind, it is hardly a fair way to discuss and encourage this tourist policy by slamming your own country. There is a common expression, which is apropps to-day, namely, "It's a dirty bird that fouls its own nest." I do not apply this to the Leader of the Opposition; but to one who does not get out and boost his own country. We forget—and I am sure that Mr. Hickman will be one of the first to recognise this fact—that the march of modern events is the boosting of one's own country. With regard to this idea about looking for tourist traffic, I might say that every place to-day is taking on a new vein of thought in this direction. People are boosting their own countries and their own attractions everywhere, and that is the secret of the tourist traffic, and there is not a man in this country who knows that better than Mr. Hickman himself. What is the history of his own business While he was talking this evening about the absence of attractions here and suggesting as if nobody would come here there is a big extension going on to his own business premises—and I am proud to compliment him on it—right in line with this very idea in connection with the modern growth of tourist traffic.

MR. HICKMAN—That is not for tourist traffic roads; that is for the displaying of motor cars for our own people.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—"I

thank thee Jew for the word." Out of the mouth of the gentleman himself have I got the suggestion that with the present administration in power people are satisfied that we are going to have better times in this country and people are providing for more motor cars to be used by our own people. Just a word about the dock. No one knows better than the honourable gentleman himself that with regard to the arrangement to be entered into that it is hardly likely to be an arrangement on the lines that he indicates. He gets up here to-day and he suggests that this is a programme in which the firm receiving the contract will be told "bale out all the money you can and when you are done spending we will hand you out $70,000."

Just as if the firms were to be told: "Here get busy, bail out all you can, and when you get the thing going there is the $70,000." We are surrounded now by quite a different atmosphere from the time when this kind of thing was done. This is not a question of a scramble. This is a question in which the Government simply comes down here, and they say that repairs have to be made to the dock, and this is not denied on any side, and that the necessity of keeping the dock open is not denied on any side of the House, and that the necessity of fixing the dock up is not denied on any side. And having admitted all these principles, there is only one course left open. And no one knows better than the honourable gentleman that you can't make a contract for repairs, that all you ever get will be what is given in this case. We get the estimate, we get the figures from a man who simply says "I have a reputation to keep and to make. I have a reputation here that preceeded me before coming here, and I estimate that this job will not exceed a certain figure." That is the best you can expect, and as far as that is concerned I will say that for any figure, whether it be less or more, whether it exceeded that figure which according to estimates and all information we can get, and the checking up of the engineers can't do. So far as I am concerned our fees are so much. What happens every day Take the honorable gentleman's own case. Let him go and add to his buildings up there. Why the man who draws the plans gets the percentage fees on the cost. If the same man draws the plans and supervises the work also his percentage is increased. And so far as this proposition is concerned the fees are simply substituted for percentage charge. I suppose it is hardly likely to expect Mr. Bishop to do it for a gift. It is hardly likely to expect that man to come down here and to say that if your finances are short, don't raise a loan, I will give it to you as a present.

Now there is a lot of talk about raising a loan. The man has got to be paid his bill. We are seeking authority to be in a position to raise a loan if required. In any event it is only authority to raise a loan not exceeding five hundred thousand dollars. The honorable gentleman talks about the difficulty of raising loans. He talks about a portion of our last loan being left on the underwriter's hands. It is not uncommon in the Old Country to have 90 p.c. of the loan left on the underwriters' hands. Now as far as that part is concerned everyone knows this. The best answer that can possibly be given to the talk about the credit of the Colony is that the Government was able to go over and raise a loan. The Leader of the Opposition seriously thinks that we have arrived at a stage in this country when we are so poor that we can't repair our own dock. As far as I am personally concerned I have absolutely every confidence

that apart from the direct results coming to us by way of the labour as regards this road building there will be a great big portion coming back to ourselves. But apart from these returns I look forward with confidence to the fact that we are going to benefit considerably in the way of visitors to this country. We must get this trade. Here we are situated right along side that great big republic of the United States. There are thousands of people there who do nothing but travelling. They have no Bermuda to go to, for at summer time Bermuda is no good to them. We have got everything to attract them. There is not a man in this House who thinks that we cannot offer something that these people want, something different. They want to come here and take advantage of our extraordinary summer air. There is not the same appeal in the ruggedness about the country to us as there is to them. Sometimes we don't appreciate the beauties of nature that God has surrounded this country with. They want to get and can't get so readily as we do the things that we despise and turn down. There are other attractions in the way of fishing and things of that kind. And ask the Hon. member does he consider this. If we only had a fraction of the travelling public available it would more than justify this expenditure. But the Hon. Member is not serious. He is only saying this, not so much that the people may think that he is serious, but he is saying this for the purpose of going on record as being opposed to the Bill. The Hon. Member is not serious, and he is less serious still when he suggests here that the Government can do other than what they are doing in these resolutions. I stated the other day, and I repeat it now, that a decision must be made because every day means not only a loss in the sense of those who are immediately concerned in the regular dock labour, but it is also deferring a chance to include others who can't get any work. There are two things before us today. There are a certain number of people who are concerned as to what is going to be the future of the dock. And in the second place there are other people who are anxiously hoping for some opportunity for work to turn up. The Government is doing the only thing that it can do. We have got to get this work started at once. We have got in touch with the best firms that we can get. We have got the public reports that they made. And now we seek authority to go on with it. As a matter of fact what really happened is this. The conduct of the Government is so extraordinary, so different from what has been the practice in the past, it has been so abnormally honest, so perfectly frank that as no other way can be found, and as something must be said, the only thing that the opposition can say is that it is too bad that we have to raise money again. The Government has not said that they have got to raise five cents. We don't know. We only say that the outside estimate indicates that we may have to get a loan. But it is only when the Bills come to be paid that we will know that. The Hon. gentleman knows that as far as the $500,000 is concerned that we can handle that. The Prime Minister has fortunately got the confidence of the business and the banking institutions behind him. He does not necessarily have to go on the market and borrow a loan, he can get a temporary loan overnight from any of the banks, he can telephone for it. That is the confidence I got in the feeling that is abroad in regards to the changed conditions of the country. The Hon. gentleman knows quite well that conditions today are such that the

poor people are looking forward to the future with hope, and he himself is looking with hope and with much more confidence than if his own administration were returned to power. He says to himself "It is one good thing to know that now that I am leading the Opposition my business will be better under the administration now in power, than if my own party had been returned.

MR. HICKMAN—There are a few points that I want to make clear. Now there is no doubt about the fact that every member sitting in this House and every member who has listened to the Hon. Minister of Justice, and we are all well used to listening to him, we all know that he is very good at drawing a red herring across the trail. Now I said when I stood on my feet before that I was serious, and the Hon. Minister of Justice said that I was not serious. Now you have my word against his. I am very serious. I am very serious because I don't like to see any more money borrowed in this country, and I don't like to see a loan thrown on this country for which there is no market. Now the Hon. Member errs when he made the remark that "a dirty bird fouls its own nest." That does not fit me. A remark like that is like water on a duck's back as far as I am concerned. It might fit the Hon. Minister himself.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Any man who knocks his own country is that.

MR. HICKMAN—I did not knock my own country. What I said was this. I said that we have summers in this country that cannot be depended upon. If you go down to Bermuda you get three or four months and every single day the sun shines. There are summers in Newfoundland that we don't get much sunshine in. You cannot depend upon the tourist traffic. If a man comes down here and strikes a bad summer, he is going back and advertise this among his friends. We are bound to have our bad summers. And what I say is that while it may not drive people entirely from this country it is going to have a bad effect upon the tourist traffic. You cannot look for the same volume of people as they get in Bermuda, Sanfrancisco or Florida. You are going to spend two millions without knowing whether you are going to get results or not.

We have plenty roads radiating from St. John's to satisfy the number of tourists we can expect to get during the next few years. There are roads to our salmon pools. If a man wants to go fishing in Salmonier, where some of the members of the Government catch three or four hundred salmon before breakfast and haul some of them in by the tail and a great many other ways, he can get there by road, and then it is a place where you can get two or three hundred salmon a day or several hundred a week, and I think that if this is the case that you have roads enough at the present time for the tourists that come until such time as we work up the tourist traffic. Now what I contend is this. Those who come here have to have a place to stop at. We must have a hotel in St. John's first, and this place where we have the hotel must be the centre, and you must build all the roads so that they will all radiate from St. John's. The Minister of Justice wants the hotel in St. John's East. I say that St. John's East is the worst place to build the hotel because if you go for a motor drive up the Waterford Valley in the evening and everything is nice and fine, and when you come down to go around Quidi Vidi you will probably find the fog coming in and then you get chilled to the bone. And therefore I say that although the member wants the hotel in St.

John's East it is not the place to have it. The proper place to have the hotel is up near that place where you have the liquor saloon in the West End. And the Hon. Minister of Justice knows in his own heart and mind, and since he is a legal man he must have a practical mind, and he has been born and bred in Newfoundland, and most Newfoundlanders are practical, and he knows very well that the estimate on the dock is not correct. He knows very well in his heart and soul that the estimate for the dock is not correct when they say that it is going to cost one million one hundred thousand dollars. Now the Hon. Minister of Justice says that we are delaying the chance to give the men a chance of employment. There have been hundreds of men walking around St. John's for months.

They have been walking around since January and have been compelled to go and get the dole and have their sense of independence taken away, and then how can the Hon. Minister come in here and say that we are keeping these men from getting employment because we are discussing the measure before the House. This is what the Hon. Minister has said and I am only bearing out his argument. He said that we were deferring the chances of employment. We would like to see the employment given. I think that the Hon. Minister's argument falls very short after men have been walking around the city look for work so long. I think that the Government should have given these men employment long ago. What might they have given them to do. They might have built one or two bonded warehouses in St. John's. It could have given the men work since January. Instead of that the Government has given out money and got nothing in return. The Hon. Minister says that we would have to borrow the money to build the warehouse. But where did you get the money you paid out in dole, I say that it would have been better for the Government to have built the warehouses than to have given the men money for which we could not get any returns. You say that the money that was handed out for the dole was charity. But if you had built these warehouses it would not have been necessary for this dole. The money was taken from the "chest" anyway. I say that the Hon. Minister's remarks fall very short when he says that we are deferring the chances of employment. We know how necessary this employment is and there is nobody who would more like to see the men get employment. I give all the employment that I can to the men of St. John's. Now the Hon. Member knows that the present Government has not got the confidence of the people today. The Hon. Minister says that the people have confidence. I do not know whether they have or not. A matter of four hundred votes in the election last year would have given us the same majority that the Government has today. I do not think that the Government has the confidence of the people as they think they have. I would like to see an election taken in the East End and see what majority the Hon. Member would get. However, I suppose that we will soon see. I suppose that we will have an election soon. Of course I am only taking the Prime Minister's word for it. I had thought seriously of settling down to business for the next few years because I thought that we would not have a general election before the next three or four years. However, we are not afraid of a general election, and when the time comes we will not be afraid of what will happen. We know what confidence the people would show in

the Government if they got a chance. The Hon. Minister said that they were afraid to build the dock. Does the Hon. Minister say that he did not say it? I wrote it down myself. Perhaps the reporter can tell us what you said. You made these remarks about being afraid to build the dock. That is what you said. I wrote it down myself. The Hon. Minister says that I wrote an article that was detrimental to the country. I never wrote anything that was to the detriment of the country. This is the country where I belong and where I was born, and I intend to stay here, so that there is no reason why I should say anything that is to the detriment of the country. I think that it is the best country in the world. The Hon. Member says that he will bring the article into the House and read it. That reminds me of something that I saw in the telegram. I will read it for the House. It is reference to the passenger steamer that the Government has given the contract for to the Dutch. I will read the article to the House:—

London, March 10.—"British ship builders while still smarting under the loss of large contracts to German shipyards have had salt rubbed into their wounds by the Newfoundland Government. Newfoundland has ordered a steamer from a Dutch firm which in turn placed an order for castings with the Skoda Works of Czecho-Slovakia."

But what I say is this that the Government have made a mistake by going too fast, and the Government ought to take their time now and see that no further mistakes are made. You ought to try and reduce the expenditure instead of putting another $500,000 on the market which you can't find purchasers for. The Hon. Member must certainly understand that, because he knows if he is in touch with financial matters that any loan in Great Britain or the United States is taken up 24 hours after it is put on the market. I know that is so.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Can you account for the fact that the Australian Government put a loan of six million pounds on the British market and 92 p.c. of it was left on the underwriters' hands. It was not left on the underwriters' hands because of the insolvency of Australia, but it was left on their hands because the people over in England could get better yield for their money. 92 p.c. of six millions was left on their hands. They could get better interest elsewhere. You could purchase good bonds payable in New York that would yield 5 p.c. in London. And for the information of the Leader of the Opposition I will tell him that if we wanted 10 millions we could have got it. They were not afraid of the credit of Newfoundland.

MR. HICKMAN—I can only take what the Minister of Justice has said about the American loan. I have no reason to contradict it. But that does not get away from the fact. I don't know what interest was paid on the American loan. It must have been 4½ p.c. That is what the most of the Government loans are raised at. The Canadian Government put one on the market at 4½ p.c. The Quebec loan was at 4½ p.c. The Australian loan was at 4¾. Well then you know that you cannot expect a man who has money to invest, to go into the market and pick up a 4½ p.c. loan as readily as he would a 5 p.c. loan. And the Province of Quebec are getting more for their loans than we are getting for our Newfoundland loan, and I say that even if you have to float another loan you will not get it except at a very small price. Perhaps in the vicinity of 90 or 92.

Now I only just want to make myself clear in reference to some of the things that were said by the Hon.

Minister of Justice, and I must tell the Hon. Minister that I have as much confidence in Newfoundland as he has or anybody else. But I don't think that we are going to find our feet while any Government continues borrowing. And whatever the object might be. If the object might be to cripple the country. I am not saying the Hon. Minister has that in mind. But if it is in the mind of anybody and we are absorbed by any other country we won't have enough to pay the interest.

MR. DUFF—Mr. Chairman, in regard to the rebuilding of this Dock: Although we know that it is entirely for the benefit of St. John's, and that it will never pay, and the whole country has to furnish the wherewith-all, yet we are not opposed to it. There is no question that this country needs a dock to repair shipping, as we are placed out in the mouth of the St. Lawrence between the Old World and the New, where all shipping has to pass; and St. John's happens to be the most suitable port for this purpose.

All the Opposition asks is that you erase Section 3 from these resolutions when you desire the power to raise further loans. If you have the need for more coin for this purpose, take a part of the two million dollars you have earmarked for the "Tourist Roads."

St. John's has to-day about 1200 families getting the "Dole" they have all the Government institutions and patronage and now, in this Dock, they will have the opportunity to give their idle work that the remainder of the country has to pay for, and, although we have very needy people in the Outports, they will neither get work nor dole.

It is scarcely necessary to tell the Government and Prime Minister, in particular, that they went to the country during the last Election with a very different idea altogether. I can assure you that this country to-day is very much disappointed in the Prime Minister, and, I may add, I am very much disappointed myself because I expected something altogether different. We looked upon the Prime Minister as one that desired to lead us up to higher things; I could picture in the words of our school book as

"A youth who bore through snow and
ice
A banner with that strange device—
Excelsior."

Since our school boy days, we discovered that Excelsior is a thin shaving that is used for packing bottles and furniture. The Mirage of the Sahara Desert is no more deceptive than the Prime Minister's pre-election promises.

To-day, with a debt of 66½ million dollars as a millstone round our necks we are asked to support this "wild cat" scheme of Tourist Roads. We have been in this country a long time, and why they did not discover before, this profitable Tourist Traffic, beats me. Who is the father of this mighty thought? We are told there are hundreds of wealthy people ready to come down to our shores and enjoy our climate—how absurd!

It cannot be said of me that I do not appreciate my native land, because I do. I love her, snow storms and frost even, and she was and should be the best poor man's country in the world; but the fact that we are a population of one-quarter million people in debt 66½ million dollars and still piling up, gives us food for reflection, and the idea of Tourists helping to lessen our financial troubles is most ridiculous. I should like to be convinced that there was the slightest hope of the Tourist Traffic helping out our finances, and I would "throw up my cap" for it; but, as I see no hope of this, I would

suggest that you scratch out Section 3 from these Resolutions, and, if you need more money to complete your Dock, take it from your two million Road Loan.

The Dock is necessary and you cannot have it too good, although we know beforehand, it will never be a paying proposition. The amount estimated, $70,000, for the supervision of the Dock repairs seems to me an immense amount, and I feel that a great deal of cement work and inside repairs could be done by our own engineers and so lessen this amount. It is said of the people of the Shetland Islands. "They make a precarious living by washing each other's clothes." We are somewhat similarly situated, as our apparent prosperity comes from continuous loans. This Government will not fall down politically on their sins of Omission, but rather on their sins of Commission. They have the Liquor Commission, Railway Commission, Road Commission and the Lord knows how many more to follow.

The Road Commission only means that the work of "Road Boards" of the Outports will be confined to the City and they will get the pay as they get practically everything else in the City.

"Road Boards" way of distributing money with little, in many instances to show for it, does not appeal to me. At the same time we have many poor old folk around this Island that depend upon such. Then we are informed that there are going to be imported men to show us how to make roads, but I would inform this house if you were in Cape Breton, Prince Edward Island, or even portions of Massachusetts to-day you would need snow shoes on to get over their soft and muddy roads, and yet our Government would go there for road makers. A former Government did something similar when they sent to Winnipeg for a man to handle our Railway Service and ships. We discovered we made a mistake and I am glad to see to-day that Newfoundlanders are managing our Railway; men that know the jibboom from the rudder.

Then again the latest we hear is that the Government is going to guarantee the building of hotels. Hotels is a venture for private citizens and are not for Governments. Former Governments did too much of that kind of thing and did not get or deserve the good will of the people.

I ask the Government to consider their ways and be wise and not be carried away with their visionary schemes that will land us further in debt, and for Heaven's sake don't ask for any more loans.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Honourable the Prime Minister if any contract has been entered into.

HON. THHE PRIME MINISTER—Absolutely none.

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 without amendment.

On motion this Report was received.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, on the motion for the adoption of the report, I beg to move an amendment, that section 3 be deleted from the Bill.

MR. HICKMAN—I beg to second the motion.

Whereupon the House divided and there appeared in favor of the amendment:

Mr. Hickman,
Mr. Halfyard,
Mr. Hibbs,
Mr. Grimes,
Mr. Scammell,
Mr. Brown,
Mr. Randell,
Mr. Duff,
Mr. Ashbourne, (9)

and against it:

Hon. the Prime Minister,
Hon. the Colonial Secretary,
Hon. the Minister of Justice,
Hon. the Minister of Posts,
Hon. Mr. Sullivan,
Hon. Mr. Long,
Hon. Mr. Cramm,
Hon. Mr. Bradley,
The Minister of Agriculture,
The Minister Marine & Fisheries,
The Minister Public Works,
Mr. Moore,
Mr. Lake,
Mr. Sinnott,
Mr. Power,
Mr. Puddester,
Mr. Browne. (17)

So it passed in the negative.

Whereupon on the motion for adoption of the report the House divided, when there appeared in its favor:

Hon. the Prime Minister,
Hon. the Colonial Secretary,
Hon. the Minister of Justice,
Hon. the Minister of Posts,
Hon. Mr. Sullivan,
Hon. Mr. Long,
Hon. Mr. Cramm,
Hon. Mr. Bradley,
The Minister of Agriculture,
The Minister Marine & Fisheries,
The Minister Public Works,
Mr. Moore,
Mr. Lake,
Mr. Sinnott,
Mr. Power,
Mr. Puddester,
Mr. Browne, (17)

and against it:

Mr. Hickman,
Mr. Halfyard,
Mr. Hibbs,
Mr. Grimes,
Mr. Scammell,
Mr. Brown,
Mr. Randell,
Mr. Duff,
Mr. Ashbourne. (9)

So it passed in the affirmative and was ordered accordingly. On motion it was ordered that the said Bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

Second reading of Bill "An Act to Amend Chapter 83 Consolidated Statutes 1916 (Third Series) and Acts in Amendment thereof."

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, it is not my purpose to do more than suggest that as the Bill is only now being distributed, it be deferred till to-morrow This Bill is to amend the Judicature Act in certain respects, which I will deal with more fully tomorrow. The amendments have been requested by the Rules Committee which was appointed by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. There is one point I would like to call the attention of lay members to, and that is the qualification of jurors. Alterations have been made in the status of Grand Jurors in the sense of the qualifications being an increase rental and property value. It has been found in practise that almost everyone at present is on the Grand Jury, and this alteration will reduce the number. As to petty jurors, instead of having to serve the whole term, they will now be called on the same as other trial jurors. The balance of the Bill is in connection with the duties of sheriffs, etc. It has been found that considerable expense is placed on the debtor where processes have to be served outside St. John's, as there is no allowance now made for it, and the debtor has to pay for the sending of the special man, it is now the intention to ask for an amount covering the serving of processes. This will obviate the need of sending a man from here to places such as Grand Falls or Corner Brook, and allow the work to be done by someone on the spot. The allowance for mileage is slightly increased as it has been found at present that the man who has to pay for the serv-

ing of the process incurs further debt.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 83 Consolidated Statutes 1916 (Third Series) and Acts in Amendmend thereof" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be deferred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second reading of Bill "An Act to Amend Chapter 4 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Legislative Disabilities and the Vacation of Seats in the House of Assembly.'"

Deferred.

Second reading of Bill "An Act Respecting a Tax on Certain Incomes."

Deferred.

Second reading of Bill "An Act to Amend the Terra Nova Sulphite Company Act, 1920.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, this is a matter which I will also leave to the House as to the second reading or not. Briefly the Bill amounts to this. The Terra Nova Sulphite Company made a contract with this House in 1920 and undertook to erect mill and certain other work at Glovertown, Terra Nova. Certain mills have been constructed, and the Anglo Development Co. took them over. Under the Bill the Mill had to be operated at Alexander Bay, but now in lieu of the expenditure there an equal expenditure will be gone into elsewhere. The Anglo Company have made additions to the plant at Grand Falls to even this up. As to the labor there will be the same amount in connection with cutting and barking at Glovertown. The wood is then hauled over the railroad and manufactured at Grand Falls. The plant at Glovertown will remain in the same condition until matters are such that until what was originally intended can be done. If the House is willing I think we might take the second reading, and if members wish to debate the matter they can do so in Committee. As far as the Government is concerned, we are making the best of a bad bargain. The original company went out of business, and the question was whether we should give the other the rights at Grand Falls instead of Glovertown.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Terra Nova Sulphite Company Act 1920" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill entitled "An Act to Provide for the Construction, Reconstruction and Maintenance of Highroads," with some amendments, in which they request the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion the said amendments were read a first time, and it was ordered that they be read a second time on tomorrow.

The Minister of Agriculture and Mines gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act respecting the records of 'Pure Bred Animals.'"

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Speaker I would like to ask the Hon. Minister of Posts & Telegraphs if he is aware that Colonel Ross has made any report to the Government in connection with Postal affairs?

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS — I understand that Colonel Ross will make his report from Toronto. Colonel Ross left for home a few days ago. His health has not been good of late. He will send along his report as soon as it is

ready, and then I will table it.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, March 27, 1925.

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

MR. POWER—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the residents of Grand and Little River, Codroy Valley, asking that special attention be given the roads in that section. It is an important farming district and with the promise of new markets being opened and the Government paying attention to the roads the people are hopeful of extending their agricultural activities. I therefore ask that this petition be given every consideration and referred to the Department to which it relates.

HON. MR. LONG—Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the honourable member for the District of Burgeo and LaPoile, Mr. Chambers, I beg leave to present a petition from the residents of Cul-de-Sac asking that that place be made a port of call for the Glencoe. The petition is signed by practically all the residents of the place and I ask that it be referred to the Railway Commission for their consideration.

HON. THE COLONIAAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay on the table of the House the report of the Cashier of the Government Savings Bank for the year ending Dec. 31st, 1924.

Mr. Warren gave notice of questions.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the Bill entitled "An An Act respecting the Records of "Pure Bred Animals" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

Notice of Question

(1) MR. SCAMMELL asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the Table of the House a list of the Game Wardens employed in the District of St. Barbe last summer showing salary paid in each case, and the locality over which each Warden presided.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker, I beg to table the information.

MR. HICKMAN asked the Minister of Public Works if there is a man by the name of Baggs, a resident of Harbour Grace District, under salary from the Government, if so, what is his position, what salary has he been receiving.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Speaker, in reply to the honourable member I beg to say that I am not aware of any man by the name of Baggs or James Baggs being under salary from the Government in the District of Harbour Grace.

(3) MR. WARREN asked the Hon. Minister of Posts and Telegraphs if there is any mail service or freight service to the Islands of Sagona and Brunette, Fortune Bay, if so, who has the contract, and to table a copy of same and when and how often is the mail delivered.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Honourable Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, I ask that that question be deferred.

(4) MR. DUFF asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs: (a) if it is the intention of the Government to operate the "Daisy" on the Revenue Service this year; (b) why was Capt. Couch suspended; if he was not suspended, what was the reason for his resignation; and if he is not pensioned, why; (c) if the "Daisy" is to be

operated, who will be in command of the ship; and when does the Government intend to start the service; (d) if the Government are not putting the "Daisy" in commission this year, what steps are being taken to protect the herring fishery, the lobster fishery, and the Revenue Service on the South and West Coasts.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Speaker, in reply I wish to say that the Government has come to no decision yet as to when the "Daisy" will operate on the Revenue Service; Captain Couch resigned and was not suspended, and he was paid his salary after that, but he is not pensioned, and as Mr. Duff is of the same turn of mind as I am he does not believe that people ought be pensioned after three or four years of public service; no decision has yet been arrived at as to when the "Daisy" will operate or who will be in command of her. With regard to that part of the question dealing with the herring and lobster fisheries, that is a matter for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to decide. As to whether the "Daisy" will do Revenue Service on the South and West Coasts, that is a matter that the Government will decide upon shortly.

Second reading of Council's amendment to "Light Dues Bill."

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Speaker, the amendment does not materially affect the Bill beyond that it allows vessels to go to Prince Edward Island once a year, and it is quite satisfactory to the Department.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the Amendments made by the Legislative Council in and upon the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 25 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Light Dues'" were read a second time and agreed to, and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting that body that the said amendments had been passed without amendment.

Second reading of Council's amendments to "Highroads" Bill.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, as I intimated last night, there are quite a number of these amendments, although they are not important, and I have had copies of them made so that honourable members can have them on their desks to follow them as they are read. The first amendment is in section (2) to strike out the words "its corporate" between the words "sued in" and "name" and substitute therefor the word "that."

The next amendment is in sub-section (f) of section (2) and strikes out the words "salaries and" between the words "The" and "compensation." The next is in section (5) sub-section (a) and strikes out the word "five" between the words "within" and "days" and substitute therefor the word "thirty."

The next amendment is to sub-section (b) of section (5) to add the following words: "and the amount shall be within thirty days." The next amendment is to strike out the last four words of sub-section (b) of section (6).

The next amendment is in the first line of section (110) to insert the words "and undertake" between the words "may direct" and "the removal." The next is to renumber section (14), as 14 (a); and as section 14 (b) add the following: "The Commission must first obtain the consent of the Municipal Council before any work can be commenced in the City of St. John's.

In section 21 of the Highways Bill, a very serious error has been committed in that that word "highway" has been decorated with a capital

"H". This is very improper, and in all cases the capital "H" must be omitted, and the word spelled with an ordinary "H".

In subsection (c) of section 21, the word "may" in the third line is to be deleted, and the words "shall where necessary" are to be added, so that the new section will read:

> "(c) While the construction, repair or improvement of a highroad or any work authorized by this Act is in progress, the Commission shall where necessary . . etc."

In section 27, between the words "any" and "person" in the first line. the words "contractor or." It will be seen that that is a proper amendmend. In section 27 also between the words "shall" and "with" insert the words "conspire." These two amendments merely involve the contractor and the members of the Commission in the penalty clause.

It is proposed to add the following section, and number it 28:—

> "28. 'Any offence against this Act for which no penalty is provided by regulations hereunder shall be punishable by a fine not exceeding twenty dollars nor less than five dollars and in case of default by imprisonment not exceeding one month nor less than ten days, upon conviction in summary proceedings before a Stipendiary Magistrate.'"

That is evidently an additional precaution against the breach of these rules and regulations.

Then you remember section 29 as section 20 and section 30 as section 31.

Section 28 is renumbered as section 29, and the words "placed by the Governor in Council" are stricken out in the third line of the section. Those words are not necessary in the Act. The Commission has the power without having it given them by the Governor in Council. The Commission has the power under the Act itself. I do not see anything, Mr. Speaker, that will alter the principle of the Act in any way, and I move that these amendments be now read the second time.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Speaker, the amendments on the first page of this printed document may be alright, but I have to strenuously object to the twelfth amendment on page two. It may be all very well for our local House of Lords to prescribe penalties for the infraction of an Act they know nothing about; but they do not represent what we may call the proletariat. In this House we are supposed to look after the ordinary common people.

Now I see nothing the Highways Act which would render a breach of it so important that we should take away from the magistrate the ordinary discretion which he has as to the amount of the penalty that he is going to impose on the prisoner convicted of an offence before him; and I would like to know why, although we have various Acts on our statute book of much more importance that the Highways Act, under which the magistrate has a discretion left to him, this House is now asked to pass an amendment to this Bill providing that in case of any infraction of this Act the magistrate is to have no discretion, but must fine a man at least five dollars, or put him in jail for at least ten days.

What is there so important in the Highways Act as to take away from the magistrate his ordinary discretion? After all, our magistrates may not be very learned in the law, but they have a great deal of common sense; and it is going a long way for this Legislature suddenly to decide that a magistrate should have no discretion in a matter of this sort.

I draw this matter to the attention of the honourable gentleman who in-

troduced this Bill, and I would like him to tell me before I vote for any such amendment, why such a drastic step is being taken.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that I did not debate this when the Bill was before the House, but if you look at section 28 of the Bill you will see that it makes certain breaches of the act felonies. That itself is rather drastic. and even a judge of the Supreme Court cannot give less than one year, whilst in cases of manslaughter he can use his discretion. Under this Legislation that we are passing now the discretion of Judges and Magistrates is taken away; and under this amendment a man, even though it is his first conviction, has to pay five dollars or go to jail for ten days.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE-- Mr. Speaker, the introducer of this Bill, the Hon. Colonial Secretary, has asked me to say a few words in reply to Mr. Warren, the honourable member for Fortune. As to section 27, I think it is quite proper that such an offence should be made a felony; but I wish to say now that I agree with the attitude he takes as to the other clause. Section 27 makes it a felony for any contractor to conspire with the members of the Commission to defraud, etc. I think that it is a clause that ought to be there.

With regard to his objections to the twelfth amendment, it is peculiar that the magistrates' discretion should be taken away in that case, because under section 22 of the Act:

> (b) No person shall injure, destroy, cut or prune any trees within the limits of a highroad without the consent of the Commission first had and obtained under a penalty not exceeding one hundred dollars.

Even under that section the magistrate has a discretion. The point that the honourable member makes is quite correct. I think that all will agree that it is proper that the magistrate should have a discretion in such a case as would be covered by the section I have just read. He hears the facts of the case. Suppose for instance that a child innocently broke off a part of a tree on a highway, he should be treated very differently from a man who maliciously cut off a tree that was, for instance. in a park.

I notice that in section 12 in the amendments it is proposed that there shall be no discretion left to the magistrate as to the minimum fine. I think we will all agree that that is a principle which, in this country. has worked considerable hardship. In going through the history of the famous Prohibition Laws we met several absurdities. If, for instance, some one had innocently manufactured a little drop of hop beer without any intention of breaking the Prohibition Law, the magistrate found himself in the position that the smallest penalty he could inflict was a fine of one hundred dollars. I quite agree with the honourable member as to the conditions in this country. Generally speaking the magistrates are to be trusted to use discretion, and in cases where judgment has to be used as to the penalty to be imposed, I think we can rely upon the magistrates to make that judgment properly.

I think, if the Honourable Colonial Secretary will excuse me saying it, that I agree with the honourable gentleman's suggestions, and I think that the words "nor less than five" and the words, "nor less than ten" should be stricken out. I think that will meet the requirements.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY— Mr. Speaker, I may say that I asked the Hon. Minister of Justice to explain this point, because it was more or less a matter of law. The Minister of Justice made some reference to breaches of the Prohibition Laws. I remember now a case that came be-

fore the magistrate, of an old woman for selling some intoxicating liquor without a license. It was home brew, and the Judge found himself in a peculiar position. He said "If I send you to the Penitentiary you can't get in, because there is no room there. If I fine you a hundred dollars, you can't pay it because you have not the money. What am I to do with you?" Eventually he said "I will send you home on suspended sentence."

I am quite satisfied if the Honourable Member should make an amendment to this Bill. I am sure that the Upper House will readily see the justice and fairness of not having the magistrate's discretion taken away in a matter of this sort.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Speaker, I would like to have permission to take this opportunity of drawing the attention of the House to legislation of this sort. It is an extraordinary thing that there are only two acts on the Statute books of this country where the minimum penalty is not left to the discretion of the magistrate. One is the case of the smuggling and the other is the sale of liquors against the act. When we are in committee it should be left to the discretion of the magistrate as to what the penalty is that he is to give. I would like to tell the House of a case that I ran up against a great many years ago. I was on circuit and it is because of the thing that happened on that trip that I want to stop this in the bill to-day. I was on circuit on the Southern Coast; I will not mention the name of the judge. We were at Marystown and we were walking around the deck in the evening. A very poor man came along and asked to see the judge. He was very poorly dressed, evidently he was very poor and seemed as if he were in great distress. He saw the judge and after he had left the judge sent for Mr. Martin Furlong and for me, and told us that the man whom he had just seen had been over to St. Pierre about a week ago, and when he had been getting ready to go a friend of his gave him some money to bring him over some rum. He himself did not get anything out of the transaction, but he had been discovered when he was bringing it over, and the magistrate of the place had no option but to give him the penalty, which at the time was four hundred dollars. It was a breach of the Customs Act and that was the penalty, and as I said the magistrate had no option. He did not have the four hundred dollars, but he had a schooner that he was fishing in, and when he was not able to pay the fine the schooner was taken and put up at auction and sold, and the last of his troubles was that his youngest daughter had fallen in a well and had been drowned and he had not got enough money to buy a coffin for his child, and he had come to the judge to ask him if there was anything possible that he could do to upset the verdict of the magistrate. And the judge asked Mr. Furlong and myself to go into the case, and if there were any loophole whatever on which the judgment of the magistrate might be appealed against he would bear us out, but we went into it and there was no appeal. The man had brought in the bottle of rum and was fined four hundred dollars, and he had lost his schooner, and the end of it was, I think, that Mr. Furlong and the Judge applied to the Government and the fine was either refunded or made a nominal amount. I shall never forget that, and I think that the House should go very slowly before it takes away from the magistrate the use of that discretion which the Government and the Colony repose in him when they consent to his appointment and vote his salary.

Pursuant to order and on motion of

Hon. the Colonial Secretary, the amendments made by the Legislative Council in and upon the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to Provide for the Construction, Reconstruction and Maintenance of Highroads" were read a second time and agreed to, with some amendment, and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting that body that the said amendments had been passed with some amendments, in which the House of Assembly requests the concurrence of the Legislative Council.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the Encouragement of Shipbuilding" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions. Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Bill entitled "An Act relating to the St. John's Dry Dock" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, we have no desire to delay the passing of the estimates, but I asked the Prime Minister a question the other day about the railway, and as I was not in the House I do not know what answer the Prime Minister gave.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I answered that it would take a week or ten days to prepare. I might say while I am on my feet that the Railway Commission and the Government are considering the question as to whether we should answer it at all. I have had a letter from the manager of the railway and he takes the position that the Canadian Government refused to answer questions that were giving the particulars in connection with the railway as they said that it was a separate unit and they would not give any particulars as regards salaries. It is for that reason I say that the Railway Commission and the Government are considering as to whether they should refuse to answer the questions that are being asked in the House or not. The railway is being run as a separate unit and just exactly in the same manner as when it was under the Reids, and it is for this reason that the Government is considering the matter, and I think that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition might defer the matter until the Government has come to some definite decision on the question.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, if the Government is considering this matter I think that they should look up the authority under which the Railway in Canada refuses to give this information. The Government should look up the acts and let us know if they are going to refuse to table the information. What is the law in Canada pertaining to the operation of the railroad. There is no legislation in Newfoundland on it.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, in the event of the Prime Minister's refus-

ing to table the information in connection with the railway which is a public utility and which without any doubt has a deficit every year when all charges are made up then it is no use to have the House of Assembly open at all. What control will the House of Assembly have over the affairs of the country if they cannot get this information in connection with the railway. The railway is an expense and it is not included in the estimates like other public expenditures, and if the public is demanding information about this utility they should get it. That is the reason why I asked the Prime Minister for this information before the estimates came up. As a matter of fact they should have been given without asking. That is my opinion. I understand from the Prime Minister that he is prepared to have the Committee rise until they have a chance to come to this decision.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I cannot see what this has to do with the other estimates.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Chairman, I would like to tell the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that it is almost impossible to estimate the amount of railroad expenditure. A steamer might come in one year and have to have fifty thousand dollars spent on her for repairs. Then again you have the dock and at one time you have a hundred and fifty men, and another time you have five hundred, and so it is impossible to estimate the expenditure.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—There are probably about fifteen hundred men employed by the Railway Commission.

MR. HICKMAN—I suppose the honourable member suggested about five hundred of those.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—I have not been responsible for the employing of any men there.

MR. HICKMAN—It is not much use for us to try and look after the country's affairs, unless we can see what is going on and get the information that we ask for. I think the information asked for is reasonable and necessary.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—You have not been refused it.

MR. HICKMAN—Could the Honourable Minister of Finance and Customs tell me the due date of these loans mentioned on page four.

HON. MINISTTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I have a fairly good memory of things, but I cannot really tell you what date these loans are due. You are giving me a very large order now. I cannot give you the dates now, but they are probably down in the department.

MR. HICKMAN—Perhaps you would not mind furnishing the information on the next day?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Not at all.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs what the last loan is selling at?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—97.385.

MR. WARREN—It is a most extraordinary thing; and I am not saying this in any way of adverse criticism, but I think that the Hon. Minister might make some enquiries.

In 1923, the Government of the day, the Government with which I was associated, gave to the Reid Newfoundland Company two million dollars in bonds, which they immediately put on the London market. Those bonds were five per cent. bonds, and they are selling today at from 101½ to 102, while the recent loan which was put on the market a few months ago is selling at 97, and 62 per cent. of them are left on the

hands of the underwriters. There must surely be some reason for that. I will tell you a few of the things that might cause that.

When the Reid loan was before the House, the solicitors for the people who were going to take over the loan, took steps to provide that the act should be different from ordinary Loan Acts that we had been in the habit of passing. It was specially provided that the proceeds of the loan should be trust funds, and that Trustees in England should be able to invest in them as trustee investments. Furthermore, it was provided that there should be a sinking fund created.

These Reid bonds are now selling at 101½ to 102, while the loan that was issued three or four months ago are only selling at 97, and 62 per cent. of them are left on the hands of the underwriters. There certainly must be some reason for that; and if we could amend the Act now so as to make the bonds trustee funds, I think we should do so.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—That was included in the 1924 Act.

MR. WARREN—Does it provide for a sinking fund?

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Yes.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the hon. member for Fortune, Mr. Warren, I may say that in regard to these so-called Reid Bonds, it is a very difficult thing for any man to be able to say what is in the mind of the purchasing public where bonds are concerned. I may tell the hon. member that the Victory Bonds of Great Britain is at par to-day; and why anybody should pay 102 for Newfoundland Bonds when they can get British victory bonds for par I do not know.

In regard to sixty-two per cent. of the loan remaining on the hands of the underwriters—that happens in ninety nine times out of every hundred. I remember when a loan was raised in 1919, I think it was but I cannot be sure now, but I do know that there was one million dollars lying in the hands of the underwriters for a long long time, and they never disposed of it, and a great deal of it was purchased in our own country. How you are going to explain that I am sure I don't know. You say that the underwriters have sixty-two per cent. left on their hands, and then we hear of another country which has ninety-two per cent. of a loan left on the hands of the underwriters.

MR. HICKMAN—What country is that?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Australia, I think.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Australia. Ninety-two per cent. of a one million pound loan.

MR. HICKMAN—It is a four and a half per cent. loan.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—But four and a half per cent. for a country like Australia in comparison to five per cent. for a country like Newfoundland. Nobody can possibly say why Australia is left with that loan, while we to-day can get 102. I can't find any explanation.

MR. WARREN—I think the Minister admits the point of what I said. I am not saying this by way of criticism at all. If you look up the London Times you will find that the Newfoundland two million five per cent loan is selling at 101½.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—What period?

MR. WARREN—Twenty years. And what I cannot understand is why a person who wants a five per cent. money loan will go and pay 101½ for it, when he can go to our underwriters and get it for 97. There must be some explanation, and I think we ought to ask what it is.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Are you sure that it is not the War Loan?

MR. WARREN—No, I can show you the "Times." It says "due 1943." It identifies the Bond. It is the two million loan, given to the Reids at five per cent. Why should a man give 101½ for that, when he can one of Sir John Crosbie's for 97?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—I I must admit that it is very difficult to explain.

MR. HICKMAN—If what the member for Fortune says is true, and he is the only authority for it, but if it is true, I certainly think that as he suggests, there should be some enquiries made as to why 62% of that loan still remains on the hands of the underwriters.

MR. WARREN—It has appeared in the Montreal papers, and I have seen it in the London Times and the London Daily Mail.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—I do not think anybody is responsible for that. The position is this—the underwriters have underwritten this loan, and now they have started in to sell it, and in about six months time they will have sold it.

MR. HICKMAN—The position is this—that the brokers have underwritten the loan, and have been unable to sell it to the public. That is a very important thing.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—More important for the brokers than it is for us.

MR. HICKMAN—It may not be very important for us at the present time, but if you contemplate putting another five hundred thousand dollars on the market shortly, the brokers will not be in a hurry to take it up.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Of the loan that was raised in New York in 1920 there was ninety per cent. on the underwriters' hands for a time.

MR. HICKMAN—For how long?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I do not know, but I don't suppose this one will be left there for long.

MR. HICKMAN—It is an index that the bond is not looked upon as a good bond, because there are today hundreds of companies — insurance companies and trust companies, who are every day collecting thousands and hundreds of thousands of dollars for premiums, which they have to invest in something; and all these companies are looking for some good means of investment, and are grabbing up everything that comes on the market that is supposed to be sound. The Minister of Finance and Customs tells us that in ninety nine out of every hundred cases bonds are left on the underwriters' hands. It is the other way around if the bond is a good bond—it is taken up within twenty-four hours of its being put on the market.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—That is a matter of opinion.

MR. HICKMAN—I make this comparison. The Canadian Government put a loan on the market last year—the Canadian Government Refunding Loan, at four and a half per cent. I think the amount of the loan was sixty million dollars. That loan was all taken up, and you can buy that loan at 97 and a fraction. The Newfoundland loan gives a much greater interest return, and is left on the hands of the underwriters, and cannot be sold on the market. I submit that when a man underwrites a loan he tries his hardest to get rid of that loan, and sell it, because in his business he wants to be in a position to underwrite another loan next week; but while he is financing one loan to the extent of two and a half million dollars he is not in a position to finance another loan right away, un-

less the brokers happen to be a concern that is worth millions of money.

There is something radically wrong when a loan of five per cent cannot sell on the market much more regularly and at a higher price than a four and a half per cent. loan. The Province of Quebec has issued a loan at four and a half per cent., which is looked upon as an absolutely sound investment. There must be something wrong with our country's finances if that loan is still on the hands of the underwriters; and I think it is well worth while for the Minister of Finance and Customs to take the advice of the hon. member for Fortune, and make enquiries.

MR. WARREN—This is not like the Reid's Act, and if the Honourable Minister will go into it, I think he will find it different and that Trust Funds cannot be invested.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—The Act was brought in to cover everything required. The point I take is that in placing that loan we thought the Trust Fund Investments were alright.

MR. WARREN—There is no Registrar on the other side.

MR. HICKMAN—What about raising the money for the Dock?

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—I am not sure that we will want that loan at all. If we can finance the proposition without the loan, alright, but we got to have the powers to go on with the loan if necessary.

MR. HALFYARD—This vote of two hundred and fifty dollars for printing and stationery calls for some remark. We were told last year that we were creating a department in this connection, but this year you asked for a vote of $250.00 for one Department alone—The Finance Department. It seems to me that the charges made against the previous Government as to extravagance in printing were not well founded.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—In explanation, I may say the increase is a provision for the printing of the Auditor General's Report. I fear that Honorable Members did not read this Report as much as they should, so we decided to have it printed, and we hope to have it ready in a few days.

MR. WARREN—Who is the travelling Auditor?

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. L. Crummey—An excellent man who has done good work.

Government Engineer's Department.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, I thought these last two items in the vote were cut out. Are not the Inspector of Masonry and Inspector of Rolling Stock under direction of the Railway Commission. Who is the Inspector of Rolling Stock?

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—The Inspector of Rolling Stock is Mr. Croke, who has been in the position for years. The Inspector of Masonry is Mr. Whelan, who is building bridges all over the country.

MR. HALFYARD—I take it the services of these men may be engaged, should the Highway Commission begin to function.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—That's what I understand.

MR. HICKMAN—What is this $10,000.00 for the High Commissioner in London?

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—That amount includes his salary and the salaries of the Office Staff, Typist, Clerk, Messenger, etc. There is also a vote of $640.00 for office equipment, etc.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, I may say in connection with this matter, and it must be borne in mind that Mr. Gordon, the High Commissioner cannot get along as becomes his position on the salary voted him by this House, and he is not paid at all commensur-

ate with the value of his services. Fortunately he is possessed of private means, but I believe that the time will come when we will have to increase his salary. All who have visited London are aware of his worth as representative of Newfoundland, and the very valuable services he is rendering, and I do not think it is fair that he should have to go to his own purse to find the means to meet his official expenses.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, the reason for this vote being in as it is, is that Sir Edgar Bowring, when he was High Commissioner, asked the Squires Government what he should pay the officials in the London office. Captain Gordon, the present High Commissioner, was then Secretary to Sir Edgar Bowring. Thereupon Sir Edgar divided up this amount among the various officials in the office. To be perfectly frank I think that Captain Gordon received first of all seven hundred and fifty pounds a year. Then it was raised to eight hundred pounds and he was given an allowance as well. When Captain Gordon was appointed High Commissioner it was understood that he was to carry on with the same salary that he had as Secretary. He is, therefore, getting the same salary as High Commissioner as when he was Secretary.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman: I would like to find out from the Finance Minister if there is any hard and fast system under which pensions are allocated? Are they given on the basis of salary earned or are they given because of the number of years a man puts in the service? The reason I ask the question is because I think the time is coming when we shall have to concern ourselves over this matter and the granting of pensions will have to be done on a business-like basis and have discrimination done away with.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Chairman: I agree with the honourable member for St. Barbe that the time is coming when the matter of pensions will have to be taken up and settled in an equitable way to all concerned. I look upon the matter as a serious one. I know of a case where a man was put into a Government building and was there a year when he was pensioned. As a matter of fact we have men now looking for pensions, men who have been from nine months up to ten and fifteen years in the public service. I think that the Government ought to make a scale whereby a person should have to put in so many years of service before he is entitled to a pension at all. As Mr. Halfyard well knows all those pensions are made up on a two-third salary basis and some of them are like Chinese puzzles to handle.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Chairman: I am glad to hear that the honourable Minister of Finance is going to see that the Government considers the matter of readjusting pensions. I would like to point out a most glaring case where a man's services has been ignored. Mr. Ambrose Fitzgerald, Postmaster at Fogo is getting $325 a year, after serving this country for fifty years. Fogo is an important place and Mr. Fitzgerald's work is strenuous, especially during the winter time, and on behalf of Mr. Fitzgerald, I would ask the Minister to kindly remember his case, if any readjustment takes place. It must be obvious to every member of this House that a man who has served this country for fifty years is entitled to more consideration and more pay than he is getting now.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman: I presume that all those men down here asked for pensions. I notice that George Saunders, line repairer, is down here for a pension. Now I do not know whether that man is incapacitated or not, as a couple of years ago I thought he was one of the best

men we had in the civil service. It is unfortunate to have to get rid of an excellent servant unless he desires to be pensioned. I merely cite this case because there are some cases in which men were put on the pension list to give place to others.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—The Minister in charge of that department can explain that matter. I have nothing to do with it.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—In the case of Mr. Saunders I might say that he is well up in years and he asked to be pensioned.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman: I would like to ask if recommendations for pensions have been considered more recently than in the past because all the pensioners whose names are down here were pensioned since the present Government assumed office. There is only one case I can speak of from my district and that is Josiah Gosse, of Spaniard's Bay. I know that Mr. Gosse has never asked the Government to be pensioned. He is not an old man and was well able to do the work he was at, but he was pensioned to make room for another man, Solomon Gosse and I presume all the other pensioners have been pensioned on the same principle. I submit that there should be some scale laid down whereby a man has to meet certain requirements before he gets a pension. Some of those pensions mentioned here are very high. There are cases here where light housekeepers are pensioned at six and seven hundred dollars a year. In addition to their pensions these men earn as high as three hundred dollars at the fishery every summer. A fisherman has to live on from $200 to $300 per year.

MR. DUFF—With regard to these pensions. $300 for Mr. Kennedy. I don't know Mr. Kennedy. I don't know whether he is young or old. But I do say that there is no great value in having a light on Salmon Cove Point. Its benefit to the country is nil. There are no ships that go to Salmon Cove. And if a lighthouse keeper is an excuse for giving pensions it is about time that the Government put their foot on it. The same thing applies to the lighthouses on Labrador. In fact I never saw the reason for so many lighthouses on Labrador. The light house is of most value to the lighthouse keepers. And I am sorry to see this list of pensions. I regret to see this great big expense added to the other expenses. As a matter of fact the Labrador light keepers are not on the coast in the early summer when the fishing vessels go North and they manage to get along without these lights, but the value of these lighthouses to give political jobs cannot be gainsayed.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman: I made a statement the other day that I considered that I always thought there was only one lunatic asylum in this country. Now I realize there are two. And now I am fully persuaded that this House should be called another one. Mr. Duff sees no occasion for a lighthouse on Labrador. I think any man who says such a thing is a fit subject for the lunatic.

MINISTER OF JUSTICE — The Chairman has called the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to order. I think the remark was quite proper. What he said was the man who said such a thing was a fit subject to be called a lunatic.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, if Mr. Duff was amongst these fishermen and had to trust to a line for his life, he would have a very poor chance of getting clear of their clutches. I was more than surprised to hear this man make such a statement. I claim that lighthouses are needed on Labrador just as much as in any part

of the world. We have had as many as three or four hundred schooners going to Labrador. I make a statement here that the men who go down there endure untold hardships. They have to stay at sea at night time, sometimes for two or three days owing to there being no lighthouses in certain harbors, where they might have got in the first night when the storm was approaching and would have got out of trouble and would be warm and comfortable. Whereas they have to stay out for days and lose motor boats and traps and here I want to say I am prepared to back up any vote for lighthouses. Anyone who makes the statement that these houses are to make jobs for people are making a wrong statement. This Government never put up any lighthouse, but there is one going up next sumeer and if I am to be on the floors of this House of Assembly as a member of the Monroe Government for the next three years there will be more than one lighthouse put down there. It is the duty of any Minister of Marine and Fisheries to put all the lighthouses he possibly can on Labrador for the safety of the fishermen of this country—the men who are keeping nearly all of us in comfort.

I made no job for any person on Labrador, and I put no lighthouse there so far, but I am putting one there next summer. Someone has got to fill it. In nine chances out of ten it will be a fisherman who has been going there for many seasons in order to catch fish to maintain his family and himself as well.

As far as a pension is concerned. If a man gets sick and is not able to do his duty, and is keeping a lighthouse for eight or ten years there is no reason why he cannot get a pension as well as any civil servant that never spends hours in the dark with lots of lives in his charge. I am surprised at any Newfoundlander making objections to lighthouse keepers (when they have become old and disabled) getting a pension. I say without fear of contradiction that they deserve it ninty nine per cent. more than any government official. He spends at least six hours in the night keeping the light going so that any ship may be enabled to make port and get in out of the storm and all the other civil servants at five o'clock and some of them at four o'clock, can go home. At ten o'clock they can go to bed if they want to with nobody's life to look out for. And therefore I say again as I claimed before that the lighthouse keeper is a big asset to this country while he may not be a financial asset he is an asset in saving the lives of hundreds around this coast.

I am of the opinion, Mr. Chairman, as far as I am concerned that the class of people that are being put in some of the lighthouses should never have been put there. They were worn out when they were put there, consequently, after two or three years they were unable to do their work, and they have to be pensioned. I argue that no man should take charge of a lighthouse over forty years of age, and after he has spent over fifteen years in it he is entitled to a pension.

MR. DUFF—Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in talking about lighthouses mentioned that I had never felt the salt water in my eyes. Well I am not here to talk about that. The point is this that we can't afford the great big expenditure. We can't afford these pensions in my opinion. I look upon them as very costly expenses. Especially having to pension a man after he is a few years in the service. No doubt the Government in the past have done the same thing. And I would suggest to the Government that these men should work out their time and not make jobs and put other men in their place for purely political reasons.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman: I understand there is another pension being paid by the Government which does not appear on this list. I would like the Minister of Finance to say why it is not there. It was referred to in the Auditor General's report—a pension to Mr. Piccott. There is no provision in the estimates of 1924 and 1925. In that case there should be a provision made in the estimates for 1925 and 1926. I would like to know why that is not properly and regularly put in the pensions list.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—This is a matter that the Government is considering and the amount has been paid to Mr. Picott in the meantime. Whether a pension will be given him or not is a matter for this House to decide.

MR. WARREN—I just want to say that I mentioned this because I did not see this matter in the estimates and I thought if the Government had settled on paying Mr. Piccott $1,000 I thought he should be on the pension list.

PRIME MINISTER—That is perfect-true. The matter was brought to our notice. Mr. Piccott has been a member of the House and at one time Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and when it was reported to us that he was absolutely on the rocks we felt that we should try and give him that little amount.

I think this is a matter for the consideration of the House before we go out of session. I don't want to continue this if the House thinks that it is wrong legislation. In one way it is wrong. But on the other hand I don't like to see a man that held the public position that Mr. Piccott has held, left absolutely a pauper. We thought that the proper thing to do was to continue it until the House was in session and then have it considered by the House.

MR. MOORE—Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amount that has been given to Mr. Piccott that is a hundred dollars a month. This is a hard case and one that the members ought to consider. I did not know until just now that Mr. Piccott was receiving a hundred dollars a month. He has been a member of this House, an ex-Minister of Marine and Fisheries and an ex-Minister of the Board of Works. His case is to-day, I think, in no way comparable with any other members, that had a seat in this House, and so we now for the remainder of his days ought to grant the gentleman that.

MR. HALFYARD—I rise to support the pension to Mr. Piccott. This is a move in the right direction. The Government have acted very wisely in doing it. I don't think that there is any member that is going to say anything against this pension.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman: I want to say that I am also in accord with the idea of giving Mr. Piccott a pension. As has been pointed out here, his case is a particular and peculiar one. I think that in whatever department of public life Mr. Piccott found himself, he served his country faithfully and well, though he has always laboured under a handicap. As Mr. Moore has pointed out. Mr. Piccott's case is a peculiar one, and it may be perhaps that not for fifty years will the Legislature be called upon to discuss such a case as we are now discussing, and I think that the Government is only doing what is right in giving Mr. Piccott some small pension to help him out for the remainder of his days.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, why was not Capt. Bonia put on the Board of Liquor Control, instead of paying him a pension of $2400.00?

HON. PRIME MINISTER—The man has been down at the hospital for some time, and he is a very sick man indeed.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Capt. Bonia has had a lot of trouble

with his eyes, and I do not think he was very keen about the job at all. I saw him the other day at his home, and he is very much run down, and could not see at all.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, may I ask if anything has been done with regard to the printing under the Act that was passed last session, under which all printing was put in the care of the Department of the Colonial Secretary.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—The Hon. Colonial Secretary is not here now, but he will be able to tell you when he comes.

MR. WARREN—Now that the Hon. Colonial Secretary is here—the question I asked was this—If anything has been done under the Act that was passed last session providing for the control of printing being left in the hands of the Colonial Secretary; and if nothing has been done, why has it not been done, and why has not the Act been put into force?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—There has been nothing done outside of the fact that the printing of the Acts has been transferred to the paper known as the Newfoundland Gazette, and Mr. Thistle has been appointed as Printer. On going into the matter of public printing it was found that the Act would necessitate the employing of at least two officials. We would need to have the King's printer, and he certainly would require a stenographer or clerk; and the King's printer would have to be called upon, of course, to edit the Newfoundland Gazette. That would probably entail an expenditure of from three to five thousand dollars a year; and after the whole matter was taken into consideration, it was decided to let it stand for one year, so that it might be seen if the printing could not be better looked after. That has been done, and I do not think that to-day the printing bills of any of the departments are excessive; and Mr. Thistle, the King's printer and publisher of the Newfoundland Gazette is not receiving any remuneration outside of the ordinary remuneration of that office.

In regard to the printing of Legislation and Debates, that is under the control of the Internal Economy Committee. The internal Economy Committee has always looked after that; and I do not know what that is costing this year, but I certainly am of opinion that, judging by the debates which we have read from the Upper Chamber, the cost of publishing those debates is going to be far in excess of anything in the history of that Chamber.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, I was not referring so much to the printing of Debates as to the printing of the Acts. Can the Minister tell me who prints the acts that come before this House, and those which come before the Upper House; because in the late government, we made a change in regard to that, and I want to know if the present Government has continued that?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—The Daily News prints the Bills for this House, and the Evening Telegram for the Upper House; and then finally the Acts are printed by the Newfoundland Gazette.

MR. WARREN—With regard to that I would like to explain the system which was started in the time of the Government with which I was associated. It had been the custom before then to have the Acts printed for one House by the Daily Star, and for the other by the Advocate, and, then, after the Acts were passed they were sent to the Royal Gazette for final publication, not only in the Gazette, but also in the ordinary book form. Then, at the suggestion of Mr. Harry Winter, who was then Clerk of the House, and to save expense, the printing of the Acts was taken away from the Daily Star and from the Advocate, and were given to the Royal Gazette,

who had to do the printing then from the beginning to the end. The type was set by the Royal Gazette and was kept in form and altered by them as the Acts were amended. When the Acts were sent to the Upper House there was not another concern doing the work, and when the Acts were finally gazetted and published, the type was still in the same form. I think the Government has made a wrong step in altering that system. You have three people now doing the work that could be done much more efficiently by one; and you are paying three bills for the same work.

As a matter of fact the system in the Canadian provinces is that the Royal Gazette originally prints the Bills, and they are bound to keep the type in form from the time that the Bill is given them until it gets back; and then they have to keep the type in form for a period of so many months. They have printed from that one form all the Acts that are required for both Houses of the Legislature, for the Gazette, and for the books afterwards.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, in the case of the Canadian Government, it is a regular Government printing office, from the printer's devil up. The Royal Gazette here was really privately owned. The point that the honourable member himself will not lose sight of is this; that if we want to follow the Canadian principle we will have to buy a Government printing press. That is the Canadian position; and it will be a very expensive proposition to set up a Government printing press. You will want a regular staff, and a regular department. There is some force in the suggestion he has made as to double printing; but I think the honourable member will find that the printing bills of the last year and this, as far as we have gone, compare very favourably with those of previous years. There is a quite considerable reduction.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, it stands to reason that if you have to have somebody put up the type for Bills that come before this House; and then when they leave this House and go to the Upper House somebody else has to put up the same type again; and then when it leaves the Upper House it goes into the hands of the Royal Gazette where the same type has to be put up once more—it surely stands to reason that that is going to cost more than it would if it were left in the hands of one person from start to finish.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, I might say that when Acts are printed by the Royal Gazette, the same type that is used then is also used in putting the Acts up in book form; and even after that the type is kept in form for a certain length of time; so that there is only one setting of type for the printing by the Royal Gazette.

Then if we should have a long session, as this is likely to be, if one office were to keep all the forms, you would have a tremendous amount of type kept in form in one office. They would have a very large amount to keep in form at one time; and I think it is very questionable whether the Royal Gazette would be able to do it.

MR. WARREN—I am sure we had long enough sessions during the last three or four years.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Was it actually done during a lengthy session?

MR. WARREN—Yes.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—It was only when you were Prime Minister.

MR. WARREN—No, before that. I know it was when Mr. Harry Winter was law clerk. That was in 1923, I think.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Was not the history of that that a certain paper at the time had such a big

job handling the census that they had too much to do?

MR. WARREN—This was done by the Internal Economy Committee. I only mentioned this bècause it much cost less to have one person doing the printing, than to have three people doing the same work.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, with regard to that vote. It has been the time honoured custom for us to vote these salaries for the officials of the House; and after the session is over the Internal Economy Committee would vote about fifty per cent additional as bonus. I would like to know whether the Government intends to stop the estimate here, or whether it contemplates confirming any votes, or bonuses that the Internal Economy Committee may award to the officials of the House?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, is not the practice in a way really better. Does not the bonus really depend upon the length of the session. It would be rather difficult for us to fix a bonus, because I can quite see that there might be a session in which a bonus was quite deserved, but again there may be a session in which no bonus should really be granted. The practice for years has been to leave that matter to the Internal Economy Committee, and I think that has been found to work out as a very good practice.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, if the Internal Economy Committee intends to grant a bonus, I think they should take into consideration the efficiency of the different reporters. I think you could do without one or two of them, and get better returns.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, I think the reports this year are certainly a great improvement on last year. I think that, in justice to the reporters, I should avail of this opportunity of saying that the reporting this year is away ahead of what it was last year. I do not refer to all the reporters, but I think that some are more efficient than others.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, I must say I have made a great many speeches this session, and I agree with what the Colonial Secretary has said; but all the reporters are not of the same calibre. I am not mentioning any names, but I think there is something in what Mr. Halfyard has said—that the efficiency of the reporters, as well as the length of the session, should be taken into consideration in fixing a bonus.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, there is only one way to encourage a reporter. I have said it repeatedly. You have got to make the remuneration sufficiently attractive to warrant a man making up his mind that he is going to devote himself to reporting and nothing else. Court reporting and parliamentary reporting are in a class by themselves. Parliamentary reporting is totally different from even newspaper reporting. Generally speaking your newspaper reporter, with some parliamentary experience makes your ideal reporter. The real trouble is this—to-day you allow the reporters two hundred and ten dollars each. It is not sufficiently attractive to warrant a man saying, "I will lay myself out to be free for that season of the year." What actually happens is that you are only able to avail yourselves of those who on account of their particular business are able to attend at the particular time that the House is open. When you get a first class shorthand man, he is gobbled up by big business houses, and you would not be able to get him to come down here for two hundred and ten dollars a session. If you want good reporters you have to make the salary sufficiently attractive to induce men to train as parliamentary reporters.

I want to say here that the report-

ing has been very satisfactory this year, and a very great improvement over last year.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I quite agree with the remarks made by the Hon. Minister of Justice, that to get good services, and have the reporters give their best, you will have to give them proper compensation. I have spoken quite a lot, and afterwards I have to read it all over. I go through certain pages and I find them alright and I do not want to correct it; but when I get down a little farther, it seems that some one else has come in then and did not take me, but somebody else. That has been my experience in reading through what I said this session. I quite agree that it is very difficult to get efficiency in every respect. Of course, some reporters may be able to take rapidly, but it should not end there. You must have men that have some knowledge of the English language; and if they do not get all our lengthy remarks they can get the sense of it anyhow.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. member for Trinity if he does not think that the reporters get a little tired of reporting the same man for four hours at a time?

MR. HALFYARD—They come on every quarter hour; don't they?

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Prime Minister with regard to any bonus to be paid officials of this House, if that would include the messengers and doorkeepers?

HON. PRIME MINISTER—There is no custom at all . . . .

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—It is a matter for the Internal Economy Committee.

MR. GRIMES—The reason why I asked about the messengers and doorkeepers is that if this is all the amount that they are to receive for their services, I think that it is a very small compensation for these men, most of whom are family men and this is the only means they have of getting the wherewithal to provide for their families. I think the Internal Economy Committee ought to take notice of that, and ought to give some consideration to those men when settling any bonus.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—That is a matter for the Internal Economy Committee to consider at the latter part of the session. It all depends upon when the Opposition is going to let us close.

MR. HICKMAN—Is that amount for the door keeper—$100—reduced from last year?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Whatever they got last year they are getting this year.

MR. HICKMAN—That is hardly enough for a man.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—They generally get a bonus.

MR. GRIMES—I understand that they received nothing over the $100 last year.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—There were no bonuses last year. It was á short session.

MR. SCAMMELL—I would like to ask with regard to this very expensive publication—Hansard—how many copies are published?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—One hundred and twenty-five.

MR. HICKMAN—This amount for debates—what debates does that mean?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Hansard.

MR. HICKMAN—Does the Government pay anybody for publishing the speeches in the Upper House in the daily press?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that the Upper House will have no Hansard this year. Their idea this

year is that they will have what they call the Official Synopsis as their Hansard. The Internal Economy Committee considered this matter as discussed at the last session of the House. Last year it was felt that there ought to be some definite publication, and honourable members will remember that at the beginning the Hansard was to be abandoned. However, it was finally decided to revert to the Hansard, and this year we have repeated the decision of last year, and, as far as this House is concerned, the Hansard will be published as usual. The Upper House is not issuing a Hansard, but are having their debates go through the papers. In other words, the official report of the Upper House is what appears in the papers, while the official report of this House will be Hansard.

MR. HALFYARD—By whom is the Hansard published?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—By the Telegram.

MR. HIBBS—Do I understand that the papers that are now reporting the speeches in the Upper House are being paid for that?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Yes. The length of them has been rather a surprise to ourselves. The Upper House did not want a Hansard, but wanted what they called an Official Synopsis, and that is what is now appearing.

MR. HICKMAN—That is not the sort of official synopsis that was given us last year.

MR. HALFYARD—I fear that we are getting the same dose this year so far as the official synopsis is concerned. Who is the compiler of the Official Synopsis of the House of Assembly?

MR. BROWNE—Mr. Chairman, in regard to the Library, I would like to point out that the present one is altogether inadequate. As a matter of fact it is not a library at all, but rather an archives. I have sent out repeatedly for such works of reference as the report of the Economic Conference only to find that it was not available. I think that the House ought to subscribe to various publications which would be useful for reference in conducting the debates, and also be helpful in connection with legislation. As to the Economic Conference Report—perhaps the Hon. Colonial Secertary may have one—I know that its contents will be of great interest to members of the House in dealing with such matters as arose here in the discussion about ordering our steamer in Holland. I think that this matter should be given consideration and that the Library Committee ought to subscribe to various publications in England and Canada which would be of value as reference works, and I believe the money would be well spent.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, I agree with the idea put forward by Mr. Browne, and would like to add a word in support of his suggestion. There are official publications in other parts of the world which we ought to be able to get at a moment's notice. Of course it is rather difficult to draw the line as to just what publications should be obtained, but I think the Committee could easily decide as to this matter of reports and documents which should be in the Library. I fully agree with the suggestion of the hon. member for St. John's West, and I think the matter should be given attention.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, I may point out for information that a few years ago there was a vote for the maintenance of the Library but this has been cut out for some time now. To-day the only amounts voted in connection with the Library are the salaries of

the Librarian and Engrossing Clerk and an amount for printing and stationary. There is no vote for the Library and Miss Morris has not five cents with which to buy a book. All she can do is put in whatever books or documents may be sent in free. If we want to maintain the Library properly there should be a vote for it. The point that has been taken by the honourable member for St. John's West cannot be doubted as correct because as a matter of fact we have not a library in the country to-day though we should have one. Take the case of the Colonial Secretary's Department. When we were in Ottawa Deputy Archivist Smith told me that we have in that department here the foundation of a splendid library. In Ottawa they have a library which any student can visit and procure any kind of reference on any subject that he may want. Of course that is a library in the true sense and one which we could not possibly hope to copy. We are hopelessly behind here in the matter of preserving documents of value and historical records. This has been sadly neglected and the reason is that there is no vote for the Library. I think that it would be particularly convenient for the members of the Opposition to be able to obtain at short notice a copy of the Report of the Economic Conference or other such publication, say at three o'clock in the morning.

HON,. THE. COLONIAL. SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, in connection with this matter I would like to say that it is all very well for us to say that we must have these things. The report of the Economic Conference, for instance, is a document that we must preserve and we have the copies of it in the Colonial Secretary's Depoartment, but they are kept in the vault to preserve them against fire and until we have a proper library they must remain there. We have even the minutes with the report of the Economic Conference and they are available at any moment if necessary. As the Hon. the Minister of Justice pointed out, in Ottawa they have a magnificent library and an amazing amount of money is spent on their archives. The building itself is as big as this House and it must have cost thousands to fit up. There is a large staff of officials and as the Hon. the Minister of Justice remarked, students may go there and obtain any reference work they need. A proper library would be alright but at present we have to drag along as best we can.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman. I would like to endorse what has been said by the previous speakers in this connection as a library is very necessary and it is most important that we have works there dealing with questions which we may be discussing here. I concur with the honourable member of St. John's West as to the value of the Report of the Economic Conference and I may say that there are also many other documents which to be found in the Library dealing with the fisheries which are of such vital importance to this country. should be there which we have not now. For instance there is very little Books of that kind may be obtained at a very small cost as can others also dealing with subjects that may come up for consideration here. Take the social legislation abroad which has been referred to here—if any information were needed as to what is done elsewhere there are no books to be referred to in trying to find out what should be adopted here. I think a vote of $500 or $600 would equip the Library so that it would be of service to the members of this House and of value to the country as well.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Chairman, I beg to support what the previous speakers have said as to the Library and in doing so I beg to be excused for referring to the vote for the Engrossing

Clerk. We all know that she is a very exacting and painstaking official and has been a familiar figure here and I think her salary should be at least $400. This would be only an act of justice as she has been a most efficient worker and has been engaged here for many years. I therefore hope that this matter will be taken into consideration and that she will be given the increased amount.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman, I agree with the honourable member for Fogo that this is a matter that should be given every consideration.

MR. MOORE—Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the suggestion that this lady's salary be increased. As has been said she is a most efficient official and has given every satisfaction here and I consider is worthy in every way of the proposed advance.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS —Mr. Chairman, I would also like to add a word in favor of the proposal to increase this lady's salary. The services of this lady have been very satisfactory to this House for a number of years and I beg to support the suggestion of an increase in her salary.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE —I think it will be looked after.

MR. CAHILL—Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that I agree as to the increase in salary for the Engrossing Clerk as she deserves it, but as to the matter of the vote for the Library itself I would like to see it granted. I would like to see the Library improved as it would be of value to the members in connection with referring to documents and if nothing else the older members at least would be able to go there when not busy in the House and enjoy themselves perusing the literature.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE —It is impossible to make a vote for the Department now but it may be dealt with in Supplemental Supply.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—I think it can be left in the hands of the Library Committee.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, I have been told that there is no room in the Library for another volume, but there is room in the W.P.A. quarters downstairs.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman. I notice there is an additional amount of $1,500 for printing, binding and gazetting the Acts. Now I would like to ask when the Acts will be consolidated again?

HON. MR. BRADLEY—In 1936.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman. It seems rather strange for members coming here not to be able to get Acts that were consolidated in 1916 and are not able to get amendments to Acts since that day. I think the Government should see that a sufficient number is printed each year.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—They are printed at the office of the Newfoundland Gazette.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—And can be bought any time.

MR. HALFYARD—I agree with what has been said by the member for Twillingate. I was trying to get a copy of an Act myself but was not successful. I do not know whose business it is to look after this matter, but I think it is worth while considering by the Government.

HR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman. With regard to the salary of the Assistant Deputy Colonial Secretary which has been raised from $2,400 a year to $3,000 a year. I agree with the increase. It has been stated, however, that some of the increases are not actual increases and that certain moneys are received from other sources. I know of $300 that Mr. Stirling got from other sources but I do not know of $600. Now there never was such a great discrepancy between the salaries of the clerks. I presume, however, the whole matter has been considered by the Colonial Secretary and possibly he has done the best he

could under the circumstances; but it has been intimated to me—and not by my nephew—that one of the clerks thinks that there is no possibility of an increase and he is considering resigning. There is a vote in the Estimates for a fourth clerk and accountant. There is no such official existing. When I was there I recommended to the then Minister of Finance that that vote be divided up among the other officials.

HON, THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman. As the honourable member for Trinity has brought the matter up, I may say that Mr. Fred. Stirling, the Assistant Deputy Colonial Secretary, has never, at least within the past few years, been given that consideration that his services warrant and I do not think that there is a better official in the whole civil service than Mr. Stirling. He has become so valuable in that Department that he cannot be spared out of it; and he has the qualifications to fill any position in the public service. He laid a very strong case before me and he stated that for the past twenty-seven years he has been in that Department and that there are people in the civil service now who came in there a few years ago and who were getting a bigger salary than he is to-day. He said further that he had come to the age when his family have to be educated and he wanted to try and give them as good an education as he could and that he could not live and support his family properly out of what he was earning. Well, after all, that is a poor return for a man of such unquestionable ability. I thought his case deserved special consideration and I laid the matter before the Executive Government with the result that they readily agreed to the increase. His salary is now fixed at three thousand dollars. With regard to the matter of fourth clerk. That vote has been taken for the last couple of years and the amount has been utilized because we have to pay for extra services in the Department. I know that during the War there was a tremendous amount of work done in that Department and the officials did it as efficiently as possible for men to do it and the entire staff, I feel sure, deserve more than they are getting now, but I thought it best to recommend Mr. Stirling for this year and to see that something is done for the balance of the staff next session. The Government wanted to cut down expenses and if next year's finances warrant it they will receive favorable consideration.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a brief explanation in relation to the vote of five thousand dollars for the Patriotic Fund. It will be remembered that in the early days of the War a public subscription was raised here. That was before the Government had organized any Department and I think that somewhere in the vicinity of one hundred and twenty thousand dollars was subscribed and was passed over to what is known as "The Patriotic Fund." That fund was consolidated and placed in the hands of a Committee consisting of a number of gentlemen in St. John's and of which Sir P. T. McGrath was Secretary. Since then they have been using money to accommodate the families and dependents of deceased soldiers and returned soldiers.

That money is practically all spent and they contended that for the next three years they would want five thousand a year to keep going. After that they think that it would practically all be over. They made requisitions to the Government and already they have paid $2,500 for this year and we are now making a vote of $5,000 for this purpose. This will be agreeable to the House because they are doing a tremendous amount of good. They are doing it in a way that no other organization is doing it and we hope

that this will be acceptable to those who 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 to-morrow.

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions respecting an Agreement between the Government and the Newfoundland Textile Manufacturing Company, Ltd.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

HON, THE PRIME MINISTER –I just want to explain that since the Hon. member for Fortune called our attention to some points in this Bill that we have made the necessary alterations. Regarding the point that he made that anybody, according to the Bill as it read, could have gone to the West End and started a sewing circle and made free entry material into petticoats without starting a mill at all, the Bill has now been altered so that it reads "The manufacture of woolen, cotton and knitted garments," and that in the opinion of the Company's officials, Mr. LeMessurier and others safeguard the right of these persons to import free, cotton, fleecy cotton, flannelette, etc., simply for use and assistance in the manufacture of knitted garments. This Bill, as I stated before, gives exactly the same concessions as were given to the Newfoundland Knitting Mill, except that this Company is not looking for 5 per cent. guarantee and I doubt if we would be much inclined to give it to them if they were.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman. I propose that there be an ammendment to this contract. In the first place 20 years is too long to be offering any protection to anything of this sort. Ten years is quite sufficient for them to get on their feet. Now as to the importation of material free of duty, I quite agree with Section A. The industry is a new one and the idea is already provided for under the Revenue Act. But I don't see how the Government has altered its position with regard to sub. sec. B. sec. 1.

Reads that sec.

Is that word left out on purpose. The word "fleece?"

Threads, Woolen and Cotton Yarn, everything down to the paper that you wrap your parcels up in; everything is allowed to come in free of duty. I repeat what I said before that if you give so much protection to a factory of this sort even down to the wrapping paper, I don't see one answer that the Government has to give to her classes of factories if they come to the Government and say "We have already given a great deal of employment, we import threads and cotton yarn and wrapping materials for this class of factory and we ought to get some consideration, though we don't get it now." I don't see what answer the Government has to the request of the other classes of factories if they are going to allow this free duty even on wrapping paper. I desire to express my opposition to this Bill.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman. This Bill has to do with an industry that went out of existence about two years ago. Every member of this House would like to see it re-started, for the more industries at work in this country, the greater will be the employment given, and the more money there will be in circulation, all of which makes for greater prosperity. But it must be shown that any company requiring concessions from the Government, for the starting or re-

starting of an industry, is prepared to give an equivalent.

The policy of protection can be carried too far, as is shown in the case of other industries which obtain large profits at the expense of the people, and we should examine the Bill carefully to see that it has in it, nothing that will in its working out be found to deal unfairly with the rights of the consumer.

If I am informed correctly, when the Knitting Mills were operating a few years ago, it imported the material required for making Fleece Lined Underwear, already knitted, so that all that was required to be done here, was cut the webbing, and sew it together according to the kind of garment required. In other words, they did not import the cotton in its raw state to be woven into a knitted article here, consequently only a few employees were needed to make the underwear, as compared to the number that would be required if the raw cotton had to be woven into cloth here. In the making of the wool underwear, the wool was spun into cloth here, from which the woollen garments were made, and this gave a larger number employment.

What I desire to know is whether the material required to make the fleece lined and woollen underwear is to be imported into the country in its raw state, and woven here from which the garment is to be made.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—That is as I understand it.

MR. GRIMES—It makes a big difference as far as employment goes, whether the company is to be allowed to import a partly manufactured article, to be completed here, and if it comes in duty free, it is a protection too great to be of benefit to the consumer.

MR. SCAMMELL—I understand that here we are not giving any more concessions than were given to the Knitting Mills before. Well, Mr. Chairman, when this Bill was brought up here the other day I did not know very well what to make of it, but now I notice that there are changes since then, and I am inclined to boost the proposition because I think that anything that can be done to encourage any likely industry ought to be done. After all it will solve itself into a matter of competition and if it is not able to put the same goods on the market as the goods that are imported, then the public will have its own judgment to use as to whether they will buy the thing that is manufactured in Newfoundland or the thing that is imported. If the company is given this concession of importing these goods named they will in a short time be employing a large number of people and looking at this from that viewpoint and from the encouragement that it will give to home industry, I am in favor of these resolutions. Of course the question of protection in a matter like this, is a big one, but we have granted concessions before when they have been asked, and they have been more than those that are asked in these resolutions. I am glad to support these resolutions after I have heard the explanation of the Prime Minister, when he says that the Knitting Mills got more than it asked in these resolutions because the Government gave them a five per cent. guarantee. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to support the Bill for the reasons that I have outlined.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I am not very clear on this Act myself, and I must say that I would like to know a little more about it, and so, for that reason, I would move that the Committee rise. Whilst I do not agree with the hon. member for Fortune Bay, that we should treat this company just the same as we would any company that

sews cloth together, but if the knitting would give more labor than is given at the present time by those who simply bring the cloth into the country and sew it together, then I think that this company should get some concessions. But if it is just a case of bringing the flannel or the flannelette in and making a garment out of it, then it is a very different thing. But I think that with the Act reading as it does, the company can only manufacture knitted goods. It was for that reason that we made the resolutions read as they do. But I would like to be satisfied that we are not granting anyone permission to bring in material and then just sew it into a bit of flannel and so make a garment. I can quite understand the force of the hon. member for Fogo. I move that the Committee rise and we will consider the matter.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

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

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on to-morrow.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

The following Library Committee was appointed: Mr. Speaker, Mr. W. J. Browne, Mr. Cahill, Mr. Grimes, Mr. Ashbourne.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, March 30th, 1925.

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

MR. BROWN—Mr. Speaker: I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Tilt Cove, Caplin Cove and Shoe Cove in the district of Twillingate, and, with your permission, Sir, I would like to read it to the House.

(Reads Petition)

This petition is signed by about sixty people. It seems as if the fisherment of Nipper's Harbor and vicinity, who have a law governing their own grounds, come down there and set trawls. It does not seem hardly fair and I support the prayer of the petitioners.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Speaker: I give the petition my hearty support.

MR. GODDEN—Mr. Speaker: I beg leave to present a petition from Sibley's Cove in the district of Trinity. The petition is signed by practically every man in that place and asks for $300 to repair a local road. I might point out that this particular local road is one very much used by the people of Sibley's Cove and is very essential to the fishermen there in their daily avocation. I would also like to point out that out of the local grant only $27 is allowed Sibley's Cove for the upkeep of some three-quarters of a mile of local roads. I would particularly ask that immediate consideration be given to this petition.

MR. HALFYARD—I have much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition.

Mr. Hichman, Mr. Ashbourne and Mr. Scammell gave notice of questions.

NOTICE OF QUESTION.

(1) MR. WARREN—Asked the Hon. the Prime Minister: (1) what are the functions of the so-called Railway Commission; (2) by what authority were they appointed; (3) do they function under Minute of Council; (4) who are the members of the Commission; (5) have any of them received or are any of them receiving any pay, emolument or money directly or indirectly from the Commission or from public

funds or railway funs; (6) do any of the members of the Commission receive or have they received any money or payment, either as principal or agent, for any goods, wares, merchandise, services or otherwise from public funds or railway funds; (7) if so to lay upon the Table of the House a statement showing all amounts paid to any member of the Commission either as principal or agent and for what the said amounts were paid; (8) under what authority any such amounts were paid; (9) if any payments were made to any company, firm or person was it revealed to the Commission that any member of the Commission was a shareholder, director or agent of such company, firm or person or had any interest therein; (10) are the net or gross receipts from the operation of the railroad and steamships public funds; (11) by what authority salaries and other payments are made; (12) if there should be a deficit in the operation of the railroad system from what funds (public or not) would the deficit be met; (13) who is the present proprietor of the railway system operating in the Colony; (14) does the Hon. Prime Minister consider those employed on the railway system as public servants or civil servants; (15) into what account are the receipts of the railway system paid eventually; (16) if not into the Newfoundland Exchequer Account by what authority are they paid into any other account and has such account been authorised by the Legislature; (17) is the so-called Railway Commission a public body or public board; (18) are the profits (if any) from the Railway part of the revenue of the Colony; (19) has the legislature of the Colony any control over the appropriation of any moneys paid by or to the Railway system whether as salaries or otherwise; (20) is the Railway a public service or a part of the public service; (21) by what authority does the Governor-in-Council or any other body or so-called Commission or any person pay out any public moneys on account of the railroad; (22) has the Auditor General drawn attention to any irregularities in this respect; (23) has the Auditor General any control over the so-called Railway or Railway Commission or its payments or receipts; (24) do the Commission keep any minutes or record of their decisions or meetings; (25) to lay upon the Table of the House a copy of any such minutes or records; (26) who is the Solicitor or Counsel to the Railway Commission; (27) is he paid a standing retainer and what is the nature of such retainer and amount; (28) is he paid for any services in addition to such retainer; (29) to lay upon the Table a statement showing all amounts paid such solicitor or counsel from June 30th, 1924, to date; (30) does the Government propose to lay before the Legislature of the Colony a Balance Sheet showing the financial transactions of the Railway system for the past year duly audited, and any report as to its operation.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Speaker: I desire to say that in reading over that question since I asked it I find that numbers six and seven really go further on paper than I intended, as I know and the public know that there are certain articles sold on commission by firms, perhaps, whose shareholders are members of the Railway Commission.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker: I hope to have a reply to that question ready on to-morrow; but I would like to draw attention to part (9) of that question which says: "If any payments were made to any company, firm or person was it revealed to the Commission that any member of the Commission was a shareholder, director or agent of such company, firm or person or had any interest therein." I am personally a

shareholder of the Colonial Cordage Company and the Imperial Tobacco Company, who, perhaps, sold a considerable quantity of goods to the Commission.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Speaker: May I say in explanation that that part of the question would come in the same category as the other two that I mentioned. I did not mean petty details or things of that sort.

(2) MR. WARREN asked the Hon. the Prime Minister: (1) What is the salary or director's fee paid to the director appointed by the Government on the Board of the Newfoundland Power and Paper Co., Ltd.; (2) is the Government directly or indirectly liable for the payment of such salary or fee during the term of the guarantee given by the Government.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I beg to table a reply to this question.

(3) MR. WARREN asked the Hon. the Prime Minister: (1) have any members of the Board of Liquor Control received any pay, salary or other emolument directly or indirectly from the public funds of the Colony; (2) upon what authority has any such payment been made; (3) are the receipts from the Board of Liquor Control public funds; (4) if not, to whom do such receipts belong; (5) if these should be a deficit in the accounts of the Board of Liquor Control would the public funds of the Colony be responsible for the payment of such deficit; (6) are the members of the Board of Liquor Control and the others employed in that service public servants; (7) are they paid out of public funds; (8) if not, who pays them; (9) into what account are the receipts of the Board of Liquor Control paid; (10) do the funds or receipts of the Board of Liquor Control form part of the Consolidated Revenue Fund; (11) if not paid into the Newfoundland Exchequer Account into what account are they paid: (12) do the receipts from the Board of Liquor Control belong to the Colony, if not, to whom do they belong; (13) are the profits, if any, from the sale of alcoholic liquors part of the revenue of the Colony; (14) has the Legislature any control over the appropriation of any moneys paid to or expended by the Board of Liquor Control, if not, why not; (15) is the Board of Liquor Control a public service or a branch of the public service; (16) has the Auditor General drawn attention to any irregularities in regard to the Board of Liquor Control or to any payments made by or to them; (17) has this House any control over the Board of Liquor Control and if so, how can that control be exercised; (18) does the Government purpose to place before the Legislature of the Colony any Balance Sheet showing the financial transactions of the Board of Liquor Control to date duly audited.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—I hope to have a reply to that question ready on to-morrow.

(4) MR. GODDEN asked Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs why Mr. S. Bradbury was disrated from the position of Superintendent of Mails and Mail Clerks; what his present position is, and his salary, and if it is not a fact that he has given eminent satisfaction during an uninterrupted period of over twenty years in the Postal Service.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—I beg to table the formation.

(5) MR. WARREN asked the Hon. Minister of Posts and Telegraphs if there is any mail service or freight service to the Islands of Sagona and Brunette, Fortune Bay, if so, who has the contract and to table a copy of same and when and how often is the mail delivered.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND

TELEGRAPHS—I beg to table the information.

The Chairman from the Committee of the Whole on Supply reported certain Resolutions, which were read a first time as follows:

Finance Department	$3,667,390.57
Col. Secretary's Dept. ..	61,527.00

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.

Hon. the Minister of Finance tabled the following documents:

Statement of Customs Revenue collected in the Colony during the year ended 30th June, 1924.

Statement of the Imports and Exports of the Colony for the year ended 30th June, 1924.

A Comparative Statement of Goods, wares and merchandise imported into the Colony during the years ended June 30th, 1923, and 30th June, 1924, showing increases and decreases for the year 1923-1924.

A Comparative Statement of Revenue received at each outport for the years 1922-23 and 1923-24.

A Comparative Statement of Light Dues, showing collections at each Outport for the years 1922-23 and 1923-24.

A Return of the Bank Fishery for the year 1924.

A Statement showing the Revenue collected on goods, wares and merchandise imported through the Post Office.

Statement showing the movements of Shipping during the year ended June 30th, 1924.

An Abstract of Shipping for the year ended 31st December, 1924.

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 Travel on Highways and the Speed, Operation and Load of Vehicles thereon," 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 it was ordered that they be read a second time on to-morrow.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the second reading of these amendments be deferred until to-morrow. I have only just seen these, and I have not had time to look into the matter. It appears that most of the amendments are merely renumbering of sections on account of sections being added. I think before we pass them, we would like to have an opportunity of going into them, and explaining any alterations that may be made.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "Of the House of Assembly."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman. I just want to say a few words in connection with Bay de Verde District. As I have already intimated to this House there is going to be a great deal of confusion throughout the country when this Bill goes through this House. Nobody knows what are the lines of the districts, with the exception of what we see here in this Bill. The Bill I understand is going to make the dividing line in proportion with the population. I was told by a man from Bay de Verde district a few days ago that Broad Cove is divided so that the line goes through the settlement. This looks as if Broad Cove Church is in Carbonear District. I am merely saying what I have been told. Per-

haps the Hon. Member can give us some information. Is not the Methodist Church in Carbonear District? He also told me of one case where a man had his home in Carbonear District and his barn in Bay de Verde District. The Bill is confusing to the people living in the outports and the result is going to be confusion all through. Every Government in the future is going to make some alterations in this Bill and unless the people are given an opportunity to express their opinions on this measure as to the divisions that are to be made the confusion will be all the greater. I suggested the other day that the Bill be referred to a select Committee to sit out of session and this suggestion was made for the sake of the Bill. I am not against the Redistribution Bill. I am quite satisfied to have the districts divided up but I think that the people throughout the country should have an opportunity to see what it means and to see how it effects the different settlements in which they live. The matter is not so important that it should be rushed. That is what it looks like. The Prime Minister told us the other day that nobody could tell as to whether we would have an election within twelve months or not.

Something must have taken place on the other side of the House because this side of the House had no intimation of anything like it. The Prime Minister gave us to understand this. I am only repeating what the Prime Minister said. I say that there must be some ulterior motive to have to rush this Bill through the House of Asembly. What should be done is that there should be a Select Committee chosen from both Houses and copies of the Bill should be distributed throughout the country so that all those places in the northern districts where they get a mail every week or so will get an opportunity to get an idea as to what the Bill means. It is going to cause a lot of confusion and a great deal of legislation for future Governments.

HON. MR. CRAMM—The statement made by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that Broad Cove Church would be in Carbonear District under the Redistribution is not correct. If it were correct it wouldn't be very serious as about one-third of the people who go to that Church will belong to Carbonear District. Broad Cove Church will still be in Bay de Verde District. . The other descriptions are not as accurate as they might be. Instead of starting at a point "north" of Lead Cove, it should be a point "northeast" of Lead Cove. Instead of the mouth of the brook running into Broad Cove Pond, it should be the mouth of "the main brook" running into Broad Cove Pond. Instead of to the "mouth of the Brook running out of" Broad Cove Pond, it should be the "outlet" of Broad Cove Pond. With these changes the description is, I think, quite accurate. Bay de Verde District will run from Old Perlican inclusive to Lower Small Point exclusive.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, with regard to the redistribution of seats I am entirely in accord with it. It is something that has been looked forward to for several years past. I presume we all are unanimous in this respect. But now that the Government has decided to make the redistribution I do not think that there is any need for undue rush. The bill has been but a short time before the House still it has been brought to the attention of the Government the alignments of some of the Conception Bay districts are not altogether correct. The Hon. Member for Bay de Verde, Mr. Cramm, has just said that boundaries of the district of Bay de Verde are wrong and the section should stand over. Now if the Boundaries of the district of Bay de Verde are not correct and the Hon. Member asks that the section should stand

over, does it not follow that the majority of the districts calls for investigation and scrutiny so that the bill when placed on the Statute Books will be as correct as it it is possible for it to be. It has been intimated by the Hon. the Introducer of the Bill that there have been some alterations made already in the districts of Harbor Grace and Bay Roberts, and I really think that it is only reasonable that we should give the country as a whole the opportunity to read the bill thoroughly and scrutinize it in every possible way. There may not be any radical changes but when you have consulted the people you can come back and say that you did not do it without consulting them. No doubt there is sure to be a difference of opinion but after the people have been given an opportunity to express their opinions they are more satisfied even though there may not be many changes. There is something sentimental about it. You may think that it is a matter of detail but after all I think that it is a matter that is worthy of consideration. The suggestion given by the Leader of the Opposition that the bill be considered out of session by a Select Committee of both Houses and report at the next session of the Legislature in a reasonable one. If it were the last year of the term of Government then there might be some reason for putting it through. We think that the redistribution of seats is desirable if not all over the country at least over the greater part of it. Now as far as Trinity district is concerned you have formed a new district and if I am a candidate at the next election and stand as the candidate for the district of Trinity Bay I do not know what my friends of the North Side of the district from Melrose down to Lancaster, which includes Port Union, Catalina, Little Catalina and Elliston will think. I do not know whether these people will appreciate being the constituents of a new district under the name of Bonavista. I think that they would prefer to go under the name of Trinity. All their associations have been with this district and there may be a certain sentiment about that.

Perhaps Spillar's Cove, Lancaster and Villa Verte, from a geographical, social and a business point of view should be attached to Bonavista. You are cutting out a part of Fogo district, and attaching it to a district called Bonavista North. I don't know what our friends in Fogo district will think of coming under the name of Bonavista district. On the whole, I would support the redistribution Bill; but I would prefer if the number of districts was less than we already have, rather than more.

Now, with regard to the population in proportion to the number of representatives. The population is scattered. It covers a large section of the country, geographically, and from that point of view there is a reason for dividing up the districts. But everyone knows that Bonavista district has a very large section of the country even for two members. Further south, in the Southern districts there is no need of having so many representatives—around Conception Bay, particularly. There is no need, however, and instead of forty there should be about thirty. Your basis of population is altogether too low. It should be increased, instead of six thousand, it should be ten thousand. That should be the basis the Redistribution should be worked on. There is another mat- in proportion to the number of representative for Labrador, and why should you not have Labrador represented.

MR. WARREN—There's no boundary settlement.

MR. HALFYARD—If we haven't a boundary now, it is about time we

did have one. This has been in dispute since 1908. At that time the Canadian Government made an issue of the question. The Newfoundland Government have been spending money in connection with Commissions since then. I don't think we should give the Canadians any reason, at the present time to think that we have any doubt of the ownership of Labrador. I don't think that there is any doubt in the minds of any one who has studied the question in Newfoundland; and in advocating that a district be put in this Bill for Labrador I would give my reasons for it.

There is no occasion for anyone in this House going into the history of the Labrador Boundary. That is well known to those who have taken up the Newfoundland side of the case. I took the trouble to look up the opinions of those who tried to gather all the information they could in connection with the Labrador Boundary Question, and I just dotted down a few facts which are well known to the hon. member for Fortune District who has been interested in the question. They are known also to the hon. Minister of Justice and possibly to others.

We have to go back to the year 1670, when the Hudson's Bay Company obtained a charter from Charles II., then by the conquest of Canada in 1760 Labrador fell into the hands of the English and this was confirmed in 1763 by the Treaty of Paris.

The question may be asked here what territory the Hudson Bay Company possessed. They possessed all that portion of the peninsula drained by the rivers that fell into the Hudson Bay, and the Straits, and then it became necessary to divide the balance, and the Province of Quebec was bounded on the Labrador coast, by the River St. John and from thence by a line running west from the head of that river. It was stated that all the coast from the River St. John to the Hudson Straits with Anticosti and Magdalen Islands was at one time under the inspection of the Government of Newfoundland, and in 1763 Sir Thomas Gray, the Governor of Newfoundland assumed that the residue was Newfoundland territory. Then with regard to the point raised in connection with the representation we collect duties on Labrador and have been collecting them for years, and the collection of duties without representation, causes revolutions. This lost the British Government the North American colonies. I don't suppose the natives of Labrador are in a position to revolt against taxation; but still if they had the power they certainly would.

(Quotes from History).

So much for the history connected with Newfoundland-Labrador and Canada.

Now, Mr. Chairman, quite recently the Prime Minister and his colleagues went to Canada upon the invitation of Premier Taschereau, of Quebec, to talk about the sale of Labrador, and I think that roving commision was initiated by a Mr. Du Champlain. who hold interests in some timber lands on Labrador. The Newfoundland Government did not know anything about Labrador or about what they had to sell. They should have courteously replied to Premier Taschereau and said that as they had a very strenuous year they would like to have a holiday, and take in the sights and scenery of Montreal, Quebec and the other cities of the Dominion.

We graciously accept the invitation and if Premier Taschereau could arrange while we are there for curling matches and other side shows, it would, of course, brighten our holiday.

The money spent on that commission could have been used to greater

advantage in the appointing of a geological survey to go down and cruise the Labrador and find out just what we want to sell, because we know very little about Labrador.

Mr. Chairman, I regard the Labrador Boundary Question as a most serious one. We have no idea of the potential wealth of Labrador. What little information we have is from the reports of the geological surveys of Canada between 1892 and 1896. We gather from that report that thirty per cent. of the Labrador disputed territory is timber land, that the total area under dispute is 120 thousand square miles.

And the Newfoundland area is forty thousand square miles. As estimated by the authorities at Quebec, six cords of wood to the acre, and six hundred and forty acres to the square mile gives us 153,650,000 cords of wood which, valued at $1.00 a cord, equals $153,650,000. That being so it behoves the Newfoundland Government and people to seriously consider the selling of this territory unless they can get sufficient money to at least whipe off the national debt. Anything less than $50,000,000 should not be given a second's consideration, as that sum is only one-third the wood value alone. As to the water power at Grand River, Muskrat Falls, there is four million h.p. A commission appointed by the House of Commons went to Ireland and estimated the water power there at three-quarters of a million horse-power, valued at ten million pounds. At that rate the water-power of Labrador is worth two hundred million dollars, and with the pulp wood valued at one hundred and fifty-three millin, the total is $353,000,000.00. In today's issue of the Daily News, there is an item on the electrification of farms, which reads:

ELECTRIC FARMING GROWS.

"BERLIN—Electric farming is making progress in Sweden, which is reported to have 52,000 electrically equipped farms, 37 million out of a total of 94 Million acres of arable land being electrified. The annual consumption is 120 million kilowatt hours out of Sweden's total production of 2,800 million kilowatt hours."

Now looking at the possibilities of our water power in electrifying farms in this climate where it is cold, it will be seen that by this heating, the ground would become arable and fertile. As to the transmission of electric power, we do not know how easy it will be in future to transmit it from Labrador to Newfoundland. The Leader of the Opposition suggests that it is already being carried eight hundred miles. In Hamilton Inlet there are sections which are most prolific of vegetation, and though of course I do not know one million part of the information concerning that place. I throw out these suggestions as to the potentital wealth of Labrador. It is too valuable at present to consider any sale, and till we know more about it I feel that no Government should undertake to dispose of it. Now we depend on the fishery there, and the overlord of the sea-coast should also be the overlord of the hinterland. We cannot have a duel jurisdiction, as whoever owns the coast much also own the inside territory. Products of the soil must be brought to the sea coast. We talk of boosting Newfoundland and its scenic attractions, and speak of it as a thing of beauty and a joy forever. The same has been said of Labrador. Sir Patrick McGrath in "Newfoundland in 1911" quotes Sir William McGregor and many others, and what part of the Continent can be described in more glowing colors for it's a salubrious climate and as a health resort. My nephew spent a winter in Sandwich Bay two years ago, and he says the climate was beautiful, and altogether different from that of Newfoundland. He was living up in the

Bay and he said there was no humidity there like near the coast, and the snow never hardened like in Newfoundland, as the climate was affable all through the winter. There would be drifts as the snow was very fine, but there was the same temperature all through the winter, and one could not be languid, as there was that in the air which caused one to feel bright and active all the time, and not half dead. He gave me an idea of how the people lived there in the winter, and said it was wrong to say they are not thrifty. They were never in bed in the morning after daylight. They had their own work to do, and they kept at it from daylight till after dark. They never had a day's sickness—his wife and child were with him—and he spoke in the highest terms of the Labrador winter. Sir William McGregor visited Labrador officially in 1908 and negotiated Hamilton Inlet in the cruiser "Fiona," and he reported to the Secretary of State for the Colonies as follows:—

(Quotes Report)

It is not my purpose Mr. Chairman to delay the Committee, but I think it only right to give my opinion on the possible potential wealth of Labrador. We have to govern ourselves by experience, and it has been said by historians that Labrador is akin to Alaska in all its characteristics, its geographical situation, and its geological formation are the same as Alaska, and many persons predict that its mineral possibilities are great, whilst its peltries are the finest in the world and fetch the highest prices. Comparing Labrador with Alaska, what do we find. Alaska was bought by the United States from Russia in 1867 for £1,440,000, and they thought they made a good bargain when they sold it. It contains 20 million acres of merchantable timber. Its resources in gold and other metals cannot be estimated. Its coal resources are put by the United States Geological Survey at a minimum of 150 billion tons. Oil of high quality has been discovered at widely separated points, what this discovery will bring forth, no one yet knows. Alaska's fisheries produce from 40 to 50 million dollars a year. Alaska carries on a trade with the United States amounting to 80 million dollars a year. Already Alaska's exports come to a total of over a billion dollars!

So that in considering representation for Labrador we also should appreciate the potential wealth of Labrador. We should never consider the selling of it unless, as I said before, we get fifty million dollars for it; certainly we should never consider selling it for a small amount. Now that we have the matter uppermost in our minds, that, as soon as we can get the Quebec Government under way to submit their case to the Privy Council, about ten or twelve months after the Labrador Boundary dispute will be settled in favor of Newfoundland and that before the next general election there will be no question about the ownership of the Labrador, I think it advisable that we should now make arrangements about representation, and, if this Bill is referred to a Select Committee to sit out of session and report back within a short time, I think greater satisfaction will be given to the country as a whole.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman: As there has been nothing new brought up by those who have spoken this afternoon on this Bill, I do not think it is necessary for me for the third time to record the policy of the Government with regard to it. Members of the Opposition think it a great mistake to have the Bill go through before the people of the country have not had time to know the boundary lines. We are perfectly satisfied that the people have had time and we want to see the Bill go through at this session. With regard to Mr.

Halfyard's address on the Labrador, I might say that it was very interesting and I have no doubt that it would be a good thing to have a member for the Labrador, if we own it. We believe we have an interest on the Labrador but the question of boundaries has yet to be settled before the Privy Counc'l I would not suppose that there are many members of this House who would want to go and canvas that district late in the fall of the year.

MR. GODDEN—Mr. Chairman: I was rather interested to hear the Prime Minister say that he had made up his mind to put the Bill through at this session of the House. In that case I do not propose to waste much time in dealing with the matter. I might say, however, that the idea of one man districts throughout Newfoundland is one which meets with my entire approval, and I believe everybody in this country is favorably inclined to that idea, but that is no reason why the first Bill calling for redistribution should be passed at this session of the House of Assembly. The Bill may prove to be satisfactory; but on the other hand it may prove to be unsatisfactory. There are many reasons why a Bill of this nature should be proceeded with cautiously, and without undue haste, and with all due respect to the honourable introducer of this Bill, I claim that it will do no harm to delay this measure for redistribution until another session, and I will endeavour to explain why. Rightly or wrongly, denominationalism has a distinct bearing on matters political in this country. Representation in both branches of the Legislature as well as appointments in the Civil Service are made with the idea in view of comparative equality regarding the different religious bodies; and rightly or wrongly, each denomination is frankly jealous of the other, and are on the lookout all the time for evidences of political discrimination. I do not suggest that this Bill for redistribution has been drawn up with a deliberate intention of unfair dealing in any part of the community. For that matter I understand that care has been taken to obviate any such thing, but when a Bill of this nature is brought to the attention of the country, the first question asked on all sides is: Who is responsible for the Bill? Are the parties who are responsible for this Bill, as we have it presented to us to-day, well enough informed of general requirements, and, above all, are they approved representatives of everybody. If not, then I say that in order to have a redistribution Bill which shall provide for the satisfaction of all parties, a committee should be formed comprised of officials appointed by the various denominations to go into this question of district representation before we discuss the matter further in this House. Another suggestion I would like to make is that an effort should be made to lesson the number of representatives instead of increasing them by four and let all districts be one man districts. Divide St. John's just as you divide all the outport districts so that there will be one district, one representative, one man, one vote.

MR. DUFF—I would just like to make a few remarks. This is a very important Bill. Under this Bill we will require thirty four returing officers, deputies and all the rest of it instead of eighteen formerly which is unfortunate. I think we should reduce the membership instead of increasing it.

As regards the district of Labrador, my friend, the member for Trinity Bay, spoke of it. Now there is one that I would suggest and that is that the people belonging to the Labrador should get the jobs as lighthouse keepers. It would save the passage money to and fro, which you have to pay formerly. I think it would be only fair to appoint the Labrador people to these positions.

I would like to bring to the notice of the House again what I said in connection with Mr. Guy. This redistribution Bill is very important but is much more important to give a square deal to the representatives of the people. I mentioned the fact that the man is well passed middle life. He had three sons in the war. One was killed, one was decorated for bravery, one returned, and this man is thrown aside like an old boot. We all know what these boys fought for. It was right against might. The Government of to-day is acting in the same way as the Germans acted in Europe. I would like the Government to reconsider this matter. I talked to several of the Government heads and I find that that they are not inclined to make this thing right. And as I go over the estimates I find that you have money for everything, even some of the old members who were in this House a few years ago are pensioned. Men who squandered hundreds of thousands of dollars. Yet a man whose boys fought in the great war was thrown out of his job for pure spite. It was nothing more or less. A man who has done his work thoroughly. There was no man in Carbonear who could do it as well. And when the war was on some of us can remember very distinctly when the boys were at the front the anxiety and the worry that was felt from day to day. Everyday they were expecting to get news that their son was killed. Fortunately I did not. And then to find after the war is over that the Government is going back to the same old tricks that the Germans played in 1914, is scarcely what one expected.

Now Mr. Chairman, if this redistribution Bill is valuable for goodness sake have a thought and be fair to the principle for which our boys died in the Great War. That is all that I have to say. I am quite satisfied with the one man districts. Carbonear is going to be extended. But I have nothing to say to that. I don't know whether I will ever come back to this House. Whether I do or not it does not make much difference, but I certainly trust it will be the means of giving the districts representatives from their own districts and not as now city men to represent outside districts with no interest in same.

MR. GODDEN—Mr. Chairman, might I ask why the District of Harbor Main was not divided up the same as the other districts.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the hon. member the reason why the district of Harbor Main was not divided into two one man districts was the desire to maintain the 13 Roman Catholic seats, and this would be very difficult without giving Harbor Main two representatives. As it appears now the Roman Catholic Denomination has 13 seats out of forty. But numerically they are not entitled to more than 13 seats. We want to arrange it so that they will not get less representatives than before with the 36 members.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Chairman, with regard to the redistribution of seats, I would like to know how you are going to manage it. I want to say that I am in entire accord with the principle of the Bill I quite agree with it. I quite agree that the whole system should have been obliterated long ago. I fully appreciate the great amount of labour the distribution of the various districts will entail. I know it is very difficult to get everything to fall in line with the views of the various speakers. I did not think that I would be saying anything on this matter because I understand the Government has made up its mind to put this thing through in spite of what the Opposition might say. But what the Hon. Member for Trinity has said has just raised a point that I would like to pursue a little further.

The Prime Minister was asked why the District of Harbor Main being an

outport has not been treated the same as the other districts.

In reply he said that in order to keep the same denominational proportion it was necessary to make it a two man district. I don't agree with that. At the same time denominationally speaking I don't suppose that the Government could do anything else. But I am the only man in the House who happens to be a native of Harbor Main I don't think that I would be doing my duty if I did not stand up and say something in behalf of that District. That District I know is very well represented by Mr. Woodford and Mr. Cahill. It is well taken care of by the members in the House. But I am the person to whom a petition was entrusted in 1920 asking for the division of that district. Now it is the irony of fate that the district of Harbor Main is the only district in Newfoundland that has ever petitioned for a division. Now it happens to be the only district that is not divided.

I wonder Mr. Chairman can we ever happen to get out of the grip of denominationalism in this country. I don't see any hope of it. Because the people whose duty it is to make a step in this direction are falling down on the job. And we all admit it is high time, if we have not got to work, to make a step in this direction. There is not much hope of this. The great trouble is that we are prepared to cater and to pander to that thing and to foster it and of course it is going to grow. What is the difference. Is there any difference, whether you belong to the Roman Catholic or the Methodist or the Church of England. It is most unfortunate. Mr. Chairman, I want to be absolutely frank about it.

Now when I say this I mean to be absolutely frank and open about it. I feel sure that I voice the opinion of all the members of this House. I do not want to place obstacles in the way when I say that something could have been done quite easily because I believe we have not sufficient courage. When Mr. Walsh and Mr. Woodford can go down to Bonavista to contest the district and Mr. Monroe and Mr. Hibbs can go to Placentia that will be the time that we can consider that we no longer are running along the denominational lines. I do not think that the people of this country want to go on in this way. But we do it because we are afraid that we are going to lose votes. We want to pander and cater to this thing so that we may be able to please everybody. If there is anything in this world that I do detest it is this habit. Here we are to-day sitting down here seriously considering how to divide this country of ours into sections so that each denomination can be properly represented. I am sure that I am not afraid to trust the Church of England into the hands of a Roman Catholic or a Methodist. I say this because that is the church to which I happen to belong. That is how I feel. We have not sufficient courage. There is no country in the world in which they divide the constituencies as they do in Newfoundland. Pardon me Mr. Chairman, I am not speaking sectarianism. I do not want to be taken that way. I really deplore this thing. This matter of the one man district has been advocated for the last ten or fifteen years. I am very glad that we are to have a redistribution. I know that it means a great deal of work and I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the person who has gone to this trouble. I know what it must be like and I would not like to have to do it myself. But I think that the Government ought to give us more time. I am really in earnest about this.

The Leader of the Opposition suggested here this afternoon that a larger committee be appointed to consist of members of both Houses and he

said that they should sit out of session and report back to the House at the next sitting. There is nothing wrong about that. There will not be an election next year at least I hope to goodness that there will not be an election next year because we do not want to put you out now. We want to give you a chance. We want to give you a chance to see what good you can do. So I do not think that there is going to be an election or at least any general election within the next twelve months. I think that the suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition should be followed out. I do not see any reason why we should not give the matter more thought. I think that it would be a mistake to decide the matter too quickly. We should regard this thing as a national matter. I hope that there is nobody small enough to look at it as anything else. I am glad to see the one man district scheme come into force. I think that the principle of the one man district is the principle that will serve the interest of this country best. I believe that and I do not feel that there is any discrimination in having made St. John's East and West and Harbor Main two men districts. Now we come to the outports. I suppose that there must be some reason why the district has not been divided. I am sure that Mr. Woodford feels that if the district had been divided he could have gone down to the Eastern End and have been elected. I know that Mr. Woodford could have done that. You do think that yourself don't you Mr. Woodford?

HON. THE MINISTER OF POSTAL TELEGRAPHS—I think that I had one half of your friends at the last election.

MR. HIBBS—That just bears out my argument. But I think Mr. Chairman that the Prime Minister should take the advice of the Leader of the Opposition. That is raise the Committee and give the members a chance to sit down and view the thing from every standpoint. We have only had these bills for a short time and we have not had time to go into them as they should be gone into. We want some time to go into a matter like this. We have to attend to our business in the day and try to carry on and so we should like to have more time. I know that I have hardly time to attend to my Legislative duties. I would like to get another opportunity myself. I say that the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House should be given an opportunity to go into the matter and see if they cannot make some better arrangements. I am under the opinion that a district with Catholic representation could have been arranged on the West Coast. I think that the matter was considered in 1923. I think at the time the population was sixty Protestants to forty Catholics. I do not know whether there has been any change since then or not. I think that the one man constituency is a good thing in the outports. But, Mr. Chairman, I want to be perfectly candid and I think that there is a lot of hypocrisy. We are here fixing this thing and condeming our country to it for the next hundred years. I think that we should take the trouble to do this thing now as best we can. I say, Mr. Chairman that I am not afraid to trust my religion in the hands of any man of the opposite religion. I hope that I can say the same thing about every other man in this House in this connection. I would like to ask Major Cashin if the regiments in France were divided denominationally.

MAJOR CASHIN—No they were not. But we had no politicians over there. They were all behind the lines in soft cushy jobs. We eliminated the politicians.

MR. HIBBS—I quite agree with what you say. But I say that the

present case of the denominational division of the districts is not only deplorable but it is absolutely ridiculous. I do not care what the thing you can find the same condition. I have been talking to men in the police force who have been there for forty years. I have talked to them myself and they are still ordinary constables and when they are asked why they are still there, they say "oh, there were so many Roman Catholics advanced and I had to stay behind because some of the other religions had to be advanced." It is a painful subject to talk about Mr. Chairman. I regret very much to have to make these remarks. I feel like saying a lot more about it but I know that it is a delicate question and I would not like to have my remarks misconstrued. I suppose that this thing must go on. Now I would like to refer to the District of Harbour Main again. This is the district that sent a petition to this House of Assembly in 1920 asking to have the district divided at Maher's Bridge and so make the two districts one East and the other West. The Government of the day was looking forward to the time when there would be a redistribution of seats and now it is the irony of fate that the one district that petitioned this House is the one district that is not to be divided. They desire to have the district divided. This petition came to me and was very largely signed. The number of signatures was one thousand. I did not take the petition officially before the House of Assembly. I presented it to the Prime Minister of the time but I knew the absolute futility of it and so it did not come before the House. I passed it along to the Prime Minister. I knew that it was absolutely useless to talk about it. I do not wish to make a point about Harbor Main but I wish to talk about the principle of the matter.

However, Mr. Chairman, if it is the intention of the Government, according to the statement of the Prime Minister to go ahead with this thing I think that it is alright. I believe that I voice the sentiments of every member of the House. But I think that the majority of the people of the country should and would like to get a chance to go into this matter and I think that the Government should give them the opportunity that they ask for.

HON. MINISTER OF JISTICE—There is nothing to prevent me under a Redistribution Bill from going over to Bay Roberts or to some district in Bonavista Bay. There is no law against that.

MR. HIBBS—You do not seem to be preparing for it.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—There is no occasion. I never believe in the man who gets ready for an election four years in advance. Something always crops up overnight and spoils all his preparations. We, on this side of the House, are not bothered with elections now; we have several other things to bother us. Elections are things that sometimes crop up overnight, but this idea of getting ready years in advance is of no moment now.

But ,as regards the feature the Hon. Member has introduced, I think that in introducing this Bill it was openly said that the Government had certain conditions which had to be met; and this Bill was introduced in an endeavor to meet with a situation that we cannot wink out of sight. For instance, I was familiar with this matter of Harbour Main District. I remember it quite well. I remember when there was a petition talked of, but I think you will find that that talk started after the bye-election of 1921. There was a general soreness in a particular section of the district where our friend had considerable influence, because the two Opposition members, who were familiarly known then as the "hang-'er-down's" were elected again; and it was following

that bye-election in which these two candidates were returned, that the end of the district which saw the value of having one man in the Government started the petition; and I really thnk it was a compliment to the honourable member himself that the people there naturally felt—if we sensible people down here had a member for ourselves, we would be in the Government. That was the petition and I do not think there was anything of a denominational character about it at all.

MR. HIBBS—I wonder why the Hon. Minister of Justice will not talk about the principle of the thing at all.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I am dealing with the point you raised. You raised this position about Harbor Main District. You said that there was a petition brought forward, and I am merely telling the history of the petition. It was common knowledge at the time up there. The honourable member himself will remember that it was suggested at the time that he had considerable influence there at this end of the district on account of the road work.

As regards the suggestion made here that this Bill should be given further consideration, I cannot see what object can be gained by further delay. I have been listening to the remarks that have been made, and it appears that every one is agreed upon the principle of having one man districts. There appears to be a general acceptance of that position; and as I understand it, when the Bill was introduced, copies of it were given to every member of the House. Surely, then, it was the business of any member who had any other form of district representation in mind to have brought it forward before the Select Committee or now. To-day there has not been a single criticism of the manner in which the Districts were laid out. No one has suggested that any of the districts have been wrongly divided, or that any of the northern districts for instance, should have any other boundaries. Such a question as that has not been raised; and frankly, I must say, that it is not a matter of supporting it as a Government measure, but it is a question of supporting a Bill that is brought in in an endeavour to meet a situation, and it is merely trying to curtail the areas of districts; and it seems to me to-day that we have had this Bill before us sufficiently long to be able to make good criticism, or offer some alternative suggestions. I do not think that we should turn round and send this Bill to a Select Committee, unless we are faced with something in the way of evidence that some other scheme would be more advisable, or that some other allocation of districts would be better. There has not been a suggestion that any Northern district has been wrongly divided, and I do not see that there is much value in the idea of sending it back to a Select Committee. It has gone to one already, and has been reported on. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition merely took the position that he did not sign the report, and that, therefore, he had not reported upon the Bill. Of course, we can understand that. He did not wish to bind his Party to any responsibility for the Bill. But that cannot be sufficient reason to come along here after three or four weeks and say that the Bill ought to be referred back for further consideration, or that it should go to somebody else.

Once you have admitted the principle of the Bill, there is no object in referring it to a Select Committee again, unless you have in mind some other divisions of the areas of the districts that will be best applicable to the districts that are meant to be served.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, having listened to the Hon. Member for Fogo, Mr. Hibbs, this afternoon, what he says bears out very strongly one

of the reasons why I say this Bill should be deferred until such time as the Committee and the people have had time to give the matter their consideration. Take the District which we are now on—the District of Harbour Main. He tells us that a petition was once presented to have the District of Harbour Main divided. Well, I say, when this Bill passes this House, how soon will it be before there will be another petition to this House to divide Harbour Main District. It will be two districts before the death of this Government, or of another Government . . . .

MR. CAHILL—I do not think you need worry about Harbour Main District.

MR. HICKMAN—I might tell the Honourable Member that I am not going to worry about it. and he need not worry about what I am going to say, because he will not always represent Harbour Main District. This Bill at present going through the House is only going to cause confusion, and every new Government in this House is going to legislate to make changes in districts different from what you now have in this Bill.

Now the Honourable Minister of Justice says that the Opposition have placed no arguments before the Government or the Se'ect Committee as to what changes are to be made. The Honourable gentleman is aware that we do not know where the Districts divide. We may be shown on a map, but as in the case of Bay de Verde District ,a man's Church may be in one section and his house in another, or his store in one place and his barn in a different one. The people should have a say as to the drawing of the lines. We only know that Mr. Morine spent three years in drawing up the Bill. He has probably gone into it closely, and perhaps had the divisions made as to his own ideas, but my opinion is that every section should be consulted before the lines are drawn. The Honourable the Prime Minister said he had numerous—perhaps not numerous but considerable—correspondence all in favor of the one man districts, and none for dividing. I would now ask the Honourable the Prime Minister to lay that correspondence on the Table of the House, or if it be necessary I would ask the formal question. If there be sufficient correspondence to prove that the people favor redistribution, and the drawing of the lines, we will have no further objection. Members of this side have said they are not against the one man districts. I am not against it, and I firmly believe it will bring a good class of legislators into this House, and that outport men of some intelligence and ability will be sitting here to frame our Legislation. But I am sincere in saying that this Bill should not be rushed, but that the people should be given a chance to know the dividing lines, and that these dividing lines should be so drawn that no future Government will have to bring in further Legislation on the matter. There is one thing that might be considered and that is whether we will have too many members, and I think instead of the number being increased it should be reduced. The Bill in itself is a step in the right direction, and is getting away from the old order that has pertained for years. But now as the changes are to be made they should be made in a way satisfactory to the country ,and so that no alterations will be necesary in future, as if such are made in one, they will have to be made in many districts. Mr. Halfyard, the Honourable Member for Trinity, has suggested a representative for Labrador, and in reply we are told that the Government are not sure if we have the Labrador to represent. I think, if for no other reason but to claim it, a representative should be appointed for Labrador It is not good politics to make statements on the

floor of this House as to whether we own Labrador or not.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman. The Leader of the Opposition will excuse me, but it was I who interrupted the Honourable Member for Trinity, and I made no such statement, but only asked as to the boundary line.

MR. HICKMAN—I did not have the Honourable Member for Fortune in mind when I said that.

MR. WARREN—I interrupted Mr. Halfyard first.

MR. HICKMAN—Anyway, I think we should have a representative for Labrador as it would help our claim to it.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, there is just one matter on which I would like to respond to the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. I said that I had received a number of letters from various sections approving the principle of the Bill, and he says that I should lay them on the Table of the House. I do not propose to do anything of the kind, as they are from private individuals, and perhaps may not convey views of all the people of the Districts in question. If I had fifty from individual men they would not indicate what boundary lines are desired by the whole people of the district. Therefore, I do not intend to bring them in. I stated that Members of the Government had heard nothing but approval of the Bill. Even the Members of the Opposition themselves tell us they have nothing against the principle of it, and the Leader of the Opposition has just said that it is a step in the right direction. Now, I believe in taking steps in the right direction, and, therefore, let us take this one.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to interrupt the Honourable the Prime Minister. but he has told us just what I expected. In arguing in favor of the Bill before going through as it was, he said he had correspondence from dozens of people. Now he says he had one or two.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition does not take down what I say. If he can find any reporter who says that I said I had one or two letters I will take back my statement.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr, Chairman, in my opinion very little has been said by the Government side to establish the idea that this Bill should go through as it stands at present. The Honourable the Prime Minister says that he has private letters which do not approve the Bill as it is now, and it is agreed that even the people living near St. John's have not yet been able to form an intelligent opinion on the question of redistribution. Only a few members have spoken from this side of the House, and they endorse what the Leader of the Opposition has said, that we should give the whole people an opportunity to find out exartly what the Bill stands for. The people do not understand it at present, and the Government will not give them a chance to learn its provisions, and there is nothing fair about it. There is no use in the Government saying they are trying to bring in a Bill to suit the people after refusing to consult them .and simply saying this Bill should be on the Statutes. The inference from this kind of conduct that there is nothing to be gained by letting the people debate it, or by getting the concensus of opinion of the people which can only be obtained by letting them get together, call meetings, and discuss it. The Government is determined not to give them this opportunity ,and in their wisdom think the Bill is perfect ,and they can no longer tolerate the idea of consulting the people. Therefore we have got to submit to the ultimatum. I cannot understand how the Government can have greater knowledge of the wishes of the people than we have. We have had no chance to consult the people,

and we are only groping in the dark. I admit the principle of the Bill, however. As Mr. Hibbs has referred to Harbor Main, it is a two man District, but I cannot see the necessity for it, and it will cause discussion and create much difference of opinion as to why it is not divided. These are things we cannot see, that while Harbor Main continues to be a two man district, other districts are divided. That is our reason for asking that the passing of the Bill be deferred till next year and put on the Statutes perhaps in an amended form, after consultation with other parts of the Island.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, I think that this section is one of the strongest points and should be borne in mind in considering this Bill. We have reached a point in the conduct of our affairs here when certain anomalies that exist should be corrected and the Government, ever since they have taken office, have seen that the earliest possible opportunity should be availed of to correct these anomalies. Forty years ago representation in this House was the same as it is to-day and naturally with the ordinary increase of population there have been discrepancies with regard to representation here, and I think that the Government have made a bold, yet justifiable, step in bringing in this Bill at this juncture, particularly in view of the fact that the Section of the Bill just read refers to a new community that has grown up in our midst within the past twelve or eighteen months. There are other communities that have grown up and they have been practically without representation, although they are very important in the industrial life of the country at the present moment.

I have listened this afternoon to the arguments put forward by the hon. members on the other side of the House, and they seem to hinge on the pivot of the District of Hr. Main. Now it must be remembered that the matter of readjustment of representation in the proposed Bill required a great deal of care and a great deal of consideration in view of the fact that this country, divided as it is denominationally, receives its representation on denominational lines. Now this House of Assembly represents districts where the predominating denomination is either Methodist, Roman Catholic or Church of England, and it is peculiarly fitting that, in the readjustment we have before us this afternoon, either of these denominations will come out in the ratio as they exist to-day. I have gone into the thing carefully as to what effect this Bill will have with the people of the different denominations and the belief was expressed that the present system ought to be changed. There was a little pivot, however, on which the Roman Catholics may not have their proportional representation because there is a district where the Roman Catholics have a large portion of people, but still have no representation. Now I refer to Burin District. Burin to-day is somewhat in the same position as Harbor Main, except in the reverse way. It is not proposed that any Catholic representatives will represent Burin and a condition had to be created whereby one district would offset the other. If you divide Harbor Main to-day, as everybody knows—it is just as well to speak frankly—you would have one section almost entirely Roman Catholic and another section almost entirely Protestant. That is the only exception outside of St. John's that an adjustment had to be made by which the Catholic people could get the representation that they are entitled to. Now with regard to

the Church of England or Methodist denominations, the other two large denominations in this country, I might say that if one will look at the figures in the Census, he will find that the Church of England and Methodist bodies will receive their quota of representation. In some districts the majority might be Methodist or vice versa but on general lines it works out in due proportion to each and the anomalies created at election periods is responsible for this House not being always represented denominationally. As a matter of fact the district that I have the honor to represent in this House is not represented on a denominational basis. The majority of the people of Harbor Grace to-day are Church of England, yet the district is represented by two Methodists and one Churchman. There is no trouble over it, as I daresay the district can be looked after by either Mr. Hickman or Mr. Russell just as well as myself. We lay down the principle and the people look after their choice of representatives. A man may be a Roman Catholic and may go into a district where the people are mainly of Church of England or Methodist denominations. But the people have the power and must be given their due representation on the other hand the same applies to Harbor Main district, where the majority of people are Roman Catholic, but it is quite competent for a Protestant to contest this district for the same reason. We all must admit that, under this Bill, members who have to go to constituencies will have only one-third of the ground to travel over and canvass that they have to-day, and it is going to boil itself down to individual work instead of team work. One man may be an excellent man and he may have all the industry and all the desire to do everything possible in the interests of the people of his district; but he may have two colleagues absolutely indifferent and who would drag him down perforce when the time came around, but this Bill provides for the individual and it will provide for better representatives because the people of the smaller sections will know the men they have to represent them better. What is the position of a place like Green Bay to-day? Take my friend, Mr. Ashbourne, a very estimable young man and a very creditable representative for any part of the country. He will have a much easier time than he has now because he will represent the environment of his own home and will not represent any other part of the Bay, and it would be better for him and for the people he would represent. And in that Bay we have the district of Exploits under this Bill. Now I am not quite sure whether it is wise in calling it the district of Exploits. Perhaps it may be wiser to call it Grand Falls or "Harmsworth" or some other appropriate name. Now that part of the district of Twillingate is covered and governed and have to submit to what the people of the other part of the Bay has under present conditions. Mr. Brown might consider himself the representative of the workingman of Grand Falls or Botwood, but it is a matter for question at present; but if he is made the representative for that section under this Bill his standing cannot be questioned. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I think when you come to consider the very grave difficulties confronting a Government that undertakes to divide the districts and find the results so equitable and so satisfactory, I think at least that it is worthy of the unbiased consideration of every member of this House. There are changes to be made, I know. Harbor Grace will be divided into two parts. This dis-

trict will lose a member but that is owing to the evolution of circumstances. The district has lost some of its population and is not entitled to three members. Take the district of Fortune Bay which is represented by Mr. Warren. Fortune Bay has only one representative but has got fifty per cent. more people than has the district of Harbor Grace. Well that is one of the anomalies that must be corrected. Take that big industry on the West Coast which makes it absolutely imperative that something ought to be done in that part of the country. There you have a town with eight or ten thousand people, and with all the rest of the district the whole place is represented by only one man, Mr. Power, who is a man I am sure who can represent a district of any proportion, but at the same time the people in that district have not got the same say that their number warrant. Therefore, it cannot be gainsaid that the time is not opportune to bring this measure to a conclusion and put on the Statute Book. I agree that there are some discrepancies, and I agree that the boundaries may not suit every member, but I do not agree with the remarks of some honourable members because a boundary line may divide a man's house from his barn. One cannot dispute the fact that you can divide the districts of Ferryland, St. John's West and Harbor Main by a single step, and the same must of necessity apply to other districts. There must be a boundary line. The demarkation line is invisible and it is not to be wondered at that a man's house is divided from his barn. I might say that I have given this matter as much consideration as I could, and I feel sure that the redistribution scheme will be a great improvement and that the representation in this House will be such that the country will understand and members will be better able to understand because they will have to come into contact with people whom they will represent in their own environment.

It will be a great blessing for men that have to go over large districts night and day for weeks at a time to try and visit constituencies that are almost unattainable. Try to go to meet people and hold meetings at a time of the year when travelling is neither comfortable or safe. The Bill will have this advantage. The men who will represent the sections will be known to the people of these sections and the people will be able to pick out their own man, the man belonging to their own particular quarters or environment. And that is as it should be. This House should be represented by people coming from all parts of the country. No man will be going from St. John's to represent an outport without leave or license. In that way we will get better outport men. Stronger outport men. I do not mean to say anything derogatory to any of the members at present in this House. I am speaking now on behalf of the people who once they realize what this means and appreciate it, will gladly avail of the opportunity of endorsing it. I do not want to delay the Committee, but I thought it right to make these few remarks. I have got the denominational population before me and I can't see any possibility of any unfairness to any denomination.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Chairman, I may say that I am in accordance with the principle of this Bill now before the House. But I don't think it is the right time to rush it through. And now that we are touching on Lewisporte, I think that I will say a few words. When you read out latitude and longitude, Mr. Chairman, it is not every man in the outports and outside the districts that knows just

what it is. Or he can't go to the map and take it up and say where he is, and I think, Sir, that we should have time to consider this Bill before it goes through the House. I have not seen the map, and I have not seen how the districts are divided up. It only read in the newspapers about it. But the average man cannot find out or understand from the map how it is divided. I don't think that it is fair to the country. This is a big issue. It affects every district in this country, and every voter. To rush this through at this particular time without giving the people ample time to consider this redistribution Bill, in my opinion is going a little too far. And I ask, Mr. Chairman that this Bill do not go through for a while until the people get time to consider it, and that will take some months. I repeat that I am satisfied with the principle of the Bill, but I am not in accordance with rushing it through at this particular time.

MR. SCAMMELL—MR. Chairman, Before proceeding to discuss this Section of the Bill, I want to ask the Prime Minister if he would be good enough to refer to the memorandum that he read on the opening day with regard to the distribution of the seats on the basis of population. What is the number of voters in St. Barbe and in White Bay?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—St. Barbe, 5,500. White Bay, 6,500.

MR. SCAMMELL—We all realize, or at least I hope that we do that the measure that we are to discuss this afternoon is of the utmost importance. And I state frankly that I would like to speak sincerely and without prejudice of this legislation, and so I say that I support the principle of the measure as has been stated by the Leader of the Opposition that all the members on this side of the House intend to do. But that is the very reason why we can well afford to allow the bill to remain until another session of the Legislature for the better discussion of the Bill. On the principle of the redistribution there has been no question. There has been no division. We have all agreed that the principle underlying the Bill is the right one. As regards the district of St. Barbe, I might say that it was part of the Manifesto of the Premier of that day, Sir Richard Squires, under whose leadership I went to the district of St. Barbe, that the district of St. Barbe should be made into two districts. I made that a part of my platform, and it was no fault of mine that the district was not divided under that administration. We had the position that the district was composed of a population of twelve thousand people who live in one hundred and fifty-five small settlements. Not that the population is a very large one. If the district were more compact and were included in a small area, and if this were the case it would not be a very difficult district to handle. It is not a very difficult district to handle from the standpoint of population.

With regard to the delineation of the district, I may say that the boundaries appear to me to have been made in the right way. I can quite see the force of the Prime Minister's argument the other day when he said that the Government has tried to get those parts of the districts which had something in common, in business, socially and otherwise, under the same representation. I think that the district of St. Barbe has been very well divided, from that point of view. The political division is of no consequence to me. It will cut probably both ways, and I am not concerned now as to the political view of the situation. Although the Government might have included Broad Harbor, which has a population of five hundred and ninety

people, but that might have taken in some people which have nothing in common with the people of the district of St. Barbe on the West Coast. I have no objection to the division. I have nothing to say about the division of the district as it stands today. But while the principle of the Bill is accepted by the Opposition, I think that the opportunity ought to be given to the people to look into the bill. I realize as was said just now that the Government has taken a bold step in bringing this Bill down to the House at this session. I am of the opinion that not only is the Government taking a bold step, but I also believe that the Government is also hauling chestnuts out of the fire for somebody else. The Prime Minister stated that the Hon. Mr. Morine had spent about three years in the preparation of this legislation. There has been some question as to what the Prime Minister did really say when he mentioned Mr. Morine in this connection. Now, if Mr. Morine spent three years in the preparation of this legislation, and if this idea gets abroad, in my opinion, that is going to be one reason why the people will want to look into the matter very carefully. Are the people of Newfoundland to be satisfied with the assurance that Mr. Morine has spent three of the best years of his life on this proposition? Is that any argument why the proposition should be rushed through the House? Surely what has occupied the genius of Mr. Morine for three years should be given at least twelve months for the people of the country to examine carefully. That is the argument as far as Mr. Morine is connected with this measure. The Prime Minister stated the other day that he had correspondence from all over the country in relation to this Bill, and he says that the correspondence has satisfied him that the people of the country are in favor of the principle of the Bill. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the people of the country are in favor of the principle of the Bill. In principle the people of the country are in support of the Bill because it must be remembered that a redistribution of seats has been advocated for a number of years. On no occasion when the matter came up before the F.P.U. Conventions, did I let the opportunity pass without urging the necessity of the redistribution of seats. Now we have got the redistribution, and as I said just now I believe that the present Government is pulling chestnuts out of the fire for somebody else, but at the same time I am of the opinion that the people of the country should be given an opportunity to go further into the measure and see just how it affects them. For that reason I would ask the Leader of the Government to consider the amendment of the Leader of the Opposition. The hon. members themselves have had barely time to go into the alignments of their own districts, and I think that the present rushing will cause a great deal of confusion which will be experienced throughout the whole country, and the people of the country are expecting the Government to give them an opportunity to examine the Bill themselves and to allow them to inform themselves of its provisions. "What alternative," says the Prime Minister, "would we suggest?" No alternative is suggested as regards the redistribution, but it seems to me to be right that a work of the best brain of the country which has taken three years to complete, should at least have the inspection of the people of the country before it becomes law on the Statute Books.

Take a case in point. You have the district of Exploits. Exploits is not in the district. But the people of Exploits will very naturally think

that they are in the district. But they are not. Even the matter of nomenclature has a mistake in it. And for these reasons I think that the Prime Minister should allow this Bill to rest over until the next session. Now I am not getting into any unnecessary heat over the matter, but I want to view it fairly and clearly. I know that opinions have been given, very influential opinions that this very important measure should first be submitted to the people of the country, and let them have the opportunity to note the provisions and the alignments of the districts. We do not anticipate any general election. I fail to see the point in rushing the matter through the House, and I think it my duty to ask the Prime Minister to reconsider the position taken by the Leader of the Opposition here this afternoon and see if it is not possible for this legislation to be postponed until the next session of the House of Assembly. If, however, he is determined to put it through the House then there is nothing that we can do. It will only be a case of having to go over the whole thing again at a later day. We had the District of Bay-de-Verde discussed here this afternoon, and the Leader of the Opposition asked a question in connection with the boundaries, and the hon. member for the district said that the section was unsatisfactory, and asked to have it deferred. The Prime Minister or some one responsible on the other side of the House said that they hoped that the hon. members would take the opportunity to come forward with suggestions with regard to the alignments of the district. Now that is the very point. It is all right for me to get up here and discuss the boundaries of the District of St. Barbe and say that they are all right because I have gone into the matter years ago. But how about the members who represent outport constituencies and are not in the same position that I am, because the question of redistribution has never come up, but that I have been interested in it. Now, Sir, I am going on record as having said that if the Government is going to put this Bill on the Statute Books without giving the people of the country an opportunity of looking into the measure, they are perpetrating an outrage on the outport people. It is nothing but an outrage. And that is practically all that I have to say. I am satisfied as to the alignment of the District of St. Barbe, because years ago I have asked myself what should be done to my district if the present situation were to arise.

MR. BROWNE—Mr. Chairman, I feel that an important measure like this deserves some consideration from the hon. members on this side of the House apart from that given by those who have already expressed their opinions. I cannot refrain from expressing the view that it seems to me that there has been a lot of apathy everywhere in connection with this measure. It is one of the most important measures that have come up for discussion here this session and yet we find from members of the Government few suggestions of a remedial nature such as might be expected if there were drawbacks in the Bill. Perhaps, the fact that there has been little opposition is a sufficient guarantee that it has gained the general approval of the people. If the Bill contained unsatisfactory elements the people would have been here in greater numbers to hear the discussion and very likely there would have been a much more determined opposition from the members on the other side of the House. Now, every member of that side who has spoken has expressed his approval of what is termed the principle of the Bill. But there is more than one principle in this Bill. The first—and

the one with which all the members seem in accord—is the giving of one man districts instead of the old system. That is, where there are now three representatives the district will be partitioned and each section will have one representative. But there is another principle to which consideration should be given and that is the principle of representation. We are a representative Assembly and are supposed to represent the people, each member representing a certain proportion of the population, and I think a principle which helps to push forward this Bill is that which makes for equal representation. That one district should have the same representation as another is, I think, an idea that is generally accepted. If the hon. introducer of the Bill had shown that this difficulty was insurmountable I would give it my heartiest support but at the present time there are things about it of which I have not yet heard a full explanation though I may be convinced of their fairness before the matter is finished. In the district which I have the honour to represent—and about which the section dealing with it is about to be read—it will be remembered that a few weeks ago I was instructed to present a petition by the residents of the Ropewalk section with regard to the boundaries of the city. The people of that locality are without sanitary conveniences, though they are expected to pay taxes because they are in the city limits. Since the boundaries of this Bill will be similar to those of the city divisions, at least as far as the North-West corner of the town is concerned, and as by this measure they will be more fixedly part of the city, I think I would only be consistent for me to point out what the Government will be doing if they put this Bill through. St. John's city will not be the same as the Municipalty of St. John's as the Southside will belong to the extern part of St. John's. I am not concerned with that and am only dealing with the case of the people who came to me some time ago and agitated in the matter which I have already pointed out. That is one thing I would like to see fixed in this Bill. Another is the disproportionate representation in some districts and I think this should be given much more consideration. I do not think that this means such a great difficulty that there will be any big agitation against the Bill—we are not sure that there will be any—but if the hon. members will consult the memorandum presented by the Hon. the Prime Minister in introducing the Bill they will see that Bell Island with a population of 4400 has one representative while Bonavista has only one for 8200 people. Ferryland has one for about 6000 and St. George's one for 4500. St. John's city, West, has two for 19000 and St. John's City, East, two for 17717. I would like to point out that in St. John's West—which I presume will be the district I will contest next election if I live long enough and desire to go there after sitting here for one, two or three sessions—one vote in some districts will be equal to more than two votes in others. Why should one district with 4500 people have half the representation of one with 19000. That is a point that deserves consideration and I feel that the Government has already given it, but I have found no argument to convince me why St. John's West with 19000 should have only two representatives, and a district with 4500, one. That is a principle that has not been carried out as fully as it might have been. In general the distribution is one member to about 6500 people and that seems to be the number acceptable to most of the members here. Another principle is as to whether we shall increase the membership of the House or not. This has been referred to by speakers on the Opposition side and I will not now go into it in

detail except to express my opinion that the number should be decreased. An increase of membership is of no benefit and we have seen by this session that the large number has not assisted in the putting through of legislation, and that ten men can represent the country as well as forty except in that large work of representation which is done outside of the House. Under the present plan there is going to be a great deal of uncertainty as to what a member will have to tell his constituents when this Bill goes through. The man who represents Burin East for example can tell a man who comes to him for anything to see the member for Burin West as he is not going back there any more. In St. John's West I am sure I shall be inclined to tell people from the outside settlements it is best to see the Hon. the Minister of Finance as he will represent them at the next election. I think a good many will take this opportunity to escape their obligations as they will not be going back to the same people and will frame their plans accordingly. They would be poor politicians if they did not do so. Before sitting down I feel I should congratulate the Hon. the Prime Minister on having the courage to introduce a measure of this kind and though there is no great demand for it, at the same time there is reform to be done and it is a big one to alter the anomalies of the past few years. Though these are smaller matters to which I have referred and which might be considered I do not propose to say more about them now; but I trust the future will prove that those who introduced the Bill and spent their time on it here were justified in doing so. Still I think it is possible to devise another system just as good and as beneficial as this one, at the same time the principal of the measure which has received the approval of the members of the Opposition is the main one, and therefore there is not much more left for me to say.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman: Seemingly every member has had something to say as to how this Bill affects his particular district and I think my turn comes now. This is a matter of many aspects and one that can be viewed from many angles. We are told that there are several principles involved in this Bill. The first is, so we are informed, that we are to have one man districts. That is a principle that is being carried out to some extent, but that principle does not run right through the Bill or else the whole country would be divided up into one man districts; but instead we find that there are several two men districts. I want to say that I endorse the view of my colleagues who preceded me and I am also in accord with the principle of having all one man districts, because I believe it will have a very beneficial effect on this House and also a correspondingly good effect on the constituencies which are severally represented by every member here. I do not agree, however, that it is a wise move to increase the number of candidates from thirty six to forty; in fact I think it would be a wiser move to reduce the number. I do not know but that I think the best thing that could happen Newfoundland would be to revert to the status of a Crown Colony and I feel assured that twenty men, perhaps, could manage the affairs of Newfoundland much better than they are managed to-day by thirty six. The Government of the country is conducted chiefly by an Executive of ten men. They formulate the plans for the country and any measures that they consider advisable are brought into this House from time to time are generally carried; I do not think that it is a wise move to increase the number of representatives, particularly as I believe that

considerable difficulty will be experienced in trying to get eighty men who will interest themselves sufficiently in politics in the future. I wish that there were men, public spirited men, who would enter political life for the good of the land and not, perhaps, for what they want to get out of it. But there is one reason more than any other why I am in accord with this Bill and that is that it gives the outports better representation, as I claim that the outports do not get the square deal to-day or their share of what is going that they should get because they have not at present their proportionate representation here and I think we will find in this Bill a remedy for that. There will be a greater incentive to the outports to return local men and then they will be able to insist that they get a square deal. Large numbers are often difficult to manipulate and in consideration of the arguments that have been put up here today in regard to this Bill, I think myself that the time has come when the outports should have a say as to who is and who is not going to represent them.

The policy in the past has been that the campaigns have been all arranged in St. John's, the result being that most of the outports had two men sent to them and they have to choose one, and probably if they had their way they would not want either of them. On the other hand, in my opinion, it would be more difficult to form a strong party with forty members than with six. What is to prevent an Independent standing in any District and being returned with split votes? And I claim, Mr. Chairman, that this is a matter that should be gone into thoroughly, and, if necessary, under a microscope. We don't want to rush into this quickly, without giving it ample thought and consideration; and as far as we can see, there is not likely to be any election within the next two or three years, and why not delay the measure so that we can go through it and thoroughly examine it in order to see that the different boundaries are as they should be.

The honourable member for Carbonear, this afternoon, spoke about a case in his own district, which, if that is any criterion of the doings of the present Government, I think is one which should cause all to look up and take notice. From the remarks of the honourable member, I think, in passing, that every member in this House, whether Government or Opposition, should question a matter of that sort. If this is done for political spleen it is not going to bring you anywhere, it is not going to get the country anywhere and it is not going to get the Government anywhere.

There have been several items mentioned with regard to this Bill. As I said before, it can be viewed from many angles. It gives the outports greater representation and for that reason it is that I say I am in accord with the principle of this Bill.

I have a suggestion to make to the Prime Minister in regard to the part about the Black Island, the word "Adjacent," should be inserted after the words "Black Island," in Twillingate District, as there are at present two "Black Islands" and this one should be distinctly shown to be the island near Tramp Island.

MR. BROWN—Regarding the name of the District in Twillingate, I think, as it stands to-day, its name is Exploits, Twillingate, Grand Bay and South Island. I would like as the present member of that District to ask the Prime Minister if he would change the name of that Exploits District, as it is not in that District at all. It is on the Southside; you might call it the District of Grand Falls, I think that is reasonable. The islands will be knows as Twillingate, the north side will be known as Green Bay District.

I think these names will be much more suitable. Therefore, I would ask it as a favor to change the name.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—In reply to the Honourable member, I was going to suggest before the Bill went through that we should get another name for Exploits. I was going to suggest Exploits Valley. I am perfectly satisfied to change it to Grand Falls or any other name.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman. I am fully in accord with the principle of this Bill. I don't think, Sir, there was any question at all in the mind of any member of this House as to the necessity for the redistribution; but the basis upon which redistribution has taken place, in my judgment, is not fair to the people of this country. Over the world to-day, in every country where people have the right to vote, the question has been how to register the will of the people, particularly in the matter of representation. You may remember that a few years ago in the British Comonwealth they made some alteration there in order that the will of the people may be more satisfactorily represented in the House of Commons, and in Canada something occurred with regard to the redistribution that took place some years ago. The idea has been that every man should have an equal vote with every other man. Now, I don't see how that is being carried out in this Bill, regarding the principle of an equal vote for every man; because, after all, when we favor manhood suffrage, we favor it because we believe that every man of twenty-one years of age should have the very same as any other man, whether rich or poor. But this Bill does not suggest that. I have hurriedly taken down the number of voters in the different districts. In the first instance, take the District of Bell Island, the number of voters there is forty-four hundred; St. John's, East, seventeen thousand; therefore, eight thousand eight hundred votes are required to elect one man in St. John's that is elected by forty-four hundred on Bell Island.

MON. MR. HIGGINS—You cannot add anything on to the Island.

MR. GRIMES—I question whether the districts can be better than they are when you allow a Bell Island voter to have his vote equal to two of a man in St. John's. St. Mary's, Placentia Bay, with 4800 voters, has the same value in voting as the 8900 in St. John's West. In other words 4800 in St. Mary's can elect a member which requires 8900 in St. John's West. Port au Port has 4300 and Fortune has 6000; so the two men in Port au Port have equal value as three men of Fortune. And the Humber area, with a population of 4700 is equal in value to Bonavista East with 8200 and in the Humber area with about 4400 is equal in value to the voters of Bay de Verde with 7100. In other wards the people of the Humber have a value in voting about twice as much as the people of Bay de Verde. St. John's, with 5300, elects one representative which requires 7900 in Bonavista North to do the same. And 5500 in Bay Roberts can elect a reperesentative which requires 7700 in Conception Bay and 5500 people in St. Barbe elect a man while it requires 7500 in White Bay to do the same.

Now I have tabulated the values. The Humber has 4700 voters, Bell Island, 4400, Bay Roberts 5700, St. Mary's 4800, St. Barbe 4500, Port au Port, 4500, St. John's 5500, St. John's East 5300. The estimated total is 66,600 voters in these eleven districts. They elect twelve men. St. John's West has 19,000 and elects two men; St. John's East has 17,700 voters. Bonavista North 7900, Bay-de-Verde 7700. Here we have a population of 60,000 and they elect seven men. In these five districts with a population of 60,500 they elect only seven men. While the 12 other districts that I have named with only

the same population, can elect 12 men. That is where I consider there is a great inequality in the value of the voting as provided for in the Redistribution Bill. I want to see why greater consideration was not given to this aspect of the question. I think it is one of the most important. In fact the most important section in connection with the redistribution Bill. The whole thing is to arrange the districts in such a manner that the people can have themselves represented in the House of Assembly properly. But when you give 60,000 people 12 men to represent them in the House of Assembly and only allow 60,000 people to elect seven men, I do not recognize the principle of polling equality. I consider it is very unfair to the voters in these districts to place the value of these voters so little in comparison with the rest of the people that I have named. I think the Government ought to take time before they rush a matter of this kind through. And I think that the hon. member on the opposite side recognises that time should be given the voters of these districts. I did not have time to go through all these other districts but when the voters become acquainted with the fact that in the 8 or 9 other districts that a man has twice the value in voting that they have they are not going to take any too kindly to the proposition embodied in this Redistribution Bill.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the best way to deal with the situation is to let the matter stand over and let the people in these districts have an opportunity of deciding for themselves just as to how the representation should be. As I said before I do not agree with rushing into this measure. It is for this reason that you do not establish political equality in this Bill, and I think that when the people of the districts find this out they will make those who are responsible for this rue the work they have done. It is not in the least interest of the country to give one district a greater voting power than another.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that we appreciate the earnestness of the hon. member in his discussion on this Bill, and the point that he has raised is one that the Government has particularly well considered. We are very well aware of the anomolies to which he refers, and the only answer is one that I am sure will be apparent to him when it has been given to him to consider. It is this. It is the peculiar way in which the people are scattered over the country and widely distributed because of the sinuosities of the coast line. It is almost impossible to control representation perfectly under our conditions. Of course the utopian conditions which would make every man wherever he voted in the country have the same voting power in the state of affairs that we would like to have, but as I say that it is practically impossible, under our conditions. I am sure that the hon. member can appreciate the position. The thing that we had to consider was the fact that our people are distributed over such an area. Now hon. members on both sides of the House can understand that you can compress little districts like Port de Grave or Brigus or some sections like these places, but in other sections the people are spread over miles and miles of coast line. Now as an illustration take the case of St. John's East (city district). Here the population is seventeen thousand, and there are eight thousand five hundred voters, and the hon. member opposite pointed out the voting power of a person is less than the voting power of one in a district where the electors number say five thousand. The explanation is that the people are

more compressed in the city. And as a matter of fact it is a very much easier population to handle as compared with the territories that are composed of settlements that are scattered along a coast line. I do not think that there is anyone in this House that can disagree with the principle that this Bill lays down. I think that when the hon. member considers the application of the principle he will appreciate the difficulty which has faced the Government. Take the district that Mr. Chambers has to represent. This district is stretched out over a particularly long coast line. We would like to have every man's vote in this country of the same power, but I do not see how it is possible to work that out in Newfoundland when you are at the same time trying to reduce the areas. We have also been considering the peculiar conditions attached to the East section. Take the district of Bell Island, and the same thing applies to Grand Falls. These districts have nothing in common with the remainder of the present districts, Bell Island has nothing in common with the Shore or with the city. The districts of St. John's East and West, (city) will perhaps be the only districts that might be said to have purely parliamentary representatives in so much the Municipal Council administers the affairs of the city. Again as regards short population at present it must be remembered that in Bell Island the population of Bell Island will be very much more than it is now. I am looking forward to the time when the population will increase very much, when these foreign shipments have been resumed. We cannot help getting the increase. Either it is going to go up as I have said or it it is going to go down altogether.

It will go to much more than it is now, or it will go down to what it was before the mines came. Now take the districts of the West Coast. I am of the opinion that of necessity these districts must develop. You have over there the Humber industry and the other development possibilities of the St. George's District which have been referred to, and it is apparent that these districts are bound to increase. The districts that are likely to or may possibly decrease are those at present larger districts that may have the people migrating to the larger industrial areas. At the same time I just say to the hon. member that on the point that he has just raised there can be no disagreement. The Government has given very serious consideration to it. The anomalies are due entirely to the manner in which the people of the country are scattered.

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 amendment.

On motion this Report was received.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Speaker, I beg to move an amendment.

MR. SPEAKER—I would like to point out to the hon. member that the amendment is not quite in order. A select committee cannot sit out of session.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION——The Solicitor of the House made this amendment out for me. I think that he ought to be able to do it.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the Hon. member, we are not objecting to the amendment. If he wants to get his point put on record, he should alter his amendment to read "a commission." A select committee has not the power to sit out of session. But if he wishes to just have the amend-

ment put on record then that is the best way to do. As far as I am concerned I can discuss the idea of an amendment freely because I have no intention of supporting it.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Speaker. If I might be allowed to intervene I think the suggestion of the Minister of Justice is a good one. As a matter of fact I have just made the suggestion to Mr. Grimes that this might be done so as to have a record of the division. It might be that you would have a Select Committee and not have it report before the prorogation.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the following amendment.

Reads the amendment.

On the motion for adoption of the Report, Mr. Hickman moved and Mr. Halfyard seconded an amendment as follows:—"That this Bill be referred to a Commission to take evidence thereon and report at the next session of the Legislature"

Whereupon the House divided and there appeared in its favor:

Mr. Hickman,
Mr. Halfyard,
Mr. Hibbs,
Mr. Grimes,
Mr. Scammell,
Mr. Brown,
Mr. Duff,
Mr. Godden,
Mr. Ashbourne, (9)

and against it:

Hon. the Prime Minister,
Hon. the Colonial Secretary,
Hon. the Minister of Justice,
Hon. the Minister of Finance,
Hon. the Minister of Posts,
Hon. Mr. Sullivan,
Hon. Mr. Long,
Hon. Mr. Cramm,
Hon. Mr. Bradley,
The Minister of Agriculture,
The Minister Marine & Fisheries,
The Minister Public Works,
Mr. Moore,
Mr. Lake,
Mr. Sinnott,
Mr. Power,
Mr. Puddester,
Mr. Cahill,
Mr. Browne,
Mr. Warren, (20)

so it passed in the negative.

Whereupon on motion for adoption of the report the House divided, when there appeared in its favor:

Hon. the Prime Minister,
Hon. the Colonial Secretary,
Hon. the Minister of Justice,
Hon. the Minister of Finance,
Hon. the Minister of Posts,
Hon. Mr. Sullivan,
Hon. Mr. Long,
Hon. Mr. Cramm,
Hon. Mr. Bradley,
The Minister of Agriculture,
The Minister Marine & Fisheries,
The Minister Public Works,
Mr. Moore,
Mr. Lake,
Mr. Sinnott,
Mr. Power,
Mr. Puddester,
Mr. Cahill,
Mr. Browne,
Mr. Warren, (20)

and against it:

Mr. Hickman,
Mr. Halfyard,
Mr. Hibbs,
Mr. Grimes,
Mr. Scammell,
Mr. Brown,
Mr. Duff,
Mr. Godden,
Mr. Ashbourne, (9)

so it passed in the affirmative and was ordered accordingly.

On motion it was ordered that the said Bill be read a third time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to con-

sider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 172 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Survey of Foreign Going and Labrador Vessels."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION:—I would like to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, if he were called upon to survey any steamer for the ice what rules or regulations would he have to follow?

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I would not be called upon to inspect a sealing steamer.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—If there are not any rules and regulations then as far as I can see the bill is of no use whatever. If a man is sent from the department he has to use his own opinion as to whether she is fit for the fisheries or not. He has nothing whatever to go by. His opinion might be biased or it might be given according to the man or the ability of the man himself. It certainly seems to me that there should be some rules or regulations governing the inspection of these vessels if this bill is to be of any use. Am I to understand from the Minister that sealing steamers were never inspected before?

MINISTER OF MARINE — They were inspected under the deep sea act, but it has been argued that that does not cover them. Formerly you could not go aboard the ships and ask that anything be done, but you can do so now.

MR. LAKE—Do I understand that there is no inspection on Labrador vessels.

MINISTER OF MARINE—They are surveyed only if they are to carry passengers.

MR. LAKE—Isn't there a survey on foreign going vessels.

MINISTER OF MARINE — They come under the act already and are not affected by this.

MR. LAKE—I thought that under this Bill Labrador vessels had to be properly fitted up.

MINISTER OF MARINE—There is no such idea in this whatever.

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 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.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Terra Nova Sulphite Company Act, 1920."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, as I explained when this Bill came up for second reading, its purport is to make a couple of amendments to the Act of 1920. At that time a contract was made between the Government and the Terra Nova Sulphite Company. The Act is particularly indexed under the head of "An Act relating to the Manufacture of Wood Products". In the 1920 Act, Section 2 of Schedule A. reads as follows, and I invite the attention of the honourable members to it:

(Reads Schedule A.)

This reads "25 cents per horse power developed" and we now propose to put in the words "per annum" so as to make it clear that it is a yearly charge. As honourable members will see the effect of Section 1 is to provide that if within ten years from 1925 they do not develop the water

powers of Grant's Falls, these will revert to the Government. As I said before, the operations at Alexander Bay have been allowed to rest and it was felt that 10 years was a reasonable time to allow to see if the company could go on. Section 10 amends Sections 9 of the old Bill.

(Reads present provision.)

It will be noticed that they are now enabled to comply with the terms by an alternative which reads:

(Reads Bill.)

The point of that section—and what has really happened—is that instead of manufacturing at Alexander Bay, the timber is now to be exported to Grand Falls where the plant has been extended, and the wood manufactured there. Section 11 reads with regard to the mill to which I have just referred—

(Reads section.)

This section is recast to say the company shall operate the mill or "such extension of the mills." I hope I have made it clear to the House that this Bill is to take advantage of this proposition and allow them the time of ten years to see if they can develop the plant at Alexander Bay.

MR. GRIMES—Can they close up operations there altogether?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—No, the Bill says they must continue to produce. They are not bound to continue at Alexander Bay but when they extend at Grand Falls the other place will be only a supplying point. I understand there will be the same labor given now in cutting and shipipng to Grand Falls as would be given in the plant at Alexander Bay.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Chairman, I take it that the Company can refuse to operate the bill at Alexander Bay they can close it down for that matter; and, further, they can close down operations at Terra Nova and divert the whole thing to Red Indian Lake. I do not see anything in this Bill that would prevent this Company from discontinuing operations at Terra Nova and confining them to Millertown and Badger. Now, as I see it, this is a Bill that members of this House should give the fullest consideration to before passing because I think it is an A. N. D. Company Bill. Is it not, may I ask?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Yes. It is not a Government measure; it is brought in at the request of the A. N. D. Company.

MR. BROWN—Now I want to inform honourable members that in dealing with this Bill they are also dealing with the smartest man in this country, perhaps, in the person of Mr. Harris, the Manager of the A. N. D. Company. Mr. Harris is one of the cutest, if not the cutest, men that ever stepped on Newfoundland soil; and if the requests asked for in this Bill are granted, it might have a far-reaching effect on this country. When Mr. Harris sits in his office with his able lieutenant, Mr. Laycock, at his elbow and wants the Government of Newfoundland to grant them something, they usually know what they are about, whilst we might come here and, not seeing the technicalities of this Bill, allow it to pass, and then after it is passed we may have great cause to regret it for the rest of our lives. I do not think it is a square deal to the people of Bonavista Bay to let the A. N. D. Company or any other company get this Bill sanctioned by this House in its present form. I know what plans the A.N.D. Company have for making another extension to their plant at Grand Falls. I worked there for eight years. They made an extension last year and that is the only extension they purpose making apart from the installation of another paper mill. Under this Bill they can make an

extension to their mill at Grand Falls if it pleases them, but they are not bound to do it. Now I am against giving this Company any more concesssions, and when I say this I think I know what I am talking about, and I think I know some of the individual members of that Company, and particularly the manager of it, pretty nearly as well as anybody in this House. The manager, Mr. Harris, is a shrewd, cute man, and everything that is in this Bill is to the benefit of the A. N. D. Company. Last year I introduced a Logging Bill in this House, and about the time of the introduction of that Bill, trouble occurrerd at Corner Brook and I, with my friend Mr. Scammell, was accused by the Prime Minister on the floors of this House with bad faith, and I think that to-day the Prime Minister has since found out to his entire satisfaction that his accusations were wrong and that Mr. Scammell and myself were as innocent as he was, and I think that it is only fair that he should say so now. To-day we are clear of it and we can honestly say that we knew absolutely nothing about the incident we were blamed for. That Bill for loggers was defeated in this House last year and was referred to a Commission of Enquiry, and I think the honourable member for St. John's West, Mr. Linegar, the man who congratulated himself on being the first labour representative in this House, voted against the Bill, as well as other honourable members on the Government side. After the Bill was discussed at length here it was decided that a Commission be appointed to go into the whole matter of logging and Mr. Warren was appointed as the Commission, and I certainly did not begrudge him the job. He did his best, but it seems to me that he was held back until late in the Fall before starting on his mission.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—That is untrue.

MR. BROWN—I accept the statement; but at all events it appears that conditions are better in the lumber woods now and men are getting a better showing than they did last year and the years previous. Why? Because this Bill was introduced on the floors of this Chamber last session. But what should have been done is that instead of having one man on that Commission there should have been five men appointed on it, and, further, not leave the thing until November month to start the work of investigation. The Commissioner could not at that time of the year go to all the camps around the country that was necessary and see every man individually and find out from him the treatment he was getting and the amount of money he was working for in the lumber woods. If he wanted to get information properly he would have to visit the camps; but, as the honourable member for Fortune Bay stated in his findings, the men were careless about coming to him because they did not want to lose any time. I would not lose my time either to give such evidence unless I was paid for it, and I quite agree with the attitude taken by the men. But then again, the investigation was not full enough. At least two-thirds of the men working in the lumber woods are from the northern districts and they should have been consulted on the matter and their views taken with regard to it. I do not know who was to blame, but I do know that the Commission should have been comprised of more men, and I do know that the northern men were not given a square deal. This year, I understand, the men worked at a scale and they made fairly good money; but, in my opinion, if the Logging Bill had not been introduced in this Assembly last

year, the men would not be getting anything like fair returns for their work this year. The A. N. D. Company had their own way for years, but since the Humber started matters are different. Many of the A. N. D. Company's good men are gone to the Humber and in order to get others to replace them they got to offer attractive propositions. Mr. Goodyear stated in his evidence to the Commissioner words to the effect that I stated here last session, namely, that the Company at Grand Falls took advantage of the country's condition at a time when considerable unemployment prevailed. Now if I stated that last year I am prepared to repeat it and emphasize it this, namely, that the A. N. D. Company took advantage of the unemployment situation and put into force the subcontract system for men to work on, and with the result that men made little or no money out of the venture. But, fortunately, times have got altogether different since the Logging Bill was introduced last year. Besides, the French Canadians that came here were well paid and it would look too scandalous if the Newfoundlanders did not get paid better than before. It is long, so long ago, however, that some officials of that Company absolutely ignored the old Logging Bill that was in force altogether. I refer now to the Bill that was put through this House some years ago by Sir William Coaker, and at a time when Sir William Coaker was in opposition. I heard that one of the camp inspectors said last year, when a report was brought to his attention that the conditions of a camp were not fit for a dog to live in, that neither he nor his Company recognised the Logging Bill. This is from a man who is an assistant manager of the A. N. D. Company and who boldly says that he ignores the law of our land; still we are asked to pass bills here to the advantage of the A. N. D. Company. Evidently because a man comes from Canada and wants a Bill passed here we got to pass it, and no matter whether the Bill is common sense or nonsense, when the House is divided every man on the Government side of the House votes for it to a man. It is only two years ago when members of the Opposition sat on the other side of the Houses and when the then Opposition were treated with courtesy and decency; but the same satisfaction and courtesy is not being meted out to us by the Government members; but although few in number we do not intend to allow everything to be put over on us. As I said before, this is a Bill, Mr. Chairman, that should get very serious consideration before passing. When you are dealing with Mr. Harris of the A. N. D. Company and his assistant you got to be very careful, and you must remember that you are not dealing with the two gentlemen who directed the affairs of this Company in the past like Mr. Scott and Mr. Thomas Judge.

These were two gentlemen without a doubt. Men that nobody could point the finger of scorn at. Men perfectly willing to give the working man a square deal and listen to his grievances when he had one. But what is it to-day. The same can't be said of the men to-day there. In those days if a man had a grievance; if he was a logger or an employee of the plant he would go to the office with his grievance and he would be listened to. But to-day if you have a grievance and you go to see the manager, you are met at the door by the secretary. The first thing that you are asked is "Who do you want to see?" And then you are asked your business. You have even got to tell your business. And then in many cases you are told that the Director is busy and can't see you. These are some of the men

to-day who are bringing in a Bill for us to grant them permission to withdraw the necessary plant from Alex. Bay and place a mill in its stead. When that mill was erected it was orected to give employment to the people of that district. But what happened. The company went insolvent. They went to the wall. The A. N. D. Company bought it.

And here they bring in a Bill asking us to pass through this House for them to be free from the obligation of operating there providing that the town of Grand Falls will have that extension there. In my opinion they do not have any more as regards machinery. I think that they are looking for machinery. Now that won't give us a chance to keep this mill or monument. That is what I would call it just where it is and it does not give the people a chance to earn one dollar in that mill.

Mr. Chairman, I think that it should be stipulated in this Bill that these people should cut at least enough wood to manufacture 100 tons of pulp for each working mill. It is only provided in the Bill that they should be working the mill. Now I ask to be corrected if I am wrong. I believe that these people were compelled to put machinery at Bishop's Falls within a certain time.

I think that they were. If that is the case they have been excluded from that. Now they are asking us to pass a Bill through this House so that they would not have to operate all round the bay. I don't know but in 48 hours after this Bill is passed they will be taking the employment out of Bonavista Bay and moving their operations west. I do not think that this is a move in the right direction. And as far as I am concerned I am not inclined to support it.

Getting back to the report of the Commission. I must say that though the number of men who have given evidence is in favour of this system still there are as many men who are not in favour of it. They are not very much inclined to say that they would rather have wages.

Now I come to Mr. Harris' report. And he still says that the only grievance he has with the men is that the dark comes too soon. The day is not long enough to work. I claim that a man who is brutal enough to make a statement of that kind is not worth the consideration of anybody. After all if a man works all day and he has got to work all day he must be at least a machine. And if this is the kind of man that he is looking for that can work six days and nights continually for six days of the week he is different from any other man that I have ever met. Then he says in another part of the report, the men don't want to work.

Reads the report.

That is a pretty good statement for a contractor to make.

Mr. Chairman, the Bill that is now before the House undoubtedly will be debated at some length, and it should be, because the Company who are asking to get this Bill through the House are not prepared to yield anything to the working men of this country or the Government. They have always held a stiff hand. They are manufacturing paper as cheap as any company but they are not prepared to give the conditions and the wages that other companies give. They want all themselves and they want the country to have nothing. They do not want to pay the workman but they come to this House of Assembly and ask us to put this Bill through that will cover them and give them carte blanche, and let the working man and the country suffer. I am against it Mr. Chairman and I believe that if the hon. member knew as much as I do after 8 years experience he would give it more consideration than he is giving it now. After all the man who works with anybody or any concern

for 18 years knows what that company or concern is. In the meantime I don't want anybody to think that I am against any man in Grand Falls.

The Logging Bill has been working for 4 months. The report of the Commission will be accepted. As far as the Commissioner is concerned, I have nothing to say against him. He went out and did his best and he got all the information that he could, but it was not the right time of the year to go and get information.

The Government of Newfoundland has given every consideration to the A.N.D. Co. They have done everything that they could for it and they still come back and they want us to do more. I am not in favour of the Bill as I already stated. If there was a man running the A.N.D. Co. like the days when Lord Northcliffe was alive. a man who was prepared to give a square deal to the working man and who was only too ready to listen to their grievances, I would support this Bill. And I would do anything to help this Bill and get it through the House, but under the present conditions I cannot do it. I have reason for what I say. I am prepared to back up what I say and when I make statements I just know what I am talking about.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, this is very refreshing indeed. I thank the honorable member for his very fine discourse. It is a pleasure indeed to see so much interest evidenced particularly by the Opposition. As far as the Government is concerned they are not a bit particular as to what form of criticism there may be on this measure at all. It is rather refreshing to find some little "pep" being introduced into the debate. It seems to me that the main object of the honourable member was to assure the House that he was not a lover of the gentleman named, he said nothing against this Bill, nothing whatever. Now it is this Bill that we are concerned with whether we will put it through the House or whether we will turn it out. I can quite conceive that the honorable member for Twillingate decided to convey to the House and to the country that he had certain opinions and reasons why this Bill should not go through. I think, after all, we should hear his reason why this Bill should not go through. Now the position about the whole thing was this, that the industry was started at Alexander Bay by a company, and it collapsed. A complaint was made that the Government of the day had not given it the support that they might have done when the money market was bad because of high exchange. However, I do not want to go back to past history. The fact of the matter is that it went "bust" and the act was left on the statute book. They left their property there. The Government had no intention of going into the timber business and nobody suggested doing anything. Now the Government takes the position that when the A.N.D. Company came along and said as far as the operation of that factory is concerned it is unpractical and unsound under the present conditions in the markets but it may alter during the next ten years and so we would like an option on this water power for that period. In the meantime we will take the lumber and instead of manufacturing the pulp here we will have it manufactured at the Grand Falls Plant extension. That is all about it. As far as the Government is concerned it is a question of doing what they think best. If the property is there, if employment can't be found we say that they ought to amend the Act accordingly. As to whether Mr. Harris is qualified, whether he is good, bad or indifferent has nothing to do with this Bill, and certainly not with the Government and not with any individual.

I would like to tell the honorable member this, that I should be very pleased to know if he does not care to tell me publicly, his reason why to-day the A.N.D. Company should be regarded as a crowd of pirates trying to put something over on this country. I would like to know it here now. The country gave it concessions years ago in the days of Sir Robert Bond, but if there could be any serious reason apart from the present opinion of the gentleman as regards the man in charge of that plant that the honorable member knows, I want to say right here now that this Committee can rise and need not do a thing further in the matter.

I would like to tell the hon. member that if there have been any breaches of the Logging Act they have never been reported to the Department of Justice. This is a very serious business in which the Government is practically asked to step in and salvage a wreck. That is what it is. This company had gone insolvent. The Anglo Newfoundland Development Company has taken over the holdings of the Terra Nova Sulphit Company. It is not a matter of charity. It is purely a business proposition. The Governmtnt finds itself in the position that they say to us "we cannot hope under the present conditions to carry on the mills at Alexander Bay and we want to be allowed, as an alternative, to make extensions elsewhere." If there is anything wrong with the proposition well then we are prepared to hold the matter up and make enquiries. I want to tell the honourable member that if he has any personal dislike for Mr. Harris, it is not like him to be so unkind, that is no reason why this bill should not go through. It is evident that there is no love lost by the hon. member on Mr. Harris, but I would not like to have anybody talk about me as the hon. member for Twillingate has spoken this evening. I happen to be in charge of this bill just because the matter was taken up with the Government. I did not personally undertake to put this bill through, and if there is any serious matter in connection with it I would like to hear it now. I have no desire to rush this thing through the House. If the hon. member thinks that he would like to look into the matter then alright; I am quite prepared that the bill be deferred until it has been examined. But I cannot for the life of me see what his opinion of Mr. Harris has to do with the merits of this Bill.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, the hon member made some reference to me. I will not keep the House very long, but I have some personal interest in the debate and this is my excuse for getting up. I did not hear all that the hon. member for Twillingate said but I think that it is but right that I should make some explanation as far as I was connected with this matter. It will be remembered that this House did not adjourn until late in the summer. I was then asked by the Prime Minister if I would undertake the logging commission. I told him that I would for a certain rate per day which is the ordinary professional fee charged everybody else. If that were not paid I would not undertake the work. He agreed. Soon after my law partner went to Montreal and I could not shut down the office altogether and I had to wait until he came back. After his return I was retained in an important case of murder and I was kept busy on that case for some time . After that I was ill and so I could not possibly go. I had a slight operation but as soon as I could possibly go I went and that is the reason why I went at that particular time of the year. Now with regard to my not seeing a sufficiently large number of loggers I say this;

I repeat what I said before early in this session. It is my opinion that the result of the Commission would have been the same if I had done what I did do seeing the few that I did see as if I had been sitting in this chamber for the whole summer with every loggers expenses paid on his way to and from here to give his evidence. It is only a matter of human nature. The result is the same as if I had consulted a hundred per cent. of the loggers because it is as I said before a matter of human nature. They did not want to make forty-five dollars as was in the logging bill of last year but they wanted to make as much as they could every month. Some of them wanted to get sixty-five dollars a month and found. Those in favour of the contract and were making sixty-five dollars a month said that they were prepared to go on wages if they made up what they were earning overtime. All of them were in favour of wages if the wages were sixty- five dollars or seventy dollars a month and found. Now let me refer to what the hon. member said as to the law of supply and demand. The year before last when work was scarce and men were plentiful the logging companies could pay practically any wages that they liked. That cuts both ways. As regards the labour and supply and demand it is the same as in any other branches of industry. Back in 1916 and 1918 when the times were good and the fish was a tremendous price the companies found it very difficult to get men with the result that they had to pay wages as high as eighty dollars per month but afterwards when the conditions were not so good men became more plentiful and wages went down. There is an incident that may be of interest to the House. I did not put it on record because it was not a part of the evidence. I was at Badger Station and I was waiting for the train that was to come in the next morning. At three o'clock I heard a train that was coming in from St. John's or somewhere in that direction and I heard considerable row. Next morning I asked Mr. Gilmore about it and he told me that Mr. Gillingham had been around Fogo district picking up a hundred men, to whom he had promised sixty-five dollars a month and board, but when they had arrived at Badger the night before they said that they were going on over to work on the Humber supposing that they got only thirty dollars a month. What can you do with men of that sort? Here was the Power and Paper Company at the Humber that had a minimum wage of thirty two dollars, and if there was anything done over it was paid for. And here was Mr. Gillingham with a hundred men to whom he had promised sixty-five dollars a month and their board and yet they decided to go to the Humber, so that it can be seen from that that there are a number of people who are in a position to ask practically what they like. The law of supply and demand will come into force and the companies will find that according as the industries get bigger and more extensive the greater will be the demand for labour, and the result will be that the loggers will be in a position to demand a higher wage than they would otherwise be getting. I just mention these facts to prove that I do not think it would have made any difference whether I saw ten or a thousand. That is the explanation why I did not go until the month of November.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—From the remarks of the Hon. Member for Twillingate I fear that he is not very familiar with the conditions in connection with the Terra Nova Sulphite Company. I do not think that he is or he would never have got up here and made the statements that he did,

and I can only assume that he failed to understand what this bill really means. What are the facts? A few years ago a Norwegian Company started building a Sulphite Mill at Alexander Bay. The war came on and they could not get sufficient money because of exchange and other things to finish the work. At that time sulphite was in fair demand and it could be manufactured at a price so that they could compete with the Scandinavians. The conditions are different to-day. The A. N. D. Company cannot manufacture sulphite and sell it abroad in competition with the Scandinavians. Now what are they asking for in this bill? Very little, simply the rights of the the water of Grant's Falls, six miles up on the Terra Nova River. They own the other water powers. They have bought them. They own the timber lands. They are not asking for any great concessions after all. They have assured the Government that when the conditions are favorable that they are prepared to complete the mills for the manufacture of sulphite. The mills at Terra Nova are not completed at the present time, and are not likely to be until market conditions change, and there is some hope of being able to compete with Scandinavian markets.

And the A. N. D. Company realizes and those who know the paper business, and I am sure Mr. Brown, the Hon. Member for Twillingate, will realize that it is much better for the labouring people of this country to have the wood cut at Terra Nova River and manufactured into paper at Grand Falls, than to send it out to the other side only as sulphite pulp. Manufacturing the wood that is cut around Terra Nova and Gambo will mean considerably more to this country when it is manufactured into paper, than it would if it were manufactured into sulphite pulp at Glovertown. There is going to be more labour at Gambo and Terra Nova than there ever would be at Glovertown. Those places are in Bonavista Bay, and the people of Bonavista Bay will get employment, because the A. N. D. Co. had given an assurance to the Government that they will cut practically as much wood as the railway can haul. They will also put up a rossing plant, at Terra Nova and Gambo, and they intend to bring the wood that is cut at Gambo and Terra Nova over the railway into Grand Falls and make it into paper there.

Now when you come to consider that—the concessions that they ask for is the right to this water power at Grant's Falls for ten years, it is very little, because if they are going to compete with Scandinavia surely it will be within the next ten years. They own the other water powers, and if they want to close down they can close down the whole operation, and this would be the worst thing that could happen for the people of Bonavista Bay.

MR. SCAMMELL — How much wood did the Company haul over the road last winter?

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Twenty thousand cords; and they are prepared to haul over the road in years to come from twenty to thirty thousand cords, provided we can supply the necessary rolling stock to handle the timber.

MR. SCAMMELL—At what freight rate?

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—I do not know what the freight rate is.

MR. K. M. BROWN—I thought it was thirteen thousand that they hauled over the road last year?

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—I do not think we could handle it all. This winter, I understand, they had to stop cutting because of the snow going so early on this side of the coun-

try. But the A. N. D. Company is prepared to cut all the wood that we can possibly haul over the railway; and I think there is more money in it for the railway and for the people of Newfoundland in getting those rossing plants put up and in getting the wood hauled over the road and brought to Grand Falls, and there made into paper, and there certainly will be more men employed in Bonavista Bay, than there would be if the wood was handled at the seaside at Glovertown

I regret that Mr. Brown should so far forget himself as to make such a personal, unparliamentary and ungentlemanly attack on Mr. Harris, or on any gentleman outside this House? It is most uncalled for, and it is a most cowardly thing for any man to get up here and make an attack on any man outside the House, because the person attacked has no redress. If Mr. Brown had made that attack on a public platform outside this House Mr. Harris would then be free to take steps to vindicate his character. I am sure that if Mr. Brown had given careful consideration to the words he used, he would not have so far forgotten himself as to say such things about any gentleman on the floors of this House.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, I am glad to see that such an innocent looking Bill as this should provoke such a deal of discussion. I did not have the pleasure of hearing Mr. Brown's remarks in toto, but I have some idea as to the spirit that animated him when he stood up here to-night. He has a grievance, and the grievance is not with him a personal one, but it is a grievance on behalf of his fellow men, because of the treatment meted out on the floors of this legislature to certain legislation which he introduced on behalf of one of the most important and one of the most deserving classes of labouring men in this country. He got scant thanks from this Chamber for his efforts in that direction; and he has only suffered being dubbed as a man who hatches plots and revolutions. If it is hatching plots and revolutions to try and get a better wage for the labouring men of this country, then that is a crime that I shall always be proud to plead guilty of, and when Mr. Brown brought in that Bill last session I stood four square with him for the rights of the loggers, and I am still four square with Mr. Brown in the fight that he is putting up to-night.

I want to say that as far as the A. N. D. Company is concerned and as regards that Commission on the logging Bill, I have to say, in spite of the efficiency of the Commissioner, that the report is only so much piffle. I still maintain, despite all the Commissioner says, that the real body of men who should have given evidence before that Commission got little or no opportunity to give that evidence. These labouring men could not afford to give up their two dollars a day or two dollars and a half, or their cord and a half of wood, or whatever it was—they could not afford to leave their work up in the woods, and come down to the railway junction to give evidence before that Commission, so then, from the labourers' point of view what after all is the worth of that report?

The Minister of Justice wants some suggestions as regards this Bill, and he wants some opinions as regards the Bill, and he wants to know some reasons why the Bill should be opposed. Now, I am going to presume to speak on behalf of some thousands of men in Bonavista Bay. Those men may not be represented on that side of the House, but at any rate they have some representation on this side of the House. There were thousands of men in Bonavista Bay who believed,

who hoped and prayed that when the Terra Nova Company Act went on the Statute Book that it would mean the operation of a mill at the waterside in Bonavista District. That hope, I say, is shattered for all time tonight by this legislation that is before us. The most that the labouring men of Bonavista District can hope for now is that they shall go into the woods as lumbering men; but there will be no industrial development at the bottom of Bonavista Bay, which was the thing that they expected, and the thing that the Government had in mind when it put the Terra Nova Sulphite Company Act on the Statute Book, and made concessions to the Terra Nova Sulphite Co.

The position in effect to-night is that the A. N. D. Company comes in here and tells the House and the country that they want certain water powers for ten years, and if at the end of that time they find that they do not want them, then the country can have them back. I cannot say enough, or Mr. Brown could not have said enough to eulogise the shrewdness of Mr. Harris, who does not come here to-night and say that they want this water power for the A. N. D. Company.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—They own the timber.

MR. SCAMMELL—That is alright, but that is not the principle that I am fighting. The principle that I am fighting is that instead of making a deal tonight with the Terra Nova Sulphite Company, ... where is that Company today, can the Hon. Minister of Justice tell me?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Gone bust.

MR. SCAMMELL—Who are the principals of this Bill?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—What happens is this—they are simply taking over these areas. The situation is that this other Company got a certain amount of money, but could not get any more, and had to close down—that is all. The A. N. D. Company took over the areas, and what the Terra Nova Company could not do they are going to do—that is all.

MR. SCAMMELL—Where is Blakstad? Where is Storm? This Company, I submit, Mr. Chairman, finds it very convenient at times to find Blackstad and to find Storm, and then to lose them again. The point I want to make is this, that instead of passing a Bill to-night for the Terra Nova Sulphite Company, we should be in here doing business with the A. N. D. Company. The A. N. D. Company should have its name here to-night on paper in black and white. And I think that the Prime Minister would be doing his duty in insisting that the A. N. D. Company should proceed with the erection of a mill at Glovertown, and start industrial development in that district.

I am going to vote against this Bill because I think the A. N. D. Company has got enough in this country, and I am going to vote against it, because I presume to speak for thousands of men in Bonavista District, who thought that the Terra Nova Company was going to put a mill at the bottom of Bonavista Bay, where some industrial development was promised.

HON. PRIME MINISTER — Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word in reference to this, because the hon. member for St. Barbe seems to think that nobody can look after the people of Bonavista except himself. I want to let him know that I have a great deal more interest in the people at the bottom of Bonavista Bay then he has now or than he ever had; I have not allowed this legislation to come here this evening without giving it every consideration, and being satisfied that it is in the interests of the

people of Bonavista Bay. I am perfectly satisfied that in passing this legislation we are not letting down the people of Bonavista Bay.

I regret exceedingly that that sulphite mill is not working at Alexander Bay. It was one of the things that we told the people at Glovertown that we would try to get going. We wanted to get something working in that part of Bonavista Bay; and we told the people that we would get it going because we thought it was possible, and these people thought it would be possible to export pulpwood from Alexander Bay.

I want to remind Mr. Scammell that we can gain nothing by telling the Grand Falls people, who have been unfortunate enough to have bought that sulphite mill—we can gain nothing by telling them "you have got to go and complete that mill or take from you a little water power you thought you owned. Most of their water powers and timber limits they have bought, and we cannot interfere with them. But this little water power is conceded to them on the conditions that they cut so much lumber and export it from Glovertown to Grand Falls. There is nothing in this Bill to show that the Company is so bound, but we have letters from them giving an agreement to the effect that they will cut so much timber on those limits, and not only that, but that they will put in machinery for cutting the wood into smaller pieces, and for rossing it.

That will give a greater amount of employment in that particular district than they had before; and I do not know but that it will give more than the sulphite mill would if it were running. After all it would only take a few men to look after the machinery in the sulphite mill. Even if that sulphite mill were completed today, it would not be running, because it does not pay to manufacture sulphite pulp at the present time.

As I have said, Mr. Chairman, I am perfectly satisfied about the interests of the people in Bonavista Bay; and I am quite prepared to face them and tell them that it is no use to bite off our noses to spite our faces; that it is no use to try and prevent these people from cutting timber, because it is going to be manufactured at Grand Falls.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I am glad to be able to sit and listen to someone else talking. I fail to see the necessity of this amendment to the Terra Nova Sulphite Act if the A. N. D. Co. can cut the timber at Alexander Bay at the present time.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—It is the Terra Nova River—not Alexander Bay. They bought the timber there from private parties and also the water powers which had previously been acquired.

MR. HALFYARD—I do not know the value of Section 9 in this Bill. It says the company shall manufacture 100 tons of mechanical pulp for every working day or in lieu of erecting a mill shall manufacture and increase production, etc.

MR. SULLIVAN—They have already built the mill.

MR. HALFYARD—They have the mills erected already and a new machine installed at Grand Falls, but they would have done that anyhow. If it is the object of this Bill to give the people of the Terra Nova areas employment, then that object cannot be achieved under this measure. This is the point that has been raised by the honourable member for Twillingate, Mr. Brown. Does this Bill make it obligatory for the A. N. D. Co. to cut sufficient timber to manufacture 100 tons of pulp daily. I suppose this is only a gentlemen's agreement and as far as we know they are not oligated to do anything. That

is the reason Mr. Brown took the attitude he did in connection with the matter.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—We are doing the best we can under the circumstances—the other company went broke.

MR. HALFYARD—If the company would agree to cut enough wood to make 100 tons of pulp daily they would be providing employment, but that is the whole weakness of the Bill, they do not agree to this. It is optional with them now if they will cut a stick or not and we are practically in their hands as regards wood cutting operations in that area. Whether we can remedy this or not I do not know but the Hon. Mr. Sullivan says the only object of the Bill is to obtain for the A. N. D. Co. the holding of the water powers of Grant's Falls for ten years. Will they cut enough wood to make 100 tons of mechanical pulp daily?

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—They will manufacture the pulp which will give just as much employment.

MR. HALFYARD—In speaking of this employment we have in mind the people of Bonavista Bay, and without consideration it might be thought that the company are under an obligation, but they are not according to this Bill, and I think the point by Messrs. Scammell and Brown was well taken. Glancing at the Bill one would think the A.N.D. Co. was going to operate the mill at Alexander Bay, but they are not and can do as they like. Section 11 says they shall operate the mills or the extension thereof. Now if the water power is so important to the company they will make an effort to keep the extension going so as to turn out the 100 tons daily. This Bill, I think, is not of such importance as far as the giving of labor is concerned as we were lead to imagine. If we could get at Alexander Bay an industry that would according to this Bill be equal to 75 per cent. of that at the Humber, it would be worth while all right. Of course all we can do in connection with the matter is to express our opinion and there I suppose it ends. I am sorry the Company cannot see their way clear to provide the wood that would when manufactured produce one hundred tons of pulp.

MR. SULLIVAN—They bought the whole thing with the idea of being able to carry on the operations in full.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to say much in connection with this matter, but it seems to me that the Honorable Members of the Opposition have missed one point. It must be remembered that the Terra Nova Sulphite Company has passed away. Mr. Scammell has asked about Mr. Blackstad. That gentleman was here in connection with the Humber project, and has also naturally passed away from here. I understand that Mr. Storm who was in charge of the Sulphite Company's Mills became sick and went abroad. To put the matter clearly, the position is like that of an insolvent company. When the Terra Nova Sulphite Company could no longer carry on the A. N. D. Company took over their plant, etc., intending to manufacture and ship sulphite pulp which could be done during the war time, and was very valuable, but cannot be done now in competition with Scandanavia, as it would not pay. We are now merely transferring the rights of one company to the other which I understand will ross the wood, haul it over the railway and convert it into paper which will give a great amount of labor. The A. N. D. Company practically guarantees this in their correspondence with the Government. If they did not take the mills over they would only be lying idle, and useless,

and in supporting this Bill I wish to say that nothing better could have been done by the people of Bonavista Bay. The matter of the water power which concerns only a small river is a mere bagatelle in relation to the rest of the deal. I must say that I am sorry indeed that Mr. Brown, the member for Twillingate has seen fit to develop an unwarranted attack on Mr. Harris, the manager at Grand Falls, and to make such a statement as that he was sorry he had ever come across the Herring Pond. Now I have known Mr. Harris for many years and have always found him a perfect gentleman, and I will not sit here and allow him to be attacked without rising in his defence. I consider it grossly unfair to attack a man who is outside this House, and therefore not able to defend himself. There are certain people as we all know, agitators, whose only object is to raise trouble for their own advantage.

MR. BROWN—I am not one of the agitators.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—If the cap fits you, you can wear it. I knew Mr. Harris for years and as the Hon. Mr. Sullivan has said, you cannot disturb Mr. Harris in any way, and I certainly do not think it fair for you, Mr. Brown, to get up and attack him as you did. But to be fair to you also I will say that I do not think you meant it.

I am speaking now, and you will have your turn when I am finished. I was going on to say, Mr. Chairman, that I know Mr. Harris for many years and I know him to be a perfect gentleman. With regard to the suggestion of the Hon. Mr. Sullivan that anything said in this House by the Hon. Member for Twillingate might tend to disturb Mr. Harris's standing with his English friends or with the Directors in Grand Falls, I think that the remarks of Mr. Brown will be taken more as a joke than anything else, because I do not think that he meant what he said, and I really think that the heat of the debate was the cause of his outburst. Grand Falls was there before he and I came here, and it will be there when we are gone; but I do think that it was unfair to abuse Mr. Harris in this House in the way he was abused tonight and that is what brought me to my feet. After all, it is the duty of the Opposition to criticize and it is their duty not to agree but to oppose. I have been in Opposition.

MR. BROWN—And you will be there again.

HONOURABLE MINISTER OF FINISTER—You made that statement before and you lost. You know the dream you had about Bonavista last Fall. Now whether I am here for four years more or not it makes very little difference to Mr. Brown; but, when he gets up here and makes such accusations as he has made this evening, I do not think that he is any acquisition to this Chamber. I know that Mr. Harris has done a tremendous lot of good, notwithstanding what Mr. Brown or anybody else says to the contrary.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Chairman, I would be very glad this evening to take advice from any man in this Chamber, but I am not prepared to take any advice from any man of the type of Sir John Crosbie. I think I know Mr. Harris; but I admit I do not know him from a financial point of view. Sir John Crosbie has seen fit to call me a labour agitator, but if we were both outside the doors of this building he would not call me such. Now with regard to this Bill before the House, I contend that if this concession is granted the A. N. D. Company, they can withdraw all their men from Terra Nova and do not have to cut a stick of wood there and that is what will likely happen,

if this Bill goes through as it is now. The honourable member for Fortune Bay has stated that this Company offered $65 per month to men to go to work in the woods this winter. That seems strange to me, as I never heard of such a figure being offered by that Company since the war, but I intend to find out if such is a fact.

MR. GODDEN—Mr. Chairman, as I see it, the whole tenor of this Bill points to the fact, particularly in the first section, that the assigns of the Terra Nova Sulphite Co. instead of wanting to use the waters of Grant's Falls for themselves they want to prevent anybody else from using them. That appears to be the whole situation in a nutshell.

MR. GRIMES——Mr. Chairman, the position taken by Mr. Brown in regard to the A. N. D. Company is true in many particulars. We are dealing with a company who has as its manager a shrewd business man, and it is only natural to expect that he is going to try and make all the profits that he can for his concern. It has been stated here this evening by the member for Fortune Bay that during the war the A. N. D. Company paid from $60 to $70 a month to loggers and then gradually cut them down as low as $26 per month. He argued that this reduction was brought about by the law of supply and demand. In other words when plenty of men came around looking for the job of logging the Company took advantage of the situation and only paid the men what I would call enough to barely exist on. The result was that when the Company cut the men down to that low rate of pay the Company's profits increased very largely. Their profits for last year, if I read the papers correctly, was in the neighbourhood of a million dollars and for the previous year a million and a half dollars. I think that the Government, knowing the immense amount of profits the Company has made, would have probably taken the right step if they had suggested to the manager that, in consideration of these large profits, they ought to guarantee a certain number of people employment and to guarantee that they would increase the number of their employees, instead of cutting it down, regardless of the effect it would have on labour conditions in the country. I do not say that the A. N. D. Company has not a right to make profits. It has. But profits to the extent of a million and a half dollars in one year justifies a Government, when a Bill comes up which has a condition to transfer the Terra Nova Sulphite privileges, to say to them "you are doing very well and we would suggest to you to spend a part of the large profits you are making to give employment to the people of Bonavista Bay."

I think, Mr. Chairman, that we should put it up to the Company and say that we would like to drop the section in this Bill in which you will assure us that they are going to give additional employment without lessening the employment anywhere else. That they will guarantee to give additional employment in consideration of the rights of the Terra Nova Sulphite Company to the A. N. D. Co.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—What is the value of that.

MR. GRIMES—Just that we will have assurance of getting more employment.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —I quite see the point of the Hon. Member. But how can it be humanly possible to say that the work is being given. All you can say is, give us to understand that you are going to do certain things. I would not give that for anything you would draft.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say for the benefit of the Hon. member who has just sat down that I don't

think that it is worth while bothering about. Say that we did put in the clause under consideration and the result is that they guarantee that 2000 more men be employed. How is it possible to check whether they employed more men or not. You can't do it. That is how I look upon these things. You have got to get back to first principles in such matters, and remember that the honesty of purpose is a bigger factor in the keeping of agreements than any statute.

Take Bell Island. I have always contended that the export tax should be down to an irreducible minimum provided that the men are employed for the longest time in the greatest number and getting the highest wage possible. Now what have acts of Parliament amounted to as regards operations on the Island. Nothing more than an excuse for an annual closing down. We get forced back yearly to the position that if the Company decides that they will not operate because of the tax we can do nothing but suspend it.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and had passed the said 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.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain the object of some of the Council's amendments to the Motor Traffic Act, so that members will know before second reading comes up to-morrow.

(1) The idea is that the light is to be placed on the right hand side, and is to show on the left hand side of the road.

MR. GODDEN—The suggestion was that the light should be fixed so that the ray should show only on the left hand side.

MR. HIBBS—I think the driver should be allowed to show it on whatever side he likes.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—In Section 10, Subsection (j) we left out the word "right." Before leaving out that it read:—

> "Spotlights or searchlights may be affixed to the right side of the vehicle only, and the ray of light therefrom shall be directed to the extreme left . . . etc."

We decided to leave out the word "right" in the first line, so that the section then read:

> "Spotlights or searchlights may be affixed to the side of the vehicle only. . . etc."

Number 5 of the amendments is as follows: Strike out all the words between the word "'sub-section" in the eighth line of subsection (b)) of section 13 and the word "shall" in the tenth line of the said subsection. The amendment is obvious. It refers to a fire engine.

Number 6—add the following words to section 16 (a) "except persons learning to qualify for a driver's license under the direction of an instructor approved by the Commission, on highways licensed by the Commission for such purpose." That merely provides that a person who has not got a license may be allowed to go on a highway, provided that he is with an instructor approved by the Commission.

Number 7—Strike out the first three words of the fourth line of Section 19. That is obvious, because he must be convicted by a magistrate. The words "by a magistrate" are stricken out.

Number 8 reads—Strike out the word "may" in the second line of Section 23, and substitute therefor the word "shall." That section reads:

> "Double the pecuniary penalties

for a breach of the last preceeding section may be imposed for:"

The word "may" is stricken out, and the word "shall" substituted, so that the section now reads:

"Double the pecuniary penalties for a breach of the last preceeding section shall be imposed for:"

Number 9 reads—Between the words "thereto" and "imprisonment" in the ninth line of section 23 insert the words "may impose."

MR. W. J. BROWNE—(Speaking on amendment No. 9 to Motor Traffic Act)—Mr. Chairman, might I point out that that is not a very correct amendment, because there is nobody named to impose the penalty. The amended section merely reads "and in addition thereto, may impose." It does not say that a magistrate may impose, but merely says that the punishment may be imposed. I am saying that putting in that "may be imposed." Who may impose?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—The magistrate, I suppose.

MR. W. J. BROWNE—Well, it does not say so. The first part of that section reads "double the pecuniary penalties may be imposed," and then goes on to say when double the penalty may be imposed, and then later on it says, that in addition to the pecuniary penalty imprisonment may be imposed. That does not read properly. If it read "imprisonment may be imposed," instead of "'may impose imprisonment," it would read better. I think that would be a much better rendering. I think that it would be more uniform for one thing, and more proper for another. I should say that it should be made to read "imprisonment may be imposed" for whatever the period is.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Then numbers 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14 are merely transpositions of numbers, owing to another section being inserted. The numbers, therefore, have to be transposed. Honourable members will see that those are quite in order.

Number 15 reads—Strike out the word "city" wheresoever used in Section 30 (b), 30 (c), 30 (d) and substitute therefor the word "municipality." That is, in that section, instead of the word "city" the word "municipality" is to be used.

Number 16—The following words shall follow next after section 33 and shall be known and referred to in the Bill as Section 34:

"Notwithstanding anything contained in this part and in part vii the Commission may further restrict the permissible gross weight where roads, bridges or culverts have not been reconditioned by the Commission under the operation of the Highroads Commission Act, 1925."

That merely provides for roads that have not been reconditioned by the Commission, and does away with an ambiguity.

Then numbers 17 and 18 merely renumbering of sections.

Section 19—Strike out the word "right" in the section renumbered as section 411 and substitute the word "left" therefor; that is just merely a transfer from the right to the left.

MR. W. J. BROWNE—That is section 40 of the old Act. I think it is subsection (b) at the top. It is on page 18 subsection (b). In the original Bill it was on the left hand side, and we altered that to the right hand side, and now they have altered it back again to the left hand side. I submit that that is not an improvement.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—The original Bill reads:—

"(b) No person in charge of a vehicle . . . . etc., overtaking a street car or the car of an electric railway operated in or near the centre of the travelled portion of a highway, which is stationary or in

motion shall pass on the left hand side of such car . . . . etc."

MR. W. J. BROWNE—We made that the right hand side, and they made it the left hand side again. They must have been confused over that. It is absurd to go out of the way of the street car, and get in the way of the traffic that is coming in the opposite direction. We discussed that when the Bill was going through here.

MR. HIBBS—If you went on the left hand side, it would means that you would be going against the traffic coming the other way. You must pass on the side that you are driving.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Perhaps we had better defer this until to-morrow, so that we might understand this better. It seems to me that you would want to be a Philadelphia lawyer to understand this thing as it is now.

The matter was deferred until to-morrow.

HON. PRIME MINISTER — Mr. Speaker, in rising to move the adjournment of the House I wish to make an explanation on a personal matter.

When the Bill in connection with the repairs to the Dock was before the House the other evening, the honourable member for St. Barbe suggested to me that we might employ Mr. Hawco in the supervision of the dock repairs. The next morning I got a letter from Mr. Hawco, telling me that I had made slurring references to him, and that I had injured his reputation. He called upon me the next day and told me that he had got it from two people who were in the House that afternoon, and that he had got it later from the Leader of the Opposition, who had confirmed that statement. In case there is anybody else in the House who is of opinion that I made any slurring remarks about Mr. Hawco, I want to put myself right with the House, because I do not want to injure any man's character, and I have every regard for Mr. Hawco. In referring to the remarks I made on that occasion, according to the reporters, I find that I said:

"There was one other point brought up by the member for St. Barbe. He said that we ought to employ Mr. Hawco to superintend the dock. I don't know whether he meant that he should take charge of the work. But at least he thought that Mr. Hawco should have a very important position. He may be a very excellent man, but I would not care to leave the superintendence of the dock construction to Mr. Hawco or any man of his experience. The only work that I heard that Mr. Hawco was the supervisor of was at Old Day's Pond, Bonavista. Mr. Hawco was a year or more in charge of that work. I don't say that he was to blame. But there was the proposition to carry ships into a pond that was 10 or 12 feet above the sea level. So when the channel is cut from the pond to the sea the pond will empty out and another pond has then to be dug. Though I don't say that Mr. Hawco was the engineer, I don't think he was, yet it is doubtful if the best expert advice on engineering was obtained in this connection."

Now, I claim, Mr. Speaker, that that was not in any way a slurring reference to Mr. Hawco. It is a slurring reference to the engineering feat he was engaged upon I admit, and I do not take it back in any way. I do not take back anything that I said, but I want to make it clear that I did not want to injure the character of Mr. Hawco or his reputation as an engineer; and I still claim that he is not a sufficiently experienced man to take charge of the Government supervision of the dock repairs. We will

have to have a man there to look after the Government interests, who can check up all the plans, and specifications, and generally act as agent for the Government at the Dock; and we will not find it very easy to get the man that we require for that particular work. I do not think that Mr. Hawco has sufficient knowledge as a Civil Engineer to fill the bill; but that is nothing against Mr. Hawco, and I sincerely hope that he will get some work in connection with that dock.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker, I would like to make my position clear. What the Prime Minister has said tonight with regard to the Leader of the Opposition and Mr. Hawco is not quite correct. It might be correct so far as the Prime Minister goes. I had a visit from Mr. Hawco, who told me that he had come to me to protect him in the House of Assembly; that the Prime Minister had made an onslaught on him; and that he wanted me, as Leader of the Opposition, the next day to get up on the floors of the House of Assembly and protect him. He said—"he said some thing damaging to my character." I said, "I understood the Prime Minister to say, when Mr. Scammell suggested you for the position, that the only engineering feat he knew you were connected with, was when you built a ditch, or an entrance to a pond down in Bonavista Bay, and that when the ditch was completed, all the water ran out of the pond, and the pond became dry." He said he was very much annoyed, and said "I want you to protect me to-day in the House of Assembly." I said, "I will refer the matter to Mr. Scammell; he brought the matter up, and I will refer it back to him." He said, "Mr. Scammell had no right to bring the matter up without your permission." I said, "Mr. Scammell did not ask my permission, and the first thing I heard of it was when Mr. Scammell spoke on the floors of the House of Assembly." I made no such charge; I merely stated what I understood the Prime Minister had said—namely, that he had said that the only engineering feat that Mr. Hawco was connected with was the drying out the pond in Bonavista.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Speaker, apparently I am getting quite a bit of notoriety. I am glad of the publicity frankly. I am looking further than this House at the present time.

First I want to corroborate the statement made by Mr. Hickman. I did not consult Mr. Hickman when I advocated the appointment of Mr. Hawco in connection with the dock. I will go farther and say in explanation, and answer to the Prime Minister that I was not actually in the House when the Prime Minister replied to my observations on that point; but I was down on the steps below, and from what I heard of the Prime Minister's remarks they were such as to lead me to believe that he would not place any great faith in Mr. Hawco for a postiion in connection with the dock, or for any position whatever. Mr. Hawco approached me the next day, and asked me for the exact words that the Prime Minister said. I told him that I could not give him the actual words; but I told him that from my interpretation of the Prime Minister's remarks there was no doubt in my mind that his chances of any appointment in connection with the dock were absolutely nil.

With further reference to the pond up in Bonavista, Mr. Hawco was not the only one who was of opinion that from an engineering point of view such a thing was possible. It was not Mr. Hawco's idea in the first place, and Mr. Hawco was only sent down there to do job work; and I may tell the Hon. Prime Minister that he

will not have very far to go to find the engineer who said that that might be a reasonable proposition; and further than that, the same engineer is going to have quite a lot to do with the repairs to the dock.

HON. PRIME MINISTER — Mr. Speaker, I am perfectly satisfied with the explanation given by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, and I beg to move that this House do now adjourn.

MR. HALFYARD gave notice of question.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, March 31st, 1925.

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

Presenting Petitions.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from Bell Island. It is very important and is from representative people of the island asking that the Road Boards which have been operating there be abolished. For some years past a Road Board has been elected for the back of the island and another for the front. The grants were divided between them. I would recommend this to the careful consideration of the Government.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, I wish to present a petition from the residents of Battery Road in the East End of the City, asking for lights and road work up there. In submitting this for the consideration of the House I want to draw the attention of honorable members to the fact that although the Battery is within the municipal limits of St. John's the Council has practically refused to look after the area. Road repairs and payments for lights have been taken out of the road grants for the district.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I beg leave to present a petition from the entire population of Flat Rock asking for the completion of the canal that was started there some years ago.

A certain amount of work was done, but unfortunately sufficient money was not available. It is not only important to Flat Rock. All this section of the shore is particularly lacking in harbours. Flat Rock is very exposed and so is Pouch Cove. This Canal Scheme will provide shelter which as a matter of fact in case of storm will be useful to Pouch Cove and Flat Rock. I may mention in supporting this petition that you yourself, Mr. Speaker, and our late colleague, Mr. Vinnicombe, have for some time past been endeavouring to have the attention of Mr. Hall, the Government Engineer, to this work. If the opportunity occurs and if it is found practical to complete this work a great public utility will be given to two big fishing settlements that badly need it. There is no wharf in either place. There is no shelter of any kind and if it is possible to complete this work you will have supplied a very great need for the residents of Pouch Cove and Flat Rock.

MR. ASHBOURNE—I beg leave to present a petition from Twillingate District on the subject of a road. (Reads petition.) Mr. Speaker, I wish to give this petition my hearty support and to ask that this be referred to the Department to which it relates.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petition presented by my honorable colleague, Mr. Ashbourne. I must say that this road was started some years ago; three or four miles more and it will be com-

pleted. This road is very important to the hundreds, I may say thousands on the north side of the district. That road is much travelled over in the spring and fall of the year, and as it is to-day, they have to wade through mud ankle deep in order to get to Botwood to connect with the train for the interior. I have much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition and hope the Government will see their way clear to grant the amount asked for.

Notice of Question.

MR. HICKMAN asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs the name of the Tidewaiter at Rigoulet the past Summer; what wages was paid him.

Reply tabled.

MR. ASHBOURNE asked the Minister of Public Works why George Gosse, outport road inspector, was dismissed.

Answer deferred.

MR. SCAMMELL asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the table of the House a copy of all rules and regulations now in force or to be enforced respecting the packing of split herrings in this country.

Reply tabled.

MR. SCAMMELL asked Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing the full amount of moneys sent by his department to the District of Harbour Main from June 1924 to date; the names of the party or parties to whom the money was sent and the amount of each allocation; also, if returns have been furnished the department for such allocations, if not, the names of the commissioners failing to send in such returns and if any attempt has been made by the department to secure same.

Reply deferred.

MR. SCAMMELL asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing all allocations sent to the District of Harbor Main from June 1924 to date for: (a) Main Line Grant; (b) Local Grants; (c) Special Grants; also, the names of each Commissioner entrusted with each or all of the above allocations and the amount of the sum entrusted to each Commissioner; also, (a) if full returns have been made to the Department for such allocations on account Main Line, Local and Special Grants; (b) if any of these returns are still outstanding, have any steps been taken by the Department to secure same, and if not, why not.

Reply deferred.

MR. HALFYARD asked Hon. the Colonial Secretary to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing the amount of money spent under the jurisdiction of the Government Engineer from June, 1924, to date: (a) On the road on the Southside of Trinity District in the vicinity of Lead Cove; (b) On the proposed road from Gambo to Wesleyville, Bonavista District.

Reply tabled.

Second Reading Council's Amendments on Motor Traffic Act.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, I think the amendments have been very well straightened out. If you will remember last evening they were a little complicated. I will explain them as we go along. The amendments are most obvious, just a transferring of the sections.

Number 23 of the amendments—"between the words "term" and "not" —fourth and fifth words in the third line of section 72, renumbered as section 73, insert the words "of imprisonment." That is more or less of an omission. The section in the Act merely refers to a term, but it does not say of what. We are now put-

ting in the words "of imprisonment."

Number 24 relates merely to transposing of numbers.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Colonial Secretary, the Amendments made by the Legislative Council in and upon the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to Regulate Travel on Highways, and the Speed, Operation and Load of Vehicles thereon" were read a second time with an amendment, and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting that body that the House of Assembly had agreed to the said amendments with an amendment and requested 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 amendments made by the House of Assembly in and upon the amendments sent down by the Legislative Council in and upon the Bill sent up entitled "'An Act to Provide for the Construction, Reconstruction and Maintenance of Highroads" without amendment.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 209 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Banks and Banking," 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 Relating to Firearms and other Weapons" with some amendments, in which they request the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—These amendments, Mr. Speaker, amount to nothing. In section 2 of the Bill as it went up it was provided that no person should have in his possession or carry a firearm without a certificate. These amendments merely ask that the word "ammunition" should be inserted, so that the section will read that no person shall have in his possession or carry, etc., either firearms or ammunition without having a certificate. The ammunition referred to is only the ammunition for small weapons. In the Act the definition of firearms is given, and a definition of ammunition also, which restricts ammunition to ammunition required for small weapons. The idea is to bring the two under one head.

The next amendment is merely a misprint in section 7, subsection 9. In the Bill that went up, the section read—"not exceeding 23 calibre." That should read 22 calibre. That is the regular thing. I do not see any reason for delaying these amendments unless the House desires to take any more time on them.

On motion of the Honourable Minister of Justice, the said amendments were read a first time, and with unanimous consent the said amendments were read a second time and concurred in, and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting that body that the said amendments had been agreed to without amendment.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—I would like to table the answer to question number one on yesterday's order paper, asked by Mr. Warren. I might say that the minutes of the Railway Commission have not yet been supplied me, but they will be supplied, and I expect to lay the original book on the table of the House to-morrow, and I would ask that this book be not taken out of the House, but that any of the members who wish to read them would do so here.

MR. WARREN—If I might have

access to the Minute Book there would be no necessity to bring it down to the House.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—There might be some other members of the House who would want to see it. We do not mind bringing it down.

Answer to Question Asked by Mr. Warren. No. 1 on Order Paper of March 30th.

1. The functions of the Board are purely advisory.

2. and 3. The Board was appointed by the Governor-in-Council. The Government in office when the Railway was taken over from the Reid Newfoundland Company instituted the practice of appointing a Board, and the manner of keeping accounts, which have been followed ever since. The policy to be followed, and the exact legal status of the Railway, have not been definitely decided, because it was deemed desirable that experience should be acquired before legislating.

4. The Prime Minister, the Colonial Secretary, the Minister of Finance and Customs, the Hon. Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Peter Cashin, M.H.A., are the members of the Board.

5. They receive no pay or emolument.

Questions 6, 7, 8 and 9 have been stricken out by request of Mr. Warren.

Questions 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, 18, 19, 20 and 21 are argumentative, and I do not desire to express an opinion.

15 and 16. The receipts of the Railway are paid into the Railway's bank account in the Bank of Montreal, and disbursements are paid out of that account. The representative of the Auditor General audits the accounts from time to time, and reports to him.

22. The Auditor General has not to my knowledge drawn attention to any irregularities under the present Board.

23. Yes.

24. Minutes of the Board's meetings are regularly kept.

25. Minute Book will be laid upon the Table.

26, 27 and 28. The Board has no standing solicitor.

29. A statement of amounts paid for legal services since June 1924, will be laid upon the Table of the House.

30. A statement, duly audited, will in due course be laid before both branches of the Legislature, showing the financial transactions of the Railway for the past year.

Answer to Juestion No. 3 on Order Paper of March 30th Asked by Mr. Warren.

1. The members of the Board of Liquor Control are in receipt of pay regularly.

2. They have been paid by the authority of the Governor-in-Council, the amounts fixed for salaries being subject to the approval of the House of Assembly at this Session.

3 and 4. The property and profits in the possession of the Board from time to time are the property of the Colony, but the profits do not become part of the Consolidated Revenue Fund until turned over by the Board to the Minister of Finance. The Board receives and disburses money, and its operations are subject to the audit of a person appointed by the Governor-in-Council. The Auditor General was appointed in March.

The answers to questions 5, 6 and 13, 14, 15 and 17 are matters of law, upon which I do not care to express an opinion.

7 and 8. The salaries of the members of the Board are paid out of the monies of the Board.

9. The Board's receipts are paid into the Board's bank account.

10 and 11. The Legislature does not control the appropriation of the Board's money.

12. To the Colony.

16. The Auditor General has not drawn attention to any irregularities of the Board of Liquor Control.

18. When the Board has submitted a balance sheet to the Government, (as it will in due course), such balance sheet, with the Auditor's report thereon, will, of course, be laid before both branches of the Legislature.

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 Lobster Fishery" with some amendments in which they request the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion of the Honourable Minister of Justice the said amendments were read a first time, and with unanimous consent the said amendments were read a second time and concurred in, and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting that body that the said amendments had been agreed to without amendment.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled 'An Act to Amend an Act entitled Of the House of Asembly'" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 172 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series), entitled Of the Survey of Foreign Going and Labrador Vessels'" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Terra Nova Sulphite Company Act, 1920," was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finace and Customs, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—The vote of eighteen hundred dollars, which is an increase of $400.00, is for the Secretary and Accountant, Mr. Godden. This is not really an increase, but makes up for the extras which he formerly received. I must say that the salary is not at all fitting for a man of the ability and competency of Mr. Godden, and I would like to see it made more. His work is of a most important character and his salary is not at all commensurate with the services rendered.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman. I am glad that the salary of Mr. Godden has been raised to the present figure, and I would like to say that I know from experience that it is not an increase. Mr. Godden is in every way worthy of whatever remuneration may be given him. When I went in that Department first he was filling the position of Secretary only, but later he took over the keeeping of the books, but received no increase, as we were trying to keep the esti-

mates down, and while he is now getting $1,800.00, I know that he is not being paid sufficient for the amount of work done. There is only one other matter in connection with this Department that I would like to refer to, and I may as well deal with it now as I am on my feet. I mean the salary of the Superintendent of Constabulary. I would like to point out the difference in his salary and that of the District Inspectors. He is next in command to the Inspector General, and has a position of great responsibility. In addition to that, in the natural course of events he will have to train himself for the higher position, if it is not made a political sop, and I think he ought to get a little more than he does in excess of the Inspectors. I know this vote is like the laws of the Medes and Persians and cannot be altered, but I would like to draw the attention of the Honorable the Minister of Finance and the Honorable the Minister of Justice to it, and would urge that if possible it be increased in Supplemental Supply.

MR. BROWNE—Mr. Chairman, I would like to endorse the suggestion put forward by the honorable member for Fortune, Mr. Warren. As the Honorable Minister of Justice and all who attend the Magistrate's Court are aware, the Superintendent of Constabulary has a great deal of work to attend to, and he fills his position most capably. I think it only proper that he should get an increase, and I trust it will be granted him, as he is worthy of it.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, as the discussion has been raised by the ex-Prime Minister, I would like to say a word not as to this particular vote but in behalf of the ordinary constables. We all know that they are not paid as well as they ought to be. It is all very well to pass resolutions of congratulation and distribute $100.00 amongst them after a fire in appreciation of their work, but I think they ought to express it in better form. The position of the ordinary constable is no sinecure, and when we consider the excellent class of man that is in the force, the fact that most of them are married, and the high cost of living, we must admit that they are underpaid and are often up against it to make ends meet. I would like to see a move made by the Honorable the Minister of Justice to place the average constable on a more equitable basis than at present.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, perhaps it is only right for me, considering the views expressed on this matter, to say that I do not at all deny the need of a raise in pay for the ordinary policeman. As a matter of fact I have always held this opinion, as these men are as a class intelligent, painstaking and have all the qualities that make for efficiency, and it must be admitted that the pay is not sufficient for the standard of men we have in the force. As I said when I was on the opposite side of the House, in the conduct of their office the matter of graft has never been brought against one of them in any shape or form, and this, I think, is a splendid tribute when one reads of the conditions elsewhere. I trust that conditions will so shape themselves that the Government will be able to do something in connection with this matter. Another subject on which I have strong personal views, though up to the moment have not been able to get the Government to fully agree with me, and that is, the Magistracy. I think that the Magistrates throughout the Island are disgracefully underpaid. It must be remembered that particularly in the outports a Magistrate looms up prominently; and has to take the post

of importance at various times. Today we have a particularly fine class of men holding the position of Magistrate and the salary voted is not such as will allow them to properly uphold the dignity of their position. It is a poor situation for such men to be in to have to do things which often put them in an embarrassing position. As far as my personal wishes are concerned I hope conditions will become such that we will be able to carry out my desires. As to the increase in the Department of Registry of Deeds, the amount covers a small allowance to Mr. Maddick and Miss Kavanagh. Mr. Adams has been ill and they have had to do extra work, and the amount granted is very small in comparison with their services. Mr. Maddick is getting only $1,800.00, and Miss Kavanagh is advanced from $780.00 to $840.00, and both deserve more. There is one other item to which I would like to invite attention. As I explained before, it is intended to ask for an extra $1,000.00 in order to cover the extra cost of the serving of processes. At present this falls on the creditor, and the sending of Sheriffs out of town would be avoided if we had deputies in the outports who could be secured by the payment of a small retainer. This would abolish the enmity which exists at present, as in the case of the hire of a motor boat by the Sheriff which exceeds the amount allowed for the mileage. This new provision would improve the serving of processes and reduce the cost to the person taking out the summons.

MR. MOORE—Mr. Chairman, while we are on this vote in connection with the Department of Justice I would like to say a few words in the way of an appeal for the members of the Constabulary. When I was in Opposition I supported the raising of pay for the recruit. That was when Mr. Warren was Minister of Justice. Now every year we come in here and raise the pay of people in every Government Department but the police force. Unfortunately the police do not seem to have the pull that others have in the different departments of the Public Service. I have been advocating the raising of the pay for members of the police force for seventeen years and I am delighted this afternoon to make another appeal on their behalf. The Honorable Ministetr of Justice has pointed out that he hoped that conditions would so shape themselves that the Government would be able to do something for our policemen. I sincerely trust that the Government will take this matter into their earnest consideration at the earliest opportunity and I hope that when the Estimates come down to this House again that those who protect us while we are sleeping will be more equitably provided for. I know that there is a great deal of dissatisfaction existing at present amongst sergeants and acting sergeants of police over the matter of salary. I know of a case in which a man, who has nine children, cannot pay his bills on account of the small pay he is getting, after spending twenty-seven years in the force. He is too old now to go and look for another job. Now when this matter asking for a raise of pay for our police comes up in this House again I propose to give it my hearty support.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, in reference to local constables, I would like to ask the Minister of Justice what is the experience of local constables in outports as against the regular police constable? I notice that the local constable's pay is from $150 down to $50 a year. What is the difference in the administration? Do they give as good a value?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—No. There is all the differ-

ence in the world. A local constable is only a part time man and he may be running a shop or a trap skiff as his daily avocation, whereas the regular police officer gives his time exclusively to police duties. The work of a local constable is only an incident unless any particular occasion arises. You cannot compare local constables with the regular police officers.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, I quite understand what the Honorable Minister means. At the same time my point is whether local constables would not fill the bill all over the country and increase the police force here in St. John's.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—In practice in any kind of a big outport centre they are now trying to get regular police constables. We had to send two constables to the West Coast this year as the local constable does not seem to fill the bill. The local constable is not going to handle a situation the same as the regular policeman. As a matter of fact we have requests from Grand Falls and Corner Brook for more policemen now.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, during the time that I have been in the House of Assembly I have always seen people getting up and asking for a decent pay for regular police officers, but nobody seems to make any move for local constables. The trouble is that the whole police force is not properly treated and has never been so. I think that the duty of any Government or of any Minister of Justice is to see that when new appointments or advancements are to be made that long and faithful service should be given preference.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I quite agree with the honorable member.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman, I quite agree with the remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition in reference to the Police Department. There is no question about it but that the Constabulary has suffered within the past few years by the constant resignations which makes it difficult to keep it at that standard of efficiency which is required to meet present-day conditions and unless the Government recognize the fact that they must pay the public servants equally as well as private individuals they cannot hope to be able to keep the police force up to the same standard as it can be kept if they give a wage to compete with private companies or individuals.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I quite see the point that the honorable member is alluding to. We are turning down our men for industrial concerns.

MR. GRIMES—Unless we do something to improve the situation and hold out inducements to men to stay in the force, that sort of thing will continue. Is the Minister of Justice taking that into consideration?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Yes, it is quite true as far as I am concerned, but unless the Minister of Finance tells me that we can afford it I can do nothing.

MR. GRIMES—Haven't you got a pretty good surplus this year? We read in the papers that you have.

MIN. OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—What you see in the papers is only in connection with the revenue collected in St. John's.

MR. GRIMES—I understand that the revenue collected in the port of St. John's is in the neighborhood of four hundred thousand over last year. That is very encouraging, and I think the Minister ought to consult with the Minister of Justice with a view to increasing the salaries to a point that will make it worth while to stay on the job. Particularly if you want a good police force, you

have to hold out such inducements to men to stay in the force instead of resigning at the first opportunity that present itself.

MR. HICKMAN—What is that about the Labrador Boundary?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—That ten thousand is a vote taken for the purpose of covering the fees that we are continually under as regards the Counsel across the water, and the expenses are continually going on. This vote can only be applied according as the vouchers are passed by the Auditor General. Whether ten thousand or one thousand will be paid during this year I cannot say. There are certain amounts that we are pledged to. Sir Patrick McGrath has to be paid for carrying on the work. We will probably get a substantial bill from the Solicitors Burn & Berridge, on the other side. When we get the bills that will come for the hearing of the case we will want a real vote. It will probably be found that we will want a supplementary supply; this does not represent any definite thing.

MR. HICKMAN—Is there anybody in Newfoundland under salary?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—The only thing is the amount paid Sir Patrick McGrath. He renders a bill for services from time to time. I don't know what the bill will be, it is some time since he got any amount. He has people in different places continually gathering up stuff. All the work in connection with the maps was gathered through that quarter. Vouchers are furnished in the ordinary way. Since I have been here it so happens that no bill has been rendered by him. You may recollect that last year something in the vicinity of two thousand five hundred or three thousand dollars was the allowance paid to him for about a year's work.

MR. HICKMAN—Has there been any allowance paid in connection with the Hague Arbitration Court?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—You were speaking of the pecuniary claims; that will also have to be taken by additional estimates. There again is a case in which it is difficult to do more than take a vote on it. We cannot tell what the absolute cost may be. I would like to say that the actual hearing of this case will be taking place in October, this year. The United States claim against the Colony is one hundred thousand dollars. I don't think the Colony will be called upon to pay such an amount as that.

MR. HICKMAN—Have you any idea as to what that big volume is going to cost? The cost of printing and getting it up?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—We have no bill for that yet.

MR. GODDEN—I would like to ask the Minister of Justice if this is for legal bills on account of the Labrador Boundary.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, this is a vote that has been disbursed according as the bills come. It is not a vote for the hearing before the Privy Council.

MR. GODDEN—The costs of the Labrador boundary are paid from your department?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—The control of the disbursements is in my department. If the Hon. Member is desirous of having anything looked up I think that it could be done.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister of Justice if there has been any effort made to have some of the claims settled before the hearing of the case in October.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I think that the Prime Minister has some correspondence on this matter.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I have some correspondence in this connection which I hape to table not later than to-morrow. I mean to place

it before the Government to-night and if they are satisfied it will be tabled to-morrow.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I would like to explain in connection with this that we require fifteen thousand dollars more to pay the teachers salaries. Because the teachers are of higher grade they require higher salaries.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, the Hon. John Harvey made a bequest of four thousand dollars for five years for the inspection of schools and now that the five years have elapsed we cannot get along without that inspection. Now that nobody else has come forward with a bequest in the handsome way that Mr. Harvey did the Government has got to carry it along.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, the position with regard to that is to explain to the House, that when the Morris Government came in they changed the pension scheme. The teachers at that time had a fund amounting to sixty thousand dollars and they paid each teacher a pension of one hundred dollars. The Morris Government made an arrangement by which they took over the funds of the teachers and instead paid a regular pension to each teacher of two thirds of his salary. That being the case we find that there will be required at least one thousand dollars a year for some years to come. It is a liability created by that act of Parliament.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Hon. Colonial Secretary what success has come out of the regulations that were made lest year with reference to the conveyance of patients to St. John's for entrance to the General Hospital. I think these regulations were put in force with the idea of cutting down expense, but I find that the vote here for conveyance is just the same this year as it was last year?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I might say in reply to the honorable member that we have had great results from the regulations that were published. Prior to those regulations there were two or three boarding houses here in the city that were filled to capacity with patients waiting for entrance into the General Hospital. To-day those boarding houses are practically empty. With regard to this vote, a great deal more than this was spent last year, as the supplemental supply will show. It is hoped this year to keep within the vote as a result of these regulations.

MR. HICKMAN—In addition to that you have to pay board.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Yes, but that only amounts to from seventy cents to a dollar a day; and then under these new regulations there will not be so much crowding of boarding houses. The people will be waiting at their homes until they can get into the General Hospital, instead of waiting here in boarding houses, and not very comfortable either.

MR. HICKMAN—While we are on this vote, now, Mr. Chairman, I might bring to the attention of the Government a conversation that I had not a long time ago with a well known physician in St. John's, who has duties at the General Hospital. He says that the Government will be compelled very soon to build a wing on the General Hospital because at present there are only two or three private rooms there, and there are a great many people who want private rooms; and he says that a new wing consisting solely of private rooms would be self supporting. And he says that at present it is very much needed. At present there are many people who are willing to pay for a private room, whereas they are compelled to go into a ward where there are lots of other sick people; and generally it is not all that it should be; and this gentleman says that the Govt., in the very near future will have to give

consideration to the building of a wing; and I should judge that he is quite right. I know several people who want a private room and are willing to pay for it, but because there is only a limited number of private rooms there they are compelled to go into the ward.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, I am glad that the honorable member has brought this matter up, because I think that the time is soon coming, if it is not here already, when this whole thing will have to be ventilated. The General Hospital is looked upon to-day as a free institution. I had a letter from a prominent clergyman the other day in one of the Western districts, in which he claims that we should not charge anybody for going into the General Hospital. That is a position, of course, which is untenable, and is not in practice in any part of the world. As the leader of the Opposition has suggested the building of a private pavilion is one thing that has proved to be successful in places outside the Colony.

I know that in Halifax, much against the desires and wishes of the Provincial Government, the medical authorities there, after years of propaganda and persuasion got the Provincial Government to build a private pavilion next to the Halifax General Hospital; and that pavilion is composed of private rooms—private wards and private rooms, and I think there are also children's wards. That pavilion to-day is not alone supporting itself, but has a sufficient surplus to help support the General Hospital; and until the time when we differentiate between the paying patients and the other patients, we are going to have the same difficulties that we have to-day.

All the patients whether paying patients or not go in the same door, and get the one treatment and the one food, and go into the one ward. That is alright in a way, and nothing should be said against doing what we can for those that are helpless; but we should not allow those who are well able to pay for themselves to get free board and free treatment and free medical attendance.

I have seen the way things are handled at the Grace Maternity Hospital, and I know a little about the system. They have first of all what are known as dollar rooms. In the Grace Maternity Hospital they are all graded according to the number of beds that are in them. In the larger wards, with more beds in them they pay a dollar a day, and then it is graded up according to the number of beds in the room to five dollars a day.

The experience that they have had up there is that women who go into the wards and pay a dollar a day, find after a few days that they would prefer a little more privacy, and the result is that they move from the less expensive rooms to the more expensive ones. I know of one case of a woman fom Harbour Grace, who came there, and went into the dollar ward, and after being there for two or three days, she moved into another room where she had to pay five dollars a day.

That same principle can be applied to the General Hospital. There are several people who go in there, and think that because it is a public institution that they should not have to pay anything for it. The difficulty is that there is no difference there. The people all go in one door, and receive the same treatment, and the same food whether they pay for it or not.

If you have a private pavilion, then all the paying patients could be put into that pavilion, and the General Hospital would be able to handle all the other patients that come in, and there would be none of the delays that we have now.

If the Government does decide—and

I may say the matter has not yet been considered by the Government, although the Commission has considered it—but if the Government does decide to build a pavilion, I have no hesitation in saying that in a very short time it will pay for itself, and relieve the congestion at the General Hospital, so that it will be able to handle all the patients that come in from the outports without any delays at all. In that pavilion there will be several people willing to pay anywhere from five to ten dollars a day.

Then I think we will solve all our hospital troubles. At present the work is so scattered that the expenses increase enormously. At present we have patients in the Grace, St. Clare's, General, and Sudbury Hospitals, and the Sanatorium—in fact all over the place—and besides that we have doctors with them. If all the work was concentrated under one medical head with a staff of doctors, it will be done in a more thorougher manner and about half the cost entailed at present. That gentleman in my opinion is the solution of this hospital trouble. So far the Commission of Enquiry on Public Institutions has not had time to give this matter immediate attention, owing to the pressure of other duties, for when it is taken up and organized, and an addition provided to the hospital, I think it can be arranged with the doctors, relieving officers, etc. to have the work done more efficiently.

MR. LAKE—I would like to ask if there is any grant in this country for artificial limbs.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY —Yes there is a small grant.

MR. DUFF—Might I ask for the sake of information how the vote for the Orphanages is made up.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY —On a per capita basis, so much for each child.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Chairman, while we are on this vote I would like to ask for an increase for the Relieving Officer at Lewisporte, Mr. S. R. Jiggs. He gives his whole time to the work of relief, and does little else, and is not at all adequately paid for his services. I have not had time to go through the estimates and see what he receives but he has written repeatedly, and I think was promised an increase. I learn now that he gets only $50.00 which is not half enough for his work. Particularly in the years of 1921-1922-1923, he had all the work to do pertaining to his part of the Bay, and lost all his time at it. He has been writing to me and other Members for the District, and also to the Charities Department, but apparently he has been ignored. I now ask that his case be given consideration, and that he be given an increase. He does his work thoroughly, and is well worth an advance.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask if there has been any change as to the Relieving Officer in the Straits of Belle Isle. Under the late Government, Mr. Chambers, was appointed to replace Mr. Batten who was moved to Bonne Bay as Sub-Collector, but I cannot see that there is anybody at Flower's Cove. Mr. Chambers has been doing the work, but I notice that there is no vote for him.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—I will see the Commissioner of Charities about it.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, I would also like to ask the Government or some one connected with the Government to write to the Grenfell Mission, at St. Anthony, to which the Government is paying $5,000.00 a year, and ask them to keep out of politics.

MR. LAKE—Mr. Chairman, I would like to know who gets the $850.00 grant for the Grand Bank Hospital.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—It goes to the Board.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY —In connection with this matter, I

may say that the Hospital is in charge of a Nurse and supervised by a Doctor. This year there was a little addition made as they were short in their funds.

MR. LAKE—Mr. Chairman, I was going to remark that the Hospital at Grand Bank does far more work than is imagined by many people. Grand Bank is the seat of the bait and ice industry, and very many vessels come there with members of their crews sick or suffering from broken limbs. Since the inauguration of hoisting engines on vessels, many men have been seriously injured, and might have died but for the treatment accorded them at this Hospital, and I think some means should be arrived at whereby it would be given a bigger vote, and in some manner endowed. The Hospital there is more or less isolated from St. John's, and the grant of $850.00 does not begin to pay the needs of the fishermen and the Hospital has to be kept up by private donations of food, clothing, etc. I hope that the Government will see their way clear to considerably enlarge this plant.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY —Mr. Chairman, I would like to endorse everything has been said in connection with this matter for the Honorable Member for Burin, and to add that it is to the credit of the people of Grand Bank that they practically support the Hospital by themselves. This amount of $850.00 is only an augmentation. I think those in charge of the Hospital charge fees and send their accounts in here, and I have been deeply impressed by the economic way in which the money has been spent. The people at Grand Bank have set an example in connection with their Hospital that may well be followed by those of other places.

MR. LAKE—Mr. Chairman, I think that this grant of $850.00 has been more of a political grant in the past. At any rate the amount is not at all adequate for the work done in the Hospital which is practically kept up by private subscriptions and I contend that this $850.00 granted by the Government has not been spent as it should be. Now I do not want to have moneys spent in my district unless they are spent rightly and properly. I think that if this Hospital was endowed with a larger grant it would relieve the Government of considerable expense which they are called upon to meet from time to time in connection with the Public Charities Department.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, I understand that there are five cots in the Hospital at Grand Bank, and I think, perhaps, if something was done towards increasing the number of cots there, it would really mean a saving for the Government. A few weeks ago I had a telegram from a constituent of mine saying that the Doctor there had ordered him to undergo an immediate operation and suggested that he go to the Grand Bank Hospital. The man was poor; in fact I knew of his circumstances. I went and got in touch with Mr. Bartlett here to try and get the man into the General Hospital, but Mr. Bartlett was unable to do anything in the matter. However, we managed eventually to bring the patient on here and had him put in the General Hospital. Now I think that, if the Government would add a little more to this grant for the Grand Bank Hospital, it would be the means of putting more cots in there whereby more patients could be taken care of, including patients who are unable to pay; besides the Government would save moneys that they are invariably called upon to pay for passages and other expenses for outport people going to and from St. John's, and in the particular case that I have just referred to, the expenses would not have been incurred if the vote was increased for Grand Bank Hospital.

MR. LAKE—Mr. Chairman, This Hospital is not only used by the people of Grand Bank. To-day the majority of our bank fishermen are from Fortune Bay and I know that there are continual demands on the Grand Bank Hospital from all other sections of the South West Coast as well. Now Dr. Burke of Grand Bank has no charge of that Hospital, unfortunately. It is in charge of Dr. McDonald, who is also the Magistrate, and he being an old man has not the time nor attention to give to it that he would like. Still the grant here is not to impress upon the House the necessity of a further grant for that Hospital and if we had a grant of four or five thousand dollars the Hospital could be maintained as it should be and we could take care of all the South West Coast.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, With regard to this vote for Inspector of Meats, I would like to ask the Colonial Secretary what is the real position to-day respecting meat coming into Newfoundland, and what are the regulations between us and Canada?

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY —Mr. Chairman, I do not think that I am able to answer the honorable member definitely, but I understand that meats coming to Newfoundland from Canada must have a Canadian Inspection stamp on them and they will not be admitted to Newfoundland without that stamp. This matter came to my attention about a month ago when there was a certain business man in St. John's who had some meat held up in Sydney and I think there was also another case which my honorable friend knows about. This meat arrived in Sydney with no Canadian stamp on it and for this reason the Canadian Authorities would not allow it to leave there. This meat came from Prince Edward Island and evidently those who shipped it were not aware of the regulations that were in force. I was convinced and satisfied that there was nothing wrong about the thing and I told Dr. Brehm to get in touch with the authorities at Ottawa to have the shipment of meat released and which I think was done. It is not a regulation of ours, but the Canadian authorities now will not allow meat to leave Canada without a stamp on it.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, that matter came up during my term of office and it was the subject of discussion in the newspapers at the time. Under the Canadian law, no meat was allowed to be exported from Canada without having a stamp on it to show that it was of sound quality, but for some reason or other that law was abrogated for about six months and representations were made to our Government, I think by the Canadian authorities, asking us if we would permit that meat to come into Newfoundland for consumption. Subsequently we found that the meat that then was coming in here was not the same as the meat which bore the stamp, and while this Government had given its consent to the suggestion of the Canadian Government that the meat be allowed in her, although, it would not have made any difference in any case, as we have no regulations on the matter, yet representations were made to us that meats were not up to the standard, and after the embargo was removed for two months the Government again put it on, and there was great discussion on the advisability of that. That was more than a year ago; we stipulated practically without authority that no meat would be allowed into Newfoundland without a government stamp. I think it was the result of experience, if my recollection serves me right. Meat without a stamp was not fit for consumption. We asked the Canadian Government to prevent the exportation of any such meat to Newfoundland without their stamp on it, and I

really think it was a very safe course to pursue.

MR. LAKE—Does this apply to St. John's?

MR. WARREN—It applies to St. John's or the outports. It applies to the whole Island. The Canadian Law is that you cannot export meat without a stamp. They asked us if we would oblige them and allow the meat to come in here just as they sold it. We said yes, though we had no authority. This came under our law, then when we found the meat was not good we asked the Canadian authorities to stop the export of it into Newfoundland or anywhere unless it had a stamp.

MR. SCAMMELL—I think the explanation made by Mr. Warren is a very good one and that the Newfoundland Government should do everything possible to have a thorough inspection of meat made, coming into the country.

In connection with these two things that come to my notice an acquaintance of mine solely on his own initiative bought some meat from his friends. He got down as far as Sydney and when it came to be exported the Canadian authorities would not pass it out. I went to see if I could get it through for him. I talked it over with the Colonial Secretary and he did his best, but before we could do anything it was sold by the authorities for the benefit of those concerned. I am thoroughly in accord with the idea that the meat coming in here should be inspected and the Government should do everything possible to work in harmony with the Canadian Government.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY —Mr. Chairman I may say for the information of the House that our meat inspector has just returned. He had gone up to Canada for this very purpose, to ascertain what the Canadian rules are. I feel sure that he will have all the necessary information. We have the evidence of professional men who tell us of the diseases that are contracted through the use of impure meats, if we are lax in our regulations here. If meats are not up to standard we should make every effort to see that they are not imported into Newfoundland.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, I think that in the opinion of 99 per cent. of the people of this island we are now discussing the most important department in the Government, the Department of Marine and Fisheries. And in going over this I am sorry to find that there is no provision whatever made for enlarging our fisheries or for treating it more scientifically than we are doing at present. I spoke about this matter, sir, when I addressed the House on the Address in Reply. And I again desire to draw the attention of the House to the importance of this industry, especially in view of the large number of unemployed there are at present in this country. While I approve of the Highways Bill and the money spent there and the money spent on the dock and in other directions by the Government, I really do think that I ought to impress upon the Government the advisability of spending some amount in order to try and encourage the fisheries, the prosecution of which in this country has got to be made practical. Compare this country with other countries as far as the fisheries are concerned, as far as the main industry is concerned, and you will find that we are a long way behind the others. Our fisheries mean an awful lot to us. They mean very little to Canada. But they mean more to the Canadians in figures than our fisheries do to us. There they have a scientific university. They have many universities—biological departments. They are trying to do everything they possibly can to educate the men to

catch fish and to grow crops and to market their produce. What I mean by crops are vegetable crops, fruit crops, etc. There is at the services of the ordinary producer which he may get to put to account in the work that he is doing. Now to a small extent the Board of Trade in Newfoundland has been doing its quota, something towards the improvement of the amount of knowledge which the ordinary fisherman ought to have with regard to the fishery he is engaged in. In a few days there will be a crowd of fishermen down to the Department of Marine and Fisheries drawing for favourite trap berths. Now does it ever appear to anybody that he ought to enquire why a particular berth is a good berth? Why another berth is a poor berth, and why it is necessary to draw lots for the berths and things of that sort? We have no institution in this country which could explain to the fishermen why a certain berth is a good berth and they ought to try and get it. But we ought to try and do something in that direction. The people are different now from what they were 40 years ago.

Remember Mr. Neilsen, who was brought here some years ago. I was a small boy at the time. He was brought here in connection with the hatchery at Dildo. He was hounded out of the place. And although an expert was brought from Norway, which is one of the most expert countries in the world as regards the codfishery and our greatest rival, the fish is still caught and dried and exported the same as it was years ago. I think that we ought to do something and try and tell the fishermen why such a berth is a good berth. Now the other day I referred to Mr. Huntsman in this House and stated that when he was a member of the Biological Board of Canada he had come down here last year and had in his pamphlet proved that the temperature of the water had a great deal to do with the main knowledge of where fish would be caught. And I recommend that pamphlet to the perusal of every member of this House.

Now I am not a fisherman, that I admit, and I do not know anything about it with the exception of those of the fresh water which I have lured onto my hook; but I do think that the fine efforts that have been made by the Board of Trade at their expense should not be ignored, and I think that these reports that we have got from Mr. Huntsman and Mr. Taylor are sufficient encouragement for us to do something, however small it may be. Now as a matter of fact when the Prime Minister referred to the thermometer in his speech the other day there was a certain man in the House listening to him and he is, I suppose, the biggest fishkiller that we have in Newfoundland or Lunenburg, and when he was speaking to me afterwards he asked me if the Prime Ministeer was joking about the thermometer as he thought that the thermometer had nothing to do with fish. Perhaps the member for Burin knows to whom I refer? I told the gentleman that I did not think that he was. He told me that as far as the bank fishing is concerned that the banking skippers go to certain places on the Banks according to the condition of the weather in January and February. Of course they do it by the rule of thumb and their intuition and go according to the depth of water. If this is a practical result we ought to do all that we can to help them by all the means at our disposal to obtain more information that scientific men have been able to collect. I have spoken casually to fishermen and I find by reading my papers and other things that there are certain places where the fisheries are threatened by the use of

oil in the boats. The Evening Telegram had an editorial a few days ago on the subject. I have in my desk a clipping from the London Times, and in England the vessels are not allowed to pump out fuel oil in navigable waters, and they stopped it, because the oil floats on the top of the water and spreads to such an extent that it prevents the oxygen from getting into the water so that not only the fish but the food that the fish consume cannot breathe. Now in this country there is no doubt that the motors which they use in the motor boats pump the oil from their exhausts and the effect must be harmful, and I would suggest to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that he should collect all the information that he can on that point. Now in Scotland, where they prosecute the herring fishery, the herring completely disappeared and they could not find out the cause for some time, and then it was accounted for by the fact the oil burning vessels that had been sunk by the Germans during the war. After some time the tanks that contained the oil had become corroded and the oil had come up and floated on the surface of the water and destroyed not only the herring but also their food. The failure of the herring fisheries was due entirely to that. I do not know very much about the matter. I am only repeating what I have heard and I would suggest to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the advisability of taking the question up and finding out the effect of the use of the oil in motors in this country. There is only one other matter to which I would like to draw the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and that is the marketing of some of our products. I am not going to touch upon the fish regulations or the standardization of fish, but upon the selling of our fish. Here we have, as everybody knows, in Fortune Bay the home of the herring, although they disappeared for a long while. They are back again now, bigger and more plentiful than ever, and if you go along the stage or the flake and wherever you look you will see the bodies of dead herring. Now with regard to the smoking business up at Harbour Breton, they are doing their best to export the products as best they can, but there is a market for herring which we have not yet explored and we have the machinery to explore it.

We have the High Commisioner in London and there is a Department of the British Government at our disposal, namely the Department of Over Seas Trade. And there are purchases made by Russia of large quantities of herring from Great Britain. I do not know very much about the details. It is sufficient that this should be explored. I merely mention this because when I was in the Government I was asked by a firm on Water Street to do something about it. I do not know whether it has been explored or not. Perhaps when I have finished the Leader of the Opposition will get up and give us his experience, which has been much greater than mine. But I say these things and I think that I should take an occasion like this to bring matters like this to the attention of the Government and the Responsible members. I know that Letvia which is a very small country bought over five thousand tons of herring from Great Britain. And besides that place you have Esthonia and all these little republics. But if it has been properly explored then I have nothing more to say and it is unprofitable, but if it has not been explored then I suggest to the Government that they take advantage of the Hight Commissioner and the Over Seas Trade and get in touch with the markets of that nature.

That applies not only to our herring but to many other of our products. There is one other matter that appeals to me. Of course the Bait Act is in force, but the Minister of Marine and Fisheries sent me a circular about a firm in St. Pierre which is going to send vessels to buy fish and I only want to express the hope that while it should do all it can to prevent the exportation of bait that everything possible should be done to encourage the enterprise of the company in order that a new market for our fish will be found on the West Coast. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have spoken very disjointedly and my utterances have been rather broken.

I did not prepare a speech on this thing but I thought that when this vote came up I ought to draw the matter to the attention of the Government and mention these points. If the suggestions are not followed then I have wasted my time, but if the Government decided to follow them and something is added to the knowledge of the fisheries of this country, then I have not wasted my time.

MR. LAKE—Mr. Chairman, I can quite understand how it is that Mr. Warren has entrenched himself in the hearts of the people when he knows so much about the fishery; he seems to know all about Fortune Bay. Captain Vatcher Cluett is the name of the gentleman to whom he had been speaking about the temperature of the water the other day and who said that it was the first time that he had heard of test being made and that he thought that it would be a good idea; now, as you may not know—one hundred fathoms is the depth of water that our bank fishermen use at the last of March and April and the skippers have to follow the fish down the Straits until the summer when they go into the shallow water. Now I notice in the estimates, on page fifty-five, that there is a vote of two thousand dollars for the protection of the fisheries; this to my mind is very small because as Mr. Warren said the fisheries are the mainstay of this Country, and this Department has only a vote of two thousand dollars: I think that is a joke. I was very much amused the other day when the Hon. Member for Carbonear, Mr. Duff, asked the Minister of Marine & Fisheries how many vessels were presecuting the Bank fishery, and if any had sailed, and he replied—that he did not know. Now I have in my possession the facts that they have all sailed and reports say that they are all well fished, and, Mr. Chairman, I want to inform the Hon. Members of this House that there are thirty vessels presecuting fisheries and there is not one of them reported as far as the Government is concerned; to my mind that is too serious a matter for us to neglect. Now, this brings another matter to my mind, and that is, the question of the bait supply of this country; this is a very serious matter and yet the Minister of Agriculture and Mines can get money for the starting of some kind of agricultural farm, but we cannot get money for a "bait depot" in Burin; BURIN DISTRICT is the home of the trawl fishery of this Country and still for years they have been trying to get a "bait depot" started in Burin: I believe that we would have twice the population in Burin that we have at the present time if this depot were started, because, at the present time people are being simply driven away because they cannot bet bait.

Mr. Chairman, that brings me to another point; speaking of bait, I have a letter to-day from the District of Ferryland, which is represented by my friend here on my right, Mr. Moore, whereby, the people of Ferryland are trying to prohibit the bank fishermen of the West Coast from hauling bait in that District. One thing, I think, that the fishermen of Newfoundland—(I speak for the fishermen in this House)—should not be

prevented from hauling bait anywhere and any place they like, and I do not know what to think of anybody or any body of men, or any House of Assembly who would prohibit any man from hauling bait anywhere on his own shores.

Capt. John Lewis was in this House once for a time, and I am the second bank fisherman who has been in the House of Assembly; I do not think that Captain Lewis would have done such a thing, and I do not think that the House of Assembly to-day will put up with any such rights being given to any man or any body of men in Newfoundland. Do you know, Mr. Chairman, that there are places in the District of Ferryland to-day where the fishermen of the West Coast are not allowed to haul caplin; in Fermeuse, Aquaforte and Renews and some other places we are not allowed to haul bait. I know that when I go back to Burin District—I am going to tell them to haul bait—where they like and how they like; I do not think that any man should stop any other man of his own country from hauling bait where and how he likes. While I am on this point, Mr. Chairman, I might say that last year when our bankers—(I am a bank fisherman and I am speaking for the bank fishermen now, and I know what they want)—were coming back from Labrador, and they do not go there until the time when the Northern fishermen are coming out—they go down about the first of September and return as late as November, but at this time I am talking of—they were coming back about the 4th November with a load of fish, and do you know, Sir, that the Northern fishermen went and destroyed a lot of the gear of those bankers.

MIN. MARINE & FISHERIES—Who do you term the Northern fishermen?

MR. LAKE—North of St. John's, Conception Bay, anywhere north of St. John's; I do not know what part they came from, but they cut all the gear of those vessels. These Northern fishermen then were going to get up a petition to present to this House whereby they would prevent the West Coast fishermen—the bankers—from fishing on the Labrador with trawls; these bankers are fishing practically from January 1st to December 31st; they fish when they can on the Grand Banks, but when September comes they go to Labrador; at the time the majority of the Northern fishermen who have been fishing on Labrador are coming back with their loads; I know there are exceptions to that rule, but at that time the majority of the fishermen are coming out. I contend that the fishermen of this country should be allowed to fish—when, where and how they like, as long as they conform to one rule only—"that the trap is not too small, so that they will not catch the tom cods." The trawl fisherman does not catch anything under a certain size, and it is very few tomcods that these men catch, and yet, we are told that someone is going to bring in a petition to stop trawling.

At a meeting of the Fishery Board the other day I saw a petition from the people of nearly all Green Bay, whereby the inhabitants want to protect nearly the whole of Green Bay against trawling. I contend that we should not stop any man from fishing in his own way, and I hope that this House will not agree to any such proposition as that from Green Bay, and as long as I am a member of the Fishery Board and have anything to say there, we will not grant any rights to anybody in this country against the Newfoundland fishermen.

Looking at all the Honourable Members, they all have some business to look after, but I am the only man who is directly interested in the

Geo. B. Cuyl.

bank fishermen, and I am going to try and advocate their cause.

The bankers in my District have asked me particularly to see that no petition is brought in here to prohibit these men from fishing on Labrador, and I am going to do all that is in my power to protect these fishermen, and see that they are left free to prosecute the fishery where they like. Another thing that I want to speak about, Mr. Chairman, is this system of drawing for trap berths; I do not believe in it. If a man wants to go fishing let him go and fish and have no drawing for trap berths; if this trap berth idea goes on much longer you are going to have the fishery of this country practically in the hands of a few men. Why should not a man from Fortune Bay or Burin come up to St. John's and fish here if he wants to? and why should the people of Fortune say that the people of St. John's should not go to Fortune and fish.

Now, Mr. Chairman, talking about the "bait depot"; the people of Burin have been clamouring to me to try my hardest to get a "bait depot" up at Burin. Now if this House can spend two million dollars on roads, (and Burin has no roads), I am going to see that Burin will get a "bait depot." We do not want a Government bait depot; we want it built by the Government—yes—but we want it built so that all our men can go there and buy, and pay for their bait. The business people of Burin, as you know, to-day are not in a position to put up such a depot, therefore, we want the Government to put up a "bait depot," but we want to pay for the bait, we do not want to be pauperized. The estimates will show that Burin District does not figure very largely in the poor relief. You will see that the vote for Burin Relieving Officer is only $39.00; that compares very favourably with the vote for Upper Island Cove, which comes to $25,000.00 already this year. Upper Island Cove can get twenty-five thousand dollars for pauper relief, while Burin cannot get five thousand dollars to put into a "bait depot"; I think it is a disgrace that it should be impossible in this country to get some money to encourage the fishery, that the fishery should be throttled while the Government will feed a crowd of men who are too lazy to go to work. If Upper Island Cove is getting twenty five thousand dollars, and we cannot get five—there must be something wrong somewhere.

I live in a District which has no roads at all, although it is the most important fishing district in the country. I want to thank Mr. Hickman for the very kind remarks he has made about the District of Burin; I have nothing to say against a road policy; it may be alright, but I cannot say that I am heart and soul in favour of it, but as I said, we have not a road in Burin District, and I believe to-day that we are the biggest fish exporting district in the country. I have heard it said that Grand Bank exported one sixteenth of the fish which goes out of this country; in spite of that we are never done hearing about the two hundred and ten thousand dollars that Grand Bank got; I contend that Grand Bank never got its due; I am going to stand up for Grand Bank and for all the District of Burin, and I say—"if we do not get a road, we should get a "bait depot." Grand Bank and the District of Burin knows the proportion of the road money that should be spent on that district by the Commission, and if they do not get that—they are going to get something else, whereby they can carry on the fisheries.

Talking about the pensions and the Department of Public Charities, I would like to tell the House about

a Bill that I had to present to that Department the other day for $23.60; it took the District representative three months to get it from the Commissioner of Charities. The bill was for two poor widows, and I may tell you that I was not very well pleased when I went down there, at the reception I received. I told the Commissioner exactly what I thought of it, and I would not take back one word of what I said; I think the next time I go down there I will get what I want. The District of Burin does not want pauper relief, but we do want some means whereby we can carry on the fisheries. We do want roads, and we do want our share of that two million dollars, and once again, I want to thank the Leader of the Opposition for his very kind remarks about Burin District.

I do not want to take up the time of the House, but when the question of the fisheries comes up— I am quite a little interested in it.

There is another matter that I want to call attention to, and that is, the matter of lighthouses on Labrador. The Honourable Member for Carbonear, Mr. Duff, made a remark in the House the other day that we did not want lighthouses on Labrador; I am sorry that the Honourable Member is not sitting opposite to me now so that I could tell him that the fishermen do not want anything on the Labrador in the day time but they do want it in the night time. These men work at the fishery all day and start early in the morning, keeping on until late at night, but when night comes—then they want a light to guide them back into the harbour; the banking fishermen do not stay in harbour all day long. I am very much surprised that the Honourable Member for Carbonear should make such a remark. We want lights and more of them, and you should pay men properly to keep these lights in order. Why should not a lighthouse keeper be pensioned just as well as any other official in Newfoundland? A lighthouse keeper is certainly deserving of a pension when he gets to a certain age. Why is it that a fisherman gets only a paltry sum of fifty dollars a year when he is too old to go to the fishery any more, while a man who happens to have been in the Government can get two or three thousand; I am glad to say that the Government to which I belong at present is going to bring in a Bill whereby we will be able to take care of all the old age pensioners at seventy instead of seventy-five. Fifty dollars a year is not nearly enough for any man, and this new Bill will give him a hundred dollars a year, and further than this, it will be continued at $100.00 a year to the widow when her husband dies; nowadays, when the man with fifty dollars a year dies— his wife has to die alongside of him, therefore, I think that the pensions of those who have always been well paid and have had the best of everything should be cut down. What pension does the merchant, mechanic or anyone else who has done his best for the country get? Cut down some of these big pensions or make them general, and give the worn out fishermen $100.00, or even more, and when he dies let it go on to his widow so that she can continue to live and not starve as is happening now. I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, if I have delayed the House, but this is a matter in which I am deeply interested and one which should be attended to at once.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, I will only take up a few minutes, but would like to make a few remarks as I interrupted the honourable member for Fortune when he was dealing with this matter of a market for herring in Russia. Two or three years ago a Russian Jew, a business man, came

here and with him I went fully into this subject. I discovered from him that the Russians on the whole use only the inferior kind of herring and which they get from the Baltic at a price that would not be equal to the freight that would have to be paid on a shipment from here. Of course if the Government were willing to pay a bounty on herring so as to make it worth while to ship herring from here to Russia, then perhaps we would be able to do something in connection with this market.

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 tomorrow.

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on to-morrow.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Speaker, on the motion to adjourn I would like to ask the Minister of Fisheries in connection with the herring regulations, to have them published and circulated as widely as possible before the herring season opens.

MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I may say for the information of the hon. member for St. Barbe that I have sent messages to all the telegraph offices and to the post offices in connection with the regulations so as to give the information to those who are going to take out licenses to engage in this industry.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, April 1st, 1925.

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

HON. MR. LONG—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from the people of Lords Cove, in Burin District asking for a grant of two thousand dollars for the repair of roads in that section. I might say that at the present time there is just a path in that section, and I hope that the Government will be able to see its way to make this allocation. The petition has been signed by all the inhabitants of the place. I ask that the petition be referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. LAKE—I beg leave to support that petition. I think that the House already understands the condition of the roads in Burin and I hope that the Government will be able to make this grant.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from the people of Hodge's Cove, Random Sound, Trinity District, asking for a grant of the sum of five hundred dollars for the repair of the road between that place and Island Cove, which road is about a mile and a half long. At the present time the road is in an impassable condition. The petition is signed by about seventy electors of Hodge's Cove and Island Cove. I heartily support the prayer of the petitioners and ask that the petition be referred to the department to which it relates.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I have never presented a petition to this House before, and I did not intend to present one, because presenting a petition from this side of the House is like talking to yourself. But I am bringing in a bill a little later in connection with old age pensions, and it is in this connection that this petition is presented. The petition is from the people of Bonavista Bay, and is signed by some two hundred people on the subject of granting the old age pensions to the widows of the old age pensioners. When

I was in Bonavista last an old gentleman named Mr. Lawrence got up at our meeting and called our attention to the fact that very often the old lady who had borne the burden and heat of the day with the old fisherman was left destitute when he died. He asked if it might not be possible for the incoming government to consider the matter of having the old age pension continued to the old lady after the old gentleman's death. It appealed to Captain Winsor and myself as being very just and reasonable, and I may say that the whole party is very strongly in favour of granting the prayer of the petition, because they recognise that the conditions are the same all over the island, and therefore I have very much pleasure in presenting this petition to the House.

MR. CAHILL—Mr. Speaker, in the words of the Hon. the Prime Minister a few minutes ago, I am now going to say a few words to myself, in other words I am going to present a petition. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from certain residents of Harbour Main and Gasters, in the District of Harbour Main, asking for a special grant for a road known as Fewer's Road. The work is very necessary and the petition is largely signed, and I commend the matter to the attention of the proper department.

HON. THE MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—Mr. Speaker, I beg to support the petition presented by my colleague. This particular road has been neglected for a number of years past. In fact all the roads around Harbour Main have been neglected for the past four or five years and an effort will have to be made to get them back into their old condition. I have always paid considerable attention to the roads of Harbour Main. A special effort will have to be made to induce the Government to grant a special amount for the maintenance of these roads and the granting of the petition.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I wish to lay on the table of the House this afternoon a copy of further correspondence that has taken place in connection with the Labrador boundary question. It will be remembered that the last correspondence which was tabled in this House was a letter which I wrote to Mr. Taschereau giving him the discription of the various fishing interests on the Labrador, and showing him that it would be absolutely necessary for the Government to see that all those interests were protected before we could consider entering into an agreement that would involve the sovereignity of the coast. Mr. Taschereau wrote back to me on the third of January as follows:—

(Copy)

Office of the Prime Minister,
Province of Quebec,
January 30th, 1925.

The Hon. W. S. Monroe,
Prime Minister,
St. John's, Nfld.

Dear Mr. Monroe,—I duly received your letter of the 13th January, which I have carefully considered.

I believe that the questions to which you refer can eventually be settled. In my judgment, the difficulty lies in the question of the price to be paid to Newfoundland, should we come to a compromise.

I do not expect you to commit yourself to any definite amount, but should the price which you ask for the conveyance of the rights which you claim to hold on the disputed territory exceed what we think reasonable, under all circumstances further negotiations would probably be useless.

I would therefore suggest that, even in a very confidential way, you

might inform me of the minimum amount which you would ask. And, if we agree on this, I believe that the other difficulties may be overcome.

Yours sincerely

(Sgd.) L. A. TASCHEREAU.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—On the 10th February I replied as follows:—

Prime Minister's Office,
St. John's, Nfld.,
February 10, 1925.

Hon. L. A. Taschereau,
Prime Minister of Quebec,
Quebec, Canada.

Dear Sir,—I have your letter of the 30th January and note that you consider the questions referred to in my letter of the 13th January could eventually be settled satisfactorily if we were fairly close together on the price which might eventually be paid.

As I understand it you are desirous that we should deal with any leasehold interests and offer you a property free of encumberances. I also understood from Judge Doherty that Ottawa would not be satisfied with any arrangement that made a dividing line, and Canada's jurisdiction must go to the Coast. I think you will remember that when you asked me in Montreal to name a price, I told you that if the property or claim to the property belonged to me personally, I would ask thirty million dollars.

It is of course, more or less like selling a "pig in a bag," for we, none of us, know the true value of this great area. My colleagues in the Government, however, feel that unless the price was a big one we would not be justified in putting a proposition before the Legislature that would involve the concession of the Sovereignty of the Coast to Canada.

Yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) W. S. MONROE,
Prime Minister.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—On the third of March Mr. Taschereau wrote back and said:—

Office of the Prime Minister,
Province of Quebec,
March 3rd, 1925.

The Hon. W. S. Monroe,
Prime Minister,
St. John's, Newfoundland.

Dear Mr. Monroe,—I am in receipt of your letter of the 10th ultimo, which I have carefully considered.

As, apparently, it is not possible to agree on a price, and as we are too far apart, I believe that we had better call all negotiations off and let the Privy Council decide the case.

I am glad to recognize the good will and the high spirit with which yourself and your colleagues have discussed this matter with us, and the trouble which you took to meet us in Montreal.

But, I presume that both Canada and Newfoundland have to satisfy public opinion on the terms of a possible settlement, terms which evidently are not acceptable to either country.

Yours sincerely,
(Sgd.) L. A. TASCHEREAU.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Now before the letter of March 3rd reached me a gentleman, who has been largely interested in the Labrador and had been in close touch with the lease holders and who proved to us that he was very much in the confidence of Mr. Taschereau's friends and in Mr. Taschereau himself, came in to see me. He produced copies of the letters which I had written to Mr. Taschereau, and he asked if he might take up this proposition. He told us that he was perfectly satisfied that the boundary line could be moved back three miles from the coast. He said that the question could be settled, and he thought it would; and he said further that if the Gov-

ernment should decide to sell the Labrador to within three miles of the coast, that he personally believed that he had sufficient influence with the Canadian Government to put it through. Mr. Higgins and Mr. Bennett and myself, who were the delegates to Montreal, discussed the matter with this gentleman fully, and we eventually decided to write the following letter to Mr. Taschereau. This went in the afternoon of one day, and this gentleman to whom I refer went on a boat on the evening of the same day. The letter which we wrote read as follows:—

Office of the Prime Minister,
St. John's, Newfoundland,
March 4th, 1925.

Hon. L. A. Taschereau,
Premier and Attorney General,
Quebec, P. Q., Canada.

Without prejudice to the dispute respecting the territory in question and strictly confidenial.

Dear Sir,—In further reference to the correspondence and conversations between us, myself and members of the Government who recently visited Canada, are prepared to recommend to Council a proposition on the lines hereunder. The proposal is entirely from ourselves, and is made without reference to our associates in the Government. If it should prove acceptable to you its confirmation would depend, of course, first upon the Council, and later upon the House of Assembly.

1. The Government of Canada to pay to the Government of Newfoundland Fifteen Million Dollars for all the latter's rights, title and interest whatsoever to the territory known as Labrador, save and except that the Government of Newfoundland shall reserve and have exclusive rights to the use and enjoyment of a three mile reservation inland from high water mark (excepting three quarters of a mile width on each side of all streams) but Newfoundland fishermen to have the right to cut timber for fishery requirements and purposes upon this three quarters mile.

2.—In pursuance of the above the Newfoundland Government or any Department thereof undertake during negotiations to do no new administrative act, nor collect or receive any payments or dues, except what may be tendered by way of back rentals, in respect of the above mentioned territory or any portion thereof, without the permission of the Government of Canada.

3. Also the Government of Newfoundland, from the date of the confirmation of the present agreement by the Legislature of Newfoundland, undertake to do any acts (permissible by or not inconsistent with law) in connection with the above mentioned territory or any part thereof as may be required by the Government of Canada.

4. It being understood that the Government of Canada shall respect the existing legal rights of all persons to any portions of the said territory in accordance with the laws of Newfoundland as they now exist.

Should it be necessary to bring the matter before the Legislature I might mention that our session will probably close early next month.

Yours faithfully,

(Sgd.) W. S. MONROE,
Prime Minister.

Then on March 16th I received the following letter from Mr. LaPointe, the Attorney General at Ottawa:—

Office of the Minister of Justice,
Ottawa, Canada,
March 16th, 1925.

Dear Mr. Premier,—The Honourable Mr. Taschereau has sent me a copy of your letter to him of the 4th instant submitting, for consideration,

a proposal of settlement upon the basis of the terms outlined therein.

Mr. Taschereau indicates that, so far as Quebec is concerned, the terms of settlement proposed are quite unacceptable; in his view, the amount of compensation stipulated is excessive and the reservations with regard to property rights would lead to endless disputes. As it seems impossible to arrive at an agreement, he considers that the question in dispute must be left to the arbitrament of the Judicial Committee, and states that he has written to you in this sense.| Speaking for the Dominion Government, I may say that I am of the same opinion.

The project of settlement outlined in your letter is not substantially different from that which was considered, according to our notes, at the second meeting between your Ministers and the representatives of the Dominion and Quebec Governments held at Montreal on the 29th December last, except in these particulars, that you now define the areas along the coast proposed to be transferred to Canada with a view to giving us access to the sea and also specify the amount of compensation which Newfoundland would expect to be paid. The various objections to settlement upon these terms were then fully examined and discussed, and I understand the Canadian representatives were unanimous in the view that no settlement could be advised upon the basis of those terms. In that view I fully concur, and as no settlement seems likely to emerge from further correspondence or negotiations, I do not think we can do better than bring the question in issue before the Privy Council with the least possible delay.

Yours fatihfully,

E. LAPOINTE.

Mr. Taschereau then wrote me on date March 18th, as follows:

Office of the Prime Minister,
Province of Quebec,
March 18th, 1925.

Hon. W. S. Monroe,
Prime Minister,
St. John's, Nfld.

Dear Mr. Premier,—The Honourable Mr. Lapointe, Minister of Justice, has just sent me a copy of a letter which he addressed to you in date of the 16th instant, regarding the Labrador boundary matter.

I am sorry that we have been unable to come to terms but, apparently we are too far apart; our terms could not satisfy public opinion in Newfoundland, and yours could not be made acceptable to our own people.

I beg again to thank you for the kind attention and courtesy which you have shown us in all our dealings with you, and I earnestly hope that the Privy Council will eventually decide this vexed question in such a way as to satisfy both parties.

Yours sincerely,

(Sgd.) L. A. TASCHEREAU.

I then telegraphed Mr. Taschereau as follows:—

(Cablegram)

St. John's, N.F.,
March 24th, 1925.

Hon. L. A. Taschereau,
Premier of Quebec,
Quebec, Canada.

Thanks for letter. May I give publicity to it together with my letter of fourth?

W. S. MONROE.

and he replied:

(Cablegram)

Quebec, Can.,
March 27th, 1925.

Hon. W. S. Monroe,
Prime Minister,
St. John's, Nfld.

No objection to give publicity to

both letters referred to in your telegram of the 24th instant.

L. A. TASCHEREAU.

Now I trust that this House is satisfied that we have done everything in our power in connection with the settlement of this matter out of Court. There have been certain satirical references to our so called junketing party to Montreal; but I might point out that we did not court any trip to Montreal We received an invitation from Mr. Taschereau to come to Montreal to discuss the matter; and it seems to me that it would have been very discourteous for this country to have refused the invitation on that occasion. We were asked to come up and discuss the Labrador Boundary question, and we could do nothing else but go up. The House will, I hope, realise that everything possible has been done; and now the Attorney General will try and get the Ottawa authorities to bring the case immediately before the Privy Council so that we may have a settlement of the dispute as quickly as possible.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words in regard to what has been said by the Prime Minister. I have special reasons for saying what I am about to say. As I said at the beginning of the session there was a great deal of criticism of my connection with the Labrador Boundary question; and I share that with the honourable gentlemen who went to Montreal a few months ago. But I considered a long time ago that the boundary question was one that was a case for settlement, and I was very glad indeed when the Prime Minister took advantage of the invitation from Ottawa—from the Dominion of Canada to go there and talk over the question of a settlement of the matter. I have heard the results of that discussion in the House and I have heard the Prime Minister read the correspondence; and I want to say that from those, and from my own personal knowledge of the facts of the boundary question, I consider that the Prime Minister has made every possible effort to settle a case which, in my opinion ought to be settled, if possible. If it is not settled, it is not his fault, nor it is the fault of those gentlemen who went to Montreal with him.

It seems now that the question will have to be settled before the Privy Council; and now I only have to express the hope that the Attorney General will make every effort to see that the Dominion of Canada and the Province of Quebec, will, with all possible speed, bring their case to be presented to completion; as ours is now completed.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, for the information of the House, and following out what the Hon. Member for Fortune has just said, I just want to say a word or two. Even while this correspondence was going on, and about a week following our return from Canada I wrote officially to Mr. Lapointe to have his case ready for presentation, but this correspondence may have given an excuse to postpone the filing of the case. It is possible that these negotiations being carried on might have afforded some excuse for delay, but I agree with the Hon. Member for Fortune, and I think that now there is no further excuse in that direction; and we will certainly ask immediately that the case be filed at the earliest possible moment.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker, I understand since the House opened to-day that the case for Canada has not yet been presented, and therefore, the Honourable member for Fortune, Mr. Warren, and the members of the other side of the House who are interested in this question, cannot cer-

tainly have any opinion of what the case is going to be; and in view of that, how can the honourable member for Fortune say that it is a case for settlement out of Court.. I do not think that it is. If there is only a matter of fifteen million dollars suggested, I am set back altogether; and I am surprised that the Prime Minister should put forward such an offer. I certainly am of opinion that we should not dispose of our rights on Labrador for the small sum of fifteen million dollars; a sum that is hardly worth talking about. If you are going to fight your case, and win it, perhaps you will find then that it will be worth from fifty to sixty million dollars to Canada. But the idea of bartering the country away for fifteen million dollars is a thing I cannot understand. The value of that country to-day has been outlined in this House. Even from the Government side we have heard of the immense water powers that are up there, and which are worth about double the public debt of this country, and there are other utilities up there which we know so little of, which make the country worth considerably more. Mr. Halfyard in his speech on this question outlined the value of the timber on the Labrador. Basing it on the valuation of timber elsewhere, of one dollar per cord, that timber is worth one hundred and fifty three million dollars. Now the Government will have to bring the case before the Privy Council, and I am very glad indeed that the Government's offer to Quebec has been turned down.

Notice of Question

MR. SCAMMELL asked the Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs if his Department is aware of any man travelling with John C. Payne, of Cow Head, as assistant line repairer, and if so, to name the person in question, and what he is being paid by the Department.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—Mr. Speaker, in reply I beg to say that John C. Payne, at Cow Head, was the only line repairer employed by the Department. He has no assistant, so far as the Department is concerned.

MR. SCAMMELL asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the Table of the House, a detailed statement showing what it cost to place the Customs Office at the Station in Bonavista, and also what the cost of removing the Customs House furniture was, and to name parties to whom amounts were paid in connection with the same.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Speaker, in reply I wish to say this matter does not come under my Department.

MR. HICKMAN—Gave notice of question (1), (2), (3,) (4), (5).

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I may as well reply to one question now, as to the Government entering into a contract with Bishop & Company, and say that it would be improper for us to enter into such a contract until the Bill has passed the Upper House.

MR. HICKMAN—According to reports on the streets Bishop & Company have already brought material here that they are going to use on the dock.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—If they have they have done so at their own risk.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay on the table of the House a list of the salaries of the Railway employees, as requested by the Leader of the Opposition, and also the Minute Book of the Railway Commission. I would ask that this be not permitted to leave the House, and to have it returned tomorrow.

The Chairman from the Committee of the Whole on Supply reported certain Resolutions, which were read a first time as follows:

Dept. of Justice $354,619.66
Dept. of Education 877,590.03
Dept. of Public Charities .. 457,809.63

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. WARREN—Mr. Speaker, before you leave the chair I rise on a motion of privilege. The motion that the Speaker leave the chair has not been put and this is not an ordinary Order of the Day. Yesterday when the House closed leave was asked to sit again tomorrow, and the Honourable the Speaker need not put the motion to go into Supply, but he must put the motion to leave the chair.

HON. THE SPEAKER—In order to obviate discussion, I will now put the motion to leave the chair.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Speaker, I do not wish for a moment to suggest that I asked you to move the House into Supply with the object of carrying out any stunt, but I have an amendment to make on the motion that you now do leave the chair. I know it is out of the ordinary, but as I propose to raise a constitutional question, I thought now was the proper time to do it. I need hardly go into constitutional history to point out to the Members of this House, and Members of the Government particularly, that before supply can be granted there must be what is commonly termed redress of grievances, and so that Honourable Members may understand the position. I would like to quote Bourinot, a well known authority on parliamentary procedure.

Quotes.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as to the amendment which I proposed to make, and I may say frankly that I do not know if it will have a seconder, as I have not spoken to anyone about it, if it does not it will have to be dropped, I may withdraw after I have spoken. Supply in the ordinary sense is the vote granted by this House to pay part of the public services. It does not matter which part. Supply is really the money given the Crown represented by the Governor by this House to pay for the public services. Now a few days ago I asked the Honorable the Prime Minister a number of questions—a good many I admit—but I did not ask them for the mere purpose of talking, or to establish a record in asking questions, but with a definite purpose, and with the exception of a few all have been taken from the Audit Act. I received the following reply:

"Questions 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, 18, 19, 20 and 21 are argumentative and I do not desire to express an opinion on them."

Now Mr. Speaker, I submit that it is not for the gentleman who was asked the questions to say that we shall confirm to the rules of the House or not, as that is a matter for the Speaker. "The voice is the voice of Jacob, but the hand is the hand of Esau," and the questions were answered by someone with a knowledge of parliamentary procedure. Now question 10 asks if the net or gross proceeds and the operations of the railroad and steamship are public funds. Is that argumentative? The Honourable the Prime Minister says he does not wish to discuss it. No. 11 question asks by what authority salaries and other payments are made. Now that is not argumentative, as there must be some way in which the Railway salaries are paid, but still there is no answer. No. 12 asks how would a deficit, if any, in the operation of the Railroad system be met. It cannot be said that that is argumentative, nor No. 13 as to who

is the present proprietor of the Railway. Question 14 is "does the Honourable the Prime Minister consider those employed on the Railway system as public servants or civil servants." That question I say is to find out if they come under the Audit Act or not, and it should be answered. Now I needn't go into details as to all the others, but I have something to say as to the reply in connection with the Board of Liquor Control. From the answers received it seems there is no vote going to be taken for the Railway or the Board of Liquor Control. According to the answer to the last question a statement is to be laid before the House in due course. That being the case, I want to say here and now that, what I am saying, I am saying with the best of intentions and trying to point out to the Government the necessity, not only of keeping within the law of the constitution and the rules of this House, but by so doing they will prevent any abuses from creeping in, and I want to say that, if they start a precedent, they will not know where it will end, and if people outside this House, who have no responsibility whatever, go and spend public moneys then you are setting a precedent which afterwards may tend to swallow you up. In the answers which I have received I am told that the Railway Commission is only an Advisory Board and that its functions are purely advisory. Now it may be news to some members of this House—but such is the case—that I was under the impression that the Railway Commission was more of an Executive Board than an Advisory Board; but if the Railway Commission, which is to a great extent responsible to this House,—because every member of that Commission is a member of this House, the Chairman being the Prime Minister, —is only an Advisory Board to the Railway then who is the executive Board in charge of the railway, and I still press for an answer on what authority salaries are paid to employees in the employ of the railway. It is a rule of this House, sir, and a constitutional principle and I refer to rule 248—

(Reads rule 248)

Now then, sir, if you look at the Audit Act by which the Auditor General is governed, the interpretation clause says:

(Reads Clause Sub-section (1) of Section 2 of Audit Act.)

I submit, sir, that moneys that are paid for transportation by any person over the railroad are part of the public funds of this Colony, under the Audit Act, and they should not be paid out again except by a vote of this House. I do not go as far as I understand the Leader of the Opposition wants to go and vote every salary here; I am quite satisfied if the Government will come in with a vote in globo; but some vote must come before this House so as to give members of this House a certain amount of control over the operation of what, after all, is the largest public spending department and which, as has been shown in the past, showed annual deficits of a million and a million and half dollars. It may be said that "we just took the railway over from you and we are doing what you did." There would be some force in that argument and my reasoning would be stultified to a great extent if that could be brought home to me. But I want to point out to you, sir, that this railroad was not the property of the Government and was not the Newfoundland Government Railway until some time in July 1923, when I became Prime Minister. Towards the end of that month I had the railway thrust upon me, as it were, without

having much chance or much opportunity of doing anything about it. The Government, at my suggestion, appointed a Commission to operate the railway and I distinctly stated in the House here that the gentlemen who were appointed on that Commission were only appointed until the House met again. When the House met again, as everybody knows, I ceased to be Prime Minister, so that I never had any opportunity of doing anything with the railway or of mapping out any plan with regard to it. It was always my intention and the intention of my Government to try and get the railway operated by outside people and it seems to be the policy of the present Government, in view of the alterations and repairs to be made to the dry dock and in view of the rerailing of the railroad, that the Government will control the operations of the railroad in future only so long as some future proposition is made from outside for the taking of it over to run. Now I do not propose to argue on the personnel of the Railway Commission because I believe that the gentlemen comprising it do their work faithfully and well. I am not at all like gentlemen who spoke when they were in Opposition and who are now occupying Government benches in connection with the railway. I need not now take up the time of the House in referring to what they said. The Hansard can tell in that respect. But I do draw the attention of the Government that no public bills should be paid directly or indirectly only by vote of this House, except, of course, for emergency cases, and even then it is the duty of the Government to come in here and ask to be indemnified for any moneys they pay out in any case of emergency. Now in the case of the railway, sir, there is no legislative provision for the creation of the Commission. I suppose that really in law they have no legal standing and I make a further suggestion to the Government that, in order to put the thing on a proper basis, some legislation ought to be provided for the operation of and the constitution of a Railway Commission—the same way that a Commission was made by an Act of this Legislature to run the General Hospital. The Board of Liquor Control was appointed by an Act of this Legislature; the Commission of the Lunatic Asylum was appointed by an Act of this Legislature and Agricultural Commissioners were appointed in the same way, and yet this railway, which is a very dangerous thing—a fact that we know from past experience—is controlled by a Commission which was not appointed properly by this House. Under these circumstances, sir, and as it was only my desire to point out to the Government, under the rules of this House,—and if I asked for your ruling I knew what your ruling would be—that moneys spent by the management of the railroad and by the Railway Commission should first be voted by this House. As regards the Department of Liquor Control. That is one that to a great extent is controlled by an Act passed at last session of the House, but it does not provide for the salaries to be paid out to the employees of that Department without the voice of this House. It may give them the right to buy liquors and that any profits they may make may be taken by the Minister of Finance and Customs from time to time and paid into the consolidated revenue fund, but no provision is made for paying out of salaries to the employees of that department. The Prime Minister stated a few days ago that he had been informed by the General Manager of the railroad that it was not the custom in Canada to table the answers to questions about the salaries paid

railway officials. Of that I do not know; but I do know that the Government railways of Canada are controlled by special Act of the Legislature there and that the salaries of those employed by the Department of railways in Canada are voted by the House of Parliament, and I will refer honourable members to the Canadian Hansard of 1917, Volume 6, Page 528, where they will find the report of the Committee on Supply on the Railway Estimates where salaries were actually voted by the House itself. I do not want to needlessly put too much work on this House or upon the Prime Minister, who has enough on his shoulders already without being Minister of Railways, but I do suggest to the Government the desirability of putting in Supplemental Supply a vote in globo for the salaries of the railway employees in the same way as the salaries for the High Commissioner's office were brought in in the Regular Estimates, so that it will be said that, at all events, this House has some control over public moneys and that we can keep within the four quarters of the Audit Act. Under these circumstances, sir, I think I have done what I could, although in a rather extraordinary manner, to point out to the Government the matters of great importance that I have dealt with. I merely got up on your motion to leave the Chair, and I do not propose to make any amendment.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman, while on this vote for the department of Marine and Fisheries I would like to take up a little of the time of this House. I will endeavour to be as brief as possible, but I would just like to point out the importance of this—the chief industry in this country. I notice that the total amount to be voted to the dpeartment of Marine and Fisheries is 395,000 dollars—a vote which to my mind is altogether inadequate. Capt. Winsor the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, informed the House that there was not a dollar voted for the Fishery Board—and this is what I would call a disgrace. As I said before, the fishing industry is the main stay of this country. Now Mr. Chairman, we may be at sixes and sevens and at loggerheads on a good many points, but I think that if I sense the feeling of this House aright in the last moments of yesterday's debate when the House was in Committee on these estimates I don't think that I would be making a mistake when I state that there was much the same sentiment of opinion in this regard. We were very much interested in the remarks of my Hon. friend Mr. Lake from Burin District.

But I would just like to point out to the Hon. Member that it is very evident that he in this regard has not been able to prevail upon the Government of which he is a member to take a more lively interest in the fisheries. I was interested greatly in the remarks of the Hon. Member, but what can we do on this side of the House? What can we do in the matter? Since he is a member of the Government at the present time I consider that he should use his influence with the Prime Minister and the other members of his Government to back him up in this important question. It seems to me that there is plenty of money to be spent on matters of far less importance, but when it comes down to the fisheries they have nothing practically. There are $20,000 to be spent on agriculture and I

think that every one is agreed that the agricultural policy of the country is one which should be developed. and one of which we should not attempt to hamper the minister in his important work. But it is ridiculous when we come in here and are asked to vote 20,000 for agriculture and only are asked to vote 2,000 for the fisheries. I wish Mr. Chairman, that some of the zeal and the ardour and the untiring attention which has been given to other parts and other matters which have been brought to the attention of this House presumably by the executive had been given to this most important matter, the fisheries. The tourist policy for Newfoundland is speculative. I don' intend to take up any more time this afternoon discussing that matter which has been already thrashed out here. But I want to say that as far as the fisheries are concerned I do not consider that we are getting a square deal. This is a fishing country and as long as I have the privilege of holding a seat in this House I shall endeavour to impress upon the Government and the Prime Minister and the other members of the Government that it is their duty to do more to encourage this industry which is lagging to-day, and my advice is that this most important industry should not be neglected. I do not understand, Mr. Chairman, the disinterestedness which is manifested by the members of the Government towards the fisheries. If one comes to the Government to-day and asks for a few dollars for the fishermen to make some essential repairs to a canal or to a wharf or for roads which are absolutely essential to the fishermen, what reply do you get? We don't know where the money is to come from. We can't do it. Still the Government seems to have money for everything else. But when it comes to the fisheries they can't get a cent. Take for instance these estimates, some of which have been already passed. We find that there have been increases given. We are told they are not increases, they are perquisites. I think, Mr. Chairman, that the axe is not being used very much. There is very little of the pruning hook being shown. I think that the public is beginning to question the acts of the Government and to give voice to their disappointment in no uncertain terms as to the policy which has been carried on by the Government since they came into power, as distinct altogether from the principle in the manifesto of the Prime Minister. We, however, on this side of the House, have no other alternative than to stand up and voice our opinions and try and get redress from any wrongs which we consider we may be subjected to. I spoke about the request made for a certain sum of money to build a canal, and up to the present I have not been able to get any guarantee that it will be granted. This canal would be of infinite service to thousands of fishermen, but I can't get it. I am told "your district was looked after by the other Government. We don't know where the money is coming from."

Take the matter of the roads again. We find that there is two millions to be spent for the roads and two thousand extra for the department of Marine and Fisheries. I think that is a crying shame. With regard to the canal that I was speaking about. Two or three times in the last session I spoke about it here on the floors of this House. There was certain money allocated and the job was about half done. I am trying to get money to complete it. I have been appealing to the Hon. Member for Bonavista and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Capt. Winsor. I would just like to say here as I stated a few days ago that I consider that the fisheries

will not be getting their right share of attention until the Minister of Marine and Fisheries becomes a member of the Executive Government. I find that a man was brought down from Canada to go out and investigate post office affairs, and he was allowed to go out of the country without having made a report. If I am wrong I ask the Hon. Member to correct me.

HON. MR. WOODFORD—I just want to explain. You asked for this some time ago. I did not have the report from Colonel Ross then. I have since learned from the Prime Minister that he had sent a report from Montreal, and that it is now under consideration and will be tabled soon.

MR. ASHBOURNE—I would ask the Hon. Member that he would do his best to have this report tabled tomorrow.

HON. MR. WOODFORD—It has not yet been brought before the Government. The Government must first see it.

MR. ASHBOURNE—The Government, no doubt, are very busy if they have not been able yet to go into the matter of Colonial Ross' report. I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that it is not the amount of work that they have got through this session that has kept them busy.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—We are down to executive meetings every night until 12 o'clock.

MR. ASHBOURNE—I would like to point out that I am not taking things easy either. When I go to work I like to get down to it. I would like to point out to the Hon. gentleman that when we come in from the outports we would like to find the legislation ready. This is a matter over which I, myself, have no control, but I do point out that in all fairness I think that we have been here now for five or six weeks and we have had only three night sessions. The Hon. member may be down to Executive meetings until twelve o'clock and they might sit in the mornings, perhaps they do, but I think, myself, that we should have more night sessions and so get on with the work of the House. However, that is by the way. Let us take the instance of the fisheries. The sealfishery is one of our most important fisheries and what do we know about it today. Practically nothing. We have no person who collects facts or records or compiles statistics in the Minister of Marine and Fisheries Department. We are lead to believe that far out in the Atlantic there is a main patch of seals. We do not know whether that is right or not. The time will come when the old sealing captains will die off, (I hope the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will not die off too soon), and the knowledge of the fishery will go with them, and for that reason I would suggest to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that his department make some move to collect all these important data in connection with the sealfishery. The fishery this year is very unpromising and as far as the steamers on the front are concerned it looks as if it will be just about a saving voyage and that is all. We should have certain information in this colony as regards the breeding of the seals so that we might be able to get some idea as to whether the seals are in sufficient numbers to warrant sending ten or eleven or twelve steamers to the seal fishery every year. We do not want to have the seal-fishery exterminated, and I think that the Government ought to make some move in this important measure. And I submit Mr. Chairman that the Government is very remiss in its duty for not having given more consideration to this important industry. Let us take for instance the whaling in-

dustry. I was reading an extract from Sir John Crosbie's budget speech of last year. The Budget Speech for this year has not been delivered yet, but I hope that it will soon come along.

(Reads the extract from the speech, referring to whale oil.)

That means a decrease of one hundred and thirty-five thousand dollars and what has the Government done about it? Have they considered it? Do they think about it? I have not seen any evidence of the fact. Reference was made by the Hon. Member for Fortune Bay, Mr. Warren, to the report that was made by Mr. Huntsman, a director of the Atlantic Station a member of the Biological Board of Canada. Mr. Huntsman came down here from Canada and made certain experiments as regards the temperature and the depth of the ocean around this country, and I think that the information which is contained in this pamphlet should impress itself on the Prime Minister to a greater extent than it did when he said that he had been reading this pamphlet, and that it was an eye-opener to him that a thermometer was a thing that was necessary for the fishery. A thermometer is a thing that is necessary according to Mr. Huntsman, and I intend this year as far as our schooners are concerned to see that every one of them is given a thermometer. But as regards the Department of Marine and Fisheries I say that it should keep records of the degrees of heat of the water and the coolness of the water each year. I submit, I may be termed a Jeremiah, I may be told that I do not know what I am talking about, but I propose to give some concrete suggestions, Mr. Chairman, now that we are on the vote for this Department of Marine and Fisheries, and the first is that we get a statistician here so that we can accumulate some data and have it at our fingers' ends for whatever time we may need it. It may be amusing to some of the Hon. members because I say this, but, Mr. Chairman, I have foresight enough to see that Newfoundland will always be dependent on the fisheries, and I think that we have little enough knowledge about these industries, and that we should not lose a single moment in getting all the information that we can get with regard to the fisheries. Last year you will remember that the fish struck in early. The fishermen were unprepared. Who knows that if the Department of Marine and Fisheries had some more data on this matter but that every fisherman in the country would have been warned that the fish were going to come in early this year because of the temperature of the water which would bring them into the shores in May month. I am led to believe from this pamphlet that the temperature which is suited for fish is from forty to forty-five degrees and who knows but that this year with the ice driven off the coast and the water warmer than usual but that the fish will be in earlier that we expect and I think, Mr. Chairman, that is an argument why the Department of Marine and Fisheries should do something in this matter immediately. I am interested in this because it is my bread and butter, but not only that, but because I have the honour to represent the District of Twillingate which is interested in the fisheries more than anything else. I believe, Mr. Chairman that the Department of Marine and Fisheries is to be congratulated on the way in which the codliver oil industry of this country is being developed, and I say that I think a lot of credit is due to the Departmnet for this. The time will come when Nfld. will have to depend for its own protection and for its own life not only on the catching of codfish and on its curing, but on the utilisation

of the waste products that are being thrown away to-day. And the time will come when we shall have a development in Newfoundland of the curing of cod roes. I believe that in Norway they derive an income of about half a million dollars from the cod roes. Nfld. derives nothing from it to-day. Take for instance the caplin. They are used for bait and food in the outports and also for fertiliser. There have been a certain number of exports of squid in this country, but in the main there has not been an endeavour to develop this to a very great extent. We should be exporting squid to China. We all know that fish contains insulin which today has been shown to have some very curative and remedial qualities in the treatment of diabetes. And I would like to point out to the Government that there are these avenues open for exploration, and we should have our eye to business and see that something is done to encourage these important industries. I have never heard of any factories having been started in Newfoundland for the making of glue. There has been one at Harbour Grace. But there are glue factories that could be erected and there are other by-products that could be got from fish. Now let us take the herring fishery. Norway with a population two or three times that of Newfoundland benefits fifteen millions a year from the herring industry, and according to the population of Newfoundland we should have an income from this industry of about seven millions of dollars from the number of herring that we have around the coast. Instead of that we get about a half a million.

We were told the other day that there was a market in Russia and Germany for herring, and I took the trouble to-day to find out something about the freight rates from Newfoundland to Germany. I am quoting now from the Fishing Gazette, New York, 1924, in which it says: (Quotation).

That is to say that Germany buys two million barrels of herring a year, and the freight from Newfoundland to Hamburg is $2.30 a barrel, and I think that if a move was made on the part of the Government to try and encourage or boost our herring industry all around our coast, I think that that would be doing much better, that it would be a much better outlet for the Government's enthusiasm and zeal, and in a much better direction than trying to get tourists to come to this country.

We are told that our fish markets are practically all blocked. There are roughly about 100,000 quintals in Portugal. Italy has a large stock of fish, Spain will not want any more for about six weeks. What then are we going to do? We are told that Brazil is about the only market that is buying to-day any quantity of fish, and they are only buying, so to speak, from hand to mouth. I think, Mr. Chairman, that the Government ought to take cognizance of these facts; and the time is opportune when some standardization might take place, whereby the quality of our fish might be perhaps improved from what it is now. I know that that question is one that bristles with innumerable difficulties and perplexities; but still, I submit, that that is no reason why we should leave it alone; that is no reason why we should continue on in the same old rut. To-day is the opportunity if we are going to look after this important fishery, when we should do something to encourage it.

Then there is the halibut industry. They have halibut over at Port au Basques, I am told. They fish for it in about twenty-five fathoms of water. In England they fish for halibut in

one hundred to one hundred and fifty fathoms of water; and to-day we find that there are only seventy thousand pounds of halibut being exported per year from Newfoundland. We are also told that there are English and Norwegian trawlers going to Greenland, and that this year the Norwegians will probably send some vessels to Newfoundland banks in order to catch halibut, and take it back fresh to England. What are we doing in this regard We are doing nothing. And yet I am led to believe that there is an enormous supply of halibut on the West Coast; and I think that the Government would be taking a very wise step in giving more attention to the fisheries—and in giving it the attention that it deserves.

If a man starts off, for instance, in Bonavista Bay, or Green Bay or anywhere else—if a man in the spring of the year catches his herring, and if he gets a chance to sell them at a profit, and I do not see any reason why they cannot be sold at a profit; over in England they fish for herring from the Shetland Islands to the English Channel—they follow the herring. If they can sell their herring profitably, then surely we who have them at our front doors should be able to sell them to advantage; and if we cannot there must be something wrong somewhere and it ought to be looked into. A man that can start off in the Spring of the Year and catch his herring, and go on and catch his salmon and sell it, and export it to England, and then can start in at the codfishery; and then following up can catch the fall pack of herring; I think myself that that man will be in a pretty good state and will have enough for the winter. But to-day a man cannot do that in the outports. We have practically no markets. The Honourable Minister of Finance and Customs, in his budget speech last year was of the opinion that the herring industry was being lost to Newfoundland on account of the cure, and he recommended, if I remember correctly, an inspection. I do not think that that is where the trouble lies at all. It is not the markets. There are markets that want our herring, and we do not know of them. Why not have a man to go into this matter and appoint a roving commissioner. This matter was suggested by the Fishery Board itself—it was suggested that there should be a roving commissioner, in order that something might be done, and that at least, if we did not succeed, it is no reason why we should not try, that some avenue should be explored in this regard; and I want to impress upon the Government the absolute necessity of going into this matter, and trying to see whether or not a way cannot be found.

What has this Government done since it came into office to try and reduce the duties which are in effect in America against Newfoundland fish. We all know the answer to what they have done. At least I think I know. They have done nothing probably. The Government could not see fit to remove the duty on molasses. They have their own opinions for not doing that, but I would suggest to the Government that it reduce the duty from molasses coming from Barbados, and ask the Barbados Government if they would not remove the duty from Newfoundland fish going in there, so that we can send more herring to the West Indies, and try to work up a reciprocal trade.

These are suggestions, Mr. Chairman, and because the matter is one of the greatest importance to my mind, and to the country, I have no hesitation, and I would not be doing my duty if I did not get up here and ask that these things should be gone into.

The question has been spoken of of

getting a steamer to ply between Newfoundland and the West Indies. There may be reasons why it should not be done, but still I consider that the matter is one which should be considered. It is not enough to say that the trade is against it. We must know what the country as a whole thinks of it. I hope that we are big enough men here to be able to sink our sectional differences, and consider the thing broadly. I do not think that I come here to ask for things for Twillingate District, and just because I come from Twillingate District refuse the same thing to any other district. That is not my policy in coming here. I want to do what is best for the country. I want to give every place a square deal. That has been the curse of Newfoundland—small politics. What are we going to do to-day about it? Is there any change? We are told that this is so, and that that is so; and catch cries are all around us, but the people have it all sized up, and I think they have it sized up the same as the members on this side of the House have it sized up—that it is all politics.

There are a great many things that need speaking of in these estimates. I hope that the House will excuse me for having taken up so much time. I have particularly noticed the extras. There are so many increases before us here, but there are very few decreases to be found. I find also in regard to stenographers that they are getting a sum that is in excess of what I claim, Mr. Chairman, the average fisherman in the outports—the family man gets in a year to support his family, and I consider that that is another thing that should be gone into. We should have a Civil Service Commission or something like that, to go right through these estimates, and pare them down where necessary. I do not want to speak of any particular cases, but I suggest that when a stenographer is getting more than perhaps some of our teachers, and more than our constables, I claim that there is something wrong.

Take for instance this case of pensions. I think that that is something that should be taken out of the area of politics. In going through the estimates we find two firemen pensioned, one at $774.50 and the other at $799.00. Now in another case there are two or three tidewaiters pensioned—one at Rose Blanche $549.00, one at Wesleyville $266.00, and one at Placentia at $976.00.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—There is a mistake about Mr. O'Reilly's pension. He is put down as a tidewaiter, that should read sub-collector.

MR. ASHBOURNE—I would like to ask, Mr. Chairman, why it is that these people who have been getting good salaries are being pensioned at such high rates. Rates which, as I have said before, Mr. Chairman, the family man in the outports, the man who goes to the fisheries, the man who by his earnings is keeping the country going, does not get by perhaps hundreds of dollars a year.

Speaking again about the herring fishery. It costs sixty cents a barrel to bring herring from Notre Dame Bay to St. John's in the Government coastal steamer. With freight rates like that no wonder the herring industry is like it is; no wonder the herring cannot be sold; no wonder that there is something wrong.

In the matter of the pensions, I endorse what was said by the honorable member for Burin in regard to the old age pensions. The fisherman has to wait until he is seventy five years of age to get fifty dollars a year pension. And I consider that in view of the increased expenditure, and in view of the fact that so much money is found for everything else,

that the fishery is the service which has been neglected. The Government can find money for this and for that, and for the most important thing of all there is practically nothing. All I have to say to summarize it all is that they are straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel.

MR. LAKE—Mr. Chairman, I would like to make some little reply to Mr. Ashbourne, as it seems he has picked up my remarks of yesterday. As to the Fishery Statistics which I brought up, I may say that he is a Member of the Fisheries' Board like myself, and is as much to blame for getting a grant of only $2,000.00 as anyone else. Had I been there at the time the $2,000.00 was requested I would have laughed at it, and the next time would have asked for $25,000.00. As a matter of fact I did not know that the Minister of Agriculture had secured $20,000.00 for his Department, or I would have asked for $50,000.00. I am a son of the soil I am proud to say and have the deepest interest in all that pertains to the fisheries, and believe there is nothing too much that can be done to improve and foster them. Mr. Ashbourne asks about the time for fishing. On the West Coast we go out as soon as ever the ice moves off, and do not wait for the sun to shine to begin our operations. Even now our fleet are on the Banks and good reports have been received, but when we get the statistics we will know more about it. I am convinced that the Government are taking steps to see that our fisheries will be protected. I feel that the Honourable Mr. Monroe, the Leader of the Government, of which I have the high honor and privilege to be a Member, will do everything in his power to encourage our staple industry. When we asked for $5,000.00 it was granted immediately and we would have got $20,000.00 if we had asked for it. Therefore, I think Mr. Ashbourne is not right or fair in attributing to the Government lack of interest in the fishery. The Fishery Board in previous years was nothing but a joke, as it's operations were carried to extremes by Coaker, and it grew to be a Board that everybody, merchant and fisherman distrusted, and we all got afraid of the consequences. I am speaking of the days of 1920, and I say that the people of the West Coast to which I am proud to belong, and where the people fish twenty hours out of the twenty-four were crucified by the fishery regulations, and only a few were able to stand the test and come through safely. Business firms were ruined in all directions. That is the history of the infamous fishery regulations. Last year when I was made a member of the Board, I did not know where I stood, and when I came here and we asked for $2,000.00 I was not aware what position we were in or just what we were going to do. We have been there only a few months yet, and I feel sure that when we have been working some little time we will do something worth while, and not waste the money as the late Government did. It is all very well for the Honourable Member opposite, Mr. Halfyard, to interject and try and start something, but I wish to make it clear that if he wants to do that I am ready to take my part at any time, or on any matter. I have been connected with the fishery for thirty years, and again I say that under the Coaker Regulations the people of the West Coast were crucified. I do not want to waste my time here in St. John's, but we have got to come here to avoid being treated as we were before, and as we would be if Mr. Halfyard and his colleagues could manage to get into power. I am firmly convinced that the Honourable Mr. Monroe, who is now in charge of the Government will not tolerate any such

things as fishery regulations, but will carry out his policy fearlessly and clean up the affairs of the country.

MR. HALFYARD—Why apologise for what you said yesterday.

MR. LAKE—I am not apologising, but speaking only facts. Now the Minister of Marine has made reference to the cod-oil industry, which no doubt needs to be helped along, and I believe that in a few days he will give us facts in connection with this that will be a surprise to all. I am satisfied that in the Minister of Fisheries we have a man who will do his best to encourage everything connected with the fisheries. He is a son of the soil, and can be depended on to do all in his power to promote the interests of the country. I also am a son of the soil and am proud of it. I have hauled cod-fish and am not afraid to go back at it to make a living either on the Banks or on Labrador. I have fished from Northern Labrador to the Western Banks, and though I am young yet it is twenty years since I was captain of a fishing vessel.

MR. HALFYARD—There are as good men as you who can't make a living at it.

MR. LAKE—But I can make a living at it, and the people of the West Coast can also do so, and we are going to build up that section again to its former prosperity. Now touching on the Pensions for firemen, to which reference has been made, they may need them as much as anybody else, but the people I refer to were the fishermen, and I say that they should get more. Some people who are getting big pensions have always been drawing fat salaries and living on the best in the land and should have saved something. But the fisherman has never been making much and should get a bigger pension, and I believe the Hon. the Prime Minister is about to bring in a measure to aid the fisherman and his wife also. Mr. Ashbourne asks about the firemen—but never mind them, they will be attended to. Mr. Halfyard interjects about the big fat salaries, but if he had continued in his Government job he too might be getting a pension of $2500 now. I would be ashamed if I were Mr. Halfyard to say as he did a few days ago that he could not now pay his income tax because he was out of his government job. I have no government job, but I can pay it out of the proceeds from the fishery.

MR. HALFYARD—You are a superior man.

MR. LAKE—Yes, the superior men are on this side of the House, and though we are cod haulers we can also make a living at something else if necessary. We are young on this side of the House, but we have nothing to be ashamed of in that, and we are able to hold up our end of the plank in connection with anything that may come up. In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that in the Hon. the Prime Minister we have a man who may be depended on to do everything possible in aid of the fisheries. Now, yesterday reference was made to the bridges and roads in Burin District, and when Mr. Hickman sends a candidate there he will be able to ride from one place to another in a motor car. Or perhaps he will be able to sell a Ford which he tried to do to me a few days ago. The roads will be there alright, sir, and I will have a car soon and perhaps I will give Mr. Halfyard a ride when he comes there to oppose me.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few remarks; first to congratulate Mr. Ashbourne on the able address he has delivered on the fisheries, and second to say that I am sorry I was not here yesterday to correct Mr. Lake on some of his statements in connection with

the Bank fishery. He said he had recieved a letter from someone in Ferryland District as to the preventing of the hauling of bait fish on a certain section of the coast. I think I know where that came from, but I want to say right here now that the men of Ferryland District are fishermen in every sense of the word and have no desire whatever to hamper the Bank fishery in any respect. There may be sections where they want to haul caplin for themselves, but who goes in there. There may be small sections like Caplin Bay and other places where the people may require all the caplin themselves, but everyone knows that after spawning the caplin go up in nooks in the cliffs and the people may not want the bankers to go in there. Perhaps that is what the petition mentioned by Mr. Lake may refer to. In such places you would not bait a vessel in ten hauls, but in other places the bankers can haul all they want. Now 20 years ago an act was passed—the Foreign Fishing Vessels Act—which drove all the vessels off the Shore, and on that very question my father left the Bond Party. The banking vessels were forced off the Shore, but he went back to the district and was re-elected. Along the South West Coast I must say the men are fishermen in the true sense of the word, but as for hauling a few caplin it is not here nor there, and in places on the Southern Shore the people use more caplin as manure on their gardens than the others do on the Banks. As I am on my feet I would like to say that I want to tell the members of this House and the country at large that I am an advocate of the fisheries, and always will be and am just as strong for it as either Mr. Lake or Mr. Ashbourne. I was born in a fishing district and am proud of it. As a matter of fact I have been told I was born with a gob-stick in my mouth.

I would first like to congratulate the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who is now Chairman of the Fishery Board. I happen to be a member of the Fishery Board too, but I look upon it now as I did in the past, merely as a matter of form. We only meet and discuss matters. The other day we went so far as to suggest that the exporters of codfish in Newfoundland would meet the Board and give us some suggestions as to the best way of handling the fishing industry of this country, and I regret to say that only a couple of representatives of firms on Water Street saw fit to come to the meeting. My opinion of what is wrong with the fishery of this country is that the Merchants of Water Street as a whole have no interest in it whatever. Look at the Bank fishery to-day as compared to what it was thirty years ago. Thirty years ago there were twenty-seven sail of vessels out of Ferryland district and commanded by twenty-seven Williams's. Thirty years ago there were one hundred and fifty bankers on the South West Coast prosecuting the fishery, and to-day there are only thirty. What is wrong? The reason is that there is no one on Water Street to-day supplying for the Bank fishery, except Mr. Monroe, who is supplying two bankers of his own. Water Street's argument is that it does not pay them. My argument against that is that last year sixty Lunenburg vessels prosecuted the fishery on the Grand Banks. They got their Spring baiting at Burin and returned well fished and got their second baiting on the Southern Shore and went off again. At the close of the voyage the sixty vessels totalled 170,000 quintals of codfish or 2700 quintals each. That averaged these Lunenburg fishermen $9.20 per quintal. Now where are we? Is not that a proof that the bank fishery of this country can pay? Still we hear men

making speeches in the Legislative Council to the effect that when a man gets up here and talks in support of our fisheries that he is talking politics. I claim that no Government in this country yet has ever made an honest attempt to do anything for the benefit of the codfishery thus far. If I had charge of the finances of this Colony to-day I would be prepared to back the fishery to the limit. I would pay a bounty on fish, provided, of course, that the fish was properly graded; but I am only one member of a party.

Now we have nine or ten old wooden plugs going to the sealfishery. In 1844 we had somewhere around three hundred vessels prosecuting the sealfishery landing over six hundred thousand seals, and they carried over ten thousand men. To-day with nine or ten ships prosecuting we have only ten or twelve hundred men engaged and it doesn't look as if the voyage will go over a hundred and twenty thousand seals. Why to-day people have to plead for berths. In fact I think there is a law passed that no man from the Southern Shore need apply for a berth at all. I know that Bowring Brothers through Captain Kean does not allow any berths to be given to Southern Shore men for the ice. Now what are we doing in connection with the sealfishery? As Mr. Ashbourne has aptly pointed out, we never had any expert to come here and point out the habits of the seals. Some years ago when the population of Newfoundland was only 180,000 people the total catch of codfish for that year was close on two million quintals. Now what is wrong? I suppose some one outside of this House will say that it is impertinent to talk in this fashion. I am somewhat in the same position as Mr. Lake with regard to the two thousand dollars devoted for the protection of our fisheries; whereas the Minister of Agriculture and Mines seems to be influential enough to get twenty thousand dollars for the encouragement of agriculture. The Fishery Board were even afraid to ask for five thousand. It looks to me as if the Fishery Board is looked upon as a joke and will be until some one steps in and does something different. As I said before, we called a meeting of the exporters of codfish a week ago and the only ones that turned up were Mr. James Baird, Jr., Mr. Baird of the Monroe Export Company, Mr. Templeman and Mr. Outerbridge. While on this point I would like to say that Mr. Hepburn, the senior partner of Baine Johnston and Company, is a most admirable member of the Fishery Board and has done very considerable work in trying to boost our fisheries in every way, shape and form. Mr. Hepburn was instrumental in asking the other exporters of fish to come to meet the Fishery Board. But no suggestions were put forward by the exporters, and I suppose if the members of the Fishery Board happen to put forward any suggestions the exporters would only go away and laugh at them. I was not in political life when the famous fish regulations were put in force. Some people are unkind enough to call them infamous regulations. But I want to say that they had their good points as well as their bad ones. If Sir William Coaker made a mistake he is not the only one who ever made a mistake, and the man who never makes a mistake is no good. But Sir William Coaker went too far. If he had put on a regulation as to grade and kept to it, they would have been some good; but he put on a price and was the first to break it himself. Now some one has suggested that the compulsory cull of fish would be a good thing. Personally I would like to see that; but it would not be workable except there would be a strict standardization rule to

compel every exporter of fish to export it in the same way that he bought it. For instance if a representative of a Brazilian firm came to me and buys one hundred drums of number one fish, an inspector should see that only number one fish is packed in these drums; but then again a buyer of fish can do what he likes with his own money, and it does not seem hardly right that he should be compelled by law how he should cull it; but on the other hand there should be a law compelling him to mark it number one, if he bought it number one. I apologise, Mr. Chairman, for delaying the time of the House, but I trust that I have made one or two good suggestions, which may, however, be criticised in the Upper House to-morrow; but I was sent here by the fishermen of this country and nobody but the fishermen will put me out of it.

MR. LAKE—Mr. Chairman, just a word in reply to the honourable member for Ferryland. I have the letter here now with reference to a petition from Ferryland district, asking that a certain cove in that district be reserved for bait for their own people. I claimed yesterday and I claim again to-day that any Newfoundland fisherman should be allowed to haul bait or to catch fish how, where and when he likes, provided that he should not use a small mesh trap. Now I do not see why the people of the Southern Shore should have any cove for themselves for baiting purposes, and I think that the waters of Newfoundland should be used for the best welfare of all concerned, and I know that the member for the Southern Shore, who I am sure has the interest of the fishermen of this country at heart, feels that way about it too. I am glad to know that his father crossed the floors of this House some years ago on the bait question; and I would be prepared to walk across the floors of this House this evening on the same issue, if need be, as that the fishermen of this country should be allowed to catch fish in any manner or in any way they like.

MINISTER MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, I suppose, being Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and head of the Department in the present Government, I should have a few words to say; but there is very little left for me to say. In the first place I want to say it is the first time I knew that I was an old man. Different speakers here this evening made remarks about the old-time seal killer. I am glad to know that I am getting an old man after all; but, nevertheless, I have heard quite a lot of discussion about fisheries during the last few days, and no doubt all is printed in the papers, it is generally understood most of the speeches are spoken for the purpose of being broadcasted in the papers. In this way they are trying to make their constituents believe that the Opposition are trying to do the best they can for their cause in the House of Assembly. I may say right here now that I am quite out of sight in the matter of speech making, and I don't want any word, first or last, to go out to my constituents. In the first place I believe my constituents sent me here knowing that I will do the best I can for them while on the floors of this House of Assembly or down in the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

In the next place why I do not want myself to be reported is because I am going to do my duty as far as I can, and I think that the country at large will admit that no member of any party should give all his mind to any one thing, and should force the Government to do all they can. In many instances we have to give our time, as members of the Government, to many things that we think are right and profitable to the country, and

yet it has been stated here yesterday and to-day that the present Government, of which I am a member, is not doing its best for the country. Now, I don't mind that coming from Mr. Ashbourne or the honourable Leader of the Opposition, but I do certainly deplore its coming from any member that sat in the Government under the leadership of Sir Richard A. Squires or Sir William F. Coaker.

After four years of the reign of Sir Richard Squires he had four dollar fish brought down to starvation price. These men owned several vessels at the beginning of his reign, they owned property and had a few thousand dollars in the bank.

During the reign of these men what did the fishermen come down to? Most of them were driven out of the country. The remainder of those would not go as long as they could get a living and enough to eat, and the men who would not be driven out of the country began to put out their traps for further fish. Some had gotten a full load of fish and presumed it would give them enough to pay for their summer supplies, and enough to buy necessary supplies for themselves and their families, and what they were given for that load of fish, it would be just as well if they had lost that fish over the schooners sides. They kept up and begged the Government of that day to reduce taxation. They would not reduce taxation. They asked them to do other things, they would not do anything in any shape or form. I have sat down here during the last two sessions to hear the very same men come in here and say that we are not doing anything for the fisheries of this country.

I claim that Mr. Monroe, the gentleman whom I am pleased to have as my leader, in the first place, was man enough to offer to the people of Bonavista Bay and the people of this country, a bonus on codfish. Therefore the good catch of fish that these men who had asked the past Government for reduction made and with the good prices last year, what do we find? We find that in the western districts of this Island and in every district of this Island and every district of Conception Bay not a solitary man is applying for relief. And I say also that we have done something for the fishermen in our efforts at giving them a shipbuilding bounty. It will cost the country fully forty thousand dollars to pay a bonus on the rebuilding of ships. That is for the fishermen. That is just as beneficial as anything else.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I know this is not the place when we are going through the fisheries supplies to bring up the question of road-building; but as it has been brought up in connection with this matter I would like to make a few remarks. As far as the two million dollars is concerned about the building of highways or roads, I say, in my opinion we are taking a chance, but if so, so has the man to take a chance who goes to the codfishery. He has to make an outlay in the beginning, and he takes a chance whether the catch will be profitable or not.

I say the Government are taking a chance; but, sir, I do not doubt that the fishermen of this country will bless the day that ever this country brought in the policy of building roads.

Down in the district of Bonavista Bay I told some gentleman here, a member of the House, that we had forty five settlements in Bonavista Bay without a foot-path, he would not believe me. I told him the other story and I suppose he wont believe that unless I produce the dead man's wife. We have been travelling for the last two or three years on the north shore of Bonavista Bay with an aver-

age of from six hundred to a thousand men. There are no roads or bridges. When you come to a brook you have to take your clothes off and wade across. There are no such conditions in any other parts of the countries.

MR. HALFYARD—How would they get the clothes over?

MINISTER MARINE & FISHERIES —Why we would throw them across, but I am afraid, Mr. Halfyard, if you had been there, you would have turned back.

MR. HALFYARD—I would have got on somebody's back.

MINISTER MARINE & FISHERIES —You would have been like Lot's wife turned into a pillor of salt.

MINISTER MARINE & FISHERIES —And on more than one occasion men laid down their lives on that road from Gambo because of the state of the bridges across which they had to go, and I am informed that a road will be built under the new road Commission on the North side of Bonavista Bay from Gambo down the north side, and I say that if the road policy does nothing more than build this road of fifty or sixty miles, then it will be a blessing to this country. I will come back to the fishermen, Mr. Chairman. There is a great deal said that there is not enough done for the fishermen. I have pointed out the instance of the country on the rebuilding of schooners, and now I will come back to the different fisheries of this country. We have had produced here during the last few days and read here a paper which was published and broadcasted through this country, written by Mr. Huntsman, I think the man's name is. I understand that the paper was got up by the Board of Trade. I met Mr. Huntsman, I met him down on the Labrador. I met him down in the Straits of Belle Isle and I went aboard and had a chant with him. I found what he was doing. I said to him "'Do you think for a moment that any Newfoundland fisherman think that nothing should be done with reference to the scientific nature of the fishery?" He said that he was not aware of it. He said that he thought that all Newfoundland fishermen thought that they knew all about the fish and their habits and everything like that, and I said "Mr. Huntsman, I would back up a Newfoundland fisherman against any other fisherman in the world." I said that I agreed that something scientifically should be done to help out the fishermen of Newfoundland. He said that he did not think that there were very many Newfoundlanders that had ever used the thermometer in reference to the fisheries. I said that I did not suppose that there were very many. When Governor McCallum was in this country it will be remembered that he took a trip down the Northern part of the Labrador with Doctor Grenfell, and Doctor Grenfell was trying at that time to make a chart of the northern part of Labrador coast that the British Government should have made for us fifty years ago and that the Newfoundland Government should have done long before. Anyhow he failed. At that time I was fishing about seventy-five miles north of Hopedale. There was plenty of fish in the deep water. I must admit that I did not have a thermometer with me, but Doctor Grenfell wanted to get up on the top of a rock and they had gone around it several times and they did not like the looks of it, and they thought it was pretty dangerous. They came right out to where I was jigging fish and they asked if we thought that it was possible to get upon the island. I said yes because we had been up there scores of times. They asked if we would go up and show them the way, and I did, and after we came

down they gave us a pretty good feed, and we needed it pretty badly after rowing twelve miles with twenty three foot oars, and only had a couple of hours sleep the night before, and we needed the cup of hot cocoa that they gave us. During the conversation with Doctor Grenfell, he said "Captain Winsor, did you ever take the temperature of the water." I said that I did not, and he said that he would try it tomorrow morning, and he did. He found that the water was ten degrees below what the fish could live in. We set our traps in ten or twelve or fifteen fathoms of water at the time, but since then we have got a little wiser and we do not make our traps so deep, and if the water is deep then we sink them and make them do the same work. The doctor found that the water was too cold for the fish to live in. We went down the coast within twenty five miles of Cape Harrigan before we found that the water was warm enough for the fish to live in. We went into the harbour, the water was calm and we had to be towed in by the boats, and there were a couple of other schooners there and they were getting all kinds of fish. I went into the place on the 12th of August, and on the 12th of September I had the pleasure of eating my birthday cake in my own home with 1200 quintals of fish. I will not say that that was the first thermometer that was ever used on that coast, but I doubt very much whether there was ever a thermometer used there before or since. I think, Mr. Chairman, that this thermometer is very necessary for the fishermen of this country. If the fishermen of this colony had been told of the thermometer before they might have had a chance to try it out and have brought a great deal more fish to the colony. Now as far as the Fishery Department is concerned, I went down there in the month of June, and the first time I went down there under Mr. Warren, and I stayed there for six days. I give Mr. Warren credit that I believe that if he were the Prime Minister of this country he would have done something. I have known him for twenty-five years and I know nothing bad about him. But since that we have had two elections. There was the election in the month of May and Mr. Monroe and myself were elected in Bonavista Bay, but our political enemies were not satisfied to let us alone. The Opposition of which Mr. Hickman is the leader were not satisfied to leave us alone, and then the Prime Minister and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had to go down to Bonavista Bay for another three weeks and spend some of our hard earned money instead of being in our offices and doing our best for the country. And therefore I have had very little time in my office, but when I went down there I found that the Fisheries Board that is supposed to be beneficial to the people of this country had been done away with altogether. I do not know who did away with it, but somebody must have thought that they would do better if they managed it themselves. I did not feel like that Mr. Chairman. I am the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and I have been fishing ever since I was twelve years of age, and if you figure that out you will find that I am not so young at all. Although I have been fishing all my life I was not satisfied to run the fisheries department all by myself without the help of the advisory board. I asked the Government to appoint the fishery Board. And Mr. Chairman I made up my mind that it was not going to be the merchants of St. John's that were going to be on that board. And if you look up the names of the Fishery Board you will find that the members are ninety per cent. outport men who have been at the fishery all their

lives and understand the fishing from the beginning to the end. We have one gentleman from the Board of Trade, Mr. Hepburn, and he is a good man. The Board of Trade should have their share in it. Now there has been some reference to the time that I spend in my department. I have been down there from six o'clock in the morning until one o'clock the next morning and you will not find me in my house to my meals until half past one or two o'clock. What do I find here? Instead of the Opposition compelling Mr. Monroe and myself to go to Bonavista in the month of October they should have left us alone and given us a chance to straighten the deplorable state of things that existed at that time. They might have given me a chance to visit the lighthouses of the country which are in a terrible condition at the present time, even not forgetting the large amount of money that has been spent on them during the last eight or ten years. Why it is one man's work to visit the lighthouses of this island and find out the leakages in the department of the lighthouses

I did not get a chance to do it. I am not supposed to do it according to the law, but I am prepared to do it in the interest of the people of this country. The other day as you will remember there was quite a discussion here in reference to the lighthouses. I am bound to say, Mr. Chairman, that the best thing that we can do for the fishermen of this country is to put more lighthouses on the coast. The discussion which took place was as to whether lighthouses should be on the Labrador. You know the answer that I made that the most beneficial thing for the fishermen of the country was the erection of lighthouses. I was called upon last year to inspect four or five lighthouses on the northern part of the island. They had been well prepared they had been erected, they were made of iron, because they had been painted every year, but they had been served for a number of years after without a drop of paint in the course of three years, and some of them were practically eaten through with rust. The lighthouses of this country are in a very deplorable condition to-day. I might say, Mr. Chairman, that the lighthouses are the most beneficial thing that we can give to the fishermen of this country. We spent quite a lot of money on lighthouses ten or fifteen years ago. And I say Mr. Chairman that the department has put six new lighthouses on the coast, and we have repaired three old ones at a cost of about twelve or fifteen hundred dollars each, and we have not asked the Government for one cent for them. You may ask me where I got the money. I will tell you where I got it. I got it buying the supplies for the lighthouses cheaper than they were bought before. That is where I got it. When I went down to that department there were bills coming in there for thirty cents a pound for rope; and I rang up certain parties and asked them what it meant; and they told me that it was a special kind of rope, but they were talking to the wrong man then, and I told them so. I told them what it was—it was plain manilla rope that I could get anywhere in town for twenty five cents a pound.

This year we shall be called upon to repair Long Point, Twillingate fog alarm, or the passage from the fog alarm to the lighthouse to the extent of twelve or fifteen thousand dollars. People may talk about these lighthouse keepers, and say that they should not get a pension, but you should go down there and see what they have to do. The man who keeps the fog alarm and the lighthouse has only one leg. When I say he has only one leg, he has one leg crippled; but

whenever that man has to get down and start the fog alarm blowing, he has got to get out of that lighthouse on a dark night and shin down a hundred feet to the fog alarm; and start it blowing to try and prevent us and other people from losing their lives on a foggy night. When a man has lived ten or fifteen years in a place like that, doing that same thing perhaps one hundred and fifty times or two hundred times a year, he deserves a pension when he gets old and is not able to keep on any longer. They deserve it, because these men do not get a large enough salary to put anything by for a rainy day. I agree that those people who get big salaries should not be getting any pensions, because they could have put something away; but I certainly think that these lighthouse keepers and firemen should get pensions, because they have all they can do to get money enough to keep themselves and their families.

(Reads extract from paper with reference to repairs to lighthouse.)

Well we are up against it there. I do not know I am sure, but that there are a few people left in this country that will talk about tearing down a building that is a hundred years old. The first thing that they will say is that is an historic building, and it would be better not to tear it down. Well, it does not matter much to me when it comes down to a question of dollars and cents whether it was built a hundred years or more ago. The lighthouses around this country are in many cases in a very dangerous condition, and I hope to be able to manage to repair them out of the maintenance that is voted each year for repairing and also for maintenance of buildings.

There are demands coming from certain parts of this country to have more lighthouses and more fog alarms. In Placentia, I think it was about fifteen years ago, when the Morris Government was in, there were cries coming from Placentia like a cry out of Macedonia, for fog alarms and lighthouses; but they have not got them yet, but I think I can guarantee that their cry from Macedonia will soon be answered.

I am prepared, Mr. Chairman, to fight with Mr. Monroe, or with any other members of this Government to get what money we can possibly get for the fisheries of this country, but I do not think that any of my constituents, nor any men throughout this country wants me to try and press the Government for money that will put an additional burden on the taxpayers of this country, if we can get our proportionate share for the the fishery. We have to remember that there are other men in this country outside the fishermen. There was mention made here the other day of a vote of twenty thousand dollars for agricultural purposes. Well, now I never knew that there were so many farmers in the district of Bonavista until this fall. I did not know until then that you could grow apples in Bonavista district. But I was down there and saw apples as good and as big as you could get anywhere else in the country. I know of one man who sold two hundred and eighty cases of fruit. Therefore, Mr. Minister of Agriculture, I am prepared to support you in getting your twenty thousand dollars for the encouragement of agricultural purposes in this country.

Speaking of these pensions. I was charged the other day with giving pensions to lighthouse keepers; and I was also charged with doing that to give jobs to some people. That I consider is not correct; and as I stated at the time I did not put one of those lighthouses there. But I am in accord with the gentleman who spoke here this evening and yester-

day, that the man who works for the Government for fifteen or twenty years and gives faithful service; if he does not get paid enough to put by something for his old age, then it is up to the taxpayers of this country to look after him. And I agree too that the man who gets enough to put by some money for his old age, then that man should not get any pension.

If we have done nothing else, Mr. Chairman, in the Fisheries Department this year, I claim that we have made big strides in the refining of cod liver oil in this country. One of the hon. members referred at some length to the factories; and I want to say right here now for the information of this House and the country at large that there is to-day in the United States a demand for one hundred and fifty thousand gallons of Newfoundland refined cod liver oil. We have a man to-day out in the United States, who went there about three weeks ago. This country, and the people of this country have no idea what the department of Marine and Fisheries has been doing this past six months; and, I must give the credit to Mr. Goodridge, for the last two years in reference to cod liver oil. We have had an uphill fight in connection with the refining of cod liver oil. I would like you to go down to a store on Water Street to-day, and see what you will find on the cod liver oil bottles. You will find marked on the battles "Newfoundland Refined Cod Liver Oil," and the bottles are put up in the Norwegian style. But I should not say in the Norwegian style, because they are put up in better style than ever the Norwegians put them up.

MR. HICKMAN—But you do not take the credit for what Mr. Goodridge did two years ago do you?

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—No, I am explaining that to you, only you are too dense to see it. Do you want to know what happened two years ago? I can tell you what happened then, if you will wait until I have a drink of water. I will tell what happened in reference to the cod liver oil and Mr. Goodridge. The American Government was prepared to send a Mr. Johnson out to Norway. They were prepared to pay his passage out there, and prepared to pay all his expenses, and everything else in connection with his trip out there; but Mr. Goodridge wrote him and told him that our cod liver oil was much better than the Norwegian oil, and consequently Mr. Johnson came down here. He came down here, and I may say that he got very little encouragement from the Government. But when he came down this year, we took hold of him, and gave him all the help that we could, and the result is that we have an order for twelve thousand gallons of Newfoundland Cod Liver Oil.

MR. HICKMAN—That is a result of what Mr. Goodridge did, and you are taking the credit.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I am not, and I am trying to make you see it. I am only taking the credit for what happened in the last six months, and the rest of the credit goes to Mr. Goodridge. He, Mr. Johnson came down here last year, and wanted twelve thousand gallons of cod liver oil at sixty cents a gallon. We went out to Bay Bulls and told Mr. Johnson that the oil could be sent out of the country in barrels that were not lined with tin just as well as in those that are lined with tin; and I saw that if we could do that we would be able to get the casks at half price, and if we were getting the casks at $2 less, it would mean so much more for the people of this country. He said that it was worth a trial, and he got ten tasks and sent it up to Ellansville to see how it

worked. He got a letter back from his father saying that it had arrived in splendid condition, just as good as if it had arrived in casks that were lined with tin.

Then the next thing that we did was that we noticed that the oil was going out in twenty-five gallon barrels; and we made the suggestion to Mr. Johnson that it should be sent in forty-five or fifty gallon barrels, and we went so far as to suggest that it should go out in eighty gallon barrels—in puncheon size. But we had to abandon the idea of sending it out in eighty gallon barrels because the railroad could not handle it in that size, and therefore we sent it out in forty five gallon barrels. By means of those two propositions we brought the price of cod liver oil up to one dollar a gallon.

The same man is coming here again this summer. The man who is up in the United States tells me that they wanted at least one hundred and fifty thousand gallons of Newfoundland cod oil; and he said that he was invited to some thirty or forty discussions in reference to Newfoundland oil, and Norwegian oil, and they all admitted that the Newfoundland oil was the better. The only thing, therefore, that I am afraid of at the present time is that we will not be able to supply the markets of the world with all the cod liver oil that they will want.

There may be people who think that this did not entail very much labour or any work of any kind, but I say that it did. And that alone goes to show that the Department which I represent has been trying to do something to uplift this country so far as the fishery is concerned.

Coming down to the codfishery itself, I claim that a lot more could be done with our codfishery, and I believe it is going to be done. We have been shipping the codfish out of our country in the same old way for the last hundred years. We are going to try and have it shipped in better condition. I suppose there are lots of people who say that they have their own ways of shipping it, and that is best—but they have their own opinions and I have mine.

What do you find with every other country—what does every merchant do? He has his agents out. What do you find with the Norwegian Government? It has agents all over the world. That is what we must do. You may say look what happened when you had agents before. But that does not matter. It is not because one man gave a thing a trial and made a failure of it, that another man cannot take it up and make a good thing out of it. And now I claim that we must exploit Newfoundland, and try to develop our fisheries, and we have to place our products on the different markets in the world. I firmly believe that the Government with which I am associated will be convinced of that, and I feel sure that Mr. Monroe is prepared to do anything that he is convinced will be for the uplift of this country, and once it is proved to him that it is going to be beneficial to the country. I think when he is satisfied of those things that he will go to the limits.

I may say, Mr. Chairman that there has been a great deal of discussion as to the vote of $2,000 for the fishery. I do not blame Mr. Ashbourne for his remarks, as he did not know there was more to be voted. Neither do I blame Mr. Lake, as I realize that both are as much interested in the fisheries as I am. But I wish to inform them that the Government is going to devote the sum of $20,000 to the purpose of scientific research in connection with the codfishery. I have faith enough in the Hon. the Prime Minister to say that I believe we will soon see a Bill introduced

asking authority for $20,000 to help in carrying on the fisheries. And I also say that it will not be spent wastefully as such money has been in the past. I asked for the appointment of the Fishery Board so as to take some of the responsibility off myself, and as I am the custodian of the money I will see that it is spent rightly and properly. Now what has happened this year? One gentleman says we may have the fishery a month earlier than usual and I agree with him. Now last year after I returned from the seal fishery Mr. Job asked me to have the Neptune fitted up to go to northern points to bring up seals taken by the landsmen, but I said it was better to send her to Blanc Sablon to catch fish. What happened? She was sent for the seals and before she got back and down to Blanc Sablon the fish had struck in and gone off again and she did nothing. Now I had no thermometer to get the temperature of the water, but I know the ice was off the coast, and when it goes off earlier than usual the fish strikes in earlier. Some people have the idea that the coldness of the water affects the fish, and I have no scientific knowledge in this direction, and do not profess to have it. But I have been catching fish at Bear Gut, Ryan's Bay, when the fish poked their noses up through the slob ice in the morning. Now yesterday Mr. Lake was talking in regard to the cutting up of trawls on the Labrador. I am something like the Scotchman who sticks out for his own country and in doing so I am not sticking out for any one section. I know only a few men from Bonavista Bay who fish along the shore of Labrador, and I will say that when I was coming up from there I saw the Bankers only going down to begin fishing for which I will take off my cap to them. They were going down when the other people were coming home, but if we had trawls and dories we would have stayed as long as the others. I will say this for the West Coast men, that they are a great class of fishermen, and as to shutting them out from any section, it would be a crying shame, and I for one would never be a party to it. I think I can name where the complaint came from, as I know who had traps cut. I might say for information that I was jigging fish—not trawling—as late as the 4th of October. I have been fishing at Cape Chidley for years and I say that nine out of ten who goes there if they had trawls and could not get fish there they would go even further north. Now Mr. Lake said yesterday that Capt. Winsor had been asked how many bankers had already sailed and he did not know the number. Mr. Lake should have asked the Customs Department and my inability to answer shows not the lack of activity on my part. The Customs are the ones to supply that information, though they may not be able to give much, as if 30 vessels have sailed they have done so only within the last few days. There has been a lot of discussion in connection with herring, and I think if this industry were properly carried on it would become second only to the codfishery. For several years now the output has been going down. Previous Governments did a lot about Scotch cure herring, but we hear many people say that the Scotch cure herring are not put up as they ought to be. We have complaints every day in my department in this connection. This year there are about 68 licensed parties packing Scotch cure. If every barrel were to go out properly of course it would be inspected by the men of my department. But it must be remembered that we have only six inspectors for both codoil and herring and three of them are too old to be sent out of town so that we really have only three. Now how can the

product of 68 packers be properly inspected by three men. Unless the inspector stays on a premises all day he cannot carry out the inspection properly. In some cases if he leaves after inspecting a few barrels the work of packing will still be carried on properly and in accordance with the regulations, but in other cases it will not be. Unless we have more inspectors and the work of packing is confined to central packing houses, it will be impossible to control it. It is the intention of the Fishery Board to recommend to the Government that central packing houses be erected so as to get better results. I am of the same opinion as Mr. Ashbourne and believe that Germany and Russia will take all the herring we can supply, and am convinced that we can sell to these countries at a profit. Mr. Hickman said yesterday that this cannot be done, but I have been told by Mr. Taylor, of Fleetwood, that there would be no trouble whatever in sending a million barrels to Russia in the summer, and he added that if we did not do it, he would. I heard from him a few days ago that he had already sent 200,000 barrels at a profit and I claim that if he can do it, so can we. But we cannot do it if as Mr. Ashbourne says, we have to pay 60 cents freight to bring the herring up on the train from Green Bay and also high rates for sending it across the Atlantic. But if the rates were cut I do not see why we could not market our product. Now there is one thing especially which has given split herring a black eye and that is the way they are put up. Mr. Ashbourne looked after his own product and I was told by them, and I believe that what he said was true. Every Spring there is a lot of split herring comes here in vessels from the north, and it is sold as the people certainly do not put them up for their health. Now if Mr. Ashbourne can do this why cannot others do it at a profit. I think we should have inspectors for the split herring as well as for the Scotch Cure.

House rose at 6.30 until 8 o'clock.

Capt. Winsor, Minister of Marine and Fisheries (continued)

Mr. Chairman, when the House adjourned we were on the question of the herring business. As I stated here this evening, as far as good split herring is concerned it could be marketed for the benefit of the fishermen of this country. I may say that during my remarks this afternoon I stated that in Russia and Germany quite a lot of herring has been sold this year, I understand, with a very decent profit. I notice that the Fishery Board has drawn up certain regulations in reference to split herring which has been broadcasted during the past fortnight, and I have no doubt but that we will have a bigger output of split herring this year than we have had for a very long time. From the numerous applications we have had this year for a license to pack split herring, there is no doubt in my mind that this will be a record year as far as the herring fishery is concerned. The new regulations provide that all split herring is to be packed into two sizes, large and medium. Previously, in nine cases out of ten, split herring would be thrown out, and large, medium and small would be packed together As far as I can find out from the Department and from the many letters received during the last few months from buyers, in my opinion, and in the opinion of foreign buyers, the cause of the downfall of the herring fishery in this country is due to the way it is packed. There are a certain class of fishermen in this country who are never satisfied with the dates that the Fishery Board may make in reference to the closing of the season. The fishermen of this country are inclined to think that any rules

that the fishing board may bring in in reference to the fisheries of this country are made solely for the interest of a few. You take the fishery board as it is constituted to-day. I don't know if any one member of that board, with the exception of Mr. Ashbourne, who is in business at packing split herring, and I feel sure as far as Mr. Ashbourne is concerned anything that he thought would be beneficial to the split herring business of this country or that would be a benefit to the country at large he would be man enough to ask for these rules and regulations to be put in force. And all the rules that have been brought in by the fishery board this year, I feel sure, have been made by every member of the board simply for the benefit of the country as a whole. I notice that the other countries are bringing in rules and regulations in reference to the herring to allow them not only to be put up as herring specially as a food but also the oil and different kinds of other manufactured articles. And sure if the other countries are thinking of enforcing rules and regulations to allow the people to manufacture other parts of the herring to get oil out of it we can boast of as much herring as any other country of the same size. Probably as much as any country of a larger size. Last spring when Mr. Monroe and myself were canvassing in the month of May in Bonavista District, in every settlement, the waters were alive with herring. And I am sorry to say that if the herring that were on the coast last spring could have been marketed with any certainty of a profit to the people who caught them our herring fishery would have been equal to one third of the codfishery last year. In several places where I went during the campaign a number of people had their nets out and were catching large quantities of them. In one place in particular where the men were picking the herring nets when we landed they asked me what price could be obtained in the city of St. John's. I had no idea at the time what the herring was selling for. But I wrote here and the message came back, $3 a barrel. Now herring at three dollars a barrel would not pay the men for putting them up. Consequently they had to give up the idea. But if they could have received $5.00 a barrel there would be a lot of money made in Bonavista and in other districts on the herring fishery before the codfishery had come into operation. It has been stated here this evening that the herring has been tried to be marketed in Russia and failed. But I think that there are quite a number of members of this House who can well remember the first time that salmon was exported in a fresh state out of this country. I happened to be in the Govt. at the time under the leadership of Sir Edward Morris. Lord Morris was a great believer in exporting fresh fish out of this country, on a practical basis. I think Lord Morris arranged with some country on the other side of the fish pond to send out a boat to take a load of salmon and try to market it. I am sorry to say at that time that the cargo of salmon turned out a failure. So it would have been with the herring if it had been exported a few years ago. Last year three loads of salmon for the English market were sold at a profitable price. Two fishermen in Bonavista Bay took a load of salmon, and I must say that the men made more money on that load than they did on the codfish. Some men have been paid as high as 350 dollars a man for salmon sold to these people. That only goes to show that if one man tries a proposition and fails another man can take it up and make a success of it. Therefore I am honestly

of the opinion that the herring fishery of this country can be made profitable to the people of this island. And as far as I am concerned and the fishery Board of this country I have no doubt whatever that this Government will do everything possible in the encouragement of the herring fishery. We expect this year to have at least 250 thousand barrels of herring, and Mr. Chairman not only the fishery board, but the fishery department will try to build up a market for the herring industry because I have in my mind a man once at Bell Isle who is trying to market two thousand barrels of herring. He has not yet arrived back, but he sent down letters stating that he had succeeded beyond all expectations as far as the market price of the herring that he expected to catch this summer.

Therefore taking these things into consideration, and I notice by the last market report the price of Porto Rico split herring is at $9 a brl. This shows that if the herring is packed all together small, large and medium can be sold in Porto Rico for $9 a barrel.

Reference has been made here a great number of times during this session to the lobster fishery. The lobster fishery has been debated to a great extent on the floors of this House during the session that we are now going through. If you would listen to some of the Hon. members on the floors of the House you would imagine that the Fishery Board, including the fishery department, was trying to close down the lobster fishery for its own benefit.

Most of the men on the Fishery Board have realised, and I may say that ninety per cent. of the men of this country realise that if the splendid industry of the lobster fishery is to be saved then the Government has to step in and call a halt and see if it is not possible to bring back this once valuable fishery. It is true that we have found strong protest from those places which have interest in the lobster fishery in St. Barbe District and some from the district of St. George's. It is also true Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Walsh took the bull by the horns, and not following the wishes of some of the constituents he told them that he thought the time was opportune when something could be done to protect this valuable asset for this country. He wrote his constituents and told them that he thought as the representative of the District of Placentia that he had the interest of the country at heart and that he thought that it was his duty to impress upon them the grave necessity of closing the lobster fishery for the next three years. And I am proud to say that the people of Bonavista Bay are prepared to make some sacrifice to see that the industry should be protected, and I am proud, Mr. Chairman, that some of the men on the West Coast, who had written asking what they were going to do if the lobster fishery was closed down since the bill has gone through have sent telegrams saying that after consideration they have come to the decision that we were doing the best thing possible in the interest of the people of the country at large. As far as the rules and regulations are concerned lots of people have said that it is no use passing laws and putting them in force unless they are carried out. With this I agree. In my opinion the Government of this Colony has got to see to it that the laws that are put on the statute books are carried out, and I am prepared to say here that as far as I am concerned and the Fishery Board is concerned that we are determined to see that the laws are carried out. The Government has seen fit to grant us twenty thousand dollars, some of

which will be spent in seeing the laws enforced. Therefore I feel that some of the people that fought this bill when it was before the House of Assembly will be the men that will be the loudest in their praise and talking in favour of it before long. Mr. Halfyard, the member for Trinity, has asked about the canning of crabs. That may seem a joke to some people, but as the hon. member knows the crabs in some countries are more valuable than the lobster, and it is a pity that all the crabs that have been caught in this country have been thrown away when they could have been turned into a good product of this country and exported. Crabs are something similar to the haddock in this country. I remember twenty seven years ago being in the city of New York. My father was with me, and when the menu was brought in in the morning my father being a fisherman he was anxious to have some fish for his breakfast, and he said that there was no fish on the menu card. I said that there was some haddock. He said that he never knew anyone to use haddock, and I could not get him to use it under any consideration, and in the same way there are men in this country to-day who will not use haddock. I have been in command for fifteen or twenty years of ten men or more, and it was not until the last three years that I could get anyone to use the haddock. Three years ago we got short of fish for fish and brewis, and I may say that ever since then that same man will take haddock in preference to codfish anytime, and therefore I feel sure that crabs as Mr. Halfyard has said could be sent out of the country at a profit. Now as I am on the canning process I may state here that we had some communication from a certain firm in the United States in reference to the canning of codfish in this country, and we asked for information on it, and the Fishery Board and the Premier have had some communication, and they are taking the matter up, and at the present time they are looking for a scientific man to come down here, a man who understands the fisheries, to be employed by the department, and we hope to give him a chance to see if there is anything that can be done to replace the lobster industry in the district of St. Barbe. They are trying to get the best man possible and therefore as soon as he advises the fishery board they will take the matter up with him and do all possible to turn out a success. And the turbot of this country is a thing that could be developed to a greater extent at the present time. I am not speaking in the interest of the people of Bonavista Bay because there is little turbot caught in Bonavista Bay; and I may say that I never saw a turbot until six years ago. In the month of October I thought that I would like to have a few quintals of good codfish for the winter's eating. I took my gear and went up the bay and set out the trawls, and after a time when I hauled them I had no fish, but there was a fish on the outer end of the trawl and I must admit that I did not know what it was when I took it into the boat. Down in Trinity Bay they have been into the turbot business for some time. Last year the Department had quite a lot of complaints from the people interested in the turbot business. This year we brought in a law that the turbot should be inspected, and I may say that before the law was put in force nine out of every ten men were anxious that there should be an inspection. The people could market the number two. The gentleman who used to buy the fish would not buy the No. 2. I got in touch with the gentle-

man and told him that he ought to buy the No. 2 also, but at a lesser price, and I am proud to say that he is now buying the No. 2 article at a reduced price. During the remarks of certain Hon. Members in this House of Assembly during the last few days there has been a lot of discussion about the supply of bait for our fishermen. It is true that there has been a certain amount of money voted for this encouragement. The Government granted a few thousand dollars to help these people out, but it did not turn out as good a success as anticipated. Very few took advantage of the opportunity that was offered by the Government and pay their proportional part of the expenses of the cost of the depot according to the act that was put through the House of Assembly; but I do agree with Mr. Ashbourne, and also with Mr. Lake that something should be done in reference to bait stations along the Newfoundland Coast, and also on the Labrador Coast. What has been the state of affairs on Labrador for the last few years? You take the men that go down there and are stationed on the Labrador. They go down there and fish with a hook and line. If there are no fish they have got to pick up their traps. What is the upshot? They do not get enough to pay their summer's expenses, and in nine cases out of ten, the Government has to bring them home free of charge. I argue that these men have to leave their stations with a half voyage when, if they had a bait station there, they could make a good voyage. Surely that has been proven by the Bankers that go down there. They have proven that it is possible to do it. The Bankers bring their own bait down there, but if these men who are stationed there could get the bait, they could do trawl fishing just the same as the bankers.

I do not mean to say for a moment that the man who is not in the trawling business is going to do as well for the first two or three years as the banker, who has plenty of experience in that line. But it is a well known saying that "practice makes master." But I have no doubt that if these people who go down to Labrador from Conception Bay could learn to be just as good in the trawling business as any man in this country. If they had bait stations down there, they could get the bait after they had taken their traps up. In the month of September, instead of coming down home, if they had not a good voyage, they could stay down there, and come out with a good voyage that would pay their summer's account, and feed themselves and their families for the winter. I think that that can be proved, and I do not ask this House of Assembly to take my word for it. Mr. Lake has proved it to you, and I think quite a lot of you knew it before. These bankers go down just about the time that our fishermen are leaving, and they get a good catch of fish. If the West Coast men can do it, surely the Conception Bay men can do it. The Conception Bay men who have gone out of this country have taken their places in all parts of the world, and are second to none in the country. And surely if they can do that, they can do the same in their own country.

Formerly they could not stay down there. The Bankers came down there, and had their own bait with them, and therefore they have the advantage over the men who are down there and have no bait. I hope, sir, that the Government of which I am a member, I hope that the time is not far distant when they will give this matter some consideration, and at the earliest possible date see that some bait stations are built on the Labrador Coast, where the Bait can be frozen and kept, so that these men will be

enabled to go down there each year and have a chance to secure a good voyage for themselves.

I noticed yesterday in the course of Mr. Lake's remarks that the question of cod traps came up, and the question of drawing for cod-traps. Mr. Chairman, I am afraid that a very serious proposition has been started in this country in regard to this law about the drawing of cod-trap berths not so much in relation to the drawing of trap berths, but in allowing certaiun places to cut out certain lines where the cod-traps are to be set.

This thing brings me back to about twenty one years ago on Labrador. There was a great agitation amongst the stationers of Labrador, that the distance between cod traps should be one hundred and twenty fathoms instead of eighty. Why was that? It was done purely and simply to shut out the floaters. I was in Indian Harbour about twenty one years ago, and I remember a man there by the name of Bishop. I do not know but he is within the hearing of my voice this evening, but I do not care if he is. He was there fishing with eight or nine cod-traps, and only ten men to handle them. He was getting enough fish out of one trap to keep the ten men going. Just about that time there were some men come down there in one of these small thirty ton schooners, who had been fishing in the Straits of Bell Isle, but had been unfortunate; and had come up to Labrador to try and make up a voyage. This man Bishop had ten trap berths, and he could only work one of them, yet he would not allow one of these men—there were three of them, two from St. Brendan's and the third was a Kane—he would not allow them to fish there. He would not give a man a fish out of these traps, neither would he allow them to set between the traps.

The following year, when I came back to St. John's, I happened to be on the Fishery Board that time, and I thought I would get the Board to make the distance between the berths sixty fathoms instead of eighty. What I wanted to get at is this. The information has been going around this country that I live in Wesleyville, and I want nobody else to come there and catch codfish. Just the same it has been getting around this country that the people in one place want nobody else to come in there and catch codfish. On the Labrador the stationers do not want the floaters to come and catch codfish. This thing is going on in every place, and every place that presents a petition to the House of Assembly or the Fisheries Board is allowed to draw a line. They draw a line so that only the people living in that place can set cod traps, and so that no outsider can come in and set a trap. I say that that is a bad practice, and if that is allowed to go on, God only knows what is going to happen to this country. But I am of the firm belief that the members of the Fishery Board at the present time are not going to allow this thing to go on.

The matter was also brought up in reference to petitions coming in to have people selecting certain coves for caplin. I am of the same opinion as Mr. Lake. A man should be allowed to catch codfish in whichever way he can get it, subject only to two rules. There are only two rules which should have to be kept, and they are the distance that cod traps should be apart, and the distance for trawls to be set apart from the cod-traps, so that they would not be tangling up. There should be no other rule, with the exception of the size of the mesh to be used.

I have been on that Fishery Board for the last twenty years, though I was ignored during the time of the

last Government. I was there when there was a petition from somewhere in Bonavista Bay asking that no one should be allowed to set a trawl in the coming season. What happens if that is granted. The next year they cannot catch any fish on the hook. Then they are going to come and ask us to upset the same law, and allow them to use trawls again. I remember the case of a man in Quidi Vidi. He came up to me last summer and told me that he had put a trawl out over night and had some two quintals of fish the next morning, but under the law he was made take up that trawl. Under the law he could not catch fish in a trawl. The result of that law was that that man got only seventeen quintals of fish for the summer. I say it is all wrong, and any Government or any Fishery Board that would uphold such a thing does not deserve to have the confidence of this country, or of the people in this country.

According as one settlement hears that another settlement has had a petition granted by the House of Assembly or by the Fishery Board, giving them permission to draw a line to shut out outsiders, they get the very same idea, and petition the Fishery Board for the same privilege. And if that sort of thing is allowed to go on, it will be the same all over the Island, and on Labrador. What is going to become then of the settlement that can catch no fish. There will be several settlements where they can catch no fish, and they will have nothing to do. I may say that if the people of Wesleyville had to rely on the fish that they would catch at Wesleyville, they would starve.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I will not delay this House very much longer in talking on this fishery matter, but I may say that as far as the lighthouse proposition is concerned the Department has been asking this year for a special grant to build lighthouses out at the Humber. I do not mean on the land—not in a village; but there is going to be quite a lot of boats coming in and out the Humber, and there are very few lighthouses there at the present time. We think it is necessary to put more lights there so as to enable these ships to get in and out there at night; but I may say Mr. Chairman, that while the Board intends to ask the Government for an amount to build these lighthouses and fog alarms at the Humber, they are not forgetting the fishermen.

We have asked for two or three lights and fog alarms on the West Coast and we have asked for one down at Peckford's Island. Peckford's Island as you are aware, is a very dangerous spot, as dangerous a spot as there is around the coast of Newfoundland, and I suppose there are as many or more vessels pass by that Island as by any other Island in the country. There is a light on that Island I will admit, but the fishermen these last fifteen years have been asking for a fog alarm, and I feel sure that if that fog alarm is not put there this year it will be in the year 1926. I am not holding out promises on this floor as they have been held out for years, but I feel sure that any suggestion that I make here in this House this evening will be carried out. If I was not perfectly convinced that they would be carried out, I would not bring the matters up.

Now, there is one other matter that I want to mention before I take my seat. While the Honourable member for Twillingate was on his feet this evening, he waxed very hot, and I could not blame him. I may say to Mr. Ashbourne in reference to the canal as it is called at Twillingate, that work has been proceeding on it for twelve months in order to get it fixed up so that motor boats of large size may pass through the tickle to

do their business at low tide as well as high. Nobody knows that place better than Mr. Ashbourne, and I may say that no place needs more attention. I have tried to help Mr. Ashbourne, and in doing so I believe that I am helping the people of Twillingate. Now Mr. Ashbourne would like to see it finished, and something like $3000 was spent on it during the summer and another $1000 to buy timber that was left over from what was to be the magnfiicent breakwater at Bonavista. With a few thousand dollars more the job could be completed with the exception of the dredging which comes under my department and for which we already have a scow built, and if the Government sees fit I will do my utmost to see that the work is finished. It can be finished with this scow and other apparatus which has been made by my department for the purpose. I hope, Mr. Chairman, I have not tired the House, but I thought it my duty to the people in the gallery and elsewhere to show that we are not dead, neither do we sleep, but are trying to do the best we can in the interests of the country. The earth was not made in a day and you cannot expect the Government to carry out in seven months what it takes four years to do, and as a matter of fact what some governments never did and never tried to do.

MR. DUFF—I would like to make a few remarks at this point and to congratulate the Minister of Marine on his interesting and lengthy speech. It appears that the gallant captain has the interests of the country at heart and if he succeeds in making improvements in connection with his department all will welcome it. I notice that the Fishery Board consists of outport men on which the Government is to be congratulated, but unfortunately they do not receive any pay. Perhaps that is why Outport men compose it. It was remarked a few days ago that a speaker on this side of the House was drinking a great deal of water during his address, but I notice to-day that Captain Winsor is also very thirsty, thought it must be admitted he had a thirst-creating subject, salt herring. It is difficult to deal with this matter of the export of fish, and it is hard to see how we can improve it. The Minister of Marine says that the export trade have not given him any suggestions worth while, but after all this is not surprising as the exporter has been at it for years and have not got very far. If these people ship inferior fish, branded with their own brand, and lose by it, they have only themselves to blame, and it is difficult for the Government to take up and do what these people should do for themselves. I may say that I have some facts here from Signor Ragnoli, showing how our fish receipts has fallen off in the Italian market in recent years. These figures show a steady decrease from 1906 until 1914. At the same time as our fish was falling off France and Iceland were increasing, and shipped thousands of quintals to Italy. This shows that we cannot compete with other fish-producing countries, and the question is "why?" The answer is "that we are over-taxed, so that our people cannot compete" and they are leaving in thousands for the States and other countries, as they cannot afford to stay here, owing to the heavy taxes which prevent them catching fish at a profit. The whole thing boils down to the question, what are we going to do about it? If the Government could reduce taxation, it would be alright, but if not, the people cannot continue to produce the fish. I was interested in hearing the Minister of Marine talk of taking the temperature of the water, and I may say that about forty years ago Captain

Fitzgerald, a man who was in his day much in advance of his time, and whose son is now in the Fisheries Department, used a thermometer at the Labrador, but I do not think with any great success. Mr. Adolph Neilson also came here from Norway and built a fish hatchery, but it did not get us anywhere. Last year Mr. Taylor of London came out here at the invitation of His Excellency the Governor and the Board of Trade, and I have read his report, but must say that I could not see anything in it, and the position is that we got to help ourselves. The Americans, French, Spaniards and Portuguese are catching our fish at our very doors, while our own people are leaving the country, most of them never to return. The French people give a bounty on fish, and other countries also help the fishermen in various ways, but we are doing little or nothing. Mr. Lake says we are going to protect the fisheries, and I hope it will be so. Now as regards lighthouses, I will touch lightly on the subject, in order to throw a little light on it. I suggest to the Minister of Marine that one place which needs an alarm is Carbonear Island, as it is a port of refuge for distressed vessels, and does as much for the men of the North as for those of Conception Bay in guiding them to safety. If an alarm had been there three years ago, several vessels which were lost with their crews in Bay de Verde would have been saved, but there was nothing on the Island to make them aware of their position, and they failed to make port safely. There was an alarm at Western Bay, and I do not know if it has been removed, but I never could see why it was put there, as there was one on Baccalieu on the northern side of the Bay, and another at Cape St. Francis on the South. The one at Western Bay could not be of much service, but a fog alarm at Carbonear Island would be a blessing, and I hope the Government and the Minister of Marine will see their way clear to have it put there.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask about this vote for the Fishery Board.

MINISTER OF MARINE—The vote in the estimates now is only $2,000.00 but it should be $5,000.00, as that amount was granted to the last Board, and I may say that it is going to be $20,000.00.

MINISTER OF FINANCE—$3,000.00 additional has been granted, and it is going to be $18,000.00 additional.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries as to who is the present Lightkeeper at Hopeall?

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I could not tell just now.

Mr. Halfyard—The reason I asked the question is that I think that the keeper of Hopeall Lighthouse was the subject of considerable discussion in this House during last session. The man's name is William Thorne, who was dismissed from office, and I understand a man named Cranford was put in his place. Now when I bring that matter to the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries he will readily understand the circumstances surrounding this case. It was generally recognised by those who took the trouble to enquire into the circumstances of that change that an injustice had been done Mr. Thorne, and I am sure that the Minister recognises it too. The result was that Thorne was promised compensation, but up to the present I do not think that anything has been done for him, and I would be derelict in my duty as a representative of the district of Trinity if I did not remind this House of this act of injustice done by the Government last year in removing this man Thorne from his

position. I say it was outrageous in the extreme. It was said that the act was done in ignorance, but ignorance is not an excuse in law. Now I think that it is the duty of those who unwittingly were parties to that unjust act to have the matter remedied at the earliest opportunity. Thorne is just as deserving of retaining his position as any civil servant in the Government. At present he is like a great many others, whether it is a departmental job in the Government or whether it is a lighthouse keeper, that when you lose a job it is not so easy to get another one; but for a man like Mr. Thorne to be the victim of political manipulation, I say it is not worthy of any Government, and it is not worthy of this House. I, therefore, protest against the change that was made, and, if the Government, through the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, is going to compensate Mr. Thorne in any way, I think it should occupy the attention of the Government or the Minister without any undue delay, because as I pointed out to the Minister at the time when he expressed his anxiety to do something for Thorne that it is not so easy to find jobs just now. Therefore, I trust that this matter will be immediately attended to.

It is not so easy to find jobs. It is not so easy to find jobs suitable to the applicant. This little job suited Mr. Thorne. He had a family to look after. He had other interests in New Harbour, at which he could earn a few dollars therefrom. Although the compensation was small the loss of the job meant a lot to him. I do not want to go into the history of the circumstances. Reference has been made to the services that was given in the Great War. And consideration should be given to the parents of those who lost their lives or were incapicitated in any way. Mr. Thorne comes under this category, as he is the father of two boys who did their duty, although they had scarcely reached the age for enlistment. Without further labouring the question I trust that the Minister will succeed in remedying an injustice as far as it is possible, and the only way to do it is to give Mr. Cranford some other job more suitable than this one. Certainly you can find some job for him for the services rendered as a good loyal supporter of the Government and let this man Thorne go back to his little job. If you can find jobs for other people why not find a job for Cranford. Make him fishery inspector and put Thorne back on his job.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—In reply to the Hon. Member for Trinity I may say that as far as I am concerned that any man in this country whether a Monroe or a Coaker man or anybody else that I feel is being treated wrong I will have it rectified as soon as possible, irrespective of what side he may be on. Any man that does his work faithfully should not lose his job. His conscience is his own. I shall certainly see him rectified. He only got the sum of a hundred dollars and I shall not take the trouble of looking up a fishery job for the other. But I shall certainly see him rectified because I consider that he was wronged in the first instance. I am going to practice what I preach. This man had worked faithfully but because he has backed the wrong side he was kicked out. He was never taken back since this Government got in. I guarantee that I will see Mr. Thorne rectified some time or other.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman, during the course of the lengthy address given by the Minister of Marine & Fisheries this afternoon and tonight, he took occasion to refer to the management of the Fisheries Department during the last four years, as not

having done anything worth while for the advancement of the fisheries.

I want to say, here and now, that there never was a time in the history of that Department when there was so much energy, enthusiasm and whole-hearted endeavour shown, as during that period. Every possible means available, which were in the power of Sir Wm. Coaker to use, to put the fishery on a firmer foundation, were used, through the Marine & Fisheries Department,, and the precarious position in which the fishing industry finds itself to-day, with its success depending more on a gambler's chance than on a well-thought-out plan for better curing, packing, and marketing, is certainly worse than it would be if the Regulations had been carried out in the main.

As the Minister pointed out himself this afternoon, the stagnation prevalent in the fishing industry to-day, was not due in the past, nor is it due to-day, to apathy on the part of the Department of Fisheries—for there was none, and is none—but is largely due to the differences existing amongst the exporters on Water street and elsewhere. Did they co-operate together for the advancement of the fishery, there can be no doubt it would be much further ahead than we find it to-day.

I heartily concur in the vote of $20,000 for Fishery Service and Scientific Investigation. If the laws and regulations existing, for the protection of the fisheries, are worth anything, they should be enforced. Violations take place in the size of the mesh used for traps in certain localities, and in other ways, and little has been done to carry out the laws and regulations governing this because the amount voted has not been enough to secure inspectors to see that they are carried out. Scientific Investigation has done much for the fishing industry in Norway, greatly assisting the fishermen in the gaining of a greater knowledge of fish life, and of temperature and currents in their relation to fish. It will certainly be of immense advantage to our fishermen to be informed on these matters and make more certain the securing of a catch of fish.

In the greater use of fish, as a food, in Newfoundland, we have done nothing, while in Canada and the United States lecturers are employed to educate consumers, not only to tell of the value of fish as a food, but also how to make it appetising. In their campaign of boosting the sale of fish, they do not confine themselves to codfish alone. All well-known edible fish are dealt with, every city and town is visited, fish meals are served, and in such an attractive manner as to result in increased sales of fish, varying from 20 per cent. to 30 per cent. within a few weeks. That is the story of those in charge of fish stores in New York, Brooklyn, Montreal and other places.

Two years ago when I visited the logging camps, I found that, outside of Fridays, fish was seldom seen on the table. I asked the reason why more fish was not supplied and was informed that the loggers would not take kindly to it. They had tried it before. If Labrador cure was provided, it would suit some, while others wanted shore, and with this difference in taste, to avoid trouble, it was decided not to supply more than was necessary for a Friday meal.

What may we learn from this? First, that the art of cooking fish to please the palates of our loggers is not sufficiently developed. There are many different ways of cooking fish among which can be found a number that will make fish, as a food, a delight, at least for one meal every day. Secondly it shows that although we are a fish producing country, on a whole our people eat little fish in comparison to other foods. Thirdly, that

there is no serious attempt to popularize the eating of more fish. Did we employ some talented lady with a knowledge of the art of cooking, not only to lecture, but to demonstrate the many ways of cooking the various edible fish, and pointed out to our people their nutritious value, and how they would make their own country more prosperous by eating less of the produce of other countries, such as tinned meat, and eat instead the fish products of Newfoundland, we would see within a few months a tremendous increase in the sale of fish in Newfoundland. If we are enthusiastic about our products, and we can only show our enthusiasm by the use we make of them ourselves, we will interest outsiders much better when we want to make sales.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that we have not done all we could to further develop our main industry. That we have got into a rut, and until we make a move along the lines I have suggested, we can do but little more.

Again, we turned down a proposition last year like the West India Service, because it required about $100,000 annual subsidy for two steamers for ten years, but accept a two million dollar proposition for building roads that means an annual interest charge of $100,000 at least, and another annual charge of $60,000 for upkeep, or $160,000 annually for all time for a very doubtful proposition, while the West India Service would certainly have developed more trade, not only in connection with our fishery products but also in connection with agricultural products. If Canada could send 500,000 barrels of potatoes to Cuba and other West India ports and get $3.00 per barrel for them, we can send potatoes also, and lumber as well.

Then there was the additional advantage of securing oranges, grapefruit, bananas, molasses, sugar, by our direct trade at a lower price than we get them for now. We certainly would have increased the sale of our fish. The fortnightly direct service from Halifax to the West Indies, enables Nova Scotia to secure sales of fish by the assurance of regular supplies every fortnight, as the purchaser in the various West Indian Ports may require.

Regarding the Labrador fishery. There can be no doubt that unless we bestir ourselves, that fishery will soon cease to exist. The difficulties under which many of the fishermen labour there, is most discouraging. We have heard during the course of this debate, that the high freight rate of sixty cents per barrel on herring, oil, etc., from the northern outports to St. John's, militate against the sale. How much more does this apply to the fishermen in militating against a profitable return on his catch. The high freight rates on salt, provisions, and fishing-gear, to and from the Labrador, make it so costly to carry on the fishery, that each year sees fewer persons engaged in it.

Again, the annoyance, the inconvenience, the great injury they meet with during the summer season, by often finding that the supplies ordered have been held up because the Hudson Bay Co., or some other company was given a preference, has added still more to their hardships, and if allowed to continue can only mean the abandonment of that fishery. When we remember that not many years ago, six hundred thousand quintals were taken from the Labrador and that the catch is now little more than half that amount, we should endeavour to remedy such a serious position in connection with the Labrador fishery.

The use of the wireless stations on the Labrador and a re-arrangement of stations, placed in centres that will enable the whole coast to be served

by them, would be of great assistance in saving time for the fishermen in their search for the wherabouts of fish. Also the establishment of refrigerators at similar centres would overcome the difficulty met with almost every year, of lack of bait. The cost would be very little compared with the increased catch that would eventually mean increased revenue and paying back to the Government the cost of operation, and here I would ask that the Minister give consideration this year to the better security of those who travel by the Labrador steamers. Every spring and fall there are trips, when from three to five hundred persons are found on board without the necessary life-boat accommodation. This could be overcome by allowing a number of trap boats to be taken on board on these occasions, that would accommodate the number on board and guard against a possible disaster.

Another suggestion I would offer is that the Government give a bounty on fish going out of Newfoundland and the Labrador, in Newfoundland built sailing vessels. Our merchant marine is all but gone,—supplanted by Danish vessels and Norwegian steamers. Newfoundland captains and crews supplanted by Danish and Norwegian captains and crews. Newfoundland blacksmiths, riggers and sailmakers supplanted by Danish and Norwegian blacksmith, riggers and sailmakers. Is there any wonder that times are not so good in Newfoundland, as they were.

Let a bounty be paid on Newfoundland fish, going out in our own built vessels, manned by our own captains and crews, and we will open up new avenues of employment for shipbuilders, blacksmiths, riggers, sailmakers, blockmakers, loggers and saw-mills. Would not that give better and surer beneficial results than two millions spent on roads for pleasure seekers?

We have concerned ourselves with the fishery in this debate, and rightly so. It is the main industry of the country and will remain so for some time yet. When pulp-mills and forests have gone their way, the fisheries will still be going on providing we give them the attention they require. They need to be advertised, not only in Newfoundland, but elsewhere, and if trade agents can be utilized for finding new markets, reporting on conditions as they exist, from time to time, there surely will be no loss to the country. Men of tact and of large experience are the only kind suitable for this work. We should watch closely the efforts put forth by England, Norway, Canada, the United States, Italy, Russia and Portugal, in their fostering of the fisheries, and be ever ready to adapt ourselves to the requirement of the times. In doing this, lies safety.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a few remarks in reply to the hon. member from the other side. First of all in regard to the West Indies trade. I do not profess to know very much about that trade. You call them the Trade, but I call them the merchants, and they have been arguing that point for a long time, and, as I am informed, 90 per cent. of the merchants say that there is no benefit whatever for the country in the idea. I do not know anything about it personally, but I have an idea that if it were beneficial to the trade of the country, that it would have been started.

Mr. Grimes spoke about the men wanting bait down on the Labrador coast. I think I have spoken about that before. Then he said something about the boats up on Labrador. I have not these boats under my charge because they are under the charge of the railroad. But I remember a little about them. I understand that

there were some complaints about the boats being filled, and I understand that the freight was taken out, and some other freight put aboard. I do not know if that is correct, but that is what I was told. About the men going and coming to the stations, I may say that as far as the men going to the French Shore is concerned, I know that I put the proposition up to the Government. I found that the men going from Trinity Bay and Conception Bay had to pay an enormous price to get down to the French Shore. They has to pay three times as much as they would have to pay to go from Conception Bay to Labrador; and I am proud to say that in the Fall of the year when the men are returning, the fares were reduced from about fourteen dollars to about eight dollars.

I remember there was a little disturbance last Fall some time, just when the Prime Minister and myself were going to Bonavista Bay for the bye-election. It seems that the Captain of the Prospero had been told to land a certain number of men at Heart's Content, but he had landed them at Catalina instead. Mr. Monroe and myself were coming down to Bonavista, and we got off at Shoal Harbor, and we happened to go into a shed and found three men there, who had been on the Prospero. They were cold and hungry and were trying to get home. Mr. Monroe did the only thing he could for them—gave them a five dollar bill. They were not voters of Bonavista. I agree with Mr. Grimes, that something should be done to try and help men like these, and I have no doubt that when the House meets next, everything will be arranged satisfactorily.

With regard to the wireless on the Labrador—that was one of the first things that I took up with the Marconi men. I sent for Mr. Collins. and asked him why it was that the fishery was not reported. He said it was always reported. I said it was not; and that I had been down there for the last ten years, and in nine cases out of ten, the Marconi men would not take the trouble even to look it up for you. He sent a message to all the operators, and told them that they had to report the fishery news every day, which I understand was done. There were about thirty schooners in the Straits of Belle Isle last year, and I went further down as I have already said. I found that the Marconi did not go any farther than Cape Harrison, and I went so far as to pay the land line men, so as to make sure that they would forward the news they got over the wireless over the land line. Last year the news was quite satisfactory down there. There were two or three places on the Labrador at which the Meigle did not call, but I think that was due to some of the stationers leaving there. There seemed no occasion to send the boat down there, but, however, that will be seen to.

Mr. Grimes spoke about bait sup- supplies. I think I thrashed that question out on the floors of the House this evening. I agree with the suggestion that there ought to be a bait station there.

The next question was that of the Labrador boat. There is a law on the Statute Book at the present time that every boat goint out is supposed to carry a certain number of boats to take the crew. If they did not do that, it is the captain's fault. In the case of Capt. Burgess—he was hung up at some place on the Labrador. There were quite a number of men there anxious to get home, and practically wanted to take charge of the boat. I think he was there some considerable time. He saw that there were not boats enough, or accommodation enough for them, so he wired

to St. John's. We had to send down another boat to bring them up. As far as the boats are concerned, my Department is supposed to see that they are secure and tight, and all that part of it. I agree with the hon. member that it might be a good idea to carry more boats. But as far as taking more than the boats can carry, that is a matter for the captain to see to.

MR. HALFYARD—Where is the increase for Labrador?

MINISTER OF MARINE—There is very little increase. Some of the Lighthouse-keepers were getting $500 and $600, and the rest only $350. Apparently the men in Conception Bay were getting big salaries and those at Labrador only $350, so we put them all together and it worked out about $500. For the information of the House, I may say that many of the men used to go single-handed, and as their stations are usually from ten to fifteen miles from anybody else, in a short time they were almost ready to enter the Lunatic Asylum owing to loneliness. An allowance of $50.00 was, therefore made for a boy to go with the lighthouse-keepers for the sake of company, or in case they should get sick, and this brought the salary up to $550.

MR. HALFYARD—Who is the keeper at Cape Harrison?

MINISTER OF MARINE—Mr. Hann was there last year. Mr. Hutchings, of Wesleyville, had it before, and was turned out by Coaker, who put Mr. Hicks there, so that when we came in I turned Hicks out. He has since said that I did right, although he had to suffer.

MR. DUFF—The vote of $500 for maintenance of Western Bay seems extravagant. It is only $250 for Carbonear Island, which is hard to get to, while it is $500 for the other place which is easy of access.

MINISTER OF MARINE—We will see about it.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, before this vote for lighthouses passes, I would like to say a few words principally in reply to the Speech of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries this afternoon. As we left the House at 6.30, somebody made the remark that the afternoon had been wasted, but I did not agree with that, and I think it was well spent, as I enjoyed hearing the Minister speak for two or three hours, eulogizing himself, patting himself on the back, drinking the waters of Winsor Lake, using biblical, political and nautical phrases, and I may say pompuously stating that he would take off his coat and fight the Prime Minister, if he did not get the money he wanted for the fisheries. Now I give him credit for that, as the fishery vote is a most important item in the estimates, and I agree with the various previous speakers that the Fishery Department is the head of the great industry which supports two-thirds of the people of all classes, and to any vote which he may get for improvement in this direction, nothing will be said by members on this side of the House. There are a few things which Capt. Winsor has taken credit for, and one is, the putting up of the price of cod-liver oil. The captain must remember that he must keep as near the truth as possible, and give credit where credit belongs. By his speech he gives the impression that it was by his labor the price is to go up to a dollar a gallon, and that he encouraged the experts to come here, and conduct their work. The men who came here visited the Southern Shore in 1923, and I do not know but they were here in 1922.

MINISTER OF MARINE—I said it was Mr. Goodridge who brought the experts here.

MR. HICKMAN—But you gave us all to think that you were responsible. Now the Minister made a statement that the United States will want one hundred and fifty-three thousand gallons of codliver oil this year to meet their requirements. That quantity at fifty gallons to the cask, means three thousand casks, which is more than Newfoundland can produce. The point I wish to make is that there are people here now from the States trying to make contracts which it is said will give us $1.00 a gallon, but if they can take the quantity mentioned, other countries will also want supplies, and it looks to me that the price could be higher. I have seen letters which were sent to some parties as to the making of these contracts. Now, Mr. Chairman, I would refer to only one more item, as I do not wish to delay the House. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries made a statement, which I do not agree with, that the herring fishery would be nearly as large and as valuable as the codfishery.

MINISTER OF MARINE& FISHERIES—I said one-third as large.

MR. HICKMAN—Now I do not know what experience Capt. Winsor has had with split herring, but I see by the Newfoundland Gazette here that he is making an experiment. In the Newfoundland Gazette, under date of March 31st, there are a lot of rules and regulations published governing the inspection of split herring. No doubt the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has done this in the interest of the country as he thinks; but while I support the inspection of any kind of fish that leave the country, I do not think that very much is to be gained by these regulations. Now the most of our herring are put up in the Spring of the year by thousands of the fishermen in Green Bay when they have just spawned and are in poor condition. I know that it was the custom of the fishermen to make the herring barrels themselves in winter time, and catch their herring in the Spring and pack them. Now these herring usually go to the West Indies, but since the United States put the duty on herring very little herring have gone there, and I am very sorry to say to-night that it is very difficult to sell any split herring. I have sold as high as twenty thousand barrels split herring in one year. To-day I do not suppose I could arrange to sell four thousand for a year. We have lost our split herring business, and these rules and regulations are going to be rather a hardsihp on the herring packers of Green Bay. Every man who cures split herring must have previously taken out an annual license and the number on his barrel must correspond with the number of his license. I presume that these regulations have been sanctioned by the Fishery Board. I see that one member from this side of the House—Mr. Ashbourne—is a member of the Fishery Board, and I am surprised that his views in this respect differ from mine. He is living in Green Bay where most of the herring are put up, and he certainly must be fully aware of the curcumstances and the quality of herring that is put up there. However, I am not blaming the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for giving this a trial, for no doubt he has in his mind the good of the fisheries; but I am very sorry to say that our markets for split herring are fast going, and it is very difficult indeed to market split herring at the present time at any kind of a reasonable price. If the Government intend to foster the split herring industry and intend to keep it going and make it an industry worth while, they will have to give something in the way of a bonus on herring so that the packer can get sufficient for his product. Now with

reference to the matter of statistics of the fisheries, I have often said here that it is regrettable that we have not anything near statistics on the fisheries. The whole thing is done by guess-work and nobody can size up the fisheries until the fish is marketed every year. All through the summer of 1924 the cry was "no fish." The result was that the markets to-day are all over-stocked, and I believe that when all the fish that was caught last year is exported, it wlil be seen that the total catch was as good as the previous year. Now if the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was wise he would get statistics on the fisheries. The question was asked here a few days ago as to the number of vessels prosecuting the bank fishery on the South West Coast, and the Minister did not have the information before him because he did not have the statistics.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—That is not for my Department.

MR. HICKMAN—It should be for your Department and you should have some means whereby you should be able to tell us how many vessels there are prosecuting the bank fishery, and if the Minister does do something in the way of getting statistics furnished with reference to the codfishery I am sure it will redound to his credit. Mr. Lake spoke strongly yesterday in favor of the establishment of a bait freezer on the West Coast. I think that he is quite justified in demanding from the Government the putting up of a freezer there. After all, the bank fishermen are dependent upon bait because if they are without bait they cannot catch fish. I know of cases where bankers were lying around for weeks on the West Coast at a time owing to lack of bait. That section of the West Coast around Grand Bank, Fortune and Burin get very little relief from the Government. They are self-supporting people and they are producers, and I think they are the people above all others to be encouraged. Mr. Lake also stated yesterday that the people of Upper Island Cove, in the District of Harbor Grace, had received a lot of money for relief during the past year, and he used that as an argument why the Government should establish a bait freezer for the people of the West Coast. It is true that the people of Upper Island Cove got relief, but it must be borne in mind that their occupation is mining on Bell Island, and you know, Mr. Chairman, that the rate of pay for shovelling ore on Bell Island was 25 cents per hour, and out of that they had to pay their expenses. In other words that while working they only got sufficient pay to maintain themselves and their families, but when the mines shut down there was nothing left for them to do but to fall back upon the Government. I am sure these men are quite willing to work if they have the opportunity, because any man who shovels ore is the type of man who is prepared to take on any kind of a job, irrespective of hardships. The member for Burin also stated that any man should be allowed to catch fish where, when and how he likes. Now I do not agree with that. If every man was allowed to catch fish where, how and when he likes, our fisheries would soon be depleted. I know that a great many of the West Cosat vessels go to the Labrador in the Fall of the year trawling fish. I have heard it said that sometimes on the decks of those vessels there are six inches of spawn taken out of the entrals of the fish. In that case our Labrador fishery are being interfered with. There is no means of stopping that at this juncture; but there is one thing I am afraid that is going

to be introduced in this country and that is beam trawling.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE--That is going on now.

MR. HIKCMAN—Now if you have beam trawlers sweeping the banks, in a couple of years' time you have only a quarter of the number of men employed as compared to what are engaged in the bank fishery at present. Now I contend that if steam trawlers intend to operate on the coast of Newfoundland, they should not be allowed to come into any port except for refuge. Several members have talked here about increasing the catch of fish. The fact is that too much fish has been caught in the past for the cost of producing it. We have to produce fish cheaper before we can market it cheaper. Anybody who has anything to do with the marketing of fish knows well that when fish is high in price the consumption falls off, and you can market two million quintals of fish each year if the price is right; whereas if the price is too high great difficulty is experienced in marketing an average catch of a million and a quarter quintals, and, unless we can get some means of producing fish cheaper, marketing will fall off. The Norwegians can produce fish much cheaper than we can, because, I suppose, they market it at less expense than we do.

A man who is fitting himself out for Labrador, if he is a good fisherman he will fit himself out with two or three traps and two or three motor boats. He will have a bill of four or five hundred dollars for gasoline, lubricating oil and kerosene, &c., because the class of engine that he uses is a gasoline consuming engine, and, as you know, gasoline is a very expensive article, and the engine consumes the gasoline very quickly, whereas the people in Norway and those who fish in the North Sea use an engine which consumes crude oil, and where an outfit here costs five hundred dollars for the fisheries the fishermen of Norway probably can provide themselves with one for less than one hundred dollars. They have no doubt other economical ways for keeping down the cost of producing fish. That is why they are able to undersell us in certain markets.

Now, I don't know any way that fish can be caught cheaper, except the man get his supplies cheaper, and I don't see how it is possible to get supplies cheaper at the present time.

I think that every man who enters the fish exporting business thinks he can go one better than his neighbours who have been in the business for a long time, and the first thing we hear is that he is after finding new markets, and after it has cost him a good deal of money he finds out his mistake.

I have, myself, made many efforts to find new markets. I said yesterday that I had been discussing this matter with a man from Russia regarding the future of the fish business in Russia. This man went thoroughly into the herring business and he told me that Russia would not pay the price that we would charge. They can get the fish almost as cheaply in Russia as the freight would cost from here to there. They get supplied from the North Sea and from the coast of England, and it can be freighted across the Baltic for twenty-five cents per package while we have to pay two or three dollars a barrel more to ship it across and get it into Russia. Consequently these markets can be cut out. Some years ago I made an effort to market salmon in Germany, before the war. I sent a consignment of salted salmon to Hamburg, Berlin and some other markets, with the result that I lost money on it, and when the salmon reached there I saw it was not suitable for the markets.

The salmon they are accustomed to use is British Columbia salmon. They

are from one hundred to one hundred and fifty pounds weight. They chop the heads off and cut it up in big slabs and cure it that way. Our salmon is too heavily salted. It has to be salted heavily in order to preserve it, and it is not large enough for their requirements; so I discovered that there were no markets there for Newfoundland salmon.

I also made efforts to ship herring and fish to the west coast of Africa; the results were not very good. I sold all the shipments but the returns were not sufficient to pay for the fish and the cost of transportation.

I also made efforts to ship fish to Rio de Janeiro. I put it up in 128-lb. cases, it deteriorated and very little returns came in. Norway caters to these markets particularly. They put the fish up very hard, in tin-lined cases hermetically sealed. The fish goes down the coast, and it keeps during the passage, right up until it is consumed.

I also made efforts to get markets in Buenos Ayres for tinned lobsters, but without results. Some of the lobsters we have been getting are fair and more are quite unsuitable, and the people down there are accustomed to buy lobsters from large grocery concerns in England, who have their own labels on the tins.

The American duty on fish is the great drawback to Newfoundland. I do not know if there is anything that the Government can do, but it is a very important matter. The fish that goes into Porto Rico for the last two years, since the duty was put on is $1.25 per quintal; while this more or less kills the markets it is not so much the United States itself as those places over which the United States is protectorate. I sent large quantities of fish to Porto Rico and on every quintal I had to pay $1.25 duty.

The United States at the present time has a claim aginst Newfoundland for duties of some kind which we have collected in the past from American vessels. I suppose that will be settled by arbitration. We should take some steps. This Government should consider if some steps could be taken in reference to the American ships coming here, and try to rectify this duty and have it taken off. After all, two hundred thousand quintals of fish at $1.25 is $257,000 out of the pockets of the fishermen and the traders of this country. The more money there is in circulation the more everybody is going to be affected whether they may be exporting fish or manufacturing articles of some kind.

In reference to the duties that the Americans are collecting from us I want to make reference to something that the member for Burin touched on yesterday. Also the member for Fortune told us that Fortune Bay used to be the home of the herring fishery; so it was. And at the time of Sir Robert Bond's administration, when Newfoundlanders were debarred from selling bait fishes to St. Pierre for the fisheries, it was in Fortune Bay that all the trouble took place. Fortune Bay was where most of the blockade runners lived. These chaps who had schooners took herring and caplin to St. Pierre and sold them in defiance of the law. The men up there did not have much satisfaction as they were chased around by the coastal revenue steamers for months and months while they were illegally supplying bait to the French fishermen. What depleted the herring fishery was the Americans. Some years ago the run of herring in Fortune Bay was very small in size and the Americans who came there in the winter time picked out all the large size and threw the rest overboard, consequently they polluted all the waters of the bay, and the following year, and ever year for ten years after there was scarcely a herring to be seen in Fotune Bay. These were the men who were destroying our fishery, and now the American Govern-

ment is claiming on us for duties collected at that time. I don't know how far back the claim dates, but I presume it is a great many years.

Captain Winsor, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to-night laid great stress on the lobster fisheries, and he told us that he had introduced regulations and laws to have the lobster fishery closed for the next three years in the interests of the country. I have already told the hon. member that if he carried out the regulations and laws that are already in existence to-day, and if they had been carried out by the past Minister of Marine and Fisheries in a different Government, there would be no reason to-day for the three years close season on lobsters.

There is a regulation which says that the laths of lobster traps should be three inches apart. That regulation has never been caried out, with the result that small lobsters have been caught and the fisheries are being depleted. But if the law had been carried out there would have been no necessity for a close season for three years.

I am stating this now in this House so that they may take notice, because there is another fishery just as important and that is the inshore codfishery. And to-day you will find that there are very few fish caught in the bottom of Trinity and Bonavista Bays. You get fish from there in the summer time, as the hon. member knows, 9 or 10 inches long. The fish is not caught in the regulation mesh traps. If the regulation traps were used you would not have that kind of fish for the market in St. John's. There is a law on the Statute Book now that regulates the size of the mesh for codfish. And if the hon. member does not see that the law is carried out he will find that the codfishery will be depleted just the same as the lobster fishery. The only fish caught inshore will be the fish that comes in during the caplin season. I think that the Government should do everything they possibly can to see that the people fish with the regulation size trap and prevent the destruction of the young, for after all it is the young of anything that posterity depends on, be it cod or anything else. The Captain should leave no stone unturned to prevent some future Minister of Marine and Fisheries from coming into this House and asking to have this or that done away with as being unfair to certain sections of the people of Newfoundland.

Now the Minister this afternoon made reference to the fish regulations and he describes them as Coakers regulations. Now in connection with the fishery regulations I may say that while the burden and the blame for the introduction of the fish regulations and the effort of carrying them out fell upon the shoulders of Sir William Coaker, he was only the tool for other people and he was placed in the position that he put the regulations in force for other influential people and then I suppose he did not want to take back what he had done. I have nothing to say about the introduction of the fish regulations. I have some very good information about them which I am not going to state on the floor of this House. They have not much to do with the House of Assembly but I am of the opinion that the regulations were never conceived in the mind of Sir William Coaker at all, but he had to take the blame for what he had done and I myself fought him to the best of my ability because I thought that they were detrimental to the interests of Newfoundland.

And now on the reference to the rebuilding of schooners the Minister of Marine and Fisheries said that the bounty would be a good help to the people of this country. When the Bill came before the House we on this side of the House supported it, because we believe that every schooner

that is built or repaired in Newfoundland is an asset. They are worn out and unless they are rebuilt it is just as good to put them on the dump, and the members on this side of the House are prepared to give the Minister credit for introducing the measure, but there is one thing that we did not give him credit for and that was that he did not take the advice of the Opposition that those who undertook the repairs to the ships last year without hauling them up should get some consideration. because they did not know the rules and regulations at all that the Bill states must be followed out, and I feel sure that the Captain will see, if at all possible, that these men will be given some assistance because it is only during the last few days that they knew it was necessary to have the vessels hauled up.

Now Captain Winsor made reference to the trip that Governor McCallum made with Doctor Grenfell on the Labrador when they were trying to make a chart. Now I saw a little while ago in one of Doctor Grenfell's magazines a map of the Labrador. I had never seen one before. I wrote to the Deep Sea Mission in New York and asked them to supply me with a larger sized one and they replied that that was the only one they had. I presume that that map was made at the time to which Captain Winsor refers. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries made the statement this afternoon that the Opposition should not have opposed him and his colleague in the bye-election in Bonavista. Now I do not see how the Minister of Marine and Fisheries expects to go on a bye-election without being opposed. It is not the usual thing to go on an election without opposition. The Captain thought that it was a hard thing to have to go down to Boonavista Bay and spend hard earned money. Well, now, I agree with him. He spent a lot of hard earned money and he spent a lot of our money as well as his own, because I have before me a list of grants that were sent out to the district of Bonavista from the Marine and Fisheries Department and the Department of Public Works from the time the Government came into power until the end of this year. It is in the vicinity of forty thousand dollars and the list has one hundred and ninety names, so that we can see that a hundred and ninety people of Bonavista Bay were getting grants, and naturally they asked their sons and their brothers and their brothers-in-law to vote the same way that they did so that the candidates that got the money for them might get a sufficient majority. This is the list that I got from the departments. I am only giving you facts and figures, and if you want them, why, here they are. That is hard earned money and included in it is some of mine. We all had to contribute. I claim my proportion of that. Now reference was made to the lobster fishery and the hon. member has told us that he considers the questions of putting up crabs. I think that the crabs are very small.

Now in reference to the West India service. I have already spoken on that before. I believe in subsidising steamers for the West India service. Now down in the West Indies there are about twelve millions of people which this line would connect us with. The Hon. Minister of Justice told us that the Bill was referred to a Select Committee and that it did not get very much support, but that was because thosse who were called to give evidence had their own personal ends to serve. I know the people who were called in and the Hon. Minister of Justice knows who they were also. There are lots of people who are philanthropists and they make you believe that they spend all their time and money in the service of the country, but whenever it comes to something that touches their own pockets or business they soon show how great philanthro-

pists they are. But I believe that if the Government got this line of steamers (I do not believe that they could get them at the present time) of two thousand tons each, with passenger accommodation, it would be the best expenditure of a hundred or a hundred and twenty thousand dollars that they ever made.

It cannot be estimated how much trade could be got. It is a well known fact that the Halifax people buy our fish and herring and take them to Halifax and pay the freight on the schooners from Newfoundland to Halifax and marine insurance, and then send them down to the West Indies and make more money than we can, just becausee we have no regular service, and therefore cannot get the fish down there on short notice. I met a man from Jamaica in New York. He was a planter, and that year he had thrown away eight hundred barrels of oranges for which he had no market. There is one thing that could have been imported into Newfoundland very cheaply, and that business could be worked up in Newfoundland to our great benefit. There is one little thing which I have myself in the connection with the West Indies. It very often happens that I tell our agent in the West Indies to send me up a few cases of grapefruit, and he sends them up via Halifax and the Red Cross boats, and they cost landed here duty paid, about five dollars a case of 100, and they cost fifteen or twenty cents each here in St. John's. That is only a small item. Now there is one other item to which I am going to refer before I close, and that is the Labrador telegraph and the wireless service. Last season the men from the fishery told us that when they arrived on the Labrador coast, the fish had been in and gone. Now I think that the Government should keep a man stationed at one of the Marconi stations on the Labrador all the winter, for the information of the fishermen. These men could report when the ice has left the coast, and the men will know when to go down to the Labrador, and the result wil be that the fishery will be better than it could otherwise be. I do not know whether some of the members know what the Mackinson cod is. The Mackinson cod was a fish that was cured and eaten in a restaurant by a delegation from the Government, and was washed down with champagne. The latter is the reason why it tasted so good and Mackinson got one thousand dollars for his recipe.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman, I would like to let the members of the House know my position as a member of the Fishery Board in relation to the regulations requiring inspection on split herring. I might say that last year, the first time I sat on the Fishery Board, Mr. Alan Taylor was also present at the meeting of the Fishery Board, and when the question of herring came up, the question of instituting an inspection was spoken of. I protested against it so far as split herring was concerned; and to-day I consider that such a move to be impracticable, and that the Government can not very well carry out this inspection, principally owing to the fact that our herring is not put up in mass production; to-day I must say that I can not speak favourably on the matter at all. However, the other members of the Fishery Board considered that the principle was a good one. It was thought that it had a good effect on Scotch cure herring, and Mr. Taylor thought it would greatly improve the cure of our split herring. I told the Board that as far as our firm was concerned, we had never had any difficulty in selling our catch of split herring, and that we had never made, so far as I can remember, a loss on

any split herring that we put up; and to-day, I believe the Government will have very great difficulty in enforcing this inspection. In this regard I would recommend to the Government, in view of the fact that our herring markets are getting fewer and fewer every year, that it should consider the advisability of granting a bonus on the pack of split herring. I think that such a move would be very advisable; and also if you decide to take such a step, I think that to-day would, perhaps be the most opportune time for that bounty to be given—that is, if you are going to require an inspection.

With regard to the point that Mr. Hickman brought up about the West Indies Service. I think myself that the position which the Leader of the Opposition has taken is a good one. We find in Newfoundland to-day that fruit is practically a luxury. There is very little fruit sold to-day in Newfoundland outports, because of its excessive price. I think that the West Indies offer a source from which we can get great value in the way of fruit, and I hope the time will come when fruit will no longer be a luxury, but instead that the best fruits that can be got will be seen in future in every home, because fruit is practically a necessity in the way of food.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I may say in reference to the wireless station on Labrador, that there is one open all the winter at Battle Harbor.

MR. HICKMAN—Every winter?

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Yes, and we get a message nearly every day.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, the hour is very late, and I would like to ask the Minister of Finance if he desires to put this vote through to-night. If he does not want to pass it to-night, I would suggest that the Committee rise.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—It will be as well to pass it to-night.

MR. HALFYARD—I do not intend to take up the time of the Committee very long. Although it is late, and in spite of the remarks made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I will have the temerity to make one or two remarks on the fisheries of Newfoundland, even though I was a member of Sir Richard Squires' Government, and I have been connected in a great many respects with Sir William Coaker.

The fisheries of Newfoundland, being our staple industry, it is only proper that there should be a most exhaustive debate on them in this House; and they should always receive the best consideration of us all. Up to the present time, we have not spent much time in debating the fisheries; but this is a most opportune time to discuss them, when we have the vote for fisheries before us.

The remarks of the members who have spoken on this side of the House and also the remarks of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, have been such as to deserve congratulation. They have taken the trouble to give some practical suggestions. I cannot say that I am in the fortunate position to do that, nor do I intend to speak at any great length on this matter, nor would I presume to make any suggestions that might be of value to the country. I think that the remarks made by the hon. member for Carbonear, Mr Duff, were very much to the point; that before we can do much to encourage the prosecution of the fisheries in Newfoundland, we will have to lessen the cost of the supplies for the fishery, if it is at all possible to do so. I think the point is very well taken. We would gather from the remarks of the Minister of Marine and

Fisheries that the Government of Sir Richard Squires should be censured for the low price of fish in 1922, and when Mr. Grimes, the hon. member for Twillingate suggested that Lunenburg was practically in the same state as ourselves, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries said that they must have had a bad Government too. I do not suppose that the Minister was serious in his remarks, because it is silly to blame a Government for the price of fish. It depends upon conditions and upon the markets, and I do not think that the Government of Sir Richard Squires should be subjected to censure for the price of fish during those years. At that time we were living under very trying conditions, and conditions financially were very similar all over the world at the same time. . . . .

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I did not censure Sir Richard Squires for the price of fish, but for not helping the fishermeen; for not reducing taxation or giving some help.

MR. HALFYARD—I am glad the Minister has made the explanation that he does not blame any Government for the price of fish; but he is inclined to criticise one Government for not reducing taxation. I trust that the Government, of which he is very important member, will do something to reduce taxation, but up to the present time it must be admitted that there have not been very many indications of any such thing. To have reduced taxation, you must have reduced expenditure; and these estimates show us that expenditure is going to be pretty much the same as it was last year.

As a matter of fact taxation was reduced by the Government of that day. The Minister of Fisheries will refer to the memorandum that was presented to the Government of that day on the matter of the fishery. I do not know whether the Hon. Minister was one of the deputation that presented that . . . .

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I was not.

MR. HALFYARD—At any rate we were asked then to repeal the export tax on fish. There was an export tax on fish then, and the Government did repeal it, and under the circumstances, and appreciating the conditions that obtained then, it must be admitted that we did the best we could.

Besides that there was an effort made in every department to reduce expenditure and cut down the estimates, because we were trying to save a million dollars if it was at all possible. That is the reason why the vote for maintenance of lighthouses was reduced. Now that the revenue is much better, the Government thinks that money should be spent in connection with the Fisheries Department; and of course if they do so, they should have the support of the whole house and the country.

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries said that Mr. Monroe, the Prime Minister, was man enough to offer a bonus on fish, but that conditions did not warrant the granting of a bonus last year. I quite agree with him. But I fear that conditions may be such next year that the Government will be called upon to do something in this respect. It is unfortunate that conditions at present are such in our foreign markets that it is questionable what is going to happen next year, and it would be most unfortunate for the fishermen of the country, and for the country if the Prime Minister has to redeem his pledge in that respect. . . .

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—You said the same thing last year.

MR. HALFYARD—I am only speaking of the conditions as they are at the present time, and the outlook is not a very bright one, but our talk-

ing about it will not make it any better. The Minister said that owing to the good fishery, we did not need so much money to be applied for relief. That is true to a certain extent, but only in part, because, as I have already stated, if the men of Trinity District were depending upon the fisheries of last year, they would have been in just as bad a state as they were during the year 1922-1923. The better conditions obtaining in the country appear to me to be due to two causes; the first is the good price for fish, and the second is that the earning power of the people has been increased because of the industries started in the country.

The Minister also says that the people will live to see that the two million dollars granted for roads would be a blessing to the country. Now take that road from Wesleyville to Gambo. A party travelling over that would have to swim across the river to get down, but it would not take much to remedy this condition. I think when the Minister travelled over that road it was in early spring, and I suggest that the placing of bridges would meet the requirements of those travelling between Wesleyville and Gambo. When navigation is open not ten per cent of the people making the journey will use the road as it costs too much to secure a conveyance, and they will prefer to make the trip in motor boats, as that is cheaper and they are used to the sea, and prefer to travel on it when weather condition are favourable. I do not see how we are to get returns for the money to be spent on the thirty miles of road from Wesleyville to Gambo at the cost per mile for the road, judging by the figures given in reply to the question I asked concerning the road on the south-side of Trinity District, and which was built by Mr. Goodyear, it will cost about $300,000.00. I was surprised to find that Mr. Goodyear spent over $15,000.00 and also $500.00 for survey on the road from Lead Cove to Old Perlican last year. It took $15,000.00 to make this two or three miles of road, and the people said it was no better than the one that was built the year before, as it was rough and had a very poor surface, though perhaps the foundation of it may have been better. I think it would be better to spend this road money in encouraging the fisheries in some way. I am a cod hauler like the Minister himself, and have been engaged in fishing, though some may not give me credit for it, and I can enter into the spirit of those prosecuting the fishery. Now the Minister has said that he is using every effort to put our fish on the market in the best way, and I hope that applies to our codfish. Though I may be repeating what I said earlier in the Session, I would like to refer to what happened when the price of fish was low, and a deputation waited upon the Government in an endeavour to have the export tax on fish removed. One of the memorials I have with me, and I will only quote a clause or two as the hour is getting late.

(Quotes Memorial)

Now these petitioners did not blame the Government for the condition of things, though it is usual for political reasons to blame the Government for everything. It was the aftermath of war, everything was upset, and these people thought the Government should do something. My object in referring to this is to point out that the Government should interest themselves in the marketing of our fish. Every encouragement should be given in connection with our staple industry, but at present I cannot see any reduction in the cost of supplies forthcoming. If you cannot reduce taxation you should try to help in some other way. It is generally admitted

that we are not trying to create that unity between politicians and merchants which should exist in arriving at decisions relating to fish matters, and in making efforts to remedy the deplorable conditions as to the cure and marketing. Now there were certain things in the fishery regulations that were admirable, and as somebody has said, the mistake if any was made by setting an arbitary price for the foreign market. Mr. Hickman has been honest enough to say that he fought the Regulations, and through the legal advice which he received succeeded in breaking them. It is a pity that all concerned did not get together around a common Board, including even Mr. Coaker, as I may point out there is nobody more reasonable than he, but the trouble was that each was fighting with the other, and the country suffered. If the matter was only personal it would not cause serious consideration, but we cannot afford to fight on a question like this. We should govern ourselves by our experience in times of depression—and we have circles of success and failure—and I firmly believe that the man who drafted the petitions referred to, and whose services are now at the disposal of the Government, would still interest himself in the marketing of our fish. Again we were told of different propositions by the Government—one was that expenditure was to be cut in two —but that has not been done, and we are no better off now than we were in 1922. The Minister of Marine is a practical fisherman, and knows the conditions as to the Labrador fishery, and the requirements of those who prosecute the industry there, and, therefore, I believe he will do anything he can to make life easier for the fishermen there by finding money to grant their requirements. I believe he will do that, but anyone with common sense, and interest in the work which he is engaged at, will do the same, but this is a bigger question and deserves the attention of the whole House. He may think that a grant of $15,000.00 or $16,000.00 more for the fishery and helping the fishermen to get up and down to Labrador more easily is doing a lot, but it really is not, and more than this should be done to improve the staple industry.

But the chief thing is to secure a better price. Our fishermen are willing to put up with almost anything, if ,when the voyage is over, they know that they will realise enough to support themselves and those depending on them. Therefore, that is the chief thing that should occupy the attention of this House and the Government, and I feel quite sure that it must be uppermost in the minds of the Prime Minister and his colleagues. Our attention cannot be diverted from the fisheries, even if it is the building of hotels that will give employment which is so badly needed at the present time by our people, and I trust that any guarantee given by the Government to encourage the building of hotels in this city will bring good results and that it will be the means of increasing the earning power of the people as well as increasing our revenue. But we must not be led away from the main issue by the building of roads and try to inaugurate a tourist traffic in this country. Such side issues can never hope to take the place of the fisheries of this country. Now I do not think that there is anything to be gained by speaking any longer on this question, and, in the absence of the leader of the Opposition, I am prepared to let the vote go through.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Chairman, in closing the debate on the vote for the Department of Marine and Fisheries I am sure that the House has gained some little

knowledge from the speeches listened to this afternoon and night. There is just one matter I would like to refer to, and the Leader of the Opposition, I am sure, has the same opinion on it as I have, namely, that I do not think that it is the duty of a Government to appoint agents to go out and advertise our fish. I think that if a merchant wants to sell his fish, it is his duty to send out a man to sell it for him just as he sends his commercial traveller to sell his dry goods. Another thing I am strong on —and I have not changed one bit since 1920 when I occupied the seat where the honourable member for St. Barbe sits—and that is the law governing the price of fish. My strong argument is that supply and demand will govern every time, and I hold to that argument now just as strongly as I did when the fish regulations were introduced into this House first.

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move the adjournment of the debate until to-morrow.

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 to-morrow.

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on to-morrow.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE— Mr. Speaker, in supporting the motion for an adjournment I would like to avail of the opportunity to say a word on behalf of the large number of Newfoundlanders who are at present residing temporarily in another country. I refer to the large number of former residents of Newfoundland who are, at the present moment, seriously affected by the strike which is on in the coal areas at Cape Breton. I think that the duty devolves upon me to say something on behalf of these people, first because I spent five or six years as labouring companions of some of those people, and secondly as I am presiding over the department of Agriculture and Mines. On my way back from Ottawa and Quebec last Autumn I remained at Sydney for a few days and visited the coal areas, and I again met many of my former acquaintances. I visited the homes of many people whom I was acquainted with at the coal areas and I found that conditions were no more like the conditions when I lived there in 1903 and 1904 than the conditions in this country now are like what they were a year ago. I noticed in the press that the Prime Minister has had correspondence with the Committee in charge of the Relief Fund for these destitute miners and their families and I do not believe that the response to the appeal has been as good as it should be. I know that when the West Coast Disaster Fund was not receiving the response it should, the member for Fortune Bay drew attention to it in this House and his efforts had some effect. Now we should be doubly interested in those people who are at the present time suffering in Cape Breton. I think that there are some four thousand Newfoundlanders there the subjects of pity and of charity. A very large number of those people are temporarily residing in Cape Breton. They went there from Tilt Cove, Little Bay, Bell Island and principally from Bay de Verde District. As a matter of fact I think that the Newfoundlanders who came from Bay de Verde district qualified best as coal miners. Now when we were up against it in this country at the time of the Bank crash and fire the residents of Nova Scotia were the first to rush relief to us. Again during the disaster of 1914 the fund was

largely contributed to by the permanent as well as the temporary residents of Nova Scotia. I do not know what the attitude of the Government is on the matter or whether or not it is the intention to send a subscription from the Colony, but I do think that the Government would be acting in an equitable way if they did make a contribution from the funds of the Colony. I noticed that some philantrophic citizens, including the Prime Minister, Sir Michael Cashin and some others, gave substantial amounts. Most of the honourable members of the House must have read the report of the two gentlemen, Rev. M. A. McAdam, P.P., and Rev. A. M. McLeod, Chairman and Secretary, respectively, of the Publicity Committee, and I think that their statement can be taken for granted as correct, and I would like to see the Government give something in the way of a response to the appeal for help. I noticed in the "Daily News" this morning that the Russian Government sent a contribution of five thousand dollars to the Relief Fund, but to the credit of the people of Cape Breton the amount was refused on the ground that their loyalty might be questioned. I bring this matter to the notice of the House for the reasons I have already mentioned.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rise it adjourn until tomorrow afternoon at three of the clock.

Mr. Scammell gave notice of question.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, April 2nd, 1925.

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

Presenting Petitions

MR. SULLIVAN—Mr. Speaker, I an allocation for a connecting road on beg leave to present a petition from the people of Ship Harbour, Placentia Bay, on the subject of a telephone. I might say that Ship Harbour is a very isolated place, and if they could get telephone communication it would be a great benefit to the people. I have much pleasure in referring this petition to the department to which it relates, and I give it my hearty support.

HON. MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting the petition.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the residents of Bay Roberts East. The petition is signed by between ninety and one hundred people in Bay Roberts East, asking if the Government will send a representative over to Bay Roberts to consult with the people there. They are in need of employment, and they understand that there is a considerable amount of money to be spent by the Government. That is really the whole of the petition. I would ask that the Government would be good enough to grant them their request, and give them some assistance. I do not know if the Government representatives for Hr. Grace district have had any communication from the people there, or if they have been requested to get them any work. They are a rather independent people, and are not looking for charity. I would suggest that the Government take this matter in hand, and I think that they will do well in acceeding to the request of the people of Bay Roberts. I give this petition my hearty support and ask that it be referred to the proper place.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present two petition from the people of Torbay, in the district of St. John's East. The first petition is in reference to

the north side of the settlement. There is no grant for it, and in referring it to the department of public works, I would ask that, if possible, the allocation be made out of the vote for local roads.

There is another petition, which is rather more important, and which is very largely signed by the fishermen on the north side also. They ask if the Department of Marine and Fisheries can arrange out of the funds at their disposal for that district, to provide a capstan. If it could be done it would be very beneficial to the people. All those who are interested in this particular petition are fishermen pure and simple, and because they are entirely dependent upon the fishery work, I consider that the prayer of the petition should be acceded to; and I ask that this petition be referred to the department to which it relates.

The Chairman from the Committee of the Whole on Supply reported certain Resolutions, which were read a first time, as follows:

Dept. of Marine and Fisheries $395,997.39

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.

Notice of Question.

MR. HICKMAN asked Hon. the Prime Minister if the Government has yet had under consideration the names of the proposed Highways Commission; if so to table same; and if not, when do they intend making the appointments.

HON. PRIME MINISTER — The question is under consideration. No appointments have been made, but they will be made as soon as possible.

MR. HICKMAN asked Hon. the Prime Minister if he has in the employ of the Government an engineer competent to check the work agreed to be done by W. I. Bishop, Limited, at the Dock; if so, to give his name; or if it is the intention of the Government to import a competent engineer to do the checking.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—I do not know of any one at present in the employ of the Government who could give sufficient time to the work. No agreement was entered into with W. I. Bishop, Limited. There is no body at present in sight for the position, but I do not think it will be necessary to import such an engineer.

MR. HICKMAN asked Hon. the Prime Minister if it is the intention of the Government to grant any relief in response to the appeal made by the Rev. M. A. McAdam, P.P., Chairman, and Rev. A. M. McLeod, Secretary, of the Publicity Committee, on behalf of the destitute miners at Glace Bay, a number of whom are Newfoundlanders.

HON. PRIME MINISTER — The Government has not yet considered the question. I as Prime Minister was asked to put the appeal to the people through the press, and I had hoped that the response would have been better.

MR. HICKMAN asked Hon. the Prime Minister if Messrs. Vickers & Company were asked to tender for the repairs to the Dry Dock, or if they made any offer to purchase or hire same for a period of years. If so to table all the correspondence relating to same. Also, are the Government aware that Messrs. Vickers & Company made a survey of the Dock during the past summer; if they have in their possession a copy of same, if so kindly place same on the table of the House.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—I had not noticed that question on the order paper, but these people were not asked to tender for the repairs to the Dock. They did not offer to purchase, or hire same for a period of years.

I am not aware that they made any survey of the dock during the past summer, and we have no record of it.

Questions 5, 6 and 7 were deferred.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to Amend Cap. 52, Consolidated Statutes (Third Series), entitled 'Of Egress from Churches, Theatres and other Buildings,'" with some amendment, in which they request the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Speaker, in fairness to the House, I think the Amendments made by the Legislative Council should be explained. The Bill as we sent it up merely repealed certain sections of Chapter 52 of the Consolidated Statutes for the purpose of amending the law in the way of providing for keeping passage ways clear. The original law only dealt with entrances to and exits from buildings. The Legislative Council have now repealed the entire chapter and re-enacted the sections we did not touch, with the amendment introduced in this House practically verbatum. It is only telling the story in another way. I would suggest that we might take up the second reading tomorrow.

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the amendments were read a first time, and it was ordered that they be read a second time on tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the amendments made by the House of Assembly in and upon the amendments sent down by the Legislative Council in and upon the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to Regulate Travel on Highways and the Speed, Operation and Load of Vehicles thereon," without amendment.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the chair of Committee.

In introducing the vote, the Minister, MR. W. J. WALSH, said:—

Mr. Chairman,—In introducing the Estimates of what is required for the management and operation of the Department of Agriculture and Mines for the coming fiscal year, I wish to make a few remarks.

As honourable members can see by reference to the printed Estimates now before you, there is a substantial increase in the amount asked for this year as against last, and I will explain the reasons for these increases, as follows:

In the readjustment of the officials, on the resignation of Mr. McNeily, a new position was created which called for a very trustworthy and competent official. This post has been filled by Mr. Ryan, who was formerly employed in the agricultural end of the Department at a salary of $1500.-00; it has been increased to $1800.

Second Clerk, which is the next increase, is Mr. Neil McLellan, who has been in the Department a long time—the only break being while he was overseas. He is a most trustworthy and reliable official and his increase is $250.00.

Next increase is for Historiographer, which position is now held by Mr. Shortis. His work is very important and he has been engaged during the past two or three years on a compilation of an up-to-date History of the Colony which, when completed, will contain some millions of words. His Excellency the Governor and other important personages have inspected the work and report most

favorably thereon. His increase is from $300 to $600.

The next increase is under the head of Surveys. Mr. Noel, who was formerly First Surveyor, has now added to his duties that of Assistant Deputy Minister, which additional position was necessitated by the illness of the present Deputy, Mr. Turner. His salary has been increased from $2000 to $2500.

The next two apparent increases are 3rd and 4th Surveyors. These are really not increases; their salaries were formerly paid out of Contingencies and I have now had them added to the regular list.

There is an increase of $1,000 for additional Surveyors and Assistants. With this vote it is my intention to employ the services of three or four young men who have just passed through College, who will come into this Department to learn the surveying business, as at the present time those on the main staff are becoming old and there are no young men to take up the work when they pass out. I think it is essential in the interest of this important Department that young men should be employed to learn the business so as to be able to take the responsible positions as the older men pass out of the service.

The next apparent increase is for the messenger at the Government Laboratory. This is not an increase, as formerly he was paid from Contingencies, but he is now placed on the regular list.

Next increase (Page 64) is for repairs to instruments. This vote was always put in the Estimates until last year when, on the suggestion of the Minister of Finance, we eliminated it, but I have been advised by the officials of the Department to have this amount voted for repairs to instruments as it is absolutely essential, so I am asking to have the vote reinstated this year.

The decrease from $1250 to $750 is explained by the fact that the Department of Public Works has taken over the responsibility of paying for office cleaning.

The next substantial increase is under the head of Supplies for Surveyors. The explanation of this is, that a great deal of survey work in various parts of the country is necessary to be done, but owing to lack of funds we could only afford to send one survey party in the field last year. I am asking for an additional $6,000 so as to be able to put three survey parties in the field the coming summer. Now that we are embarking on a policy of development of our natural resources, and with the introduction of two, if not more, paper mills, it is essential that we have the important work of survey carried out.

The next increase is under the head of Logging Inspectors. The explanation is that an additional Inspector had been engaged during the past year, which brings that vote from $2500 to $3400.

The explanation of the $1500 asked for under refund is, that formerly when we had to make refunds the amount had to be refunded and charged to Contingencies. It will not be necessary to do so in future now as all the refunds can be charged to the grant for that purpose and the amount left over can go as a drop balance.

Under the head of Encouragement of Agriculture we are asking for an increased vote of $15000, and I hope to be able to justify this vote later on in my address.

Under the head of Poultry Exhibitions in St. John's and Bell Island we are asking for $650.00, which is apparently a new vote but which, in reality, dates back to 1910, but was paid from the general vote for agriculture hitherto. On advice of the Auditor General this year I am asking for a

seperate vote for these exhibitions.

Agriculture, Mines and Forests are three of the most important factors in the building of a country or nation. The three giant contributors to the commercial greatness of the United States are Coal, Iron and Oil. Canada's rapid expansion and prosperity are largely due to her farms, her mines and her forests. Now, for the convenience of the Committee, I think perhaps I should group my remarks under three heals—Mines, Agriculture and Forests.

Let me first deal with our mining possibilities. It may be news to this Committee to know that the Mines of Canada last year contributed well over $200,000,000 towards Canada's trade, and are at present providing over four million dollars per week. Miners are receiving from the mines of Canada over seventy five million dollars per year in wages, salaries, etc., taxes, hauling charges, supplies, etc., and eighty to one hundred million goes yearly in the pockets of those whose money and enterprise started the industry, from some of the mines of Northern Ontario over 100 per cent. of profit being paid on the original investment. The various mines in the Province of Ontario during 1924 paid out the enormous sum of $63,000,000 in wages and supplies. I may be pardoned for dealing at length on the mineral possibilities of Newfoundland, but my apology must be because of the fact that I spent some years employed as a miner, both in Canada and Newfoundland, and I am particularly interested in and more conversant with this branch of our industries than I am with any other.

To give the Committee an idea of the immense growth of mineral production in the Dominion of Canada I would quote the following statistics which are absolutely authentic and which were compiled for me as a result of my recent visit to Canada and are taken from the official statistics in the Department of Mines, Ottawa.

Let me take the McIntyre-Porcupine Mines, Limited, which are situate in Northern Ontario.

The mine commenced operations in 1912 and produced as follows:

Late	Period	Tons Milled	Val. per Ton	Gross Value
1912	12 Months	14,400	$ 7.00	$ 101,555.16
1913	12 "	'1,979	7.85	251,314.45
1914-1915	15 "	85,654	8.87	760,232.16
1916	12 "	105,758	7.71	815,345.49
1917	15 "	195,307	10.00	1,954,793.28
1918	12 "	178,327	10.05	1,793,197.55
1919	12 "	179,874	9.78	1,759,627.40
1920	12 "	188,835	11.52	2,175,891.31
1921	12 "	171,916	11.67	2,005,672.00
1922	12 "	193,971	10.69	2,074,088.40
1923	12 "	240,615	9.96	2,397,303.00
1924	12 "	360,140	9.69	3,488,863.00

As it will be seen, Mr. Chairman, in 12 years the production in tons of this mine increased from 14,400 tons to 360,140 tons, while the gross value increase was, during the same period, from $101,555.16 to $3,488,863.00; or, during the 12 years, the total value was in the vicinity of $20,000,000 for this one mine alone.

Take the case of the Hollinger Gold Mines, Ltd. This mine is also situate in Northern Ontario, and produced as follows:

Year	Tons of Ore Mined	Values Recovered
1911	1,000	$ 46,082.52
1912	45,000	933,682.00
1913	140,131	2,488,022.58
1914	211,846	2,719,354.47
1915	441,236	4,205,901.69

During this period there was paid in dividends to the stock holders of this Company over $4,000,000, besides leaving an estimated amount of ore, valued at $16,000,000.

In 1915 this Mine was consolidated —Hollinger Consolidated Gold Mines, Ltd. The history of the new Mine is one of rapid and sure expansion. In the fourteen years (1911 to 1925) the increase of tons of ore mined is from 1000 tons in the year it commenced operations to 1,600,000 tons in 1924. Value during this period has increased from $45,082.52 in its initial year to $13,000,000 in 1924. The dividends paid stockholders were nil in 1911 (its initial year), but in 1912, after twelve months in operation, they paid $270,000 and the increase for every year has been substantial since 1911; and in 1924, the last year for which there is any official statistics, the amount paid as dividends was $3,928,000. Added to this, the Company estimated that an Ore Reserve—which is an important asset—valued at over $50,000,000 was in sight.

These two illustrations, which are compiled from authentic statistics, should convince the Committee that minerals should receive more consideration than they have received in the past by this House.

I have taken trouble to compile statistics covering all the important mines of Canada, but I do not think it necessary to worry the Committee by producing these statistics. I have them in my possession, however, and would be glad to submit them to any interested member of the Committee.

I have no doubt that many of our people have been reaping some of the rich dividends which are being distributed to investors in the various Canadian Mines, but I do think it is a crying shame and a matter, that should make us, Newfoundlanders, blush, to think that the Natural Resources of our own Country have received so little support from the various Governments of the past.

The Hon. Charles Stewart, Federal Minister of Mines at Ottawa, in an article written by him for a special Mining Edition of "Saturday Night," published in Toronto, has the following to say: "With only the southern fringe of the areas of favourable Geology explored, the Mines of Canada are producing an average of over Four Million Dollars per week."

Favourable Geology.—In these two words we have the whole crux of the situation, as far as mineral possibilities of Newfoundland are concerned. A great deal of the territory of Newfoundland has never been examined geologically, and where geological survey work was done I think it will be admitted it was done in such a haphazard way that our records are very meagre regarding the result of this work.

In 1919 I was at the head of the Department of Agriculture and Mines for a short period, but during that time I made an attempt to try and obtain the services of a competent Geologist, and I am hoping that in the very near future we will be able to avail of the services of such a man.

I think it would be conceded by even the most skeptical that we have in Newfoundland even a greater variety of minerals than are to be found in Canada or the United States, and while both these countries have been and are still making large expenditure of money for the encouragement of mineral development, we in New-

foundland have been content to lay on our oars and allow things to drift and if we do take any active interest in mines or minerals, without geological advice, our activities must necessarily be more or less haphazard.

What Newfoundland requires immediately is the services of a first class Geologist, and in the selection of such we should see to it that he is "first class" in every particular.

The only Geologist engaged in scientific research work in Newfoundland at the present time is a Mr. Hatch, who is employed by a private corporation and is doing only private investigations of mineral properties. Of course I have no fault to find with any company or corporation that employs the services of a scientist; on the contrary, I think they are doing a patriotic work in trying to prove the extent of our mineral wealth—but the general public should note, and the State must not, be dependent upon the service or advice of the servant of any private corporation.

I regard Mr. Hatch as an honest, straightforward gentleman. I also think him a most competent Geologist. I regard his company as doing a legitimate work—yes, I regard it as a patriotic work which I sincerely hope will very soon give the results which it deserves, and in the Company's success the country must materially benefit.

To show the Committee how haphazard have been our activities along mining lines during the past, let me illustrate.

Take the case of Tilt Cove. It was accidentally discovered in 1857. The discovery was made by the late Smith McKay. Mining operations were commenced by four men in November of that year. The first ore shipment was made from Tilt Cove and consisted of three tons of handpicked copper, which was forwarded to Swansea, for which was received £13. 15. 0. Tilt Cove was operated continuously until 1918 when the ore production became exhausted. However, it has produced about two million tons of ore, averaging 4 p.c. copper, 35 p.c. sulphur and about $2.00 per ton for gold.

Bett's Cove Mine, which was opened in 1874 and closed in 1885 is another. I would not say that the ore in this mine was exhausted as I do not believe it was. I believe bad management and misrepresentation played a prominent part in its collapse. The ore mined at Bett's Cove totalled about 130,000 tons, which averaged about 10 p.c. copper.

Little Bay Mine, in Notre Dame Bay, was discovered in 1879 purely by accident. I knew indirectly the man who made the discovery; his name was James Colbourne, father of Michael Colbourne, one of the officials of the B. E. S. Corporation, now residing on Bell Island. Mr. Colbourne was shooting partridge and was climbing up a hill when he discovered the metal shining in the rocks. Little Bay was operated from 1879 until about 1885 by the Consolidated Mining Company, Ltd., during this period producing something over 200,000 tons of ore, averaging between 5 and 10 p.c. copper.

I have no hesitation in saying that Little Bay Mine would be working today and still providing a large amount of labour and revenue to the Colony, were it not for the incompetency and the dishonesty practised by some of the officials of that company.

Pilley's Island, also in Notre Dame Bay, played a prominent part in our mining activities, but unfortunately this closed down.

The same may be said of York Hr., in St. George's District, at which mine I worked as a miner, and which I believe contained sufficient ore to warrant it being re-opened if we

were successful in having the proper people to take hold of it.

Great Gull Lake, situated inland from Hall's Bay, has recently been examined by a competent Mining Engineer, whom I had the pleasure of meeting at my office, and I am very hopeful that operations on a large scale will take place in this area in the very near future.

At Sunday Cove Island, in Notre Dame Bay, also Colchester—in fact, in any portion of the Bay of Notre Dame—if you break a rock you can find samples of copper ore. Now that electric power is apparently available for smelting purposes I believe that the country should awake to the immense possibilities and, instead of having our money sent away to assist in the development of foreign countries, our people should be made to realise that just as attractive mineral possibilities are to be found almost in sight of our own homes.

Take the story of Bell Island, for illustration. There is one of the greatest deposits of Hematite iron there to be found in the whole world. It is estimated that this deposit contains about four thousand million tons which means that, at the present rate of production, the mine is good for the next four thousand years. This valuable and immense mineral deposit was lying dormant at Bell Island for hundreds of years; the fishermen used to ballast their boats with the metal, and no attention was paid to it by the Department of Agriculture and Mines or any other Department of the Government.

If properly handled, this mine should be giving more returns to this country than we have been receiving from it.

As the actions of Besco are at the present moment the subject of investigation by the Government it may be injudicious to make any public pronouncement as to what I think, so I will reserve further comment for some future opportunity.

To sum up, we have here in Newfoundland almost every kind of metal which is to be found in any part of North America.

The coal areas of St. George's Bay which were visited by me last November, convinced me beyond the shadow of a doubt that commercial coal —which, on analysis, has proved to me superior to that which we import —is to be found in certain sections, if only sufficient money could be secured for its proper development.

The possibilities of the development on a large scale, of the Lead Ores in Placentia Bay is most favourable. I understand that negotiations are now being carried on between the local company operating at Cliff Silver and a group of financiers in England with a view to having their capital largely increased, which is essential for the future success of the Company.

LaManche Lead Mine, which is situated some 20 miles East of Silver Cliff, is also under option to local interests, who I understand are making arrangements for development work on a large scale in the early spring; so I look forward to a great deal of activity in this direction in the very near future.

We have in Newfoundland, as I stated, big deposits of almost every kind of mineral, including gold, platinum, silver, bismuth, antimony, nickle, asbestos, zinc, calcide, gypsum, native copper and numerous others.

It has been proved almost beyond a shadow of a doubt that our building stones in various parts of the country are equal, if not superior, to those which are to be had in any other country.

Cement has been found in various sections. Slate has been mined successfully in sections of the island. Oil is known to exist in several parts of the island, and oil shale, which is

a positive indication of the presence of oil, is found in large deposits in St. George's Bay. So far as I know, no money has been spent in this section to prove our oil deposit.

So, what I would advise is, that the Government immediately continue the negotiations to try and employ the services of a competent Geologist, which is the first essential to ultimate success in the intelligent development of our mineral resources.

AGRICULTURE

According to group, the next subject that I wish to deal with is Agriculture.

The following is an extract from the Report of the Board of Trade, 1924:

"Although much has been written regarding Agriculture in Newfoundland, it is a fact not generally appreciated that during the fiscal year 1923-24 the imports of agricultural products that could have been raised in Newfoundland, amounted to a substantial figure. There is, however, very little interest taken in Agriculture and it is suggested that more could be done by the Department of Agriculture to interest the public in the possibilities of farming new areas and of introducing new and improved methods on the farms already in existence."

Mr. Chairman: I wish the Committee to distinctly understand that no remarks or statements of mine, which I am about to make regarding this important subject, will be made with the intention of faulting the activities of my predecessors with regard to the administration of this Branch of the Department of Agriculture and Mines, it is just as well that we "let the dead past bury its dead" and, if possible, try and profit by the mistakes of those who have gone before.

It is a fact, and one which is accepted, that this country is called upon year after year to send to the Maritime Provinces and other parts of the American Continent a large sum of money to pay for agricultural products that could and should be produced at home. For ten years, 1915 to 1925, there was voted by this House under the head of "Encouragement of Agriculture" over a quarter of a million dollars. What benefits accrued to the country from this large expenditure it is impossible for me or any one else to be able to estimate. I think most of us will agree that the major portion of this money was spent without any appreciable returns. In 1910 I think it was, Agricultural Societies were organised all over the country, and amounts of money were granted for each individual society irrespective of what the possibilities of agriculture were in the section where the Society was formed. Every member of the community was, as a matter of course, a member of the Society. These Societies were open to all; no fee was charged for entrance and they became more or less political clubs. Farming implements were distributed in various sections where they were never used. Live stock was distributed in sections where they were slaughtered when there was a shortage of fresh meat. No inspection by a qualified person, or by anyone else, was ever made of these implements sent out or of the animals distributed. This being the case such reports as come to the Department are accepted without question; therefore, abuses of almost every nature crept in which made it impossible for the Minister and his staff to be able to cope with the situation, and the result was that the money was spent and very little was accomplished to improve production.

Statements showing imports of Agricultural products during a period of 5 years, from 1919 to 1924:

Year	Value of Imports
1919-1920	$5,413,492.00
1920-1921	3,879,170.00
1921-1922	2,550,446.00
1922-1923	2,662,985.00
1923-1924	3,433,699.00
Total	$17,939,783.00

I have here a statement for the five years, 1919 to 1924, inclusive. Of course, in this is included pork; beef tinned milk, fresh meat, carrots, beet, butter, eggs, etc., but even allowing for these there is a large amount of money sent out of the country each year for articles we can certainly raise at home.

During the five year period from 1919 to 1924, inclusive, there was imported into Newfoundland agricultural products to the value of $17,939,783.00, or over three and a half million dollars per year.

If we deduct from this large total the amount paid for salt beef, salt pork and certain cattle feeds, there is still an enormous expenditure for the importation of agricultural products which could and should be produced at home.

Statement showing Agricultural Production for Newfoundland and Labrador, taken from Census of 1921; the values being estimated at current prices in that year:—

Wheat, Barley and Oats—Bus	9,220	$ 9,802.00
Hay—Tons	49,250	2,198,051.00
Potatoes—Brls.	529,102	1,912,681.00
Turnips—Brls.	68,464	208,700.00
Other Root Crops—Brls.	4,013	15,507.00
Cabbages, heads—Brls.	7,668,117	448,021.00
Small fruits, strawberries, plums, currants, &c.	27,940	31,326.00
		$4,824,090.00
Horses—No.	16,340	$1,634,000.00
Cows—No.	18,024	1,441,920.00
Other Horned Cattle	9,697	775,760.00
Sheep	86,732	1,300,980.00
Swine	14,573	364,325.00
Goats	14,240	142,400.00
Butter—Lbs.	574,867	
Milk produced—Gals.	8,199,379	4,919,627.00
Wool—Lbs.	216,874	32,531.00
Poultry	242,673	303,341.00
Eggs—Doz.	1,091,897	655,138.00
Cattle killed for food	7,876	630,080.00
Sheep killed for food	29,366	440,490.00
Swine killed for food	8,902	223,300.00
		$17,687,982.00

Value of production, not including live Horses, Cows, other Cattle, Sheep, Swine and Goats and two-third Poultry:—

Grain—Bus.	9,200	$ 9,804.00
Hay—Tons	49,250	2,198,051.00
Potatoes—Brls.	529,102	1,912,681.00
Turnips—Brls.	68,464	208,700.00

Other Root Crops—Brls.	4,013	15,507.00
Cabbages—Heads	7,668,117	448,021.00
Fruit—Gals.	27,940	31,326.00
		$4,824,090.00
Butter—Lbs.	574,867	
Milk produced—Gals.	8,199,379	4,919,627.00
Wool—Lbs.	216,874	32,531.00
Poultry Crop, say one-third	80,891	101,113.00
Eggs—Doz.	1,091,897	655,138.00
Cattle killed for food	7,876	630,080.00
Sheep killed for food	29,366	440,490.00
Swine killed for food	8,902	223,300.00
		$11,826,369.00

Mr. Chairman: As may be noticed by Hon. Members of the House, in co-operation with the Prime Minister and Executive Government we are trying to establish an Agricultural Policy which will be both practical and economical. With this end in view I have had several meetings attended by various farmers and stock raisers, and I am glad to be able to announce that, as a result of these conferences, we are about to launch our agricultural barque under most favourable conditions. We are at present negotiating with several Agricultural Colleges with a view to engaging the services of an Agricultural Scientist, and in the selection of such a man I assure the House that a Newfoundland applicant will be given preference, if such a man is available and possesses the necessary qualifications and can produce the required credentials. The committee of farmers and the Secretary of Agriculture have made many suggestions and recommendations whereby a "speeding up" agriculturally can and will be accomplished, but until our program is endorsed by the Scientific Expert referred to above I think it would be unwise to, at this moment, go into details. All I ask the House to do is to accept the principle that we should successfully produce in Newfoundland quite sufficient vegetables, such as potatoes, cabbages, parsnips, carrots, beets, onions and celery. I am also convinced that we can produce here in our own country a sufficient supply of hat, oats and barley—the last two at least in sufficient quantities for feed for our live stock. At any rate by the selection for seed purposes of early and prolific varieties of these grains, and by having them planted as soon as the ground can be properly worked in Spring, most beneficial results would accrue; this practice, of course, involves Fall ploughing.

In further reference to our Hay supply; it seems to me absurd that we do not grow enough of this easily-raised crop to supply our own requirements. This state of affairs can be remedied in a great measure. It is well known that in many parts of the Island people do not sow grass seed at all, excepting any sweepings they may get from the feed stall or the barn loft, which at best is mostly weed-seed, and dirt. They do not think it is necessary to sow grass seed. Very many do not use clover seed at all: they have never been taught that if clover seed be mixed with grass seed the resulting crop

for feeding cattle is a great improvement on timothy hay alone and when the clover sod is turned under, the field becomes an ideal place for the planting of potatoes.

Nova Scotia farmers claim that their increased yields of potatoes can be easily traced to the general use of clover seed when sowing their grass lands.

In the past five years we imported hay, as follows:

	Tons	Cost
1919-1920	7,821	$249,945.00
1920-1921	10,357	374,781.00
1921-1922	4,736	152,260.00
1922-1923	5,633	107,810.00
1923-1924	6,759	118,916.00
	35,306	$1,003,712.00

If we take potatoes, we find that these have been imported during the same period, as follows:

	Bushels	Cost
1919-1920	154,751	$245,092.00
1920-1921	108,357	101,691.00
1921-1922	83,076	41,822.00
1922-1923	101,473	63,312.00
1923-1924	140,881	87,881.00
	588,538	$539,798.00

or 196,179 1-3 barrels.

Nobody can convince me that we are not able to produce these crops and many others included in the lists herewith presented, in our own country, thus saving to our people the cost of these imports and at the same time giving employment to a large number of men.

In apparently such a small matter as the selection of seed for next year's planting, there is much we have to learn. It has been proven that if seed potatoes of uniform size are selected from healthy stocks and placed in such a way that they will not come into contact with diseased potatoes and are not stored in bulk, the result from such plantings will be of a better quality and be more uniform in size than when seeds are selected in the usual haphazard way and they will be free from disease because the parent stock were from selected, healthy stalks. When seed potatoes are left in bulk all winter no one can tell if they were grown on diseased stalks or not, but you do know that they are often lying side by side with diseased potatoes and are likely to be diseased on that account. This work can only be carried out by demonstration and I hope before long to be in a position to demonstrate to you how we propose improving some of our most easily raised crops.

These other items of importation, for which we send out of the Colony large sums of money—vegetables, especially—require a boost and, to my mind, a demonstration showing how to produce them in the favored districts would be an act of encouragement to growers.

When the last general Exhibition took place here an excellent showing of carrots, parsnips, beet and other small vegetables came in from Hr. Grace. These exhibits are often referred to to-day by the St. John's folk.

When the Sub-Committee for wild fruit and agriculture made an attempt to get a supply of locally-grown vegetables for the Wembley Exhibition, some of its members made a search of the town and the suburbs, and were surprised to find that they could obtain practically nothing that would be of use to them. A very few vegetables were put up in glass, but those that were put up were all that was available. Of course the season was admittedly a poor one for agriculture, but nevertheless, the result of the season's work was very far from supplying home requirements.

It seems to me that Agriculture has

lost a very great deal of its one-time enthusiasm. Time was when prizes were given for the best field of standing oats and ploughing matches for the man doing the best work in the field. I hope before very long to revive this interest in agriculture, and I am now asking this House for their unqualified support in this matter.

Wild Fruit also demands a more general boost than has been the custom to give it in this country. I have been observing Mr. W. A. Munn's efforts to promote the partridge berry industry for some years, with a very good deal of interest. He deserves very great credit for the persistent manner in which he continues to support this work; but for him and his interest this industry would have long ago ceased.

Some months ago pictures showing Cape Cod cranberry industry were seen at the Nickel. Anyone interested in our wild fruit must necessarily have been interested in these pictures. In them there was a suggestion of Newfoundland possibilities.

When one comes to think of the thousands of acres of march lands, knows from their nature that they are acid and require drainage, the fact of the common marshberry growing there is further suggestive of what could be done if they were taken in hand and reclaimed.

I can see in our future developments great possibilities for these miles of wet territory, and I do not expect to have to wait very long for it either.

Take again the **Blueberry:** we find that this excellent fruit is hardly considered at all from a commercial point of view, yet it has great possibilities and it is possible that its merits will be much heard of in the near future.

Within the past few months this Department sent a can of Blue Berries, put up by Mr. R. A. Templeton, of Water Street, to Professor Cummings of the Truro Agricultural College, and asked him to give an opinion as to the quality of the fruit. Quite recently Prof. Cummings wrote, stating that he and his family had much enjoyed this wild fruit; that the quality was superior, and that he thought it ought not to be difficult to find a market for such excellent berries.

Since Prof. Cummings' communication was received I understand that Mr. Templeton has forwarded some samples to the Editor of the Newfoundland Weekly in Boston, and I have no doubt that he will get similar encouraging reports from him for the effort he is making to boost this fruit.

The **Bakeapple** is also a fruit that needs more than passing notice. This excellent fruit may be gathered each summer on our many marshes to the northward, and on the Labrador Coast, by the thousands of gallons, but the effort at canning, by those who offer them for sale, cannot be considered as first rate—that is the opinion of many people who have tried them out.

If, instead of packing them in barrels when they are first picked, it were possible to have such canning done as Mr. Templeton did with his Blue Berries, this delicious fruit would have long ago created a real demand, not only in our local markets, but also in Canada.

Another wild fruit deserving of a great demand is the wild **Raspberry.** For some years past hundreds of acres of wooden lands were burnt over every year. The first vegetation that shows itself from among the ashes is the wild Raspberry; in the second year the trees bear fruit, and if the territory is a fairly rich one (even though it be rocky), an abundance of this fruit is assured.

This is mostly lost, too. There

should be no reason why such a waste of wild fruit should occur, now that the interior of the country is being developed and the means of transport multiplying.

Eel Grass:—Since the Wembley Exhibition, enquiries for Eel Grass have come in in great number. I would like here to give my predecessor, Mr. J. F. Downey, a due mead of praise for having been the first to recommend a sample of this material to the Wembley Exhibition Committee. Some years previously he had already, whilst an Agricultural Commissioner, shipped a few tons to brokers in London. The sample, however, recently shown at Wembley has attracted widespread attention and my Department has had some of its officials, who were employed in various capacities in different places, report as to their finding with regard to this Grass when visiting one of our bays.

It is now known that large quantities of Eel Grass are available in most of our Outports where fresh water comes in contact with vegetation.

A very great opportunity is afforded for an enterprising firm who will invest its capital in such an undertaking. Knowledge as to the requirements for putting out a first class article for the purpose of upholstering, and the facilities to make a success of the enterprise, are to my mind the two elements which make for success. As much as $40.00 per ton has been offered by manufacturers, so I understand, for a really good Eel Grass.

Lime:—In a country like this, where we have ponds and marshes on the hills, is it any wonder that the lower lands and bottoms are wet? The water must run off, partially at any rate.

In the earlier days of our Agriculture, the old settlers used to put in "French Drains" thereby freeing the land of a great deal of its surplus moisture. These old drains, in a great measure, have gone into disuse, but I do not see that there is sufficient interest abroad to replace them. It is quite possible that the present occupants would not know where to find these old drains.

The land does not yield so well as formerly; it is sown and needs a corrective. Other conditions being equal, a liberal supply of lime will help greatly to offset the condition of th esoil and if a particular piece of land does not need drainage the good influence of the lime will be all the more pronounced in a larger crop.

At the Humber large quantities of refuse Limestone will be available when their immediate development work has been done. At Aguathuna large quantities of refuse rock are already available. This Department is endeavouring to point out to the owners of these properties a prospective ready sale of ground limestone, if this material were further reduced to a pulverized condition and made available to farmers.

In Nova Scotia Limestone can be pulverized at the rate of 75 cents per ton, and if quarrying is necessary the cost is but $1.50 at the quarry.

Through an arrangement made with the Railway people the Nova Scotia Government sells at $4.00 per ton by the carload lot at Railway Stations along the railroad, and I am hoping that before very long my Department may be able to make a favourable announcement to those who desire to have agricultural Lime to use upon their ground.

Now Mr. Chairman, I wish for a moment or two to examine what we have been doing to promote the development of our "Forest Wealth."

Here, again, it may be well to ex-

amine what our neighbours across the Gulf have been doing along these lines.

Of the total area of Canada, viz:— 3,729,665 square miles, 100,000 square miles is covered by lakes and rivers, leaving, approximately 3,600,000 sq. miles. The area suitable for agriculture, including grazing lands, is estimated to be 469,000 square miles, of which 93,180 square miles were under cultivation in 1921. This leaves, approximately three million miles of timber lands owned by the great Dominion of Canada. The growth on this last-mentioned area contains a great variety of wood of different grades and species, and, for the benefit of the Committee, I have again consulted official Canadian statistics.

The following table will show the estimated stand of timber, of merchantable size, in Canada, by species in 1924.

Species	Saw Material	Pulpwood Fuel-Wood Ties, Poles, Posts, etc.	Total
Softwood:	1,000 Cu. feet	1,000 Cu. feet	1,000 Cu. feet.
Spruce	25,264,715	44,783,154	70,047,869
Balsam Fir	10,526,820	19,203,440	29,720,260
Jack Pine	3,996,530	25,254,492	29,251,022
Cedar	17,979,240	4,065,761	22,045,001
Douglas Fir	16,512,600	374,400	16,887,000
Hemlock	14,879,518	1,265,136	16,144,654
White Pine	3,827,025	4,559,958	8,386,983
Red Pine	866,145	1,632,735	2,498,880
Larch	732,115	710,184	1,442,299
Western Yellow Pine	876,000	117,000	993,000
Yellow Cypress	876,000	117,000	993,000
Total	96,326,708	102,083,260	198,409,968
Hardwood:			
Poplar	3,234,630	26,315,480	29,550,110
White Birch	1,188,045	5,599,100	6,787,145
Yellow Birch	2,278,695	3,003,550	5,282,245
Maple	1,359,114	2,671,125	4,030,240
Beech	401,979	741,734	1,143,713
Nasswood	242,214	302,100	544,314
Elm	195,786	235,298	431,083
Ash	120,669	213,250	333,919
Cottonwood	172,572	.....	172,572
Oak	43,143	58,330	101,473
Alder	.....	4,750	4,750
Total	9,236,847	39,144,717	48,381,564
Grand Total	105,563,555	141,227,977	246,791,532

ESTIMATED STAND OF TIMBER OF MERCHANTABLE SIZE IN CANADA, BY REGIONS.

Region	Saw Material	Pulpwood, Cordwood, Posts, etc.
Softwood:	1,000	1,000
oSftwood	1,000	1,000
	Cu. feet	Cu. feet
Eastern Provinces	16,666,115	64,700,590
Prairie Provinces	3,938,715	31,825,170
British Columbia	75,721,878	5,557,500
Total	96,326,708	102,083,260
Hardwood:		
Eastern Provinces	7,037,430	20,342,417
Prairie Provinces	2,037,795	18,620,950
British Columbia	172,572	205,200
Total	9,247,797	39,168,567
Grand Total	105,574,505	141,251,827

With the increasing demand for 000 tons by 75, which is about the newsprint, the saw mill is giving place to the Pulp and Paper Factory—and the saw mill and other woodworking factories give employment to large numbers of people—and will continue to do so. This branch of forest development is a dwarf as compared to the comparatively new giant—the paper making industry.

From official statistics I found that in 1924 there was invested in the Dominion of Canada, in the various pulp and paper mills of that Dominion, the enormous sum of $405,000,000 and to prove the confidence held in in this industry by Canadian investors, 75 p.c. of this huge sum was contributed by them, which is, in my opinion, absolute proof of the stability of the industry.

In 1920 the number of tons of newsprint produced in Canada was about 750,000. In 1924 the total output was over a million and a half tons, or an increase of over 100 p.c. in four years. Let us multiply 1,500,- current price, and we find that from this branch of forest production in Canada in 1924, $112,500,000 went towards her total trade.

The paper mills of the U. S. A. in 1924 produced just about the same amount as did the Canadian mills, but American mills have reached the extreme limit of their productive capacity, while Canada is still forging ahead, with the limit of productive capacity still "far off."

The chief factors which are hampering American paper mills are shortage of wood pulp and lack of water power on the scale that they are to be found in Canada.

Mr. Chairman—Now let me for a moment examine what we in Newfoundland are doing towards the development of forest wealth.

While this industry in Newfoundland is one of comparatively recent growth, it is rapidly forging to the front and may, within a short space

of time, rank as one of the major industries of the Colony.

Newfoundland is particularly favored in the natural resources that go to make this possible. We have extensive timber areas suitable for pulp as well as considerable areas suitable for general lumbering, and all that is required to insure to us a perpetual supply of raw material is the adoption of an intelligent policy of "Forest Conservation," and with this end in view I have extended invitations to the Managing Directors of the various pulp and paper companies to meet at my office at an early date to discuss with me the best possible way to afford the necessary and all important protection to our valuable forest wealth.

The A. N. D. Co. at Grand Falls are producing now about 275 tons per day. The Armstrong Whitworth Co. at Corner Brook will be producing 400 tons per day as soon as their mill is ready to operate. The Gander proposition (which I am informed will soon be ready to commence construction operations), when producing, will have a capacity of 200 tons per day, giving us from three mills a total daily production of 875 tons of newsprint, at, say, $75.00 per ton (and there is not likely to be a decline in the price of this commodity). Newfoundland's total trade will thus be contributed to by the pulp and paper industry to the amount of over $20,000,000, or nearly twice the present value of our fishery products.

Mr. Chairman, it will be readily understood and agreed to by every member of this House—yes, and by every native of the Colony, that an industry such as outlined above should receive the wholehearted support of the Department which is officially responsible for every action of the State regarding its protection and development.

During the past, large sections or areas of forest growth have been recklessly destroyed; this wanton destruction must immediately cease and, where necessary, the Crown Lands Act must be amended so that a recurrence of the forest destruction of late years will be rendered impossible.

Mr. Chairman, it will serve no good purpose for me to fix the blame for mistakes made in the past on any Government, or individual member thereof, but it is my plain duty and the duty of the present Administration to profit as much as possible by past msitakes.

An immediate "stock-taking" of our timber holdings must be proceeded with, and future requirements for public purposes, such as telegraph and telephone poles, wharf and breakwater timber, and railway sleepers, must be provided for: then again certain reservations for the requirements of fishery development and operation must be made and safeguarded.

To accomplish this the first step must be a complete stock taking of what we have. The second step must be a clear understanding of what we require; then we can intelligently provide for our requirements. Since the railway is now being operated as a Department or Sub-Department of the Government, the Management are called upon every year to provide certain timber for construction and operation purposes. The supplying of railway ties is a problem which must be immediately solved, and it matters not if its operation is by Government or private corporation—railway sleepers will continue to be one of the chief requirements. It is a well known fact that the cutting of this material is a most destructive form of lumbering, as only a small portion of the tree is utilized. The balance being left in the woods in such a state as to very materially increase

our fire hazard, besides lessening the commercial value of a large amount of good timber left to decay where it fell.

In future I propose to try and remedy this unnecessary evil by the introduction of a scheme whereby no permit or contract can or will be given or entered into for supplying railway sleepers unless the contractor guarantees to save every inch of saleable timber in all trees cut down.

The portion of the tree which is at present left in the forest to decay could be almost all utilized for pulp making, and I think in this matter we will get the support of the present and future pulp manufacturers of Newfoundland.

All of these matters come under the scope of "Forest Conservation" and I assure the Committee and country that when next I am called upon to introduce Estimates (which I trust I will be in 1926) I hope to have all, or nearly all, the proposed reforms which I have predicted here in my address no longer suggestions or premises but actual facts, and actually in operation.

Destruction of Forests by Insect Pests

Some four or five years ago it was brought to the attention of the Department of Agriculture and Mines that the trees in a section of the country in the vicinity of Nagle's Hill, St. John's, were being denuded of their foliage by some insect.

Branches of the affected trees, and the larva and moths in the neighborhood were collected and sent to the Government Entomologist at Ottawa.

It was stated in the local papers that the damage to the trees at this place was being caused by what is known as the Spruce Bud Worm, which had caused such destruction during previous years to large areas in New Brunswick and the Eastern United States, but on examination of the specimens sent to the Entomologist at Ottawa the Department was advised that this was not the case, but the insect was identified as the Hemlock Looper (enius Ellopia), which it was stated was common in Canada, but not considered a very dangerous pest.

The injury by this insect was, at that time, confined to a comparatively small area, but last season it was found that it had spread eastward to sections as far as Logy Bay and north to Winsor Lake, possibly farther, and has since been found to have attacked timber in several other parts of the country and has done a considerable amount of damage on Port au Port Peninsula.

In the autumn of 1923 it was reported to the Department that srpuce trees at Cowan's Farm, between Waterford Bridge and Topsail Roads, were also attacked.

Specimens of the bark of the affected trees were forwarded for examination to the Entomologist at Ottawa, who identified the insect causing the destruction as the Eastern Spruce Bark Beetle.

On examination it was found that over a hundred trees in an area of five or six acres were either destroyed or badly infested by this beetle, and that a considerable number of trees on other properties in the vicinity were also attacked.

The Department at Ottawa had advised that the spread of this insect might be controlled, where only comparatively small areas were affected, by having the trees cut down and the bark, branches, etc., burned. This was done in the case of all trees discovered to be affected in the section above mentioned, and at the same time circular letters were sent to the principal operating lumber companies and pulp companies drawing their attention to this outbreak and asking them to report any appearance of this insect in their localities and en-

closing them copies of a pamphlet prepared by Dr. Swain, Asst. Government Entomologist at Ottawa, giving information as to the method of identifying this insect and means for controlling its spread.

Later examination by the Department has shown that the trees in several sections between Mount Pearl and Logy Bay have been attacked by this beetle, but as these were discovered after the season in which they could be safely treated by burning had passed nothing has been done to control the spread.

Considerable correspondence has taken place on this subject between this Department and Dr. Swain, who has arranged to come here in July and make a study of the whole question. In the meantime a preliminary investigation is being held as to the possible extent of the area attacked by these two insect pests. On receipt of Dr. Swain's report and advice the matter will be considered by the Government.

One point which may make it difficult to handle this matter, particularly in the vicinity of St. John's, is that practically all the trees affected are situate on private property and there is no authority in any law now in force in the Colony for entry on these properties for the purpose of destroying affected trees, should this be decided on, nor is there any power to compel the owners of the land to destroy such trees.

It would appear necessary, therefore, that an Act should be passed either empowering the Government to enter and, without compensation, to destroy any effected trees, or to compel the owners of the properties on which such trees are found to take steps as directed by the Department to prevent the spread of these pests.

MR. DUFF—Mr. Chairman, I would like to congratulate the Minister of Agriculture and Mines on that very fine address on the resources of our country.

About three years ago, Mr. Chairman, a company was formed to manufacture cement. I was a member of that company, and we had a considerable cement deposit over in Trinity Bay, and we had engineers and surveyors and all the necessary equipment to work that deposit. We found that that cement rock was one of the finest deposits in the world, and we had in our company some of the cleverest men in the island; and then one fine day we found that our claim had been jumped by a man of straw; and although I do not wish to say that the department would be a party to anything of that kind, I think that certainly there should be some way to remedy it. When the Minister of Agriculture and Mines knows that a bona fide company, working in the interests of the country, has a deposit; and they let some shyster come in some fine day and jump that claim, and they know very well that he has no interest and no money or anything else, then I say something should be done. That department should notify that company, and give them three days notice at least. If the company which I speak of had been allowed to work that cement property, they would have had from fifty to a hundred Newfoundlanders working there for the past two years. The Company could have furnished all the necessary cement for the Humber proposition, and they would have been able to manufacture all the necessary cement for the repairs to your big dock, and for the Gander, or for any other proposition that might be started. But to-day these cement claims are lying up, and nothing is being done to them; and I consider it is a shame; and I feel sure that when I bring this matter to the notice of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, he will do all that is possible to see that this does

not happen to any other poor unfortunate, because the class of men who live on the wits and brains of others should not be allowed to do such things.

I was pleased to know that we have slate areas in Newfoundland. I often heard that we had slate quarries in Newfoundland, but I was never sure that it could be marketed profitably. I think that the Minister of Agriculture and Mines in encouraging the slate industry will be doing a great thing for all concerned, as it gives perfect fire protection and lasts for all time.

We have been told that we have coal for a long, long time, and I hope that some day in the near future we will be mining our own coal, and we will not have to go to Sydney for that very necessary commodity

I would also like to call the attention of the Minister to the fact that he has a number of woods rangers and fire wardens all over the country. In many cases men have nothing to do but draw their pay. I hope that the Minister will take notice of this fact, and if he can get them doing something in connection with the upkeep of these roads that are going to be built, or plant trees to beautify them, they will be doing something for the money they receive.

Again as regards agriculture. I think that after all is said and done that the most satisfactory man we have to-day is the fisherman-farmer. In the city of St. John's to-day you are giving between twelve and fifteen hundred families from five to eight dollars a week; and many of these are outport men, who had their piece of land before they came to St. John's. What a great pity it is that we can't put these men back on the land, where they can rear their own vegetables, get their own firing, and all the rest of it, and not be a drag, perhaps, on this city.

In the old days the old settlers came out here from England, Ireland and Scotland, and settled upon our land, and we see evidence of them to-day, where they took stones and built walls around their properties; and there are successors to-day who will not even keep up those walls or fences. These old settlers had apple trees and damson trees, and grew all different kinds of small fruit. To-day that industry is not being kept up in this country; the trees have gone to ruin; and I just wonder, Mr. Minister of Agriculture and Mines, if there is not some way in which this industry can be encouraged. I think myself that we should encourage the fishermen-farmers, because they are the best men that we have all over the country.

Now I saw in the paper the other day where the people of Cape Breton have had a large amount of immigration. Now we have none of that. I found that Cape Breton last year had 3800 immigrants, and of these 2000 were Newfoundlanders. Why in the name of goodness a man should leave this country to go to Cape Breton I cannot understand. There must be some reason for it, and I would ask the Minister of Agriculture and Mines to try and find the remedy.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, I feel sure that the House has listened with the fullest measure of appreciation to the very fine address which the Minister of Agriculture and Mines has given us this afternoon in introducing the estimates of his department. As he very properly pointed out, the subject of agriculture and mines is one which must concern us all a great deal.

I think it was a year ago that a leading citizen astonished us all, or a great many of us at any rate, by producing figures to show that in that year the total value of our agricultural products were in excess of

the value of our fishery products. Now if that statement is correct, and I take it that the source from which it came would leave no doubt but that the gentleman who produced those figures had gone very carefully into his statement—if that is correct, there is something after all to show us that this business of annually voting money for the Agriculture Department is not all pettifogging, as it would appear to be.

The Minister this afternoon quoted some statistics. Unfortunately it was not possible for us to grasp in detail all the figures quoted by the Minister of Agriculture, and I would like to ask what was the quanity of the agricultural products produced last year and the value of the same. I would also like to hear the value and other details of the agricultural products imported into the Colony for the same period. The Minister did state that an average of three and a half million dollars worth of agricultural produce was imported the last five years, and I as a Newfoundlander maintain that there is no good reason why we should send three and a half or four millions out of the country every year for what can be produced on the spot. All who have the interests of the country at heart are of the opinion that we should make better strides from an agricultural point of view, but despite the efforts of private parties, and the policies of various governments, we are to-day no nearer the mark as far as making ourselves self supporting in this direction is concerned.

There is too much money altogether going out of the country for the products mentioned. We have had various agricultural policies, but they were subjected to criticism—much of which was not justified—and the country suffered on that account. The Minister has referred to the policy of 1910, when Sir Edward Morris inaugurated the establishment of Agricultural Societies through the country. There was a good deal of value in that policy though no results were apparent at the time, as it stimulated interest in agriculture all over the island. In the outports the idea was taken up with real interest, and the people looked forward eagerly to the Spring when they could hold their meetings, discuss matters and receive their seeds. The Minister has also referred to the policy of the Government which preceded the present on. That policy I may say was put into force with all sincerity. The Hon. Dr. Campbell really felt that he was improving the breed of cattle throughout the country, and despite the political tinge which is generally given to our remarks, no one will gainsay that that policy was not a good one. There may have been some justification for criticism as to how some of the money was spent, but there could be none as to the movement itself. I think the Government should concern itself with this question of agriculture, and also with the point raised by the honorable member for Carbonear as to the position of the fisherman-farmer, who is the greatest asset to the country. It is generally found that the man who finds time to combine fishing with farming is very well off and of independent means. The early settlers to whom he referred were certainly not lazy, as they cleared the virgin land, cut trees, pulled up stumps, planted gardens and built up the farms which we have to-day. But the younger generation is not taking the interest in agriculture that their forefathers did. To-day the young man will not pull up stumps or clear the land and his whole object seems to be to get aboard a vessel, get to Labrador for a fishing voyage, and if he makes a voyage, rest satisfied. The old type is passing

away, and I think it is a sign of decay to see that the young man is not following the example of industry shown him by his forebears. I think that something should be done to encourage them to take up farming. The Minister of Agriculture is going to bring in a vote for the promotion of agriculture, and I hope the industry will be given every encouragement. All I can do is to wish him well in his endeavours, and if there is anything to be learned—as there certainly is—from the policies of the previous governments, I trust he will give past policies every consideration when embarking on his new scheme. I may say that he ought not concern himself with St. John's and its environs alone in connection with his plans. There are many other places throughout the island capable of agricultural development, and I hope he will go further afield than St. John's in putting his plans into practice, and that he will give the young men of the West Coast, many of whom are anxious to engage in farming, some encouragement under this scheme. Now take the section through which the Badger Road passes—there is no better agricultural land to be found anywhere in the Island than there—as many here are well aware. Many young men are not afraid of hard work and they are ready to start farming in a small way if they get encouragement from the Government. In my opinion there ought to be provision made in the tariff to encourage the importation of agricultural implements. These implements are high in price, and the present import duty makes the purchase of them prohibitive. I know of a case of a man in the District of St. Barbe who was clearing some land at Daniel's Harbor and wanted a stump puller, as he intended to begin farming. He wrote to me and I got the address of a manufacturer from the Department of Agriculture, but the price of the implement staggered him and he was not able to touch it. Here was a man who was anxious to work and had a market for his produce at Bay of Islands, but he was unable to go ahead because of the prohibitive cost of the necessary apparatus and had to abandon his idea. If the Minister is out to help agriculture, this is one way in which he can do it—by having the excessive duties on implements removed. I would also like to say that I think the distribution of seeds, not potatoes in particular, is a step in the right direction. Without going into further details Mr. Chairman, I may say that I am in accord with any steps to encourage agriculture and help to get better results from the farms than we are getting to-day. The money for this vote will be well spent if it prevents such huge amounts as previously mentioned, going out of the country, and in that way alone ample returns will be given for the expenditure. It is a disgrace to be sending out four millions yearly for what can be produced in the country. In conclusion I wish the Minister well in his efforts and hope that we will see substantial results from his venture.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE—Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a few remarks to thank the honorable members for St. Barbe and Carbonear for their expressions of encouragement as to the agricultural policy which I have outlined. As to the encouragement to be given farming I wish to disabuse the minds of these gentlemen of the idea that there will be any discrimination in the expenditure of the money. The District of St. Barbe will receive the same treatment as St. John's East which is represented by the Attorney General, or St. John's West, Bonavista or any other place. Wherever anything can be done the same support will be given by me, and

I wish to assure the honorable members that party politics will play no part in the distribution of the money while I have anything to do with the administration. I would like to point out that at present there is no duty on agricultural implements and the article referred to by the honorable member for St. Barbe is not listed as such. Regarding the distribution of seeds, the system formerly in use was for a man to send in his order and the Department send away for the seeds. No doubt it was a good system, particularly in conveniencing those outside the city, but when I went in as head of the Department I found that there were large sums for seeds charged up to parties in different parts of the country. Some people were prepared to pay cash when they received their orders, but others had the amount charged up, and we had to hand them over to the Justice Department to try and have them collected. When this failed we had to go out of the business, as anyhow we were in business with regular business houses who had the necessary machinery to attend to the work.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the members on this side of the House, coupled with that of the Opposition members, I would like to express our appreciation of the very excellent address given to us this afternoon by the Minister of Agriculture and Mines. I am sure that it does him credit, and the amount of data which he gave to the House on the various questions, particularly as regards our mines, which we are most concerned in, was both instructive and interesting. We have great mineral possibilities in this country, and, from a geological standpoint, the interior of this country has not been even scratched yet, and I am glad to know that the Minister of Agriculture and Mines proposes, within a short time, to get an experienced geologist here for the purpose of ascertaining as far as possible what the mineral possibilities of this country really are. There is no doubt that we have minerals of all kinds in Newfoundland. Almost everything has been discovered here, although our mineral resources have not been developed to any great extent; but we must of necessity have untold wealth in the unexplored territory of the interior of this country, because all our mines that have ever been worked are on the fringe of the seaboard, such as Tilt Cove, Bett's Cove, York Harbour, Bell Island and lately the last attempt, I understand, has been made to develop a mine at Cape Gregory in St. Barbe district. But the seaboard is nothing to be compared in area with the great interior, which is yet practically untouched. Therefore, I say that any money spent would be well spent for the purpose of mineral development. I endorse the attitude of the Minister and I for one in the Government will give him every possible assistance I can and give him every dollar I can for this purpose. I believe that we have in this country to-day something that we know nothing whatever about. Over there in Mr. Walsh's own district, I refer to the Sliver Cliff Mine, promoted by Mr. McKay, at Argentia, which is now undergoing development. Last year I saw the samples of that ore taken from the Silver Cliff Mine and which were shown at the pavillion at Wembley. As a result of that display many English people became interested in it, and Mr. McKay, who is an authority on mineralogy, got interested a group of capitalists who are coming out here within the next month and without any question are going to develop that mine to a greater extent than even the optimistic Mr. McKay himself ever dreamed of. There is a possibility of opening up

there an industry that may take care of one thousand workmen. Well now if that is true on the fringe of the seacoast, what must the mineral possibilities be in the great hinterland, which is practically undiscovered. I think that the country is fortunate in having a man like Mr. Walsh in charge of the Department of Mines at this juncture. He was once a practical miner himself, and for that reason is naturally more interested in that particular branch of his department. I hope that the interest he has already shown will develop to a higher plane and that greater returns will accrue from his efforts than ever he anticipated. It is a good thing for us to have a practical man—not a theorist or a dreamer—at the head of a department, and, I am sure, that the future will demonstrate his fitness in that direction. I think that the statistics that he has furnished this House with this afternoon are most illuminating. The agricultural features of his report have been so openly and so freely discussed in this House that it is superfluous for me to elaborate on them. But I must again say that since taking charge of the Department of Agriculture and Mines he has demonstrated to the Government and to this House his absolute sincerity of purpose, as well as his determination to leave no stone unturned to bring about the development of Newfoundland's resources, particularly with regard to our mines.

MR. GODDEN—Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few brief remarks with regard to agriculture. I notice that the Estimates for the Agriculture and Mines Department are thirty thousand dollars in excess of what they were last year. Whether they are too much or too little for the operation of this Department I do not know. I think I have already stated in this House that one of the things that agriculturalists need in this country is protection, protection from outside competitions, and the Minister will have to bring this home to our practical farmers and all those who want to grow their own vegetales that they are protected, and give them good reasons why they should try to produce more than in the past. I refer particularly to root crops. Year after year the producers of those vegetables are faced with the same problem. Farmers from the outports come to town to place their produce with the merchants, and the reply they invariably get from the merchants is that they will only take them at a ridiculously low figure or for their account. The reason is that they get potatoes from Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia, where they got them last year for as low as $1.30 per barrel, and where potatoes are grown to a greater extent than they are in Newfoundland. And when they have more than they can use themselves in Prince Edward Island and Maritime Provinces they sell them here at a lower rate than what our local potatoes can be bought for. In order to encourage and protect local farmers I would suggest that a close season be put on our imports; or if not put on a larger amount of duty at certain seasons of the year. Either one of these ways would, I think, encourage our fisherman-farmers to grow more potatoes and turnips. The same applies to poultry raising in this country, and our own people should be protected through a higher rate of duty being charged on imported eggs during the laying season. Local producers cannot attempt to supply the trade at the same prices as imported eggs are to-day. The situation to-day is, as a matter of fact, that the American and Nova Scotia Produce Companies find that they have more eggs on hand than they know what to do with. I have a telegram in my possession

now asking me if I would take two hundred cases of eggs on consignment from Canada, and asking me to do the best I can with them, which of course would tend to sacrifice prices. Now that is what is happening every year and the only way to get over the difficulty for the benefit of our people and to afford protection to the poultry farmer is to raise the duty on imported eggs or put a close season on them for a certain period. I submit these suggestions in all earnestness.

With regard to our mineral prospects, the only way I am interested in this regard is that I am a shareholder in a few local mining concerns which have not yet paid any dividends. The Colonial Secretary made some nice encouraging statements about the Silver Cliff Mine; but I would also like to know from the Minister of Agriculture and Mines if his Department knows any reason why the coal fields at St. George's are not in a more advanced stage of development than they are to-day. We are told that there is a large quantity of coal there, but there are certain rumours abroad that there are certain influences in this country—I do not know whether they are political influences or not—who are preventing the further development of the St. George's coal fields. If that is not so I would like to have all doubts set at rest on this matter. I am not interested in these coal fields myself, but hundreds of our investing public are, and for their sake nothing should be allowed to prevent the further development of these areas if it is possible and profitable to do so.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES — Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Member who has just sat down referred to St. George's coal fields and suggested that the department give some reliable information that has not yet been given with regard to the deposit of coal and as to why the fields are not being developed at the present time. And further he said that there is suspicion abroad that it might be possible that some influence whether political or otherwise has hindered those who are trying to promote a company to the development of that property. Now I must frankly state that I was suspicious myself as to the various reasons assigned for tying up the various mineral properties in different parts of the island. That is one of the reasons why I am here. I am particularly interested in having the services of a reliable geologist employed by the Government and not be depending upon advice that we may get from a man who might be brought down from Canada to go and have a look at the coal fields. He may possibly be a director of some coal fields himself. It is only reasonable to suppose that if such a man was able to give an adverse report on the property that he had examined it is only human nature to suppose that he would do so. Some men would, some men would not. For this very reason I think that the Government should htve a competent scientist to be able to send to the various properties.

I must say that when I saw the coal fields I was favourably impressed. I had seen some samples before that, but I had no idea that it was five or six feet thick on the surface. That is what I found in St. George's. There are various reasons why this property is not developed at the present time. But I think that all the obstacles could be overcome if we got hold of the right man. The first thing to do would be to drill over the whole property and prove beyond a shadow of a doubt that there is sufficient coal there. It might be possible that the seam would run for twenty feet and there may not be

half a million tons in the whole deposit. On the other hand there may be a 100 million tons. There might be as much coal in the St. George's coal fields as there is hematite ore in the deposit on Belle Isle. You cannot determine that until such time as somebody comes here and drills the deposit and proves the depth and the extent, and figure within 100 tons what the exact deposit is.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, I think every member must have been pleased at the very lucid speech of the Minister of Agriculture on the estimates this afternoon. It was rather lengthy, but I propose to take up some parts of it and ask for a little further information and for the Minister to go a little further.

First of all he dealt with the mineral portion of the Department, and after reading to us what had been done in other countries he said that we were lying on our oars. So far as that is concerned that is what we are, whether spelt with an A or otherwise. He referred to the necessity of getting the services of a scientific surveyor. With that I am sure everybody must agree. But if we get the services of a surveyor the next important thing will be for the Minister and his department to decide how the services of the surveyor can be utilised. While I was Minister of Justice and in the Squires Government that was spoken about, and on one of my visits to England was asked to see if the services of a thoroughly competent geologist could be obtained and at what figure. At that time I was attached to the British Metals Corporation as Proxy Director and therefore I was able to get in touch with some of the other directors of that corporation, who could put me in the right direction.

Eventually I received letters to Sir R. Redmayne, and after discussing the matter with him and others I found that we could get a perfectly competent man to come out here and undertake a geological survey of Newfoundland. A man who was thoroughly reliable and who had the finest qualifications and references for $7500 dollars a year. But for other reasons we did not go on with the idea, and we never engaged him, and no particular man was suggested to us.

But I would suggest to the Minister that he does, and I hope he does, obtain the services of a surveyor that he will alter the late system and that he will get that surveyor to devote his attention towards the profitable mineral ores that are at present known to exist, instead of going all around the country and making a report on the geology of the country in a rather desultory way, as before. I, like the Minister, regret that the money is got out of the country goes to finance the mines in Ontario and Quebec. And I may tell the Minister that recently a large amount of money has gone out to the mines in the Province of Quebec, and I hope that the large number of people who have invested money in those mines will make a 100 p.c. and then turn it back into Newfoundland.

With regard to the agricultural side of the Department. I was very interested in reading the estimates to find that the vote had been increased by the addition of 20,000 dollars, and I listened with a great deal of attention to the Minister's speech to find what he is going to do with that. We have had in the past various agricultural policies. Whether the policies were a mistake or not I don't know. But there is not a doubt whatever that whether the policies were a mistake or not they were made in the administration. At the same time we had Sir Robert Bond and his model farm; Sir Edward Morris and his agricultural system throughout the

country. And then in the Squires Government they started what was called a model farm, but was really a stock farm. While the model farm did not do all that it was to have done I believe that the policy was right.

I would again ask the Minister to explain to the House how he proposes to expend that 20,000 dollars that is going to be voted to him. I hope that he is not going to pay that out in salaries at least, nor to get men appointed to look after the ravages of certain kinds of beetles. There has been some complaint about the destruction of the forests by some sort of bug or beetle. But whether the salary of 1800 dollars a year to kill bugs and beetles or to stop their ravages is enough I would like the Minister to explain. I hope that he is going to devote the whole twenty thousand to agriculture.

The Minister did to a certain extent touch on a certain form of policy. But he did not go far enough. He stated that after the consultation with the local farmers here in St. John's they had decided on nothing and he was going to get the services of a thoroughly competent scientist in farming to come down here, and he stopped there. Now I would like to know and the House would like to know what the scientist is going to do after he comes down here. He proposed to have a sort of model farm or technical school of farming or is he going to have a certain man going around the various places giving lectures. But the Minister stopped there. We are going to have a scientist and he did not explain what the scientist was going to do.

I believe with him that there is a market for some of our wild fruits. I sent some blueberries to a friend of mine in Canada a couple of years ago. I was rather disappointed. While the gentleman thanked me for the two tins of berries he asked me would it not be possible in packing up the tins the next time to pack up a tooth brush with them. That is the drawback.

Now there are various industrial enterprises on the West Coast. I am told by the member for St. George's that quite a few people who gave up their farms and left there some years ago are now returning and taking an interest in agriculture. My firm has a client in London who has taken over some land belonging to a prominent man. He is a man of repute and considerable means. He proposes in view of the new market on the West Coast to first of all clear the land and put up some farms there, and eventually to turn the land into farm land and go into farming on a fairly large scale in view of the market at the Humber, and the market is to become good on the West Coast. We have the finest soil for the growing of crops. I was at Corner Brook not long ago and I saw where they had been excavating for sand pits, and they had excavated in some places down to a depth of twenty feet and you would not see a stone bigger than an inkbottle, and these would be few and far between. I understand that a very reputable farmer here in St. John's paid a visit to Corner Brook, and he sent a package of it away and had it analysed, and when he came back he expressed his regret that he was not able to go into the farming industry over there because he was unable to dispose of his place here in St. John's and did not have the capial to begin over there. But in spite of the land over there and the richness of the soil the people of the West Coast find it practically impossible to grow crops, because up to the present time, with the exception of Grand Falls there has been no market for their produce. It is a fact that potatoes and other farm produce can be imported

here to St. John's cheaper from Prince Edward's Island than from the West Coast, and I understand that the reason is because of the high freight rates. I hope that the Prime Minister will take the matter up with the railway and transportation system, and make some arrangement whereby the farm products can come over the railway at a minimum rate. I remember in this House some years ago when Sir Edward Morris was Prime Minister he made an arrangement with Bowring's and Reid's by which these products were brought along at a minimum rate. Now the Minister said that he was not going to make the mistakes that had been made by various previous governments, but that he was purely going to profit by them. I am glad to see that he is going to profit by them, but I want to tell him that there may have been mistakes as far as the administration is concerned, but there were no mistakes as far as the policy was concerned. It is pleasing to me and the members of this House to find that the Minister is going into his department so wholeheartedly, and whether he makes mistakes or not he intends to leave it in a better shape than that in which he found it.

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES—Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the Hon. Member for Fortune Bay for the way in which he has just spoken. What I mean, Mr. Chairman, by profiting by the mistakes that have been made is like in the instance of the late government which spent a lot of money on what they called the Stock Farm, and the present Government has no intention of encouraging anything like a Stock Farm. That is one way in which we are going to profit. I consider that a mistake. The Hon. Member said that I made reference to the fact that we were going to employ the services of a scientist and that there it stopped, and that I did not give any explanation as to where the twenty thousand dollars was to be expended. That sum is to be expended only after consultation with the scientist whom we intend to bring down here and put at the head of the agricultural end of the department. I do not propose to say that so much of that sum is to be spent here, and that so much is to be spent there, because I feel that I am not competent to do so. I do not think that we have any man in the Government who is competent to do so. But although we are going to call in the agricultural scientist we are not going to spend the whole of the twenty thousand dollars in this way, because as the Hon. Member must know over five thousand dollars have been spent already in connection with the seventy five or eighty agricultural bulls that are distributed throughout the country. Previous to my taking charge of the department the animals would be sent to some particular settlement on the advice of the representative of the district to some man to be kept. He would sign an agreement to keep the animal for three years and then it would be his. After keeping the animal for two to six months for some reason or other the animal would be destroyed, and it would be after costing the department anywhere from seventy five to one hundred and fifty or two hundred dollars. I do not propose to have any repetition of that. That is another way that I intend to profit by the mistakes that have been made. I intend to inaugurate a new system whereby the animals will be sent to some person on the advice of the member, some competent person, and the department will pay the person who keeps it a certain subsidy, but the animal will never be his. The

Department of Agriculture and Mines will always own the animal, and if the department wants to, it can send it to the Hon. Member's own district of Fortune Bay, or it might be sent down to Mr. Scammell's district, and after that it might be sent to Placentia district. In reviewing the farming situation on the West Coast I think that I should take this opportunity to tell the House about the time I was over to the St. George's coalfields. I was off at Stephenville Crossing and I met Charlie White, the son of Captain Dick White, whom many members must know. Last summer he had supplied twelve thousand dollars worth of vegetables to Corner Brook, and the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company gave him the cheque for this amount, and he had done this with the help of two or three hands on the farm with him. It has been said what is the use of raising crops if we cannot get a market for them, but the fact that we are importing two or three millions of dollars worth of Prince Edward's Island is food for thought. I feel that if the Government were to spend money for the encouragement of the agriculture of this country it would be a move in the right direction.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS— Mr. Chairman, I have not tired the House very much with any remarks that I have made up to the present time, and I am sure the House will have patience with me for just a few words. Other gentlemen have been heard time and again. In some cases they have made very interesting speeches, and in other cases they have made very tiring remarks. But I think that I should not allow this opportunity to pass without adding a word of praise for the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, who came into this House this afternoon, and in the words of some other members, gave a very interesting report of the work of his department and his plans for the future.

I also want to endorse the remarks made by Mr. Duff, the Member for Carbonear, in connection with the cement proposition in Trinity Bay. In this country we are always looking out for some means of employment. We had before this House a few days a Textile bill for the encouragement of the manufacture of woollen goods in this country, and this House was asked to grant certain concessions for the purpose of giving employment for the people. Now I have some knowledge of this cement proposition in Trinity Bay. There was developed near Heart's Content a splendid electrical power, and one of the chief reasons this electrical power was developed was for the purpose of doing something with this cement proposition. That meant a great deal of employment for the people, as not only the actual manufacture of the cement, but the manufacture of barrels and other things in connection with it. And just at the important juncture a man went down to the Agriculture and Mines Department and took away from those people that on which they had spent their time and means, and put an end to the prospects for the industry to which the Hon. Member referred. I hope the Minister will take that thing into his consideration and if possible bring in some rules or regulations that will prevent that happening again in the future. Now in reference to the agricultural policy. When the Marine and Fisheries vote went through the House the other day I did not have very much to say in connection with the fisheries. In fact I had nothing to say. I am the son of a fisherman, but I was not brought up to that industry and my knowledge of the fisheries is more or less theoretical. I have no very

great practical knowledge of the fisheries, and, I therefore left fishery matters to those who are more capable of dealing with them. As a matter of fact, no matter how practical or how experienced with the fisheries certain gentlemen are the result seems to be the same. It seems to me that we have a very practical minister in charge of the Marine and Fisheries Department now. But we can talk and talk and write on the fisheries policy, but I have never seen very much happen from it. I am nevertheless very hopeful now that Capt. Winsor's practical efforts will bear fruit in the near future.

But what I want to refer to particularly now is the agricultural policy that the Minister of Agriculture and Mines intends to resurrect, if I may put it that way, beginning this year. Sometime ago he was good enough to invite me, with others, to his office to discuss certain matters in connection with agricultural matters which were recently considered before the Government.

I remember in 1910 after the election of the People's Party to power, the agricultural policy of that Government was started in the various districts. Referring particularly to the district of Harbour Grace, we had agricultural societies started there. The old Agricultural Society of Harbour Grace was in operation long before 1910, in fact about fifty years ago, and it did not depend upon any one Government for its agricultural policy. But there were agricultural societies inaugurated in Spaniard's Bay and Bay Roberts, and several other places in the district of Harbour Grace and elsewhere around the country, and I can assure this House that I know of nothing better to stimulate and encourage practical agriculture in the ontport towns and districts of this country than these associations. Take the agricultural societies at Bay Roberts, Spaniard's Bay and other sections in Harbor Grace District. I want to assure the Minister of Agriculture and Mines that those societies did a great deal to stimulate agriculture—live-stock raising, poultry raising, fruit raising and various other things. It has been my experience that these societies in the district of Harbour Grace were a huge success, and I want to assure the House that the district of Harbour Grace is suffering to-day from an agricultural standpoint because these societies were discontinued during the past few years.

What do we find in Canada and the United States where agriculture figures very largely? They have their co-operative associations for almost everything. They have their associations in connection with egg production, poultry raising, live stock raising, bee-keeping, and in connection with every imaginable branch of the farming industry. Then these societies go in for co-operative marketing of their produce. My friend, Mr. Godden, made some reference this afternoon to the matter of finding a market for our eggs and for other products of our farms. A lot of our produce will be left on our hands until such time as we establish markets for it in St. John's, Bell Island, Corner Brook and other industrial centres. With markets, our people could bring their products together and market them in a co-operative way.

I remember in 1912 when the agricultural exhibitions were inaugurated by the People's Party. We had one for the twin districts of Harbour Grace and Carbonear, and I want to assure this House that that exhibition was a great success, and was a great stimulus to agriculture. It was a great pity these exhibitions were discontinued. But what have we got over in the district of Harbour

Grace to-day? Scarcely any cattle, scarcely any interest taken in agriculture like we had it there a few years ago. I hope the Minister will revive these societies and exhibitions.

Years ago we had our vote of two hundred dollars, and we had our societies. We charged a membership fee of twenty-five cents, and we started in to buy implements and give them out to the people. Every man could not get a harrow, every man could not purchase a plough, every man could not purchase a weighing scale. And so we placed a harrow in this section, a plough in that section, and a scales in another. We also imported seeds, and particularly we were instrumental in buying cattle feed wholesale and selling it to the people at cost price, and in various other ways we helped the people and thereby stimulated agriculture.

Mr. Warren made reference to the freight rates. I have had occasion to come in contact with the same thing. Some of my constituents were very anxious last fall to send some potatoes to Corner Brook. The people in Conception Bay are trying to compete with the people of Prince Edward Island, and if they are to be at all successful in that they must have the freight rates from Conception Bay to Corner Brook and other large centres reduced. At present they have to pay fifty or sixty cents a barrel on potatoes and other vegetables. I hope the Minister of Agriculture and Mines will take that matter up with the Government or the Railway Commission.

One last word. I hope that when we get that flour mill started we will be able to get feed for our cattle, so that the raising of cattle will become greater in Newfoundland, and probably some day soon we may be able to export them to other countries principally because of the cheaper feed we will get from the flour mill.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, while we are on this vote, I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, seeing that the Prime Minister is not here, what is the policy of the Government as regards timber lands

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—You mean with regard to timber limits. The policy that we have adopted right through is in fact that there has not been one instance of granting timber lands. There was only one disposal, and in that case a sale was made, whereby the Government got forty five thousand dollars. No grants have been issued by the Department since I went there.

MR. SCAMMELL—Who are the third and fourth surveyors?

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—Mr. James and Mr. Burridge.

MR. SCAMMELL—I see that under this vote for our logging inspectors there has been an increase. I do not think that this is necessary, because the trouble is that these men do not do their duty; and if they are not, it would be much better to do away with them altogether. I will have more to say about this matter before the House closes. I had occasion to ask how the logging inspectors were doing their duty, and it appears that things are not nearly as satisfactory as they should be in the logging camps.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—I might say in reply to the hon. member that we have had reports that some of the logging inspectors were not doing all they should; and we have just sent a man out to investigate the matter. As soon as he gets back I will get in touch with the hon. member.

PUBLIC WORKS

MR. SCAMMELL—Who is the stenographer to the deputy minister

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Not appointed yet.

MR. SCAMMELL—Who is the architect

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Churchill. I would like to say that he has always been receiving fees for doing architectural work. The Government has decided to cut that out, and put his salary on a straight basis of $3,000.00 a year, and do away with these extras for fees.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, while we are on this subject of insurance and repairs on public buildings, I would like to take this opportunity of urging on the Government the necessity of replacing the Court House at Bonne Bay. The Court House there was burnt in the big fire that took place in January, 1921, and the place is badly in need of a public building of that nature. At present a dwelling house is used as the Court House and is not at all suitable for the purpose. This has to serve for the whole section of the coast from Bonne Bay to Flower's Cove and the people are handicapped in many ways by not having a proper building. I presume the insurance from the fire was passed into the Government's funds, and I think it is time to get down to business and have a proper building erected. It is absolutely necessary that this building be proceeded with and I think the Hon. the Minister of Justice will agree with me as to the importance of the matter.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, as far as I am personally concerned, I must say I agree with the remarks of the honorable member for St. Barbe, and I hope that as it is an important matter some move will be taken to provide a suitable building.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Chairman, I may say that this matter is receiving the attention of the department now.

MR. DUFF—What is the vote for the fire building at Carbonear.

MINISTER OF FINANCE—$225.

MR. DUFF—The man there has no way of drying the hose and I think we should have an extra $40 or $50, which would satisy the fire brigade for the purchase of coal, as only a few tons would be needed. If the fire departments cost the country $50,000 why not add $40 or $50 for Carbonear. In Hr. Grace the vote is $1729 against $675 for Carbonear, where there is just as much revenue paid on the buildings. If we are going to economize, why not start here.

MR. SCAMMELL—I would ask the Minister of Public Works what is the position as to the Normal School. Is it finished or is more money to be spent on it?

MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS—It is practically finished and has been taken over by the Educational Dept. This vote is for an extra salary. There is some dispute between one of the contractors and the Public Works Dept.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Was the vote taken in globo the last year.

MINISTER OF FINANCE—Yes, but it is in detail this year, and the total is the same.

MR. MOORE—Where are we to find the rent for the Public Charities office.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—The Public Works Dept. has nothing to do with it.

MR. DUFF—What is this vote here for Hr. Grace?

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—That was for an outbreak of disease.

MINISTER OF FINANCE—It was put in for an emergency and there was a similar vote for St. John's.

MR. SCAMMELL—What is the estimate for the building at Bonne Bay.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—The matter has not reached the stage

of having the estimate of the cost prepared yet.

MR. WARREN — Mr. Chairman, while this vote for the Department of Public Works is before the House I would like to draw the attention of the Minister to a matter which I am not personally interested in, except as the member for Fortune Bay, and I would ask him if any arrangement has yet been come to with regard to payments to the doctors at the General Hospital by the patients that go in there? I do not think that I would raise the point if it had not been that in the early part of the session the member for Twillingate (Mr. Grimes) asked some questions with regard to some payments made to the doctors of that institution. A rather extraordinary case happened in regard to a constituent of mine who came on there, a Mrs. Bullen. She entered hospital and was prepared to pay her ordinary fee. I saw her at the hospital and she asked me about her fees and as to how much she was likely to be charged. Eventually she left the Hospital and went home and I was very much surprised afterwards to receive a very indignant letter from her, and in which she stated that she had paid her Hospital fee, but that the Board had billed her for another $47. She said she had paid $50 and that they owed her $3 back. She complained about the treatment she received after she left the Hospital. Not being able to walk, she had to be conveyed to the dock premises and had to be carried on board the "Glencoe." She wanted me to publish her letter in the papers, but I refused to do that, and I wrote the Hospital Commission on the subject matter of her complaint. The correspondence that has been tabled is not satisfactory and I draw attention to it now because the matter is likely to receive a certain amount of notoriety; nor am I satisfied with the answers that I got from the Hospital Commission. As I understand that it is not the intention of the House to sit to-night, Mr. Chairman, I shall withhold any further remarks I have to make on this matter until to-morrow.

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 to-morrow.

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on to-morrow.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to Amend an Act entitled 'Of the House of Assembly,'" without amendment.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, April 3rd, 1925.

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

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay on the table of the House the returns of the fire insurance losses for the year ended Dec. 31st, 1924. It is interesting in this connection to note that the losses were $186,753.75, and the net receipts by way of premiums according to the Inspector General of $743,486.66.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I wish to lay on the table of the House the report of the

examinations conducted by the Council of Higher Education in 1924, and also the Financial Statement in connection therewith, together with the replies to the question asked yesterday by the honourable member for St. Barbe, many of which are answered in the Report of the C.H.E.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the report of the Inspector of Weights and Measures for the year ended Dec. 31st, 1924.

Mr. Warren gave notice of question.

Mr. Ashbourne gave notice of question.

Mr. Scammell gave notice of question.

The Chairman from the Committee of the Whole on Supply reported certain Resolutions, which were read a first time as follows:

Department of Agriculture
and Mines $107,156.66

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. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act Relating to the St. John's Dry Dock" without amendment.

EGRESS FROM BUILDINGS BILL

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, whilst copies of the amendments are being distributed I would only repeat what I stated yesterday, namely that this re-cast bill contains nothing new except a provision to protect those buildings which do not comply with the present law as to doors opening outwards, but which at the same time are admittedly not dangerous. If satisfactory to the Inspector General and Government Engineer there will be no occasion of inflicting any unnecessary hardship on the parties interested.

MR. BROWNE—Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Hon. the Minister of Justice as to the precedure in this case, and whether he proposes to put it right through without going into the committee stage, as the Bill was prepared here, sent to the Upper House after being given considerable attention and sent back considerably altered. I think we should have an opportunity for discussion of it as there are some clauses which may need interpretation in Court later.

MR. ASHBOURNE—These amendments have reference to the outports too, and one section says the present doors of buildings need not open outwards if satisfactory to the Inspector-General and the Government Engineer. Now it is not likely that these gentlemen will visit the outports to inspect any buildings, and I would like this bill to be dealt with in Committee so as to see how the outports will be affected.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into a Committe of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, yesterday before the House adjourned I drew the attention of the Minister of Public Works and the House to the question of the payment of fees to doctors at the General Hospital, and I had not proceeded very far when the Committee rose. It will be remembered I stated that a constituent of mine had become a patient in the public ward in the Hospital, and she had been quite willing and ready to pay her fees while there. Apparently she had asked the nurse what amount she owed and she was told $50. I understand that she asked how much

she would have to pay the doctor and there was some controversy on that point. She paid $50 and then went home. On her arrival home she received a bill from Mr. Rennie, Secretary of the Hospital Commission, for $47 more. She then wrote to me very indignantly and stated that she had paid $50 and that she thought that they owed her $3. She asked me to publish her letter in the papers, but I would not do that. I wrote the Hospital Commission about it first and then I wrote Dr. Keegan about it. The letter I wrote to Mr. Rennie of the Commission was as follows:

(Reads letter to House).

In reply to that I received this from Mr. Rennie—a most extraordinary letter to get.

(Reads letter to House).

Mrs. Bullen's complaint was that she left the Hospital before she was able to walk properly, that she was taken to the dock in a cab, and that when she got out of the carriage at the entrance to the dock, just about where the freight shed is, she collapsed and had to be carried on board the "Glencoe" by the cabman and another man who happened along when she collapsed. As a matter of fact Mrs. Bullen was well able to pay her own way home, but having been told by a nurse at the Hospital that if she wanted a passage home she could have one, she took it for granted that a free passage was being supplied her. She had no friends in St. John's and did not know anybody to find out differently from. At all events she found herself in the steerage of the ship and, as I said before, wrote a very indignant letter after she got home over the way she had been treated. I do not complain of that so much as I am anxious to find out exactly how patients stand with regard to payments when they go into Hospital. Dr. Keegan's report on the matter is as follows:

(Reads report to House)

That is absolutely untrue. Mr. Bullen never spoke to Dr. Fraser in her life. That fairly corroborates what Mrs. Bullen said. Mrs. Bullen then wrote to Mr. Rennie as follows:

(Reads Mrs. Bullen's letter.)

I replied to Mr. Rennie as follows: (Reads reply to Mr. Rennie).

Accordingly I sent Mrs. Bullen this questionaire and she replied as follows: (Quotes correspondence).

Well I know that is a mistake in view of what she says before. She thought that Doctor Fraser's bill covered all expenses.

Now that is a most extraordinary case. This woman enters the hospital and does not say a word to anybody and is perfectly prepared to pay her expenses unlike eighty per cent. of the people who do go there. She is billed for forty seven dollars on account of amount which has been paid Doctor Fraser, and that in view of the fact that she never saw Doctor Fraser and made no especial arrangements, and he was there because Doctor Keegan was away, and also in spite of the fact that she was not a private patient but was in the public ward. I would just like to have a statement from the Minister of Public Works or from the Colonial Secretary. I would like to have the statement for publication so that the people going into the Hospital will know how much they have to pay and will not be able to be charged surreptitiously by the doctors in additional to the hospital fees. I have no objections to special doctors' fees being paid. I have myself paid large amounts to doctors for operations. But I say this on behalf of those people who go into the Hospital and do not know what they have to pay, or the rules and regulations, so that

they will go prepared to pay a certain amount and know that they will not be charged an extra amount by the Doctors that have already been paid by the Government. And in the instance of Mrs. Bullen I think that it is my duty to bring this matter up in this House so that we may get a decision and an answer as to how patients stand with regard to the payment of fees when they go into the Hospital, and whether they will have to pay the doctors' fees as well as the ordinary fees charged by the Hospital Commission. I would just like the Minister of whatever department this matter refers to let us know the scale of fees which are charged by the Hospital Commission and have been confirmed by the Governor-in-Council, and to say whether the above charge is not the only charge to be paid by those patients entering the Hospital.

THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Chairman, Mr. Warren has just mentioned my name in connection with this matter because I am in charge of the Department of Public Works. I want to say in reply that, as he probably knows already, the Department of Public Works is not responsible for the internal management of the General Hospital. For the information of the the Hon. Members on both sides of this House I may say that a few years ago because of a row or some misunderstanding, a Board of Governors was appointed for the General Hospital, and an act was passed conferring certain powers on that Board. They then took over the internal management of the Hospital. They were given a secretary, and everything in connection with the matters referred to by Mr. Warren is managed by the Board of Governors. My Department acts as the commissariat for the Hospital, the Sanitorium and the Sudbury Hospital. Two or three years ago the Sanitorium and Sudbury were also placed under the Board of Governors of the General Hospital, so that my department acts in the same relation to the Sanitorium and the Sudbury Hospital as it does to the General Hospital. So that, Mr. Chairman, I say to Mr. Warren that I know absolutely nothing about the matter to which he refers and therefore I have no explanation to give him. Hon. Mr. Long is the Executive Member on the Board of Governors, and he may be able to give some explanation as to the matter to which Mr. Warren refers.

HON. MR. LONG—Mr. Chairman, as the Executive Member of the Board of Governors of the General Hospital I beg to say to Mr. Warren that the case he has presented here is regrettable, and that no one regrets it more than the Board of Governors, and for the information of the Hon. Member I might say that it is contrary to the rules and regulation of the Hospital for fees to be charged by the medical officials.

(Reads the Rules).

With regard to the case of Mrs. Bullen, this lady came to the Hospital during the absence of Doctor Keegan, when Doctor Fraser was acting superintendent. There is no doubt in the minds of the Board of Governors that Mrs. Bullen, when she paid this fifty dollars, thought that she was paying the General Hospital fee of one dollar per day, and the Hon. Mr. Warren is perfectly correct when he says that when a patient pays Mr. Rennie it covers all obligations to the General Hospital for the period named. The Board of Governors also wrote Doctor Fraser on three or four different occasions demanding the repayment of this fifty dollars, and it is regrettable that a man of Doctor Fraser's standing in the community adopted the

stand that he has. On Feb. 20th we wrote Doctor Fraser as follows:

(Reads the letter).

Doctor Fraser replied to this letter on Feb. 23rd. Mr. Chairman, perhaps I had better read this letter again. (Reads letter).

This is the reply of Doctor Fraser to our letter of Feb. 20th. Since then the Board of Governors have sent another letter to Dr. Fraser making a final demand on him to refund the money. I have only got to say for the information of the Hon. gentlemen that while regretting the action of Dr. Fraser, the Board of Governors have decided that no matter how unpleasant it will be to Dr. Fraser they will have to resort to other means if he still refuses to refund the money. I just make that explanation to the Hon. Members, so that they may understand it perfectly.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—Mr. Chairman, before getting away from the discussion on this matter I would like to add a word to what has already been said, against a very vicious principle. Some three years ago when the Hon. Member for Fortune Bay, who brought this subject before the House this afternoon, was a member of the Government of the day and Sir Richard Squires was Prime Minister, and I regret to see, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Chambers is not present, as he is familiar with the subject brought up two years ago. The case was somewhat like this.

A gentleman named Bruce of Long Harbour, Placentia Bay, came in for treatment at the General Hospital. He did not come to me or to my colleague as far as I know. But he was a personal friend of Mr. Chambers, and he took him to the Hospital and saw Dr. Keegan. He discussed with Dr. Keegan what the possible cost would be for two or three weeks. Dr. Keegan told him that it would cost in the vicinity of two dollars per day. Mr. Bruce decided that he could afford to pay this amount. There was no operation. I think, perhaps, that Dr. Keegan might have seen him during the time, but I do say that the man had no operation. After two weeks Mr. Bruce decided to go home. A bill was presented him by Mr. Rennie, the Secretary of the Board of Governors. It was 25 dollars. Mr. Bruce paid the bill, without any objection, and was passing out of the institution when he was called into the private office of Dr. Keegan and presented with another bill for 40 dollars. The poor old man paid it. He paid the additional 40 dollars, and went home. He wrote to my colleague and to myself and he also made a complaint to Mr. Chambers. We brought the matter before the Board of Governors, and also Mr. Whiteway. He was a personal friend of Mr. Bruce and an intimate friend of Mr. Chambers. All that was possible to be done was done to get the money refunded, as he was a very poor man. Finally I had to bring the matter befor the House. I brought the matter up in the House from my place on the other side, and I think that I would be very inconsistent in my attitude if I did not take the stand that I am taking now and give my support to the Hon. Member for Fortune Bay who has brought a similar case before the House. At that time I stated that I had no personal ill will towards Dr. Keegan. I did not question Dr. Keegan's ability, I did not question whether he was receiving sufficient funds to repay him for the services that he was rendering to the country. But all that I had to do with was whether it was just and right for the Government or any individual of the Government to levy fees and charge any private individual of the public whatever he thought fit. If Mr. Bruce could be charged for two weeks in

the hospital could not any other individual man or woman be subjected to the same treatment. My objection then is to the vicious principle which allow the public to be fleeced of the large amounts.

Since that time my act has been criticised by individuals both in and out of the House. Because I got up and brought this before the House they actually made it out to be a personal attack on Dr. Keegan. It is no more personal attack than the Hon. Member for Fortune Bay on Dr. Fraser. I support the Hon. Member against a system that permits such a thing to go on. It is not good enough for the matter to be brought up and the correspondence read, and then the matter to be allowed to drop. I consider that what the Hon. Member for Fortune is more interested in is the return of the 50 dollars. My friend, Mr. Bruce was more interested in the return of his 40 dollars. He does not need the return of the money now, he passed away two years ago. He has gone to a country where he does not need the services of any practitioner.

I hope that this discussion will bear fruit. I trust that it will be made plain that the party that goes down to the General Hospital will have to either pay or not. Not to charge one man $40 and give another man the services free of cost. In drawing this matter for the first time as far as I know officially to the attention of the Government I hope that the matter will not rest as it did when I brought a similar matter up three years ago. The only thing that I got was ridicule. I don't think that I would be acting consistently with my attitude on that occasion if I did not say a word against the principle this afternoon.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word in this connection, as I happened to be closely identified with the General Hospital. As a matter of fact some ten years ago I introduced what was known as the General Hospital Bill. Prior to that the Hospital was directly under the control of the Colonial Secretary. A Bill was introduced at that time that a Board of Governors were to be appointed and were to be given practically full powers as regards the internal working of the General Hospital. The Governors were to be appointed under certain conditions and were to remain in office for a certain period. A certain number went out after a few years of service. The point raised this afternoon by the Hon. Member for Fortune and explained by Mr. Long, the Government member of the General Hospital Board, is a very important one. Dr. Fraser's position that he was consultant is absolutely untenable. There is no such position provided for under the Act, there is no such position. The Act does not provide for any consultant, and therefore Dr. Fraser has no standing as a consultant. The Act provides:

7. "The chief officials of the Hos-
"ptial shall be:
"The Superintendent.
"Visiting Medical Practitioners
"and Surgeons.
"First House Surgeon, who shall
"be a medical practitioner.
"Second House surgeon who shall
"be a medical practitioner.
"Superintendent of Nurses.
"X-Ray operator, Anaesthetist and
"Dispenser Matron.
"Kitchen Superintendent.
"Housekeeper of the Nurses'
"Home.
"Storekeeper.
"Engineer."

That shows that there never was any such position as Dr. Fraser claims to hold, even thought of, or created under this Act. Therefore, Dr.

Fraser is absolutely out of Court on that point, in my opinion.

With regard to the collection of fees. The collection of fees is specially provided for under this Act; and there is special provision made for those who are unable to pay their own fees, having them paid by the Commissioner of Public Charities, who issues orders for the admission of patients into the Hospital, and pays the bills afterwards when they are certified. That section also provides that all monies paid into the institution are to be handed to the superintendent, who in turn hands them to the Minister of Finance and Customs for the use of the Colony. The act specially provides: (Reads Section 7 of Act.)

Now, I submit that the Act is very specific on that point. I do not think that any medical man in that hospital is allowed to take fees under the Act. Private arrangements may be made between patients who may go into the hospital under the care of their own physician, and who may visit and treat them. But when a patient comes in there from the outports with absolutely no connection with any doctor in St. John's, I think it is very improper to demand fees from them. I think that the attitude taken by the Board of Governors in regard to this matter is a very proper and sound one.

It is not that we do not appreciate and admire the doctor in charge of the hospital, Dr. Keegan. He is a man of unquestionable ability, both as a medical man and as a surgeon; and a man whom it will be very difficult to replace; a man who has the highest confidence of his confreres and associates in the medical profession, and also of the community. The Hospital under his superintendence is, to-day, as good as any that will be found in any place of this size in the world. Dr. Keegan, no doubt is a most excellent and efficient man. But that is not the point. If the people up in the Hospital are not satisfied with their salaries, the right and proper thing for them to do is to call upon the Government to pay them such salaries as will satisfy them; they should not collect fees from people coming into the hospital.

The General Hospital is an institution that is kept up by the Government, and, therefore, by the people, for the use of the people; and any money that is paid there for medical services that are given, should be paid over to the Minister of Finance, and should be accounted for in the public accounts. There is no reason in the world why that hospital should not earn a very large sum in return for the very large expenditure that we have upon it each year. I think the trouble is the fault of the system that has been allowed to grow up, and that is becoming more vicious each year; and I think that the remarks I made the other day with regard to the erection of a private pavillion for paying patients may well point to the solution of this difficulty that we are discussing now. I think if we had a private pavilion for paying patients that these difficulties would not arise at all.

I merely want to subscribe to the idea; and I hope that the Board of Governors will soon be able to clear this matter up; and I feel sure that the Government, as a Government, will stand behind them. I, as Colonial Secretary, have very little to do with the management of the Hospital, but I think we ought to be in a position to tell the public whether they have to pay or not; and I think it ought to be established as a fact that no fees are to be paid to the officials by people going into the Hospital.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, I have very little to say in regard to the discussion that has taken place

just now; but I think that after all it should serve a good purpose; and both the point raised by Mr. Warren and the incident referred to by the Minister of Agriculture and Mines to my mind serve to accentuate the position that Mr. Warren has taken, that it is about time that some clear, explicit and definite instructions were issued to the people of the country as to the matter of fees. They should know what is expected of them when they become patients at the General Hospital. I believe that was the point that Mr. Warren sought more than anything else to impress upon the Government—that they want to know what is the system.

The Hon. Colonial Secretary said that he thought the Act which he read was very explicit. I do not think that the Act is. It is not explicit on one point, because he said, from what I could judge of his reading of the Act, that all fees are payable to the superintendent. I suppose that there are a good many people under the impression that they should be paid to the Board of Governors.

Personally—it is none of my business, I know—but I would like to say that letter which Mr. Warren read as coming from Mr. Rennie was absolutely impudent. It was a piece of impertinence and impudence from start to finish; and I would like to say that if Mr. Rennie ever wrote me such a letter as that, I would go right down there and have the matter out with him, because I consider that Mr. Rennie has no right to send such a letter to any man who represents some twelve thousand people in this country. I would not stand for it from anyone. Fortunately we have a member of the Executive Council down on the Board of Governors, who is able to get up here and give us an explanation in regard to this incident. The fact stands out that this discussion has served the purpose of impressing upon the House that it is time that the Board of Governors got down to some rules and regulations which will show the people just what is expected. The sooner that is done the better, and the less of this sort of thing we will have.

MR. SCAMMELL—What is the explanation as to this vote in connection with New Harbor?

MIN. PUBLIC WORKS—There is no Half-way House there, and there was no use in putting in a vote.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, I am glad to see that these men of Portland Creek, River of Ponds and other places in this section have been placed on the regular list ferrymen. I may say that it was only the last year I was in the Government that the necessity for these ferries came under my notice. The rivers mentioned are of large size, and it will be a very long time before they will be bridged. People travelling up and down the coast find great difficulty in crossing those streams, and the custom has been for the traveller to light a fire on one side, and a man would come over from the other and take him across. The same people had to do this practically all the time at such inconvenience, and I think that few of the older men should be paid to do it. The year before last they got something out of the district grants, but I am pleased to see that they have now been placed on the regular list of ferrymen.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, in connection with this vote, I would like to point out that early in the Session I presented a petition asking for an improved ferry between Harbour Breton and Jersey Harbour. At present the ferryman, Wilson White, has to pay for the gasolene out of his salary, and devote all his time to the work. I do not ask for an increase, but the petition was sent me, and I

presented it and it was supported by the Honorable Members for Burin, the Honorable Mr. Long and Mr. Lake. As I pointed out, some two thousand people travel every year by this ferry, and a motor boat would be much safer than the dory now in use. The distance between the two points is about two miles, and I would ask the Minister of Public Works to make a note of the fact, and in place of the dory get a more suitable boat, which could be done for $100.00 or so.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—I have already made a note of the petition.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, in connection with this Bonne Bay ferry service, it is put out on contract, and the contractor is running it for $110.00. The man there at present is under the impression that his contract has terminated. The contract was made in 1917 I think, and I presume the Minister has no intention of terminating it.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—This is the first I have heard, and the contract has not terminated.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman, the Minister said yesterday that he would give us an opportunity to make a few remarks on the votes passed, and I would now like to draw attention to the small vote for the Notre Dame Bay Memorial Hospital. I would ask the Honourable the Colonial Secretary if any report has yet been received from the Directors of the Hospital.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—No report has been received so far.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Figuring up the beds in the General Hospital, and the sum required to maintain that institution, we find that it costs over $3.50 per patient per day, and in this connection I would like to point out the fact that the vote for the Notre Dame Bay Hospital comes to less than half that. In addition if the General Hospital takes care of paupers the Charities Department pays the bills, but in the Twillingate Hospital that privilege is not extended, and we are, therefore, called upon to operate a hospital which cost $100,000.00 and towards the construction of which the Government contributed only $10,000.00, the rest having been raised by public subscription. I do not intend to take up the time of the House, but I wish to point out that in my opinion, in view of the fact that the General Hospital costs over $3.50 a day per patient—or as the Honorable Member for Trinity says nearer $4.50—that the Notre Dame Bay Hospital gets only $1.40, and I hope the Honourable Colonial Secretary will take up the matter with the Executive, and see if something better cannot be done. The cause is one in which I believe all will acquiesce, and is worthy of every support.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak briefly in endorsation of all that my colleague has said in connection with the Hospital of Twillingate proper. At present it is allowed only one-third of the sum granted for patients in the General Hospital, and I think a vote of another $10,000.00 would be no great tax on the Treasury, as we are expending more at present and the conveyance of people in bringing them here. If this amount was appropriated for the purpose of going towards this Hospital,—I think we would get back a large proportion of the sum given. Under existing conditions there is a great deal of inconvenience and suffering inflicted on patients who have to travel long distances by train and steamer in coming here. I have known patients from Northern Points to undergo such strain that they passed away before reaching here. That sort of thing would be avoided if a sufficient vote were granted to

accommodate more patients at the Twillingate Hospital. I trust that the Honorable the Colonial Secretary will see his way clear to do something in this matter. I think that as there is supposed to be a surplus in sight in the revenue, that out of it ten or fifteen thousand dollars could be provided for the Twillingate Hospital, as we would say an equal sum which is now spent on the conveyance of patients. I hope, therefore, that the Minister will give this matter his most serious consideration.

MR. DUFF—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that I have received a letter from the Chairman of the Road Board stating that Mr. Gosse visited there a few days ago, and drawing attention to the fact that they are not allowed to spend any road money. I wish to point out that the Board was appointed by the people, and though last year it was not recognised, I think the Government should consider this matter and allow them to handle the expenditure. I believe it would be only right and fair to do this. I may say that we have a number of poor people over there, many of whom come back from Sydney, and I have received letters asking for assistance. I understand that the Government intends to spend some money on the Heart's Content road, in shortening it across the marshes, and I think in this connection they could employ those deserving people.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Chairman, I might say in reply to the Honourable Member for Carbonear that the Chairman of the Road Board at Victoria is also laboring under a misapprehension. There are a number of gentlemen over in Conception Bay, particularly at Bay Roberts East, where Mr. Hickman presented a petition from yesterday, who have allowed their imaginations to run away with them. Mr. Josiah Gosse, outport district road inspector, was sent by me to Victoria for the purpose of reporting on the probable cost of fixing up the road, which was in bad shape after the dam overflowed. That was Mr. Gosse's only business there. He had no business there with the Chairman of the Road Board.

MR. DUFF—Thank you.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister if he has any suggestions to make to the Government as to how the moneys voted here for the different districts in the outports are to be expended. The reason why I ask the question is that there are so many methods adopted with regard to public expenditure and so that one can be in a position to tell his constituents when they ask how money is sent out. In some cases Road Boards handle the money and in other cases the money is controlled and spent by private individuals. Now I would like to make a suggestion in connection with the spending of this money. My own experience is that where you have a number of people who are particularly interested and anxious to have their own Road Boards elected they should have control of the public moneys. Generally such people will elect their own best men on Road Boards, and it is a well known fact that people in the outports would be better satisfied all round to have moneys spent by Road Boards instead of by private individuals for the reason that they are always in the position of keeping tab on any moneys that go to the different districts, and they will know who did and who did not receive their proportional share of the grant, whereas when the grant is handled by private individuals the people do not know anything about it, and in some cases the moneys are not spent, while in other cases men do a couple of hours work on a

bridge or a road and then send in returns for having done sixty or eighty or a hundred dollars worth of work. I think there ought be some way of devising means whereby all public moneys sent out from the different departments could be accounted for in a proper way. A statement filled in and signed by a single individual intimating that such and such an amount was spent on such and such a work does not fill the bill; where you have a statement from a Road Board or a couple of Commissioners you have some certificate that the moneys sent out were legitimately spent on some public work, but that does not appertain to a large amount of money that goes out from the different departments to-day. Now I think that the experience that the Department of Public Works has had and the trouble they have had in getting returns back from private individuals should stir them to work out a better system. One thing certain that if you give the people an opportunity to elect their own Road Boards, that is, in places where people are interested in electing their own Road Boards, you will get better returns than by sending out money to any particular individual in a place. Of course I do not agree with the idea of having to send out money to a Road Board in place where there are very few people and where the grant would only be about $20 because that would mean a considerable amount of work for the department, even if the people in such a place wanted to elect their own Road Board.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Chairman, I fully agree with the remarks of the honourable member for Twillingate (Mr. Grimes) as to the advisability of having public moneys spent by Road Boards. The matter has given me a great deal of concern since I became Minister of Public Works. Even before I became a representative of the people of Harbour Grace district I was in close touch with the doings of Road Boards in that district. Time and again I conducted the election of the Road Boards there. I know their weaknesses and I know their strength, and I know that moneys allocated to be spent by Road Boards have been wasted just as much as moneys that have been sent out to individuals. It is a big question, and I can assure Mr. Grimes that as soon as I can find time I will give the whol ematter my serious consideration. At the same time it is my opinion that the Local Affairs Act should be enforced, but not as it is to-day, because it needs to be amended in some respect. Now I am not so sure as to whether the present system of elective Road Boards suits this country best. I was in favor of it at one time, but subsequently I found out there were some districts in which it was not workable, and I sometimes think I would be in favor of going back to the old system where the elected representatives recommended persons who would form the Board. There are many difficulties I know in the way of getting the largest returns from either elected or appointed Boards. The men who comprise the Boards in certain places may be politically opposed to the man representing that particular district and to the Party with whom he is associated, and in various ways the members of the Road Board may not coincide with the views of the district representative. Consequently, there is likely to be an absence of co-operation. That, Mr. Chairman, is one illustration where an elective Road Board would be "sawing across" so to speak, and there are other instances that I could cite also. However, there are matters mentioned by Mr. Grimes that are well worth consideration, and I intend to bring them to the notice

of the Government at the earliest opportunity.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that in the main I am a firm believer in the application of the Local Affairs Act. I believe in the principle of elective Road Boards, but more particularly so in the larger communities. I remember when the Local Affairs Act was first introduced into this House, one of its strongest advocates at that time was Mr. Morine, who occupied a seat in this House. Another strong advocate of the Local Affairs Act then was Mr. (present Judge) Kent, who occupied a prominent place in this Chamber. I can recall very well the debate that took place on that occasion and amongst other things Mr. Morine said in supporting the idea of having elective Road Boards was that in time the system would lead the people into getting for themselves better self-Government. I notice by recent utterances of his that he is of the same opinion to-day. I concur with Mr. Grimse that Road Boards are not as necessary in smaller communities, because it is hardly worth while to have an elected Road Board in a community that has the spending of a grant of from $20 to $50, and we know that there are a great many small localities that get a grant as low as $20 to spend. I understand that the Minister of Public Works said that he was seriously considering the enforcement of the Act in certain respects, but I would like to point out to him that if the Act got to be enforced at all that he will be obliged to enforce it in every respect. To-day the Government has ignored the Local Affairs Act. You cannot say, Sir, that you are accepting the principle of the Act when you accept the principle in one community and wink it out of sight in another. You either got to take the position that the law as it stands on the Statute Book to-day is applicable everywhere where road moneys are allocated or it is not applicable at all. If you think that a certain community must spend money on a certain system, then you can have less excuse, it seems to me, for allowing some other community to administer the same law on an entirely different system. I can quite see that as to the necessity in so far as you might consider an amendment to the Local Affairs Act that you would presume making a step whereby to improve the Act as regards the expenditure of Road Moneys. If the Minister proposes some sensible amendment to the Local Affairs Act that is in force for a number of years and he is able to learn from experience the good that is in it and the weakness, then let the Minister bring in an amendment that would be acceptable to the House and to the country. But I shall never entirely agree with the idea of wiping the Local Affairs Act off the Statute Book altogether. Permitting Members of the House of Assembly because they are the elected for certain constituencies to go into 150 different communities in the District and nominate the road board which shall operate in that locality during their term of office, is in my opinion a retrograde system. It reverts to the days of the Feudal System.

I say by all means if you are going to do something to improve on the matter of spending road moneys, if you consider that this is not a satisfactory state of affairs, then take this Act as your "Status Quo," take this as a basis on which you can work and bring in something that will be progressive. But don't let us contemplate the idea of perpetuating a system whereby the elected representative of a district shall appoint the road boards. I don't think that the Hon. Minister of Public Works, quite a young man and a progressive man

in many respects, seriously contemplated that idea, and I feel that the people of this country do not want, despite an amendment to the Local Affairs Act a reversion to that state of affairs.

It must be manifest that when it was placed on the Statute Book by some of the brightest minds in the four walls of this Chamber, men who would not easily subscribe to any false idea suggested by the caprices of party politics. When you have men of the calibre of Judge Kent for example who had looked into this very carefully and was satisfied to register his opinion on the floors of the House in support of the measure is not that a substantial argument in favour of it? You will agree that that there must have been a great deal of reason for the outlining of the Act. You may say that the Act has never been applied. Well, we have heard in our day of other Acts that were never applied. I don't know whether there is any reason to point to any Hon. Member who has intentionally done anything to have the Local Affairs Act set aside. I know that during the time I have represented St. Barbe wherever I happen to come in contact with the Local Road Board I have as nearly as possible, except in the case of extenuating circumstances, taken the recommendation of the Board. Certain localities in that community do not qualify under the Local Affairs Act for the election of Road Boards, and in such cases I had to recommend the commissioners to the Government. In some cases in my own district commissioners stated that they had no time to hold meetings to conduct the election of Road Boards. On one or two occasions we had to send instructions as often as three times to ask them to come over and conduct the election of the Road Boards.

I do not favour the idea of reverting to the system whereby a representative of a district shall nominate a road board. I want to point out to the Minister that this step ought not to be taken in that direction. If he sees anything good in the Act hold fast to that which is good. Build upon that for more progressive legislation in this respect. Mr. Chairman I just rose to point out to the House my position on this matter of public policy.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, as we are going on with the Department of Telegraphs I must say that I am a little disappointed. I thought that when I came to the House this afternoon that I would have the pleasure of listening to a speech equal in quality to that which we heard from the Honorable Minister of Agriculture yesterday. I had expressed this hope and I have been disappointed that the Minister has not addressed this House, explaining the conditions in which the Department is in, and the policy which is to be carried out in order so that he may have the support of every member of the community in carrying out that policy.

But apart from that, sir, there are one or two comments that I want to make upon the department that we have now before us. This department has recently been under investigation and I think that we ought not to close the vote until we have had an opportunity of seeing the report which has been handed to the Prime Minister by Colonel Ross before leaving. If any changes are to be made in the department the House is entitled to know it, and through the House the public. And the question has been asked for the report, and I reiterate that the report should be laid on the table before the vote has reached conclusion.

Now there are one or two points that I would like to draw the attention of the Minister to. They don't

concern me personally, but they concern my constituents. And as I said the other day before we vote supply we are entitled to a redress of our grievances, and I would like to draw the attention of the Minister to them.

First of all I want to take this opportunity of not only complimenting the Government, but also thanking them for the mail service which we have in Fortune Bay to-day. The S. S. Glencoe has become a very popular boat. While it does not call at all the ports that the Wren called, yet the people of Fortune Bay would be very sorry if there was any change made in the present service. But the fact that it does not call at all the ports that the Wren called at means that some places have to be neglected. I asked the Hon. Member about Sagona and Brunette. These two islands in the centre of Fortune are out of the ordinary run of the steamer. They were ports of call for the bay boats. The Glencoe does not call there. I asked the Minister why there was no freight service to these places. The Minister replied that these Islands were being served.

(Reads letter.)

Well, sir, if it were so and the service was being carried out as the Government intended there would be no complaint. But there is a complaint about it. The boat is not satisfactory. It is not a weekly service. The people of Brunette are especially cut off. Sagona is only 12 miles from Harbour Breton, but Brunette 25 miles. I would like to read for the Minister a letter that I have here. I will take it up with him later on. I just wish to draw his attention to it publicly now. My correspondent asked me to write him soon about the mail service.

I think that it would be alright if the Glencoe would call. It would not be out of the way. But I do hope that the Minister will take up the matter and see that he has on that service the boat which he pledges that he has.

Sometime ago I wrote to the Department of Post and Telegraphs, and I did not get any answer. I want the Minister to see that that state of affairs is altered. Another place where no boat call and which some arrangement ought to be made for is Boxey. I have interviewed the General Manager of the railway about that and he said that it was absolutely impossible for the Glencoe to call there, but that the Portia goes that way and he would eventually try and see that the Portia would call there. But in the meantime that place is a farming place, one of the few in the Bay. It was served by the Wren. Since the Wren has been taken off the mail service has been neglected.

When I was told by the railway department that the Glencoe could not make it a port of call I wrote to the Department of Post and Telegraphs and asked that they would see that a mail carrier would be appointed. There is a mail carrier that carries mail from English Harbour to Coomb's Cove, and Boxey is on the way. It would not cost any money. I did not get an answer to that letter and I found out that the mail carrier that goes that way does occasionally when he likes bring mail to Boxey as well. This is a letter dated March 7th. (Reads letter).

That is quite clear. In view of the fact that I have not received a reply from the department although I wrote about September or October and it is now April, I trust that the Minister will make enquiries into that and see that since we have lost the steamer there some provision will be made to get the mail on steamer from English Harbour.

There is one other matter, sir, with regard to the Post Offices and the

Telegraph Offices, and that is that we find it impossible to get bills paid for coal supplied the telegraph offices by Harvey and Company and Thomas Garland of Gaultois, and because of that they have refused to supply more coal to the Post Offices. Now that has never happened before. In Pool's Cove I was told that the people had to supply the fuel to keep the girl from freezing because when they asked Harvey's of Belleoram for coal they refused to supply it until they had been paid for what they had supplied the year before. Now I have in my hand the bills certified by the Postmistress of Hermitage for the coal that has been supplied on November the 11th and the coal has all been burned. Two bills have been sent along and now this one has been sent to me asking me if it is possible to get it paid, and they have refused to supply more coa at the office of Hermitage until they have been paid for what has already been supplied. There is no excuse. The department should see that the bills are paid. I notice in reference to the question of salaries that the salary of the postmistress of Belleoram has been reduced two hundred dollars, and when we come to that I would like the Minister to explain why that is. She has been there quite a long while and there must be some good reason for this reduction. Now so much for the reduction of salaries. I notice that after a lot of persuasion on my part Mr. J. C. Short has been granted an increase, but I am very disappointed at the amount of the increase. He has been getting four hundred and twenty dollars and now he is getting four hundred and eighty, and when I see the increases given to other officials in the public service, and when I consider what they do, and when I consider Mr. Short's circumstances and what he does, and when I see the salary that is paid to him and what is paid to others I say that it is a crying shame. Mr. Short went overseas and was unfortunate in losing one of his legs. He cannot do anything else except some such work as telegraphy. He was appointed because he was a returned soldier. I had him appointed at Hermitage and when he went there he had only one office to look after, and he was paid the minimum salary of $420.00. He had not been six months in the office before Gaultois was made a wireless station and Mr. Short had to repeat all the messages from Gaultois and his salary was not increased. There are wireless stations now at Ramea, Pass Island, Rencontre, Grand Bruit, and now he has to do the business of these five offices in addition to his own at Hermitage, and until now he has had no increase in his salary. Now I wrote to Mr. Stott, the superintendent of the telegraph system, and I was amazed to receive the reply that because Mr. Short was getting a pension from the Board of Pensions for the loss of his leg he was not entitled to any more pay as a telegraph operator. If Mr. Short had not gone to the war and lost his leg in the defence of Mr. Stott and others he would not have to ask the Government for four hundred and twenty dollars or an increase. I sincerely trust that the Minister will take this matter up and see that this man is paid according to his services as an operator. He is a married man with a family. When I consider the salary and the increase that he has got of five dollars a month with the increases of some officials in the Custom House and the Inspector of Meats, who has got an increase of two hundred dollars I think that it is not right when he has to do all the work that he has. Gaultois cannot send a message and there is quite a lot of business there unless it is transmitted through J. C. Short. Ram-

ea cannot send a message except through J. C. Short. Rencontre cannot send a message unless it is repeated by J. C. Short. And he gets sixty dollars a year increase and others get two hundred. Now compare his salary with some others in the same service and I ask if it is fair. Take Grand Bruit. They put in a new office at Grand Bruit and they pay the man there six hundred dollars and John Short does the work that he does, and is a repeating station for all these others. As I said, the Government put a new station at Grand Bruit and all the messages have to be sent to Hermitage to be repeated, and the new operator at Grand Bruit gets $600.00 and Short gets $480.00. The operator at Crabbes in the District of St. George's gets $840.00, but I bet that he does not do one half the work that is done at Hermitage. At Elliston in the district of Trinity Bay the operator gets $600.00, or operatoress, I do not know whether it is a he or a she, and I am sure that they do not do anything like the work that Short has to do. A man in one office gets a salary of $840.00, and a man who has to do the work of five offices besides his own only gets $480.00. I point these things out to you, Mr. Minister, and I think that it is an injustice to think that man who was getting $420.00 a year, and then has the work of five other offices thrust upon him and then only gets an increase of five dollars a month. It is shameful to think that because a man is receiving a pension it should be taken into account in fixing a man's salary. It is beneath contempt. Now, sir, that I have drawn his attention I hope that the Hon. Minister will become a little more gracious and instead of an increase of sixty dollars that he will increase it at least three times that amount.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman, now that this vote is before the Committee I would like to ask the Hon. Minister whether or not the Government has decided to abolish telegraph offices in those places that have the Government railway offices. There have been instances that have been brought to my attention in which the Newfoundland Government Railway has an office, and the Telegraph system of the Newfoundland Postal Telegraphs has also an office there and to my mind there is overlapping, and I would suggest to the Government that they consider this matter, and it might be advisable to close one of them so that expenditure might be cut down in that way. I am also told that there are places in which there are these offices and one has not the privilege of sending a message through them. I think that the right should be extended to those people living in the vicinity of these offices to be able to send a message to St. John's for transmission to any other part of the country. I would like to know what the Government intends to do in this matter.

MR. WARREN—Before I leave the subject, I have a letter here from the operator, in which he says that he is working for the six other offices, and he says that he is supposed to get five dollars for each additional office and he cannot understand why he is not getting the money. Five dollars a month for each additional office, and that would mean three hundred and sixty dollars, and even that would not bring it up to the salary that is paid some of the operators that have only one office.

HON. THE MIIISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Member for Fortune Bay, said in his remarks in reference to the vote before the chair, that he expected a speech from the Minister this afternoon such as the Minister of Agriculture and Mines de-

livered. It was a very able speech. I did not have the pleasure of hearing it because I was not here at the time. I understand that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries also delivered a very able speech. I would like to congratulate them on the excellent way in which they explained the work that is being done in their departments on the way in which they explained the work that was going on in their offices, and the propositions that they will put before the Government for future consideration in the way of improving their departments.

I did not make any speech. I did not expect that it would be necessary. I knew of course, that when this department was taken up that somebody would ask questions, and I thought it would only be necessary for me to answer those questions. I was sure that some debate might take place on the Postal Department. I can only explain now what I have done since I went to that Department, and the condition in which I found it.

It was with great reluctance that I went up to that Department. I had no knowledge of the Department whatever. But the Honourable Prime Minister asked me to take it over, and of course I had to obey my chief, and with pleasure I tried to do a little in the way of improving affairs up there. The Postal Department was really in a state of chaos. After a couple of days there I found that I was in the hands of the Philistines, so to speak; and I could not understand the staff.

I could not understand the general staff up there. I found it difficult to get any information. However, I began the job early, and got to work to make some enquiries, and I found that there was no discipline whatever. Every department appeared to be in the strange position of being bitterly opposed to each other. They had little petty grievances—political grievances probably; and after two or three days I found that I could not rely upon any official in particular. I did not know whom to depend upon, and I could not trust anybody to write a letter, or to do anything, or to carry out any orders. After I had been there about three days I came across a young gentleman whom I knew personally, and it struck me that he might possibly be the one on whom I could depend to help me out in the way of taking general stock, and in finding out the grievances, and helping me carry out my instructions; and also to help me in dealing with all my constituents whom I have coming in there every day, and I found it impossible to look after my work and them. This young man was Mr. William J. O'Neill, who is now my private secretary. I thought I could depend upon him at any rate. I invited him into my office and said "that I had some work there for him to do." "I may pay you for your services and I may not." I found then that he started into work and began to enquire into certain official's work and the general work of the Department, and to settle down to business.

After a little while I found that it was necessary to get other extra help. I explained the situation to the Government, and I asked the Government to allow the Auditor General and Sir John Crosbie to come up to the Department and help me out, and make a general enquiry. They consented to come up. Sir John Crosbie and the Auditor General voluntarily came up, and we formed a board of enquiry, and went into all the departments, and we gave a report which is under the consideration of the Government at the present time, as is also the report of Colonel Ross, I.S.O. Both reports are at present

under the consideration of the Government.

MR. WARREN—When will we get it?

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—When the Government has accepted that report. That will be within a few days.

MR. WARREN—If you do not like it, we will not see it at all?

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGSAPHS—Oh yes, you will see it. There is nothing in it that would prevent tabling it. There is nothing covered up in it, but it is not his main report. He will send us his general report from Toronto.

MR. W. J. BROWNE—He has to have his home atmosphere.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—Yes. However, Sir John Crosbie and the Auditor General and myself made a full enquiry, and we did our best in the way of improving the different departments—the money order department, the postal department, the stamp department and all the other departments, and we got them working as we thought they should be working.

Colonel Ross was given full charge to go into the department and investigate everything, and find out if he could make any suggestions or recommendations for improving the working of the general post office; and his report will explain what work he has done.

The only report that I have at present I think I have tabled, that is the statistical report of the department.

As far as the staff was concerned, I found out when I took charge that it would be necessary to make a change in the caretaker. The caretaker was a young man who was paid a salary to look after the general condition of the building, and see that everything was kept clean, and see that order was kept. His work was almost entirely internal work. He was supposed to be going around the building looking after the public, and see that the charwomen kept the building in a presentable condition. That was his work, but I found that he spent most of his time on the street outside the building instead of attending to his work inside. I made up my mind that that would not do, and I recommended that he be placed inside at some useful work. I recommended the appointment of what is now known as an orderly. His duties were those which should have been carried out by the caretaker, and I think that if you go up there to-day you will find that that building has been cleaned up and is kept clean. There is no doubt about that. The place had not been painted or cleaned up for twenty years, so I was told by some of the officials, and it was reeking with filth and dirt in every section. The officials were shut up like rats in holes, four or five on top of each other in small rooms, where the ventilation was frightfully bad, and some of them made the remark to me that you could grow potatoes in some of the rooms. That is a candid fact.

We got to work, with the help of Sir John Crosbie and the Auditor General, and we made a contract for the painting and general cleaning up of the whole department. That has been done. We have had the whole place cleaned up now, and I would like any member here, who has any doubt of the truth of what I am saying, or who thinks that I am exaggerating, to go up and see the building as it is to-day, and compare it with what it was like when I took charge.

Then we made another change. We found that there was a fireman there by the name of Thistle, who lived in a part of the building. This man was occupying rooms which we needed for officials; and being an old man and

in bad health, he asked to be retired. He said he had been there for thirty six years, so we decided to retire him; then when we had some alterations in the building, we put some officials in these rooms. Then we thought it advisable to combine the two jobs of fireman and caretaker and appoint one man to do both; that is, to look after the fires and also to be general caretaker. We have appointed a man for that and we will vote a salary now of $1200.00, to cover this job which combines the former two jobs. He is a capital man, and I think there is a great improvement in the way that the work is being carried out.

Then in the money order department we have made considerable changes. We threw two rooms into one where the offices were divided. by cutting an opening in the walls, and cleaning the place out, and putting the whole staff out there. Mr. Lloyd's staff were in that outside place in a little coop on the west end of the building; we put them into this large room, and gave them a comfortable and roomy office. I would like Mr. Halfyard to go up there and make a general inspection of the place. Why I mention his name is because he has been Minister of Posts for some years, and he would know all about the conditions of the place.

As regards answering Mr. Warren's letters. I do not know of any that he wrote me that I did not answer. It may have been the Deputy Minister or someone else.

MR. WARREN—It was to the deputy I referred.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—As to the non-payment of bills for supplies of coal, I think that was on account of being short of funds. We have had to pay out some fifty thousand dollars for outstanding liabilities from the late Government out of our past year's vote, and that left us short in many cases.

MR. HALFYARD—You don't really mean that you had to pay fifty thousand dollars for past debts?

HON. THE MINISTER OF POSTS —We have to pay forty or fifty thousand dollars liabilities incurred by the late Government, and which we have to take up in Supplementary Supply.

MR. WARREN—I think that was paid last year.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS—I wish you could send it to us.

MR. HALFYARD—There must be some misunderstanding. The main line repair grant was overspent, but all the rest was voted here.

HON. THE MINISTER OF POSTS —I understand there are outstanding bills which have not been paid, and we got to ask for the amount in Supplemental Supply. Your Government last year cut in half the amount necessary to carry on the services.

MR. WARREN—But you adopted it.

HON .THE MINISTER OF POSTS —Yes. We simply took up your estimates and passed them as they were. Now I do not think there is anything extravagant in the estimates before the House—there may be a few alterations, but nothing of any great consequence. I think there are some offices where operators get more salary. because they handle a greater volume of work. This applies especially in the Repeating Offices, where the operators are paid more than in the others. I hope when the Postal Department is straightened out that everything will be satisfactory. But there are yet certain recommendations to the Government to come up, such as contained in the report of Colonel Ross, which I think will be confirmed. We have not yet had time to deal with them, but when they come up I will be

able to give more detailed information to the House and to the public, as to what has been done and is going to be done in the endeavour to put the Postal and Telegraph Departments in proper shape. I do not think I have much else to say now, but if any Honourable Member has any question to ask I will do my best to answer it.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, to a certain extent my efforts were not wasted after all, as they have called forth a most interesting speech from the Honorable the Minister of Posts which would not have been forthcoming but for me. Now there is one thing that I wanted to draw the attention of the Honorable Minister to, and that was the injustice done to the Operator at Hermitage, but he sits down without even referring to it. I was in communication with his Department for a whole year on this matter, but got no satisfaction, and therefore thought I would bring it up in the House. The Minister says that one man had to get a salary of $600.00, but here is another who is filling four jobs and only getting $480.00.

HON. THE MINISTER OF POSTS —I will take the matter up, and I may say that I think an increase would be justtified. When I referred the matter to Mr. Stott I was told the man had a pension and was fairly well off, but I will bring up the subject again. There are a lot of votes here that must be revised as justice is not being done to many officials with small salaries. Now I tried to get an increase for Mr. John Hannon, a most capable man in every respect, and worth far more than he is getting. He is the repeating operator at Holyrood and far superior to the one who held the position before.

MR. WARREN—I am in the same position in respect to the man at Hermitage.

HON. THE MINISTER OF POSTS —That is probably so. My contention is that competent officials should be paid for their services, but as we all know the Minister of Finance is trying to cut down expenses, which is also the policy of the Government, and not to waste any money. But those entitled to it should be paid, and I will do my utmost to satisfy the Honorable Member for Fortune in looking after Mr. Short and all others of his class.

MR. WARREN—But your friend has received an increase.

HON. THE MINISTER OF POSTS —But he should be getting $900.00 or $1,000.00, as he is worth every cent of it. In the operating department the general pay is $900.00—of course there are some get more because of their special duties—but in the case of a man like Mr. Hannon who is on duty all day, has to attend to all the repeating of telegraph messages around Conception Bay, St. Mary's and so on, and in every way is most efficient, courteous and attentive to his duties, I may say that he is not half paid. No doubt Mr. Warren's man is in the same position.

Now in answer to the request of the honorable member for Twillingate. I may say that the Government has the matter under consideration and are thinking of the advisability of using the railway offices where feasible, that is, cutting out the Government offices and handing the work over to the Railway. No definite decision has been arrived at yet in this connection as we have not had time to deal with it, but it is in view by the Government, and no doubt will be done when we get a chance to settle right down to work. The whole department, I may say, is in such a state that it seems to have been forgotten entirely in the past. It has been utterly neglected ---and I will not say that this was the fault of the late minister or the

one who preceded him—but whether it has been the fault of the governments of the past or not, the fact remains that it seems to have been the dumping ground for all who wanted to get a job of any description. Every day now there are applications without number coming in from people who apparently think that I have nothing else to do but put their fathers, brothers, uncles or sons in jobs. I cannot understand the view taken by the public of this department, but from the number of applications coming in for positions as letter carriers, stenographers and in other departments, it seems to me that in the past everyone could safely depend on getting a job there for whoever they thought wanted one. The department is largely overstaffed now and Col. Ross has recommended the paying off of certain officials as honorable members will see when his report comes before the House. I trust that when we get the department working properly we will be able to satsify the public and have everything carried on there with greater efficiency and economy.

MR. DUFF—Mr. Chairman, the Minister has referred to the inefficiency in the department, and I must say that he is right. I remember that one day I had occasion to go up there last summer and it reminded me of the Botanical Gardens with all the little coops there. I was there quite a while with no attention being paid to me until I met Mr. Aylward—who I may say is one official that is doing his work—and then I got my business through. I am glad to hear that things are to be better there now, but at the same time I think that someone could have been found in this country just as capable as Col. Ross to carry on the investigations. There is one matter I would like to bring to the attention of the Minister now.

With regard to the Postal Telegraphs Department I find that the salaries of the officials are more in Harbour Grace than what they are in Carbonear. There is a total difference in the salaries of $1200. Carbonear is the terminal for the train from Bay de Verde and St. John's, and the officials there have just as much to do as at Hr. Grace. There is a returned soldier, a married man, at Carbonear, whose salary is something like $650 a year. Surely no married man can support his family on that amount to-day, and I would like for the Government to consider that. I notice that there are two letter carriers down for $487.50 at Carbonear. For the information of the House I might say that we have no letter carrier at Carbonear and have not had one for years, so if you are paying that amount away in pensions why not include it on the pension list instead of having it in this Postal Telegraph vote. You have also two letter carriers down for Hr. Grace. There is no necessity for letter carriers there either. The people in Hr. Grace and Carbonear can always find time to get their own mails. I think it would be a step in the right direction if the Government would consider the cutting out of Western Union Telegraph offices all round the country, as has been suggested by the member for Twillingate (Mr. Ashbourne).

I would like to mention also that when the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs decides to send mails for Canada and the United States by the Red Cross steamers St. John's people are notified beforehand, but the people in Conception Bay towns are not notified until a few hours after the steamer sails. The Minister should consider that there are more people concerned than the St. John's people in connection with this matter. Now I think that the Minister was a member of a Party that came to the coun-

try and promised to put two blades of grass where one grew before; now we have three mail clerks on the train where one grew before. When the express mail gets at Brigus Junction on Saturday night the least that can be done is to let one of those three mail clerks take the mail for Carbonear and Hr. Grace districts because we have to wait until the following Monday now before we get this mail whereas we should get it on Saturday night. I feel sure that it is only necessary to bring this matter to the notice of the Minister and he will have it remedied. To-day we are getting one train a day at Carbonear, except Saturday and Monday. Now I find that people are complaining of the trains being over-crowded and that they do be several hours late in arriving there. I think it is high time for the railway commission to give us two trains daily on that important line.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I am sure that we listened with some interest and a great deal of surprise to the honourable Minister of Posts and Telegraphs this afternoon. He has made certain statements that, to say the least, were very uncomplimentary to every one connected with it from the head of that Department down to the humblest official. If you had stopped at that we would not have minded. It is well known that the offices were overcrowded and that the whole place lacked the proper ventilation. Any one who has had anything to do with the Post Office knows that after that new extension was built there should be a different layout on the first floor and it was our intention to make different appointments and have a better layout for the different officials. That decision was come to by the late Government before they went out of office. Some one or some Government had to lay out the offices, and I was going to say that the present Government should have gone further and taken out the partition at the back of the building so that there would be more light from the back windows, and free access could be had over the whole flat. But the Minister went further in his remarks and said things that I am not going to allow to be said with impunity. He said that when he went into the Department he found all the officials opposed to each other, that a bitterness of feeling existed amongst them and that he could not rely upon an official, even to send out a letter. That surely is a sweeping statement to make against every official of the post office. Then he said that he met a young man on the stairway and that this young man helped him to bring order out of chaos. To say that he picked up a strange man on the stairway and brought him in to supervise the whole affairs of the Postal Telegraphs Department is a most ridiculous statement to make, Mr. Chairman.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAHS—I had to go outside for a man when I could not place any confidence in anybody inside.

MR. HALPFYARD—Why are you not straight about it and say that you engaged Mr. O'Neill to assist you in your district matters. This man happened to mixed up with you politically and you wanted to give him a job. But the general public do not want a man there to assist you in your district matters. They want a man there to look after the Telegraph system and the transportation of their mails. That is proper administration. I can only question the mentality of the Minister when he comes here and makes such outrageous statements. The Minister stated that he had to get Mr. O'Neill to go into that office to bring order out of chaos, and that nobody up there, including men who

had spent thirty and forty years in the service, could be trusted.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—Yes, and I repeat that statement again. I could not trust a single individual inside the doors of that Department, and I wanted a confidential clerk to depend on to carry out my orders when I would give them. That is the reason why I offered Mr. O'Neill the position as Secretary and confidential clerk, and I am pleased to state he is a capable official giving satisfaction to the general public as well as the department.

MR. HALFYARD — Nobody finds fault with the Minister getting a confidential clerk, as most of the heads of Departments have private secretaries to do their work. When I was there Mr. Campbell, the secretary, assisted me with departmental work. The Minister said that there was not the proper spirit existing amongst the officials and that there was an absence of unity among them. Well how can he expect to get the older officials to work with him in harmony in view of the statements he has made regarding them. He has not got to depend upon Mr. O'Neill, be he ever so clever, to do the work of that department; he has to depend upon Mr. Campbell and others, men who have spent the best part of their lives in the service, to do the work. What in the world does Mr. O'Neill know about running the Postal Telegraphs Department?

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—Mr. Chairman, just a word by way of explanation. How could I depend upon any man in that Department in view of this? One day I called in a stenographer to my office and dictated a private letter that I was sending to a friend of mine who was then in Boston. The stenographer went in the outside office to type it. There were present in the outside office Mr. Campbell, Mr. Bradbury, Mr. March and the stenographer. Accidentally I happened to open my office door and to look out in the outside office and to find Mr. Bradbury and Mr. March, each standing at either shoulder of the stenographer who had my letter, and as she was typing it they were reading it. She knew it was private and they knew it was private from the very address. Of course I suppose these officials had nothing else to do except read my private correspondence. I then satisfied myself that this was the kind of game that was going on all the time. Now I look upon such officials as political spies, especially Bradbury, how could I place confidence in officials of that type. I suppose they thought they would never be caught. I dare say if it was any other man but myself he would have them immediately removed out of the office.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister has at some length explained what he meant by saying that he could not trust any official in the Post Office. He wrote a letter of some private nature and some of the officials, he states looked at the typist, when they should not because it was none of their business. And Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister perhaps that was due to the want of space and proper arrangement. They might not have done that intentionally. As far as I was concerned all the district matters and everything else was left on the table. I had confidence in the officials. If the Minister had something that he did not want anyone else to see he should have put it in his pocket.

I am really sorry that Mr. Woodford made such statements, because those statements will not do him any good. If the Minister had seen things going on in a way that they should not be going why didn't he arrange matters differently. But to say that the officials of the postal telegraph

department cannot run that department and that he had to pick up a man from the street to run it is ridiculous in the extreme. You spoke of Mr. Bradbury, and the other man referred to probably was Mr. March. But I notice in the estimates that Mr. Bradbury was disrated. He was superintendent of the mail clerks. He has now been given notice that his services in that respect are no longer required. He has been asked to go back to his former position of mail clerk. You may see fit to penalize Mr. Bradbury, but I regard Mr. Bradbury as one of the best officials in the whole department.

He is not one of my special friends. I never had a special friend in any department. I treated them as officials of the department, consulted with them, I asked questions of them, and then decided whether to act on their advice or not. In most cases I did act on it because they knew more of the details of the Department than I did. It is disgraceful for a man like Mr. Bradbury, 20 years in the service, to get such treatment. And you know what the conditions were like when Mr. Bradbury became an official of the Post Office.

The Hon. Minister of Finance said that I had political friends. Well I have political opponents as well as friends. Some are in the Post Office and some are in the other departments. Look here, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, there was something happened on the West Coast last year. A parcel of medicine was shipped by parcel post to some place on the West Coast. It never reached its destination and the life of the person depended on getting that parcel. He died before he got it. If Mr. Bradbury had been in that department I have no doubt but that parcel would have reached its destination. But you had a man there who did not know what he was doing.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—That parcel left the Post Office and where it got caught up was in a place called Argentia.

MR. HALFYARD—Yes, but it should have been sent to Lamaline on the Argyle. We have the Superintendent coming in here and recommending the increasing of the staff of men at the Post Office, and then to have the audacity to broadcast that this Government is trying to lessen the staff of officials in the General Post Office.

(Reads)

There are 150 or 20 more men on the staff than last year. And for this Government to come in here, and for the Minister to come in here and have the audacity to refer to the staff of the General Post Office in the way that it has been referred to he must think that we have no blood in us. Then after getting the exceptional (?) services of Mr. O'Neill they have to appoint a commission composed of the Auditor General, Sir John Crosbie and himself. We are waiting for that report of Colonel Ross. Why have we not got that report. We have paid for it just as well as the Government. They don't want to cook it, do they? Is it not boiled enough. Does it not appeal to your appetite? Is it distasteful? What is the good of paying Col. .Ross $500 a month and expenses? Mr. Bradbury was disrated by a commission including the Auditor Gen'l. I recommended that he should be reappointed. What does the Auditor General know of the transportation system of this country? It is enough for him to audit the Government accounts. As the saying goes, "Every cobbler should stick to his last." The Auditor General recommended that this position should be abolished. We were told last year that the Auditor General was too busy a man to act on the Railway Commission. Now he is not too busy to act on a post office commission. Now

we are told of the filthy, dirty condition of the post office building, and Col. Ross was brought here to do the dirty work for the Government. Bradbury is disrated and other men appointed who do not know their way about the post office.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

At four 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 the Governor, in the Council Chamber.

And Mr. Speaker and the House being at the Bar of the Council Chamber, His Excellency was pleased to assent to the following Bills:

An Act Relating to the Constitution of the Supreme Court.

An Act to Amend Chapter 200 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of Banks and Banking."

An Act to Amend 11 George V Cap. XLV., entitled "An Act to Incorporate the Women's Patriotic Trust Fund and for other Purposes."

An Act to Amend Chapter 3 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (Third Series) entitled "Of the Election of Members to the House of Assembly."

An Act to Amend Chapter 25 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of Light Dues."

An Act to Provide for the Construction, Reconstruction and Maintenance of Highroads.

An Act to Regulate Travel on Highways, and the Speed, Operation and Load of Vehicles thereon.

An Act to Amend the War Pensions Act 1922.

An Act Respecting the Lobster Fishery.

An Act Relating to Firearms and other Weapons.

An Act to Amend an Act entitled "Of the House of Assembly."

An Act Relating to the St. John's Dry Dock.

Returning to the House, the Chairman of Committees took the Chair.

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 tomorrow.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again 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 afternoon next at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, April 6th, 1925.

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

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Portland, Brooklyn, Lethbridge and Jamestown, in the district of Bonavista Bay.

(Reads petition to House.)

I may say that I know the road running around this mountain very well. Up to a few years ago only a few families lived at Winterbrook, but there are quite a number of people living there now. Winterbrook is about eight or ten miles from Brooklyn, where the train connects. Jamestown and Portland are also on that same line. Up to about fifteen years ago the people of Jamestown and Portland had to go in boats a half mile around this mountain in order to connect with the road on the other side. Since then a road was cut

through over the side of the mountain, but within the past year or two it has been found impossible to get a horse and waggon over that road, and the petitioners are asking for a grant to enable them to get back and forth from the train. This petition has my hearty support and I ask that it be referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. CAHILL—Mr. Speaker, I wish to present a petition from the residents of Manuels, in the district of Harbour Main, asking for an allocation for an extention of the wharf at that place. The petition is signed by practically every voter of the place and it has my hearty support.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the prayer of the petition. A few years ago a small wharf was built at Manuels. While it was very useful to the people of the locality it was since found to be not large enough, and the petitioners are now asking for a grant with which to put another block to the wharf. I do not think it would cost much to make this very necessary improvement, and I trust that the matter will receive the earnest attention of the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Notice of Question.

(1) MR. WARREN asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs what was the total amount paid into the Department of Finance and Customs for duty, sales tax or any other tax upon ales, wines and spirituous and alcoholic liquors for the year ending June 30th, 1924, except upon liquor in transit.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE — Mr. Speaker, the answer to that question is being prepared.

(2) MR. ASHBOURNE asked Hon. the Colonial Secretary if Mr. Vinicombe of St. John's East, and member of the Board of Liquor Control, has resigned his seat in the House of Assembly; and if so, state date of resignation.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE — Mr. Speaker, I might say that the Honourable Colonial Secretary is gone to get the information for the honourable member for Twillingate.

(3) MR. SCAMMELL asked the Prime Minister if the opening of St. John's East has yet been considered; if so, what time the bye-election is to take place, as I notice that the period allowed by the Act expires on May 1st. Also if it is the intention to take the Voters' List in the near future and to vote an amount for that purpose.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — Mr. Speaker, I may say that the opening of St. John's East has not been given consideration by the Government up to the present time.

The Chairman from the Committee of the Whole on Supply reported certain Resolutions, which were read a first time as follows:

Dept. of Public Works..$944,719.00

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.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the amendments made by the Legislative Council in and upon the Bill sent up, entitled "An Act to Amend Cap. 52, Consolidated Statutes (Third Series), entitled 'Of Egress from Churches, Theatres and other Buildings,'" were read a second time and passed, and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting that body that the said amendments had been agreed to without amendment.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER POSTS & TELEGRAPHS—Mr. Chairman, in submitting for your consideration the Estimates of the Department of Posts and Telegraphs by the Finance Minister, Sir John Crosbie, I would ask the Committee to give the varoius items the consideration they deserve.

As previously stated, I accepted the portfolio of Minister of Posts and Telegraphs reluctantly, and it did not take me long on assuming the office to learn the true state of affairs as they existed in the various branches of the Department. As I said, chaos reigned supreme. The enormity of the work unveiled to me the immediate necessity of a thorough re-organization of the Department, as it was clearly evidenced things were in pretty bad shape. Lack of discipline was an outstanding feature, and in no section did it seem that the officials were working in harmony with one another. I thank the Prime Minister for agreeing to my request to permit Sir John Crosbie and the Auditor General to assist me in investigating the causes which were responsible for the lack of co-ordination and unity that prevailed throughout the entire Department, and it was only some months afterwards that I really satisfied myself that such an inquiry or investigation was essential, that matters were a great deal worse than I even presumed.

The result of this inquiry gave me an opportunity to make right the wrongs which prevailed, as I knew if I were to undertake the work it was highly important for me to familiarize myself with conditions and if possible better same for the general welfare and success of the Department, having due respect for the great public service which it commands. I am satisfied in the statement that a great deal of good was accomplished during the first few months of my tenure of office. It must be remembered, Mr. Chairman, that the Department of Posts and Telegraphs is easily the largest Department in the civil service, and when it is known that fully two thousand (2,000) employees are engaged, only then can one realize the enormity of the work accomplished daily.

The General Post Office was one of the many important Departments of the civil service that suffered greatly by reason of the neglect of previous administrations, consequently a clean up under these circumstances necessitated serious attention. The first important step was to authorize certain alterations, positions, structural improvements and renovations, and it is a source of satisfaction to me to know that the public, particularly the great multitude who have occasion to transact business with the main office, favorably comment upon the work done and the presentable condition of the interior to-day. Not alone Mr. Chairman, were the interests of the public best served by reason of those changes, but also the Superintendents and their staffs are highly pleased with the special effort which allows them to work under conditions much better than those which heretofore prevailed.

When the Prime Minister agreed to have Sir John Crosbie and the Auditor General, Mr. Berteau, inquire with me into postal affairs, we, after an exhaustive review, accomplished that task in what was afterwards designated a very businesslike manner, with the result that a great deal of preliminary work was effected previous to the arrival of Colonel Ross, the Canadian postal expert, and I leave it to you, sir, or anyone acquainted with postal conditions of years past, viewing them as they are to-day, to admit that an honest endeavor has been made to extend to the public a service which is rightly theirs.

I shall be pardoned for saying that the amount of work and traffic that the General Post Office performed during the months of December and January was by far the greatest in the history of the Department; and I take this opoprtunity to say a word in praise of the officials, particularly the old standard bearers, who exerted themselves day and night with the one sole purpose in view—that of giving the general public the best service that could be given them under existing circumstances.

The large influx of mail during the period mentioned made it urgent for me to have a special service to the Humber area, which, in addition to the regular express service, received mails on Mondays and Fridays. This innovation received unanimous favorable comment on the part of the public, particularly those directly concerned.

It is not for me to criticize previous administrations or to lay particular stress upon the very many things which might have been done but were overlooked, but I cannot let certain facts pass without justifying my position as Minister during the past year, also to submit to this House matters which have been frequently discussed in and outside this Chamber. On Friday it was incorrectly stated that I said in reply to an interruption by the honourable member for Trinity that I could not find anyone in the Department whom I could trust. Such is not the case, but I could have qualified that statement by saying, and as I afterwards proved to my personal knowledge, that there are some who, by reason of their conduct, could not expect to enjoy my confidence or the confidence of any members of this Assembly. I have confidence in many officials in both Departments, and since my association with them that confidence has increased to such an extent that I sincerely regret the retirements of Messrs. LeMessurier, Martin and Devereaux. There are officials in the Postal Telegraph Department to-day who have spent their lives there and rendered valuable service to the public. Not every Deepartment of the civil service is favored with men of the type of those whom I allude to and have in mind, and I am sure you, Mr. Chairman, and the honourable members of this House, will admit that they deserve every consideration.

The appointment of a personal secretary did not seem to meet the approval of one honourable member, but I am satisfied on this score that the objections are only personal and emanated from a disgruntled official. Every Minister of every Department finds the necessity of a personal secretary Sir William Coaker when he assumed the position of Minister of Marine and Fisheries provided himself with two such officials, and I dare say they performed the duties assigned them in a satisfactory manner. You will admit, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, that with the volume of correspondence and other work in connection with the Department of Posts and Telegraphs that a personal secretary has no easy task, and in fairness to the official I must say he has given every satisfaction, not only to the members of both sides of this House, but also to the public in general, and the best recommendation I can offer him is that I was fortunate in his acceptance of the position when I first intimated or offered same to him. Be it known that the incumbent of this office has done considerably more work than that which is usually accredited to a personal secretary, a fact which is substantiated by the Secretary of the Department, Mr. Campbell, whom I had recently much pleasure in recommending to the appointment of Assistant Deputy. Mr. Campbell is a valuable official to the

Department. His knowledge of postal affairs warranted me in this recommendation upon the retirement of Mr. LeMessurier. I am grateful to Mr. Campbell for the able assistance he has rendered me sinc I assumed office. The importance and the enormity of his work daily prove him to be thoroughly competent for the position which he holds. In passing, I may mention that I am particularly grateful to him for his untiring efforts and his invaluable service. One instance in particular which prompts me to refer to him at this juncture was his willingness last year to forego his usual holiday in order that the work of the Department might progress uninterruptedly.

Another matter which, if I were not incorrectly reported, I would say I was misunderstood in replying to Mr. Warren's remarks re communications received from Mr. John Short, operator at Hermitage, whose salary was increased from $420.00 to $480.00 per year. From what I learn Mr. Short is one of the first class officials of the Department, and whilst it is true he is a returned soldier who has rendered noble service to his King and Country and receives a well-merited pension for his war services, this is no reason why it should in any way interfere with his receiving a proper salary for his work as an operator or an official of this Department. I support the contentions of Mr. Warren in every respect, as I am sure he likewise would support any that I should advance for officials in other districts. Mr. Warren's answer was given him by Mr. Stott, and now that the votes are tabled, I would ask the consideration of the members particularly respecting the claims of deserving officials. Operators in repeating offices deserve this extra consideration, as I have heretofore outlined.

Regarding Mr. Warren's assertion that coal dealers in Fortune Bay refused to supply any more coal to post offices because their accounts were not promptly paid is regrettedly true. They have been paid by the Board of Works these past years. They should have been paid before I accepted the portfolio of Minister of the Department. I hope and trust that under the new system of accountancy such irregularities will not occur again. I might mention that we have had similar complaints during the first months of this fiscal year.

The volume of work for 1924-25, as I have already stated, was in every Department greater than that of 1923-24, an account of which is shown in my annual report, which was tabled in this House a few days ago, a fact which will be demonstrated in black and white when my next report is submitted to this Assembly.

Time and again it has been stated and unwarranted comment has been made respecting the number of officials in the Postal Telegraph service, particularly in the main office, and recently it has come to my notice that certain statements have been made which tend to reflect on my administration during the past year with regard to the number of officials included therein, and for the benefit of the Committee, Mr. Chairman, I submit the following figures including the General Post Office and Telegraph Department the following years:—

1919	1920	1921	1922	1923	1924	
216	276	265	235	239	230	officials

In view of these figures it will be seen that this year under my administration less clerks have been employed than in any year since 1918, and I did not take the trouble to get the figures for the preceding years. It is true we found some of the officials overworked, chiefly owing to faulty organization, whilst others were not placed to give the best satisfaction, a state of affairs which I now hope is more or less overcome. I have in mind the

proper training of some officials in all branches of our work who would be available to send out in case of emergency to outside offices.

In considering advancements or appointments I do so irrespective of political thought or otherwise, as I am firmly convinced that it is desirable to employ only the most competent and efficient officials in the proper conduction of such an important institution. In submitting you the Estimates of the Department of Posts and Telegraphs for the coming year it will be noted that the total for 1925-1926 is $70,000.00 more than that of the preceding year. Strictly speaking, this is not in the sense of the word an increase over last year, when it is shown that one of the first problems I had to contend with this year was the paying out of over $60,000.00 for bills contracted by previous administrations, which were unpaid up to the time of my assumption of office. Consequently those items had to be paid for out of an additional vote on contingency account. Then, again, it has been customary in the past to include in the contingency account certain expenditures which should have been voted in the regular Estimates. This year they are covered in this amount of $1,220,998.07.

To again refer to the work of the commission I alluded to and the very many changes enacted as a result of their investigation, one in particular is worthy of special mention, being the pre-audit system of accountancy which was initiated in the Department of Posts and Telegraphs and I understand introduced in the other Government Departments as well. This systetm enables the officials in the Accountant's Branch to work with greater efficiency than heretofore, and I have every confidence that scandals such as those which came to light during the past year will not be duplicated. Referring to those scandals, I cannot but censure previous administrations which allowed such defalcations, whereby it was shown that in eight (8) offices of those already investigated, shortages amounting to the fabulous sum of $27,867.44 were discovered. In consequence of these alleged scandals I have placed the matters in the hands of the Justice Department in all cases where the shortages are reported. Thus far some officials have been dismissed, whilst others are suspended pending inquiry. Such a state of affairs was, to say the least, the result of criminal neglect on the part of those responsible, as filed communications show that repeated requests had been made by those concerned calling for certain attention, one in particular being that of Corner Brook, wherein the official asked repeatedly for assistance and was repeatedly ignored. For the benefit of this House I wish to state that every effort is being made to prevent such a recurrence, and trained officials are from time to time auditing the accounts of the outport offices in the same manner in which they are audited in the city offices.

Again I wish to point out to the Government the dire necessity of having a proper adjustment of salaries inquired into, as like all Departments of the civil service, the Dept. of Posts & Telegraphs suffers greatly by reason of existing circumstances. Competent officials qualified in every respect to perform the duties assigned them, are inadequately paid. I have already recited the case of one in my District, but he is only one of many of the deserving officials in the outports as well as in the city branches, who is insufficiently paid, whilst others, who do not enjoy the same responsibility, are overpaid.

Recently, Colonel Ross, the Canadian Postal expert whom I referred to, returned to his home, after conducting an extensive inquiry into Postal affairs. Colonel Ross has submitted

many recommendations, some of which are already in operation and others, worthy of favorable consideration, which I have no doubt will be entertained in course of time. Principal amongst those already instituted, is the creation of a Postmaster for St. John's. Mr. Milley, late Superintendent of the Money Order Department, has been appointed to that important position. During Colonel Ross's inquiry, he also had installed in the general office, modern equipment, which will prove advantageous in the despatch and receipt of mails. Mr. Chairman, you must bear in mind the multitude of work accomplished daily, monthly and yearly in the Department of Posts & Telegraphs, when it is known that there are 292 Money Order Offices, 496 other offices and 226 telegraph offices not including the main office at St. John's, and altogether over two thousand (2,000) officials employed in postal, telegraph, telephone and wireless work, each subdivided and branched in such a manner as to make one independent of the other, but all operating for the one purpose under one Minister. Knowing this, you must be prepared for certain irregularities which will crop up from time to time, as no system in the world is perfect and the best of systems can be improved upon, and we must be always prepared to entertain and estimate for these improvements. Postal work throughout the world is perhaps the most valuable public utility in the civil service, and it is because of such, that the regulations governing same are daily being modernized. These improvements and modern ideas are sometimes very costly, consequently, we must be prepared to pay for them, and for that reason, the Estimates for the upkeep, must year after year, be necessarily increased, therefore, Mr. Chairman and honorable gentlemen of this House, you will now see the urgent necessity of passing these votes as detailed, and I ask your co-operation in the conducting of this outstanding and most important branch of our civil service. I thank you.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Trinity in the latter part of his remarks on Friday afternoon made reference to the fact that Colonel Ross had been brought here by the Government to do dirty work. Now if the hon. member refers to dirty work simply as a matter of cleaning up we can very well understand his remarks. But he said it in such a way that we really took it to mean that Colonel Ross was asked to do something that should not be done and I would like the hon. member if he accuses the Government to explain on what grounds he says that the Government had dirty work to be done and on what grounds he claims that Col. Ross was brought here and asked to do dirty work and what dirty work he did. I certainly think the hon. member will be honourable enough to withdraw the charge against the Government or else substantiate it.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, in reference to the remarks that I made on Friday evening in the course of my observations on the speech made by the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, I think that anyone listening to the Hon. Minister of Posts and Telegraphs speech would conclude that the only work that had been done since Col. Ross was appointed and came to this country in connection with the Postal Department was actually dirty work. The hon. member referred to the department and said that the officials were living in rats holes and that the accumualtion of dirt was sufficient to sow potatoes in. It appears to me that the only work that has been done since the Hon. Minister assumed the position of head of that department has been the alteration in the structural lay out of the department. He speaks of renovations and

structural alterations and I don't see anything else that has been done. We have not the report of Col. Ross in which he recommends that the whole department had to be cleaned up and in which he makes it his business to say that a general house-cleaning is necessary in connection with the department. For the life of me I do not know why Col. Ross was brought down here from Canada in connection with that work. The remarks of the Hon. Minister of Posts and Telegraphs caused me to use the term dirty work. The taxpayers of this country will be very sorry to hear that Col. Ross had to be brought down here and paid the salary of five hundred dollars a month to tell the officials up there how bushels of dirt were taken out of St. John's and dumped somewhere else. I may say, Mr. Chairman, in reply to the Prime Minister, that my utterances were made in connection with that nature of the work. Now, as I am on my feet, I may make a few further remarks in connection with the speech that the honorable minister read this afternoon. Of course he might have saved himself the trouble of reading it. He might have asked us to consider it as spoken, and have passsd it over to the printers, and the same object would have been served; but I do say the honorable minister did profit by reading it. Perhaps he has a better knowledge of it now that he has read it, than he had when he brought it down for delivery. I do say that, in order to get a proper knowledge of it, he had to read it some time, and it was just as well to read it in the House to-day, as in the papers; and then again, it saves us the trouble, too, of reading it to-morrow morning, since we have already heard it. I am glad the Honorable Minister of Posts and Telegraphs have taken this opportunity to apologize to the old officials in the post office for the very uncomplimentary inferences that would have been drawn from the remarks which he made at the last session. I thought at the time, that the minister would regret these remarks, and I am not surprised that he has regretted that he gave utterance to such statements, and would now eulogize the work done by the old officials in that department. Anyone can make a mistake. I appreciate very much the minister's action this evening in somewhat complimenting these officials by referring to what he had said last Friday in an apologetic manner.

The Honorable Minister of Posts and Telegraphs said that the General Post Office had been neglected by the past administrations. That is the same old story. Every new administration always makes similar statements. Personally, I have no fault to find with any statement made by the honorable Minister this afternoon. It is only what we expect that if the minister takes the trouble to make a speech on his department and my advice to him is that it should be a record for all time. He should have that speech put in as an adendum or appendage or a foreword in the Ross report. That is the place for it. You should have it embodied in your report, then the people would be able to read it and would be able to appreciate it in the years to come, because in the years to come the people will know nothing about what has transpired during the last few months, and they will be able to read and appreciate the wonderful work performed by the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs in the post office during the year of Our Lord 1924-1925. The Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, the Honorable Mr. Woodford, will go down to posterity as the man who cleaned up the post office and brought about a new order of things. The money to be expended was only a secondary consideration, the department is to be put into such a position that it will command the

respect and confidence of the public. That is a wonderful thing to go on record. We cannot see the work that has been done. That work is too close to our eyes for us to appreciate it. For the life of me I cannot see what a wonderful report is to come from. Where are the great improvements that the minister said had taken place? I would like the honorable minister in connection with the post office to particularise his great improvements, the statements need to be explained, not in abstract form but in concrete illustrations of what was actually done. The honorable minister in one respect has contradicted himself. He said you must have competent officials and intimated how difficult it is to get competent officials, you cannot have the work done properly otherwise.

Now, Mr. Chairman, take the very first vote we have to consider in connection with this department. A new Deputy head has been appointed. Well, does that cause confidence in the minds of the community as to greater efficiency in the officials when we have to consider a deputy head a brand new official with absolutely no experience of post office work.

We are told that Colonel Ross submitted many recommendations. We would like to know where they are. Here we are casting votes for the post office and telegraph office when the total increase in both departments is $120,082.50.

It has been rumored that Colonel Ross recommended an increase in the staff of the post office as well as the increase in expenditure.

In spite of what the honourable minister said as to the work that is being accomplished by Colonel Ross and also the Commission, we have the Estimates before us for adoption by this House, showing an increase in nearly every vote. And still the slogan of the Government was retrenchment. The Honorable Prime Minister in speaking in this House last session (you can refer to Hansard 125) said: "The Government was elected on a policy of retrenchment, and as far as possible they have retrenched. The expenditure has been curtailed in some respect."

These estimates do not show any retrenchment to have taken place. We are voting half a million dollars more this year, in spite of the good intentions of the Prime Minister when he first entered the House.

Mr. Chairman, if the Government is really correct about Col. Ross's report, I think the Committee should rise on this vote and wait until we get this report, and then if there is anything good in it, adopt it. What is the good of bringing a man down here to recommend certain things to be done, and then, after all the management of affairs does not show any great improvement. The new appointments that have been made do not encoufage us to believe that there is greater efficiency in the post office. The men who do good work are not appreciated. New men are being brought in who have no knowledge of post office work whatever. I understand the conditions were made so bad in the post office that Mr. LeMessurier said they were intollerable, and that he could not remain with any self-respect in the post office department. He was not consulted, his advice was not taken, and he could not stand that, and he asked to be retired. We all know that Mr. Woodford, with all due respect to him, had no more to do with the appointment of the Deputy Minister of Posts and Telegraphs than the man in the moon. He admits it himself. The job was too big for him and he did not dare to tackle it himself. He got frightened to death over it and he went up there because somebody in the Department came to him and said that there was a differenc of opinion amongst certain individuals

as to the running of the department. There was no unity there. Was not Bradbury told that there was no unity there. There was somebody who was fighting Bradbury. Some official told the Minister that there was nothing but bitterness and wrangling. There was no unity and therefore he got worried to death over it and he asked the Government and the Prime Minister and Sir John Crosbie and two commissioners to run the Post Office. You did take dictation.

MINISTER OF POSTS—You can blame me if you wish. I will take all the responsibility.

MR. HALFYARD—You failed to tell others to mind their own business, though you were put there to handle the job. It is a most humiliating position indeed to see a man appointed to a position of responsibility and to have to take dictation from somebody else. I was in a Department at one time and I was regarded by some people as a rubber stamp. But I was not and when it came to a show-down I told certain people to mind their own business.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS—For the information of the honorable member, I may say that I do not allow anybody to dictate to me. There is nothing done in connection with the Department without my knowledge. When I went there first many of the officials did not know their duties, and there was nothing but conflict, but now there is not an order or requisition goes out but it is signed by me, so that I am really responsible, and that I will be.

MR. HALFYARD—I appreciate what the Minister says in this connection. But a few days ago the Minister said there had been a special request for an official at Corner Brook but it was ignored, and none was sent.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS—It was in April last that the official at Corner Brook asked for assistance. Mr. Leawood was dismissed when it was discovered he was about $20,000.00 short in his accounts. After Sir John Crosbie went to Corner Brook and located the shortage, he came back and reported it to me. Mr. Crummey was sent out and audited the accounts. When Mr. Leawood asked for assistance it was in April, and before I took charge of the Department. He repeatedly asked for assistance, but his request was ignored. I can prove it by his own correspondence.

MR. HALFYARD—When the Minister took office in June the request for assistance must have been on the file, but it took him until October to send the required help. I will read a letter from Mr. Leawood to Mr. Milley as to sending his sister up to help him. (Quotes letter).

MINISTER OF POSTS—That letter was dated April 12th, but I did not go into office until June.

MR. HALFYARD—I appreciate that, but think that Mr. Leawood is more to be pitied than blamed, and there is no excuse for not giving him the assistance he asked, as the request is on the file. While the outgoing head of the Department may have been on an election campaign somebody else should have attended to the matter. Now the improvements and renovations that the Minister speaks of have not been done for nothing, they cost $10,942.00. Referring to the estimates a few days ago, Mr. Duff in his remarks stated that we now have three mail clerks on the Carbonear Branch Railway where there was only one before. Why is there three now? This is not much evidence of economy. In the Stores Department there are also three officials, Mr. Bambrick with an increase of salary to $1,440.00, Mr. Manuel and Mr. Richards. Everybody knows that one man and a boy could do the work there.

MINISTER OF POSTS—We had to find work for Mr. Richards. As I said on Friday, he spent most of his time on the streets. It was suggest-

ed to me that he be dismissed, but I felt that would be a hardship, and I found him a job in the stores looking after the mail bags of which there are thousands owned by the Canadian Government which had to be packed up ,and sent back to the Canadian authorities. He is working hard every day, and I may say, with his coat off, carrying bags and parcels up and down stairs. I also wish to add that he is one of the best men in that Department, and I think I did a good turn by putting him there.

MR. HALFYARD—I am glad to hear the explanation, but why did you not give him the job as Storekeeper.

MINISTER OF POSTS—He was not fitted for it. I would like to explain, Mr. Chairman. We appointed Mr. Froude caretaker, and he is filling two jobs. As I stated before the Post Office is now a credit to us, as we have done the cleaning up, and the right men are in the right places. The hon. member, Mr. Halfyard, I know in his heart and soul, gives me credit for the work done.

MR. HALFYARD—Now as to the appointment of an official to look after the lobby, that may be alright, but we must remember that before the extension was built, there were eighteen or twenty boys just at the age when they felt like riding rough shod over everybody in the lobby, but now they are in the new building. That is an improvement, and I agree with it, but what I find fault with, and what the general public will find fault with, is the fact that there is not that esprit de corps in the Department to get the officials to work with any degree of interest. To get that you must treat them properly, and if promotions are in order they should be given to the older and tried employees, and not have outsiders brought in, and put over their heads. The Minister says that incompetency must be avoided, but he is making no effort in that direction. An ex-Postmaster General says: (Quotes Report).

I agree with that, and if appointments are to be made by any administration, they should be made in conformity with that finding, and all things being equal, the older officials should be allowed to have them.

Well, unfortunately, you have not done anything in the way of an improvement in that respect. That is why we find fault with you and that is why the community will find fault with you. It was stated in the Speech from the Throne, some six weeks ago by His Excellency the Governor, who was the mouthpiece of the Government for the time being, that "the Post Office was overmanned and underworked, and that more efficiency must be obtained at less cost." In spite of that, here we have to-day on the Table of the House Estimates for the same Department increased by over one hundred thousand dollars, and then the head of that Department will get up a nice essay and have it printed and broadcasted to the general public, who, not knowing the difference, will say that the Government is doing wonderful things and that they are carrying out all the promises they made. There is no one to contradict the Government, and I might as well be talking to the air, because anything I say of any point in the way of a fair criticism will never see the light of day in any newspaper, so that the Government is in a very happy position politically I must say. If the Minister decided to get a Commission to enquire into the work at the General Post Office, I think that the work of that Commission should have been conducted on different lines. It does not take very brainy people to find out what should be done with regard to the appointments or re-arrange-

ment of the different offices of the building. It would have been better for you to secure the services of some good draughtsman or architect instead of having to put up certain petitions one day and tear them down the next. What should have been done is that a Commission of some members of the Government should have enquired into the actual requirements of the different communities where Postal Telegraph offices are. In other words, there are a great many places in the outports where railway offices have a system to report the movements of their trains and steamers, and where there are Postal Telegraph offices, perhaps, next door or a few yards away from them. I remember when Mr. Morgan was here as manager of the railway, and when he took up the cost of running the railway, he expressed himself to the then Executive Government that hundreds of thousands of dollars could be saved yearly by combining the railway and postal telegraph offices. Whether that can be done I do not know. I will not admit that such is workable to any great extent, but at the same time the matter should be thoroughly enquired into. If only a few offices could be done without, it would mean the saving of several thousand dollars. Another thing the Government would do well to consider is that the Anglo-American Telegraph Company are doing local business in this country at a loss. They have to maintain their lines from St. John's to Cape Ray and from St. John's to Trepassey ,and from St. John's around to Hr. Grace. According to the company's charter given them in 1854, they are obliged to operate and maintain those lines, but they would not do it only they are obliged to. They are quite satisfied with the cable business that they do here and they are maintaining offices in some twenty different places in this country at a loss. We have postal telegraph offices, too, that are a liability on the country, and are just kept going for the convenience of the public. Some of those offices take in seventy or eighty dollars a pear and perhaps an official in one of them gets about $600. Now is it not worth while to take this matter up with the Anglo people and make an arrangement which would mean a saving to both the Anglo and Postal Companies.

There is Mr. Bursey a returned soldier. He was connected with the registration department and was given promotion. In our opinion to give the public what they wanted, quick delivery of mails we used a motor transport service and here in the opinion of the Government they can get the mail distributed more quickly by going back to the old horse and cart and at the same time disrate the man who through a combination of circumstance over which he had no control since he did what he was told.

Mr. Chairman, I would advise the member to be careful in what he is saying. He had to apologize this afternoon for statements that he made at the last session and now he makes statements in connection with the mail carriers. He should be in a position to substantiate these statements. It is unjust, uncalled for and not in keeping with his past record to come in here and make those statements against officials that cannot come here and defend themselves. The Government does not care anything about the late delivery of mail. The people have got to suffer in silence, whether they get the letters 12 or 36 hours after it reaches the Post Office. They can only go and make complaint to the office. There is no publicity given to it.

Mr. Chairman, if the Government are fair minded they will see that the officials are properly compensated. It

is unfair for Bursey, who thru no fault of his own, has had his salary reduced from $1200 to $846. And you have put a new official in his place with a salary of $1500. This is no way to treat men in the service. I say that you can give Bursey something to do to earn $1200 instead of $846. As I said I have not seen the chap for years. He was a very effecient official, when I knew him and no doubt he is just as good now. That is one thing that I would draw to the attention of the Minister. But at the same time I don't want anyone to suffer from the remarks that I have made. I would rather not say anything at all. I may be abrupt in my statements, but I am nevertheless sincere.

Now next to the chauffer there is a clerk paid $480. He is on the night shift. He does the assorting. Why should that chap who is in the service 14 years, why should be get only $480. Mr. Minister, will you enquire about that and find out.

There is an item there for $5.00. Does that mean $5.00 each. The work of a stamp clerk is important. It may not seem much to the person who comes in to buy stamps. And a stamp clerk can get away with lots of money if he is dishonest. He has to keep a record of the cash received for stamps. It is an important position. Here you are trying to have competent and effecient officials and you are reducing the pay of the officials who have responsible positions. You are cutting their salaries.

Cannot a member of this House refer to a vote that may come up and mention the name of the person's name who happens to be the official at the time. I say that a girl of 15 years of age could hold down the job of General Delivery Clerk. This clerk that was there was getting $1448 per year and used to come down when he pleased and stay as long as he pleased and then got $1448 and the stamp clerk who, no doubt, does a lot of work has had his salary cut in two. The General Delivery Clerk has not the work of an ordinary post office official where they get fifteen or twenty letters. There are bins there and a letter comes in addressed to John Jones of the schooner Mary Anne and he puts it in a bin and if the man comes and asks if the letter is there he says "yes" and he gives it to him. Onc a month he is supposed to make a list of the unclaimed letters and give it to the papers and sometimes the official did not do this.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—I think that the man in charge there is a very capable man. The job requires some man like that. That is how I understand it. It demands attention.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—You talk about the remarks that have been put across to you, Mr. Halfyard.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I will take anything from the Minister but I will not take anything from anybody else. Mr. Minister, I suggest that you find out what ths delivery clerk has to do. Mr. Attwill is a fine gentleman and he should be doing something that he could get sixteen hundred dollars for. The Minister of Finance said that the Assorter's salary was reduced because he was driving Mr. LeMessurier's car. But he did not drive the car during the office hours. Cannot an official drive a car out of his hours of duty for somebody else. He did not drive the car during the hours of duty. No one said that.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—I say it right now. I saw him with my own eyes. He used to drive around the town with Mr. LeMeasurer's family during the office hours. I had to call him to account for it.

MR. HALFYARD—Did you call Mr. LeMessurer to account also.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE &

CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, I had no intention whatever of getting into any controversy over the estimates. I looked forward to each Minister being able to explain matters concerning his own department. I would like to say to honourable members opposite me that anything I may say is not said in any personal manner; and I have no intention of making it a personal attack, but I would like to point out that on Friday afternoon last in debate, Mr. Halfyard raised the question of my right to go up to the post office, and he went so far as to say that it would be better for me to mind my own business.

I was not ready at that time, nor anxious, to get into any controversy, but I feel that I cannot let this opportunity pass without explaining to this House the position as I found it at the Post Office when I went there with the Honorable Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, and Mr. Berteau. I would like to say that since Hon. Dr. Robinson left that department, the department has gradually gone down. Possibly, as the late Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, Mr. Halfyard, has said it is mainly due to politics that the office has been misused in the way it has; and I think that it was a great loss to this country when Dr. Robinson left that position, because I feel confident that he was gradually rooting out politics, and slowly but surely bringing the department into proper condition, and running it in a business-like way. But I suppose that he, like many more, could not do it all in a day; and his efficiency and the results of his stay in the department did not show until he left the departmen.

I want to take advantage of this opportunity to thank Mr. Milley, Mr. Howley, Mr. Crummey and Mr. Aylward for the information which they gave me during my enquiry. First, with regard to Mr. Crummey, I would like to say a word on his behalf. He was an auditor at the Railway Station but on a change of policy Mr. Crummey was practically thrown out of a position, and as I knew that he was a good man, I got the Auditor General to take him on; and all I can say now is that Mr. Crummey has been a very valuable servant to the Colony, and helped me as Finance Minister in rooting out things in that enquiry.

When I first visited the Post Office my firm intention was to find out where the Customs money was—what they were doing with the money, and who kept the books. When I went there I asked for the books of the department, and when some books were given to me I said, "what, are these books?" The man said, "yes, these are the books I keep." I asked when I last viewed them up and he said about six months ago. Then when he last wrote them up and down, they reminded me of the cross word puzzle that you see in the papers. But how any man could work out the problems that I wanted to work out from those books was beyond my imagination. That was one of the things that we found out there when the cross-examination took place.

There was a gentleman up there whom we called in and asked a few questions, and I was astonished when he told me that for the past three or four years he had been taking the exchange on American notes and putting the money in his own pocket—and thinking he had a right to do it. I asked him why he had done it? He said that he used to buy a pencil or a drop of ink now and then for the Department. I said, "Young man, what about the stock of that commodity upstairs?" He said, "There it is, that is what I have done."

Now you know when you looked round and saw chaos like that, especially in the books, you were naturally suspicious. I got in touch with

Mr. Milley, Superintendent of the M. O. branch, and I had a talk with him, as I wanted to see what the conditions of outport offices were, and after I had a chat with him about certain matters I decided to say nothing more at the time. I proceded then on an inspection tour on behalf of my own department over the country. Accompanying me were the Attorney General and Hon. Mr. Sullivan.

We had an audit at Grand Falls, which I must say to the credit of the gentleman in charge of the Customs Office there, we found pretty satisfactory. Then we went on to Botwood, and found a puzzle in the office there. Eventually we got things right, and then we drifted along to Millertown, and finally reached Deer Lake about six o'clock in the evening. Auditor Fred Brien was with us, and I said to him, you take the Post Office and I'll look after the Customs. After spending about four hours I thought I had things pretty well straightened out at my end of it, and I went over to where Mr. Brien was working. I asked him how he was getting along, and he said, "Sir John, we'll never be able to audit this." I said to him, this is an awful looking place, and then I asked him how far he had got with the work. He replied that he hadn't even started to count the cash yet. I said I'll do that, and we started in, and at midnight we were about exhausted without the job being completed. Mr. Jas. Boland was in charge of the office. We found that up to a day or two before that he was keeping his cash in a till made from a biscuit box, and his stamps in a cigar box. Sometimes he used to put the money in the stove and at other times he would hide it under the mail bags, and once in a while he would even throw it on the floor, as nobody would expect to find it there. That man, James Boland, handled no less than $268,000.00 in eight months, and when he wrote in here for assistance he was sent out a 16 year old boy at $70.00 a month. Boland was getting the sum of $75.00 a month. I do not know how he ever carried on that office, it was certainly a mystery to us, and as the Attorney General said, there must be an honest crowd of people in Newfoundland. My companions, like myself, were simply dumbfounded at the condition of affairs in that office. After handling $268,000.00 in eight months Boland was only $700 astray, and when I saw the conditions under which he had to work I certainly could not penalize him. Imagine a man having to handle $268,000 in eight months at a salary of $75.00 a month, and then when he asked for assistance being sent a boy at $70.00 a month.

Now let us take a look at Corner Brook. When we got there the Customs Office was closed, and so we went on to the Post Office. I said to Mr. Leawood, you owe money to the Department, and he said "I will pay it now." I asked him what had become of the money. He said he had got it all and would pay it up, so that we could go on. I said "No, everything is all mixed up here." He said he had enough to pay up, but I told him I did not like the look of things, we were going west and for him to find out just how much he was short. When we came back he didn't know, although he had had the auditor working with him. We came on back to St. John's and got Mr. Crummey to go out there and make an investigation, and the result was that we found a shortage of $10,000.00. Now I do not say this was the fault of the past Minister, because some time previously Mr. LeMessurier, the Deputy Minister, was out there and said everything was correct.

MR. HALFYARD — Did Leawood have an assistant?

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—He was never even appoint-

ed Postmaster. As has been said, perhaps he was more to be pitied than blamed, because when he asked for an assistant it was not given him. This was done under the late Minister and in no way can Mr. Woodford be held responsible. Now take the case of the Gambo man. My honorable friend, Mr. Halfyard, was cognizant of that, or at least I believe he was. You remember that when he was short at Deer Lake under your jurisdiction I asked if anything had been done with him and to have the matter cleared up. This was not done, but now he has been dismissed from the service.

MR. HALFYARD—We gave him a second chance.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—You gave him a second chance, but do you think it is fair if any man steals Government money to give him a second chance? You and I are not the authorities to give second chances and nobody would be justified in letting such a man clear. It would have been better for the Colony if the first debt had been fixed up and this man sent about his business, as the country would not be $700.00 short now. Now, again, let us go to Bonavista, where there is a shortage of between three and four thousand dollars. We find that at this place arrangements were made for the guilty one to deduct the money from his salary and pay up the shortage in that way. But how in the name of common sense would the official live if he did that; the Minister was only fooling himself with the idea.

MR. HALFYARD—I had no knowledge of that.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—That's just exactly the trouble, there seems to be no knowledge of anything, and when a man does find it out he is only blackmailed, and if he tries to build up the country and straighten out the finances of the different departments, he is vilified in every way. Now take Hr. Main, where there is a shortage of $3,700 on the part of a woman official. That began in 1919, and it ran on until now. She admits a shortage of $3,500.00. Was there ever any attempt to hold an audit or enquiry at that office until the Monroe party came into power? No, sir. No effort whatever was made in that direction, and if we did not have an auditor travelling and myself make an inspection trip, the shortage would still be unknown. Again, at Bay Roberts the same kind of thing has been going on for four or five years, and the Postmaster there has a shortage of three or four thousand dollars. Nothing had been done to fix that matter up by our predecessors, but in a few short months we are expected to perform miracles. If that place had been cleaned up when the trouble started a few years ago, the money would not be gone as it is now. I was informed by a man in the Post Office, that when the Sulphite Company was started at Terra Nova, a girl got into trouble at the office there, and your attention was called to it. There is the same kind of a shortage at Exploits. Now let us look at the General Post Office. It will be found that there will be little difference in the report of Colonel Ross and that signed by the Audtior General, the Minister of Posts and myself. As has been stated certain offices are overstaffed there, and I may say the same applies to some in my own Department. But we cannot turn innocent men on the street, and have their wives and sisters or brothers come crying to us the next day, and saying it was not fair to turn out father or Joe or Jack. This matter has got to take time, and cannot be all done in a minute.

When I undertook to go through the Post Office, after being asked to do so by the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, what I saw would make

one's blood boil, in view of all the money that was spent on it. It was dirty from top to bottom. While going around the Department in Company with the Minister and the Auditor General trying to re-arrange matters I asked the clerk of the Customs office if he had any back parcels belonging to the Custom House and he produced six or eight parcels. I said "Is that all you have after three or four years" and the clerk said "yes." We took a tour around and we found in a heap ten bags of parcels belonging to the Custom House. But the most peculiar thing about it was that we came across a strayaway article in the shape of $17.75, and I remarked that that must have been a red hot stove. Now some of those bags of parcels were lying there since 1919 and nobody cared where they went. But the greatest surprise that I got since I have been in the Government was in January last when Mr. Milley telephoned me and told me that the Money Order account in the Bank of Montreal was in credit, the first time for five years. Now does not that show that the little attention given by us in a short time made certain people step up and that the Colony's money was safeguarded in a way that it had not been for some years.

I next want to refer to the Stock Room where I was invited to have a look around. I found everything topsy turvey there. We could find no head or tail to the place, and I do not think anybody else could either. The whole thing was in a chaotic state. We made an attempt to clean up and after serious consideration we realised that we would want two good men there. Accordingly I recommended Mr. Bambrick to take charge of it with an assistant, a Mr. Manuel. Bambrick has proven himself to be all that I desire since he has taken over that department, and I want to say further that I think this Colony will be saved thousands of dollars in the future as a result of these appointments. Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to give the Committee a few interesting items as to the amount of extra stock in the way of stationery that was piled up in that Department when we went there. Here is a sample of printed envelopes (shows samples to the House) enough to last the Department for three years; here is another sample, enough for two years; here is another kind that will do for another eleven years; here is another sample of stock enough to do for seven years; here is another sample of stock addressed to the Manager of the Bank of Montreal and cost $3,000, and which will do for the next twenty years. Here is a sample with 14 years' supply; another sample with 10 years' supply; another sample with nine years' supply; and last but by no means least, here is a sample of stock enough to last one hundred years and which cost thousands of dollars, and still I may go on. This printing costs thousands of dollars. Still we are questioned on this side of the House for taking stock in that Department.

MR. HALFYARD—That is too bad for the printers.

MR. HIBBS—With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I would like to explain that the Advocate Office did not print those envelopes; they were imported.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—I am not raising the point of who printed them. I want to keep clear of being personal at all, any more than I can help. It is immaterial to me who printed them, they were printed during the last four years and even if it had been the "Daily News" or "Evening Telegram" that printed them I would condemn the parties who gave the orders for printing to be done just the same. The point

is that there is stock enough in some cases to last twenty years and even a hundred years. We next went around and found rolls of cloth of which Uniforms were made. I asked Bradbury about the cloth, which I might say was moth eaten, and he said he knew nothing whatever about it, but somebody must have known about it. It was a very much overstock. Now I would like to ask the question: Am I looking across at the Liberal Party, Mr. Chairman, that was led by Mr. Hickman? Can anyone tell me if that is the same as the Liberal Association? My reason for asking the question is because up in the Postal Telegraphs Department to-day are bills for six thousand dollars against the Liberal Association, and we cannot get anybody to acknowledge them and they are still left unpaid. There is another bill there for $634 charged to the same people and that nobody seems to recognize. These were messages sent out by the Liberal Party during last election. Whoever the party is they started pretty liberal alright and helped themselves pretty liberally to the courtesy of the Telegraph Department. Still I am asked by members of the Opposition if the Monroe Government is doing anything to change things that existed in the past. Yes they are, but you cannot expect them to make golden roads in this country within the short time of nine or ten months. Mr. Monroe has been left legacies that no previous Prime Minister was ever left in this country and, in view of recent disclosures, when he goes to sleep to-night he does not know what he will have to face in the morning as a result of the misrule and mismanagement of the country's affairs for the years 1920, 1921, 1922 and 1923. Now another matter I would like to refer to is that there are bills in the Post Office to-day for $88,000.00 that the Monroe Government got to face. Bills for repairs, etc., to old steamers that were given to us, we thought, as a free gift. There are coal bills that came in from Fortune Bay for the years 1922-23. Why were all these bills left over? I would certainly like to know. I would also like to take this opportunity of saying that if the Auditor General had been given the slightest backing from the Finance Minister of the late administration things would have been different from what they are. I was speaking to a certain man in connection with a certain office in the Post Office, and in answer to a question I put to him he said that his accounts had not been audited for five years. I asked him why?

MR. SCAMMELL—What did the man say?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—He told me to see the Auditor General, and I did so. The Auditor General told me that he reported the matter and it was no use reporting it. Nobody noticed it. Take the Auditor General's Report now on the table of the House. How many honourable members have taken the trouble to read it through. Now, Mr. Chairman, the only thing I am sorry for to-day is for the unfortunate people who were connected with the Post Office and who started in to take money, were never checked, and who gradually went on incurring shortages until the large amounts that we have discovered were reached, and I am convinced that by the time Auditor Crummey gets through with his work that a further story of shortages will be told. My only reason for speaking at all is to defend my position in connection with the Post Office. My help was given at the request of the Government. Mr. Woodford asked me to go there. Perhaps it would have been better had I stayed out. Mr. Hickman has asked me if Hickman's Harbour was fixed up.

Through the assistance I gave to him within thirty hours, the whole thing was cleaned up and audited by Crummey.

Mr. Chairman, I only make these remarks this afternoon to tell Mr. Halfyard that there was a lot more going on than he knew anything about. I don't think it possible at all for the minister of a department to know every detail unless he has a man at the head of every department who is prepared to devote a great deal of his time in trying to carry it on. The only thing I want to impress on him is this, that if he happens to have half an hour off tomorrow I will show him the post office as it is to-day, and if Mr. Halfyard does not tell me how much we have done I will be much more disappointed than you can possibly believe, but I am sure he knows I am right, and will give Mr. Woodford and his so-called Commission credit for something they have done.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words in regard to the matter that has been brought up by the Minister of Finance, and I might say in answer to the enquiry of the Leader of the Opposition as to the standing of certain people—In order that the House may understand the position of things—I would like to say that there are certain cases to-day which have been placed in the hands of the Minister of Justice, and arrests have been made. I think that there are four cases. There are certain other cases, however, in which arrests have not been made so far, and the explanation is largely due to the set of facts disclosed by the Minister of Finance to-day. Since the matter has been referred to and particularly to two offices, the office at Deer Lake and the office at Corner Brook, I think I ought in justice to the House, in justice to the officials involved themselves state the position of the Justice Department and the principle upon which the Department has acted if I happened to be called upon to express an opinion. In the first place take the office at Deer Lake. Sir John Crosbie said that Mr. Sullivan happened to be present when Mr. Brien went into the affairs of that office. But I want to say right here now that the person who would suggest that proceedings should be taken against Mr. Boland ought to be arrested himself or put in a lunatic asylum. The state of affairs at that office in Deer Lake was something disgraceful to the administration of the postal service. He had a position of great responsibility. He was out there an intelligent young fellow working at a salary of 75 dollars a month. The post office and the telegraph office were combined. He issued in the course of three days as much as $1500 worth of money orders alone. He had not a safe, not even a common old fashioned outport trunk or strong box. He had to fix up the office himself out of cigar boxes, old biscuit boxes and gem cigarette cases, and things of that nature. And I want to publicly confirm the statement made here by the Minister of Finance that he used to handle mail orders at a time, sometimes having as much as eight or ten thousand dollars in cash. He was asked where he kept his cash. There was a slow but sure combustion stove in the corner. He said he used to throw it in there and throw papers over it. Nobody would think of looking for it there. Sometimes he used to scatter it among the papers on the floor.

He sent in and asked for help. Help was sent out in the form of a 16 year old boy a few months in the service. His salary was 70 dollars a month. 268,000 dollars was handled by this young fellow Boland, and when his accounts were checked up there

was a shortage of in the vicinity of from 900 to a 1,000 dollars. It was a miracle. It was nothing but an act of Providence that it did not happen to be 20,000 or 50,000 or 100,000 short. It is a miracle there was not a continual shortage. It was said that this man should have been arrested. I say this now that the boy Boland ought to get a Victoria Cross. Talk about men getting rewards. A man who would go through under these conditions and work around ought to be decorated.

Now I said that this was an interesting story. It only shows what an honest people we are in this country. There were men coming there from all sections. They were not educated to the crook stage fortunately. Talk about a field for men to come down here from the outside. It would be virgin soil for some. The man had not even one of these catapults to defend himself. He had nothing but the honesty of Newfoundland to confide in. Fortunately he trusted in the right people.

Now take the office down at Corner Brook. The story is one of such a mixture of tragedy and humor that I can scarcely tell it. There are a couple of phases of it that will bear repeating in detail. The story appealed to me in the sense that I was supposed to be there in the capacity of advising the officials as to his proceedings. I never met the man before, and I don't know anything about the man at all; but here is the story. He was up at Grand Lake as a telegraph operator. He asked to be transferred to Corner Brook also as a telegraph operator. He was never appointed postmaster at all, he went there as a telegraph operator and the telegraph office happened to be near the track and the staff house of the Corner Brook people, and for their convenience they asked him to get permission to accept their mail and to put it aboard the train. There was in Corner Brook at the time a regular postmaster under salary and he had been there for some years; he had an office in another part of the place. The practice went on for some weeks of this chap Leawood receiving the mail. The next thing we knew he wrote in and asked for money orders; he wrote in to the office in St. John's, and from that day to this the thing went until finally the Commission went out to investigate. You have the amusing situation created that a man who had never been appointed postmaster, was doing all the business of the place, looking after all the mail and registering or issuing all the money orders. There was a man outside getting paid for doing nothing at all. He handled about $372,000 in all; finally he got involved, having no method at all; no one told him how to open books, and he sent in to have someone sent to help him. He was in exactly the same position as Boland, only that in his case there was provision made for him to keep the money. One day a safe arrived, and every one in the office had a key to the safe. Can you imagine a greater combination of humor and tragedy? Public money so handled and the official possibly getting blamed and perhaps the man himself might be entirely innocent; but certainly there is no reason in the world why I should be justified in ordering the arrest of that man, and I want the House to understand so far as the Corner Brook and Deer Lake position is concerned, as far as the criminality of those cases is concerned, I think the blame should be attached to the Post Office Department. There was no possible justification for this condition of affairs whereby a man can go out to Corner Brook and handle thousands of dollars that he had never had a right to

touch. He was never apopinted by the post office, he had no authority to do it. There must have been many reports coming into St. John's from this office. These reports must have been received and accepted, and yet when we went out there this chap told us that three days before a letter came to the postmaster and he said "I opened it ,thinking it was for me." I found a cheque in it for the last quarter salary of the man who was supposed to be postmaster and who was doing nothing at all. It was absolutely disgraceful. But I will say that the shake up that the Finance Minister gave when he went out to these outport offices, has convinced me and the members of this side of the House that the things that had been going on were an absolute farce. I will say that in so far as the effect of this thing is concerned that any official placed in the position that he is, starved as to salary having no check on the huge sums of money passing through his hands, and being in the position that no assistance of any kind being given to him in response to his repeated requests .then I say as Minister of Justice that I am in the position that I cannot take any proceedings against that man, and I am prepared right now in this House to admit my incapacity or inability or refusal to order his arrest. And as Minister of Justice I am prepared to accept all responsibility for the proceedings in connection with these men.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, might I ask the Minister of Finance what are the amonuts due by Fortune Bay.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—If I said that there was any large amount owed by Fortune Bay I must have unintentionally misrepresented it. There is no large amount due by Fortune Bay. I said that the coal accounts are due and have not been paid. These bills are some belonging to 1922 and 1923. But I did say that there was eight-eight thousand dollars for the Watchful, Lobelia and Daisy due to the British Government.

MR. WARREN—I am glad to hear that. I thought that the amount was in the thousands. I only got these bills a short time ago; if I had them before I would have taken the matter up before. I think, however, in justice to the Government of which I was the leader for some time, that I should make just one remark. I am glad to see that the Government is continuing the work of the cleaning up which I infer from the speeches which we have heard here this afternoon, but after all it is only a difference of method. The Government of which I was the leader at the time started the clean up. The first instance of anything wrong in the Post Office came to my attention in January, 1924, I think. Mr. Hawco was the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs and the matter came up before the Council. I did not know the extent of the thing. Mr. Aylward was made inspector and his duty was to drop in on these outport offices with out notice and so be able to detect any irregularities that might be going on. That was just before I left office. Just before I resigned the office of Prime Minister, G. N. Read, Son & Watson were instructed to go into the Post Office. I think that the letter would be in the Prime Minister's office now . That was all that we could do because that was all the opportunity that was afforded us, but we did take those steps. I am glad to see that it has been carried out by the Government.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, I have listened with very great interest to the speeches of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs and also the

Minister of Justice . Fortunately I was out of political life since 1919 and none of the things that have been spoken about to-day that have been happening for the last five or six years can in any way be connected with me. There is one thing that I do not understand, and I would like the Minister of Justice or the Minister of Finance or the Prime Minister or somebody to explain what are the duties of an auditor. We have an Auditor General and I understand that he has to audit the books and the accounts of all the public offices of the country. I take it that he would audit the offices of the departments just as any auditor would audit the books of any private concern, and if this is the case then I do not see how in the name of common sense these discrepanices and thefts could have taken place. Certainly if a man is an auditor he must have some system of auditing the books and if he makes an audit of the books of the Post Office Department he must of necessity find out if there is anything wrong. If he does not find out there is no audit at all. This, as I said before is my impression of the duties of an auditor and if it is not right I would like for somebody to explain to me what they really are.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—The Auditor General does not audit the outport post offices, but he is supposed to look after the department here in St. John's.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—These accounts are furnished by the outport offices and sent to the office here in St. John's, and the Auditor General audits these accounts here.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—The Auditor General in the department of the Post Offices makes an audit of these accounts. I am referring to the accounts at the Post Office and that has nothing at all to do with the Post Offices in the outports. I am referring to the Auditor General's work in the Post Office. You say that the money came into the department and that there was never an audit of the money. Nobody went over the books. The Auditor General should audit these records and the books of that department.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I believe that he should. I believe that he reported these irregularities and that there was no notice taken of them.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—I am not referring to Mr. Burteau. I am refering to the department. I want to know whose business this is. From this it seems that he has got absolute authority to go into the department and audit the books of the department, and if this is the case I say that the Auditor's Deparmetnt is of no use.

My object this afternoon, now that this vote is before us is to see that the Auditor General has the proper authority because he is the most important official that you have. Mr. Minister of Finance and Customs, you have not the time to audit the books of the departments yourself, and I think that now is the time that we should discuss the audit act and see if anything can be done so that the Auditor General will have absolute control of every department in the country and be able to furnish to this House the necessary statements of every department of the country wherever it is.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman, I rgret that the honcurable Minister of Posts andd Telegraphs is not here at the moment, because apropos to the question of salaries of postmasters in the outports I am going to bring to his attention the case of a man who is doing a considerable amount of work in the outports, and on looking up his salary, I find that he is paid the amount of $58.50 a year,

and I consider that that is altogether too small an amount.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Where is this place?

MR. ASHBOURNE—Summerford, on page 134. This man informs me that he receives $58.50 as Postmaster and $12 for attending to the telephone, and he also gives me some idea of the amount of business he is doing in that office. He handled about $5000 in money orders in 1924; the duty on parcels came to over $300, he had over $70 for telegrams and sold between $200 and $300 worth of stamps. There are some places of course which deserve more attention than others and I think if the honorable minister were here he would consider this a case where the man is underpaid. During the winter in particular this man is very busy and he has seven sets of couriers calling at his office He has to assort the mails for each of these, for Moreton's Harbor, Carter's Cove, Cottell's Island, Twillingate, Herring Neck and Boyd's Cove and Friday's Bay, and he has to do this twice a week—when the couriers are going and also returning I would, therefore, ask the Honourable the Minister of Finance in the absence of the Minister of Posts to make a note of the case of this man and have it checked up, having due regard to the case of other officials I do not know how these outport salaries are made up, but I take it that here is a case where it will be found the official is very much underpaid and not treated fairly There is also another matter, Mr. Chairman, which I would like to refer to, and that is the state of efficiency in the Post Office at the present time. This afernoon I learned that motor vans are used to assist in the despatch of the mails, and I hope that this efficiency will be such that we will be able to post letters up to a half hour before the mails leave town. In Toronto and other large Canadian cities one can post letters up to a very short time before the train leaves, and in these places they have huge quantities of mail to look after. It therefore seems to me that here in St. John's this matter could be adjusted. I am told that in the East End Post Office one has to post his letters before 11 o'clock in order to get them off by the express at 1 p.m., and at the General Post Office before 11.30. I think there should be greater efficiency in this connection, and that the time could be extended to within half an hour of the express leaving. I would like to draw the attention of the Minister to this and see if it can be brought about. It would facilitate business and make for greater efficiency, and that is the one thing of which we are in more need than anything else in our civil life to-day.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, in the absence of the Minister of Posts I would take it upon myself to say that I think both positions are very well taken, and I will bring them to the attention of the Minister.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman, I would like to endorse what my colleague, Mr. Ashbourne, has said as to the case of the man at Summerford. I was there last summer and I saw the amount of work he had to do, and in comparison with those in charge of some other offices I think he is worth considerably more than he is receiving at present. Mr. Ashbourne did not speak too strongly in this man's behalf, but as the Hon. the Prime Minister says, his case will be attended to, I will not say anything further.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—As I look at it, all these offices have to be revised. I am continually receiving letters from outport officials asking for an increase, and all I can tell them is that the salary depends largely on the amount of business handled at their office. Some officials may

be getting too much—though most of the offices are not big—and the whole matter needs to be revised.

MR. GRIMES——There was a commission appointed about two years ago I think to enquire into the whole management of the civil service, and I do not know if the Minister of Finance has yet come across their report, but it suggested the remedy for all laxity along the lines suggested by the Hon. the Prime Minister, and there is no doubt that we should get a better system than exists at present. We have heard a lot of efficiency in the civil service, and according to the pronouncements on the political platforms and in the press at the last election we were going to see great improvement along that line, but so far I cannot see that any serious step has been taken to put the service on a basis where an official can look for promotion on the ground of merit or because of the years that he has been connected with a department. Complaint in this connection has been voiced by the members who are now on the Government side of the House as well as by those of the Opposition. In the minds of many members we have never spoken strong enough on the matter of putting the system on a basis where officials can expect the recognition to which their services or ability entitle them. We have evidence now that the Government is proceeding rather on the lines of recognition of political services than for capability in a department. Men are being taken off the streets and put into offices over the heads of those who have been there for years, and have proved their efficiency What I cannot understand is how a government composed of business men who recognize the need of efficiency in those in their private employ, and who will not promote a man unless he is deserving, can come into power and run the Government departments on the very lines which they condemned during the last election. It is not now a question of practicing what you preach—it is all a game of bluff. And it is got off because some of the Government were new men who had never sought the suffrages of the people before and they were taken on the value of their previous reputations. Promotions are not being awarded properly now. No matter what fault may be found with some officials, it cannot be said that all are inefficient or that they should not hold their jobs. There are some who are most efficient, but they are ignored when it was thought we would see steps taken in connection with proper promotions, and that as long as men rendered good service they would be in line for advancement and increase in salary. This however is not being done. I do not know what the Minister of Finance stated has been done in some departments, but I think the Government should have thrown overboard the idea of bringing in political favorites and putting them over the heads of capable and long service men. But this was not done and we will see a repetition of the same thing over and over again. No official can feel now, no matter how well he may do his work, that he will be recognized.

If somebody happens to drop a word against a member of the Government politically, all his valuable services and interest in his work are only a minor consideration, and there is put over his head one who worked in an election campaign and who has pull enough to get into the public service. I say, Mr. Chairman, that, with such a system prevailing, all the money that is being spent on commissions and spent on bringing experts here is only like money thrown over a wharf for what benefit it is going to do the people of this country. You bring in a man from outside and pay him five hundred dollars a month and you appoint a commission of investigation to

try and improve conditions in a certain department of the Government, and then, despite all that you say in a few words "we are not going to bother about these commissions. We will carry out some suggestions they may make." But as far as creating something that will last is concerned, that is a secondary consideration. How can you expect anything to last when you still continue to employ men and put them over the heads of men in the civil service, and men who have proven their worth in the departments in which they are engaged. Here I say is where the Government condemns itself and any professions they make are hollow and empty and it is a shame and a disgrace upon the Government of the day to still go on with the same old policy of telling the people that they are going to bring about reforms and that they are going to make improvements in the civil service. You pay a man from outside this country a big sum, hard earned money belonging to the taxpayers of this country, to devise ways and means to bring about improvements, and after he makes suggestions you say you are going to consider your friends and are going to employ the men who helped you during the election and the result is that the majority of civil servants are in the same position as they have been for a number of years past. There is no further recognition for faithful and efficient servants; the only person who has a chance of recognition is the one with pull. It is not merit that counts with the members of the Executive Government or with the heads of the departments. It is the one with the pull. There was an idea abroad that the Government intended to appoint a civil service commission to take up all those matters and handle them on a proper basis before making any new appointments; but instead of that they have gone in the direction I have already outlined, and I repeat again that, under such conditions, the civil service will be demoralized greater than ever instead of being improved or reformed. There is a good deal that one could say in connection with the report of the Post Office commission. I had hoped that the Prime Minister would have brought down the report of Colonel Ross, but evidently he is holding it back. I think, however, that this House is entitled to know the contents of that report. We are here representing the people and they want to know how that Department of the Government is carried on. Why withhold the report? We have been in session for six weeks or more and this report has been asked for over a week ago, and we hear nothing of what it contains.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say that Colonel Ross's report has only been in our hands a week and there has been no meeting of the Executive Government since the report came to hand. I feel that the matter should be considered by the Governmen t before it goes before this House; and if we adjourn this House to-morrow until Monday next we will certainly have the report brought down here on Monday next.

MR. GRIMES—That being so I shall reserve any further comment I have to make until then.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Chairman, I could not allow the opportunity to pass without saying a few words. The honourable member who has just sat down reminds me of a short-horned cow who gave a lovely bucket of milk and then kicked it over. I very much appreciate his advice, but after looking at him in the past and looking at him now, I realise that he has forgotten about the milk and has become a politician. I am sure he does not accuse me of troubling about any man because of a man's political affiliations. I would not care one iota whether a man voted

for our Government or for Mr. Grimes. If I thought he was worth while having and was able to do his work properly, that would suit me.

MR. GRIMES—What about Mr. Young?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—I would ask the honourable member, who was not present this afternoon when we were discussing postal matters, not to mention Mr. Young's name, as the least that is said about him here now the better, and I would much prefer, in Mr. Young's own interest, that I should remain silent, but if the honourable member wishes me to talk in a personal way I shall proceed.

MR. GRIMES—We will see it, I suppose, in Colonel Ross's report.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—I am not talking about the report now. I stated this afternoon that it was my intention in dealing with this department to refrain from being personal as much as possible. I do not want to refer to certain individual officials of that department. Some of them have not been what they might have been, but I hope that they will make good in the future. Many a man made a mistake and made good afterwards, and by debating Mr. Young's position in the House would not, in my opinion, be helpful for him in trying to make good; but, as I said before, all Mr. Grimes has to do is to say the word and "up she goes." I think Mr. Young may make a good official in the future, and if he does, there is no man more ready to forgive than Crosbie. So now we will let Mr. Young rest for the present. The honourable member for Twillingate, Mr. Grimes, stated that this Government considered a man's politics more than his ability when appointing him to a job in the civil service. Might I point out to Mr. Grimes that the Monroe Government is doing all it can, and doing what it thinks is right, in the best interests of the Colony. We will make mistakes, I admit, but under the leadership of Mr. Monroe and with the policy he has passed over to the Executive Government to carry out I feel that by the time another year has expired Mr. Grimes will be able to say to him in the words of Scripture, "Well done thou good and faithful servant." Now I would like to say for Mr. Grimes' information that I do not care one iota what a man's politics are in my department. If he is worth while having to assist me in collecting the revenue of this Colony that is all I worry about. I think that the system of paying civil servants that are not worth while having is bad and I feel sure that because of what happened in recent months that more satisfaction will be given to the country at large by the different departments in the future. I know that at the present moment the officials at the Custom House are showing up better all round. Now I do not think that Mr. Grimes was serious when he said that this Government had only been playing a game of bluff for the past nine months. My answer to that is, give Mr. Monroe a chance and he will measure up to a plane, even higher than ever was expected of him.

Give him a chance. He is going to give every man a chance and opportunity to prove himself, irrespective of his politics or his religion. I know you are sincere, I know you want to do it. I know you are going to give an opportunity to the civil servants of this country to prove themselves the men they say they are, and I think you will find they are alright.

MR. GRIMES—Take the case of Mr. Bradbury. Here is the case of an official who had given very efficient service, but because they thought his services were not absolutely essential to that department they told him that they were no longer required.

MR. HALFYARD—I have been very much interested in the speech made by the Hon. Minister of Finance

and Customs this afternoon. He referred to the administration of the General Post Office since 1919, and said that Dr. Robinson was a very able man in that department, and since his resignation the department had been gradually going down. He attributed some of that to politics.

The Minister goes further and says it is unfortunate for the Colony. I beg to differ from the honourable Minister. Dr. Robinson was a very good official; nobody could gainsay that. I was very sorry that Dr. Robinson could not see his way clear to remain in the office at the time the Government decided to have a political head there. Dr. Robinson was Postmaster General. He could not do just as he wished and he could not put all his ideas into actual practice. He had to submit to the rulings of the Executive Government of the day, and he had scarcely any freedom of action. The Executive Government through the Colonial Secretary would dictate the policy in connection with the Post Office in almost every particular. And I know there were some important questions in connection with the cable business and Dr. Robinson and Mr. Stott were not consulted at all. They lost interest in the whole matter. Dr. Robinson knows better than anyone else the conditions under which he had to work. Appointments were made and he had to submit to it whether he liked it or not. I would be the last to detract in any way from the efficiency of Dr. Robinson, but he was only a servant of the Government and he had to carry out the wishes and the whims of the Government. And if there is any department in the Government that should be represented in the Executive Government it is the Post and Telegraph Department.

The Hon. Minister next said that he does not care what a man's politics might be; he would not allow that to interfere with his appointment. The conclusion that we would arrive at from that would be that politics had a lot to do with and governed our actions in the General Post Office from 1910 to 1923.

I don't know why the Minister made that statement. He can't give any examples to show that politics governed our actions in the administration of the Post Office. I would like to find out where politics had anything to do with the administration while I was there as Minister.

What were the new appointments? Were there any new appointments made while I was there? There may have been two or three new appointments but there was no new appointment made in connection with the administration. I simply accepted the men who were there already. I did the best I could with them. I had no special favourites as has been intimated. I was not under the influence of certain men. I would try to set the mind of the Hon. Minister right on that point. If it has been intimated that there was a game of politics going on up there in connection with appointments, it is altogether wrong. You can't prove it. Go back and look up the list of all the appointments from 1919 to 1923. We appreciate the efforts of the Minister of Finance in trying to make things better and to lessen the abuses in connection with the financial matters. And he attributes the state of affairs in connection with different parts of the Post Office to a large extent to the treachery and mismanagement of the last administration. He says that inspectors should have been appointed. Now Mr. Aylward was the inspector of outport offices and if the right person had been appointed he should have inspected the outport post offices. Evidently that was not done. I suppose the Minister of the day thought he was doing the best thing possible in appointing the best man that he knew.

It was the work of the inspector of the outport post offices to make an inspection and ask for any assistance that he required. That was not done. I think that Mr. Woodford said that he went up to the Post Office and fell into the hands of the Phillistines. I hope the Prime Minister has not fallen into the hands of the Phillistines also. You must realize that to carry on a Government under the party system you have to do a lot of compromising. As the hon. member for Fortune said it is very hard to practice what you preach. And I fear that the Prime Minister will find it very hard to put in force these principles he espoused when he appealed to the electorate for election as Prime Minister of this country.

Now in reference to the changes that have been made in the Post Office. In going back to the old system of having the horse and waggon take the parcels around the city it was said that the motor truck was useless. When I went to the General Post Office any mail that came in after 6 o'clock in the evening by the shore train was not assorted until the next day. But we put on a night shift, we had a surplus of mail clerks at the time.

We put on a night shift and the motor truck was there to take the mail we had it delivered that night instead of the next day. It was the same if any steamer came in, foreign or local.

That truck was used to collect the mail from the station and get it distributed to the King's Bridge office, the East End and other places, and in a great many cases it has been found very useful to make deliveries hours earlier than they otherwise would be made, and yet it has been discontinued, but I do not know why. Because it was introduced when I was there you are led to believe that it is no good and it is discontinued. It certainly appears to be unreasonable. We did not do it for the love of spending money. We did it for the sake of making quicker deliveries, which the people of the city were clamouring for. They were complaining that a long time sometimes elapsed between the arrival of the mail and the delivery. It has been suggested boxes should be placed at different places in the city and the truck could take parcels and the mails to them and then clerks could go around to the different stations and have their keys and so make quicker delivery than we have at the preset time. I do not want to be harping on Mr. Bradbury, but I feel quite sure that there are other officials in the department that if they were treated in the same way we would not hear the last of it from some members of this House if they were on this side. Certainly it must be politics. I cannot think of anything else that it can be. It seems cruel to a man who has spent the best years of his life in the service of the department to be told now that he could go back to the main line as an ordinary clerk or leave the service. Mr. Bradbury says that he is prepared to make an affidavit that he never intentionally looked at a private letter of Mr. Woodford's, and Mr. March is prepared to do the same thing. The typists are in the office next to the office of the Minister, there are two of them with Mr. March and Mr. Campbell and Mr. Bradbury. Bradbury used the stenographers to make out his daily reports of the steamers and the trains and would ask Miss Curtis to make out the reports, and very often he would be looking over her shoulder to see if she were putting down the right figures. Officials get fed up reading letters, official and otherwise and they should not be regarded as spies. I think that it is unjust, extremely unjust. I think that Col. Ross was glad to get information from Mr. Bradbury,

as he certainly knows more about the transportation system than anyone else, and I trust that the Minister will be big hearted enough not to misunderstand a man of the type of Bradbury. He is a very efficient official and has given his services to the department night and day whenever he was wanted. It made no difference what time the trains came in he was there. He took as much interest as if his own health depended upon getting the mails out. We were talking about the despatch of the mails on the West Coast on Friday. Well, Mr. Chairman, I will tell you what Mr. Bradbury did when he had complete charge of the transportation of the mails. The Argyle did not call at Lamaline or Grand Bank. They were not the regular ports of call for the Argyle when the mail was sent to Placentia and other steamers went to these places as their regular ports of call. The Post Office instructed the courier at Grand Bank to go to Lamaline for the mail but the Post Office neglected to instruct Collins, the mail clerk on the Argyle, to take the mail for Lamaline and Grand Bank, and when the Argyle got to Lamaline the courier from Grand Bank was there but there was no mail. It was left at Argentia and when the Post Office enquired why the mail had not been taken the mail clerk wired that he assumed no responsibility for not taking the mail. Bradbury used to wire the mail clerk when there was any special mail, both by the railway postal system and the Postal Telegraph. You cannot afford to lose the services of a man like Bradbury. These stories that have been told about him are absolutely untrue.

Mr. Chairman, we are adopting estimates for the financial year of 1925-26 and we were told that the Monroe Government would submit everything to this House to be publicly passed upon and that they had no intention of spending monies on executive authority. But what has been done during the past eight or ten months. Salaries have been increased by the Executive. Salaries were voted here by this Government last year and evidently these people could not wait until the estimates were passed to get these increases. From this it can be seen that increases were made to these officials on executive authority. That is not carrying out the principle that you have been preaching. And we thought that there would be a saving over the estimates of last year. The general opinion, Mr. Chairman, is that if you have the pull with certain members of the Government and ask for an increase you will get it. According to these estimates somebody must have some pull.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—These amounts have not increased the estimates. These are votes that were never taken in the past In the $230,000 there are only ten or fifteen people who are getting increases Many of these salaries were paid out of contingencies account before.

MR. HALFYARD—Not at all.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—From the 4th day of January to the 31st day of March you spent $256,-000.00.

MR. HALFYARD——I do not think so.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—I am not thinking at all, I am sure of it.

MR. HALFYARD—In the winter of 1923 we tried to keep some twelve hundred people from starving, by giving them work.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—And you went up and broke rocks at a cost of twenty dollars a ton, and they have been sold since for fifty cents a ton.

MR. HALFYARD—It is at least better than your idea of giving out the dole.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—The way it was is this. In honesty and fairness to ourselves, the Monroe Government was not justified in spending money on breaking rocks. I would not have been a member of the Monroe Government if it started to throw away two hundred and fifty thousand dollars, as you did, and did not even give the avantage of it to the people of St. John's.

MR. HALFYARD—I am glad to get the Minister interested.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—You will get more interest than you expect. It will be compound interest.

MR. HALFYARD—We were simply talking about the principle of increasing salaries on executive authority, and I said it was absolutely wrong. It seems that the principle was altogether wrong in the Squires and Warren administrations.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—I was not talking about Mr. Warren. The man tried to clean up, but as soon as he started he was crucified.

MR. HALFYARD—Who crucified him?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—I don't know—Crowdy.

MR. HALFYARD—It seems that it is altogether right for the Monroe Government to spend money on executive authority, but it is altogether wrong for any other Government to do that. That is one thing that is settled. It is alright to spend forty thousand dollars in Bonavista district in four or five months, and at the same time to spend five or six thousand dollars in Trinity district, where the necessities were just as great.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Do you believe that the Government was justified in spending the fifteen or sixteen thousand dollars in Trinity district, where the necessities were just as great.

MR. HALFYARD—That is not the question.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Don't twist around it. Can't you answer a question. Do you believe that the Government was justified in spending fifteen or sixteen thousand dollars in Trinity District?

MR. HALFYARD——I do not question whether they were justified in anything. I am trying to hold you down to the principle pronounced by the Monroe Government.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Don't try to hold me down. I am a hard man to keep down. All you have to do is answered the question I asked.

MR. HALFYARD—I am not saying that you were not justified. I am just reminding the Hon. Minister of the pronouncement made by the Monroe Government, and by the people that were connected with it. Incidentally I may refer to the money spent here in St. John's, where there are ten or twelve hundred people receiving about ten dollars a week.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Not so. You have not got anything like that.

MR. HALFYARD—And I think that after all breaking rocks might be of some service this year, when you are talking about building roads, rebuilding the dock and also an hotel

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—At ten dollars a barrel?

MR. HALFYARD—Some return is better than none at all.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—When I appealed to my constituents in the West End of the City, I remember telling them that I was against the rock sheds, and that if I was elected there would be no more of them. I told them that if it was necessary I would rather feed them.

MR. HALFYARD—Did they appreciate that?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—They did.

MR. HALFYARD—Do they appreciate it today?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Yes, because they are intelligent.

MR. HALFYARD—Those people today question the action of the Government. They want to know today why they are not put at work.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—You will soon see them at work.

MR. HALFYARD—They do not want to be getting something for nothing. They do not want the dole—it is demoralizing. It is recognized by all Governments that the system of simply doling out money and getting no returns for it, is one of the most demoralizing systems that we could have. The Government of Great Britain has come to realize that. The men there have come down to that stage now where they will not accept transportation to Canada; but would rather stay at home and take the dole.

Mr. Chairman, I am not questioning whether it is right or wrong to spend money on Bonavista District or Trinity district. The question I raised was this—whether it was right to spend moneys without their being voted in this House; and the honourable Minister of Finance has said that it all depends upon circumstances. I quite agree with him that it all depends upon circumstances. Conditions may arise which will necessitate the Executive Government to act without a vote of this House.

While I am on this question it will be just as well for me to refer to another action of the Monroe Government, and the Prime Minister himself is concerned in this matter, as well as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and that is in connection with the steam service on Trinity Bay.

Last year the Malakoff was taken off Trinity Bay, and her services were confined solely to Bonavista Bay. I said at the time that the services on Bonavista Bay would be more costly to the Government than if the boat were performing services on both bays; and I am justified in that statement. In reply to a question asked by me as to the cost of the Malakoff in 1924 as compared with her cost in 1923, I found that, counting the cost of the repairs to the wharf at Port Blandford to make it a fit terminus for the Malakoff, that there was a difference of $5,633.51 against the country. That is to say, the Malakoff cost the country more on Bonavista Bay in 1924 than she did in 1923 on Bonavista and Trinity Bays, by the sum of $5,633.51.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—You must spread the cost of that wharf over a number of years, and not put it all to one year.

MR. HALFYARD—That is straining a point. Even if you left out the cost of the wharf altogether, there was a loss.

Now whether politics had anything to do with that change is a question. A great many people will be inclined to think that it had a lot to do with it—with taking the Malakoff off Trinity Bay, and leaving Trinity Bay with no steam service at all. I pointed out at the time that even if the Government gave Trinity district—or Trinity Bay a motor ferry service that it would cost anywhere from ten to fifteen thousand dollars. That would be to give them the service that they are hoping to get. What I want to say is that if you put a ferry on Smith Sound from Clarenville round to Trinity or Bonaventure for eight months of the year, and then put another boat on the South Side of the Bay, it would cost twelve or fifteen thousand dollars, more or less. And that expense is altogether unnecessary. The Prime Minister said—I do not question the honesty of his statement—but he actually said in this House last year that the Government was elected on a policy of retrenchment; but this is an instance of extra expense with no corresponding returns.

The people of Bonavista district would have all their requirements met as far as freight and transport-

ation are concerned, by the steamers plying from St. John's, and the Malakoff going round there once a week and doing Trinity Bay as well.

We are speaking about it just now from a financial point of view; but at the same time, the district of Trinity has been left with no service, although it is needed. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries said that the people of Trinity Bay did not want the Malakoff. I agree with him that Trinity Proper or Port Rexton do not want the Malakoff or any other steamer. But when you go up to Bonaventure, British Harbour, and across to Britannia, then out round Ireland's Eye, and different places around there, and then come up the Sound, I assure you that the people there want some means of getting their freights around, and in the fall of the year when they have their herring fishery, I presume that the Prime Minister will see that they have some means of taking away their herring.

If that is the policy of the Government, to treat the people of Trinity Bay like that, I think it is very unfair and unwise, and a very bad policy. The Government cannot afford to do such an injustice to the people of Trinity District. I do not know what the Government intends to do this year in connection with this matter, but I presume that they will give Trinity Bay some sort of service.

Bonavista Bay was well looked after last year ,and there was a good reason for it. The Minister of Marine is an old politician and did not let the grass grow under his feet or the feet of his colleague, Mr. Little, for the six months previous to the bye-election. Now as to this vote for $38,000—the Hon. the Prime Minister said that it was well spent when I referred to it earlier in the debate, and when I said that some of it was spent for the digging of wells and roads to private gardens, he said that such was not done ,though now it is plain he was a party to it. At Knight's Cove $450 was spent for the erection of a fence around the school, ticians appreciate when a bye-electicians appreciate when a byee-election is on, money will be spent in different directions and that is what the Hon. the Prime Minister and his colleagues did in Bonavista Bay last year. Now that you have been returned and there is no further necessity to employ the people of Bonavista Bay to get their votes, why not give the next door district—Trinity—the smile of benevolence. The trouble is this, that in spending the thirty or forty thousand dollars, you did not build the bridges that were necessary and we could not get the money to do so.

MINISTER OF MARINE—You did not ask for it.

MR. HALFYARD—You do not know what we asked the Minister of Public Works for. I asked for money for the wharf at Elliston, and I got it only when it was almost too late to do anything with it. I got it in December after praying all the summer for it. But the Minister of Marine is wrong when he says that I did not ask for it. I say again that the district of Trinity has been practically ignored by the present Government. Does the Minister of Marine think that Trinity Bay was properly treated last year in connection with the matter of steam transportation? Does he think we got a special favor by the Railway Commission making a special minute on October 9th for the Prospero to call at Valleyfield, St. Brendan's, Flat Island and Salvage for a few trips only. What was the object of that special minute I would like to know?

MINISTER OF MARINE—She was ordered to Heart's Content to land men from Labrador.

MR. HALFYARD—Yes, and she

landed them at Trinity, and they had to beat their way home, on train, via Clarenville and Whitbourne to Heart's Content. There were so many steamers on Bonavista Bay they were likely to collide with each other, but there was nothing on Trinity Bay, and yet you say there were no special favors for Bonavista Bay. I venture to say that if any district on the Southwest Coast got similar treatment all the newspapers would be filled with it. From the attitude of the Minister of Marine he seems to be reconciled to the thought that what was done last year in Trinity district was alright, but I cannot understand how he thinks so. I trust that this year Trinity Bay will get a much better show. It got nothing last year, and if you will go through the district, you will find as was reported by the inspectors who were actually sent there by the Public Works Department, that certain bridges were in need of repair but we could not get the money to do the work. My reason for speaking of the steam transportation service is to get the opinion of the Hon. the Prime Minister as to what is going to be done this year, and I trust that when we come to the vote for steam subsidies, he will let us know.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Chairman, there is one thing on which I and the honorable member for Trinity, Mr. Halfyard, agree, and that is that the Hon. Dr. Robinson possessed the qualifications which made his appointment to the Post Office Department a good thing for the Colony. But unfortunately for the Colony, the Government of which Mr. Halfyard was a member, decided to place the position in question under an executive head, and Dr. Robinson was absolutely forced out. Mr. Halfyard refers to the treatment of Dr. Robinson under the Government with which I was associated, but surely he does not think that the Government under the leadership of the Hon. Sir W. F. Lloyd, did anything to handicap Dr. Robinson. At that time there was nothing done to handicap Dr. Robinson, and that the hon. member for Trinity must admit, as he was a party to all their actions. There was nothing of a beneficial nature that we turned down. It is true that we may not have been unanimous on certain things, but we always bowed to the will of the majority. Now, in 1918, under the Lloyd administration, I went to Canada on business, and consulted the C.P.R., and other parties as to certain things that we were going to do. Shortly after I came back, I left the country again and in a brief space afterwards the Government went to pieces. In 1919 the Hon. Dr. Robinson went to Montreal in connection with matters dealing with the Commercial Cable Co., and I think there is a report somewhere which was made to the Cashin Government.

Speaking of an inspector, might I point out to the hon. member for Trinity that an Inspector of a Post Office is not an auditor and could not be an auditor. An Inspector of a Post Office or of any other Departmental office can look after things in general, and see that things are going pretty right; but when you talk of getting a real auditor ,you got to get a man who has spent the greater part of his life at auditing. With regard to the auditor that was sent to Corner Brook to investigate, he came back and reported on the conditions that existed there. Another matter I would like to refer to is that Mr. Halfyard said that I said that the Prime Minister was a real baby in the game of politics. I think the hon. member misunderstood me. What I wanted to convey was that Mr. Monroe had nothing to do with

public life during a certain period, and that when he finds out the dishonesty that was practiced in the past, that it will be almost impossible for him to believe that such a thing could happen in a British Colony. Does the hon. member for Trinity understand me now?

I wish to come to another matter now, a matter that I skipped over this afternoon. That was in connection with Mr. Bradbury. Now Mr. Halfyard made one remark— and I agree with him—that Mr. Woodford was a big-hearted man, because if he or I caught a man seriously reading our private correspondence, we would kick him out of the department; not disrate him. I would not mind Mr. Bradbury's explanation of the matter either; I would prefer to take the word of the Minister, and I am perfectly satisfied that Mr. Bradbury was wrong. Mr. Halfyard also said that Mr. Bradbury was prepared to deny the Minister's statement by affidavit. There was many a man like Mr. Bradbury who was ready to make an affidavit when it was too late. With regard to the Estimates for the Department of Posts and Telegraphs showing an increase of four hundred and thirty-eight thousand dollars, I would like to say that this is not a real increase. The salaries are voted to meet other contingencies. We have endeavoured to go as near as possible to the Colony's expenditure for the year. In some cases we may have over-estimated and in other cases we may have underestimated. Certain conditions will arise when it might be necessary to utilize the authority and the right, under Section (33B) of the Audit Act, to spend money. The Prime Minister is opposed to spending money on Executive responsibility and it is only this afternoon that an instance of this occurred. My attention was drawn to it and he said we canot pay this money on Executive responsibility. He wants to give this House the right to vote all moneys, and that is what I admire in him; but, as I said before, it is almost impossible to estimate the different expenditures to the cent.

MR. GRIMES—He evidently has fallen into the hands of the Philistines again.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—He has fallen into the hands of the Angels, and if the Angels in Heaven heard you to-night they would weep. Some people listening to Mr. Halfyard talking in this House this evening about Mr. Monroe discriminating in the expenditures in Trinity and Bonavista Bays would imagine that he was telling the truth. I want to say that I know Mr. Monroe to display one of the greatest spirits I ever heard of within the past eight months in connection with the same matter, and if I had my way the Prime Minister would not have done it. It was in connection with the expenditure of fifteen thousand dollars in Trinity Bay. He was insistent about voting that amount to fix the roads in Trinity Bay. I told him and his colleagues in the Executive that I would not vote a penny; I would give it to those who put him in power.

MR. HALFYARD—That is awful.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Is it awful? It is the truth, and the truth is awful nasty to some people. I was quite prepared to listen to Mr. Monroe and let him have his way, however, and I am prepared to give way to him at all times because of the admiration I have for him, and because I know he is honest and straight. I will support him until he goes down and out, and when he goes I am prepared to go with him. I have my own opinion on times, but I am prepared to sink my opinion in ninety cases out of a hundred for him. Now there is one thing that strikes me forcibly about certain members of the

Opposition and it appears to me that they are like a crowd of false prophets. One minute they get up and clap one on the back and say everything is splendid, and the next minute they get up and are prepared to tear everything up. They get up here and make charges about our expenditure for the the past eight or nine months when they know that no Government could keep so near to our estimated expenditure as we are keeping. When we are estimating an expenditure for 1925-26 of $9,000,000 we are going the full limit; but the late Finance Minister, Mr. Cave, estimated a revenue for 1923-24 of $10,119,000, and he estimated a surplus of $143,000, and he has the unique honor, if it is an honor, as a result of his estimate of having a deficit of $1,718,000, a thing that no other Finance Minister done before, and I hope will never be done again. Mr. Halfyard also wants to know why we spent so much money in certain directions. Let me remind him of the eighty special policemen they had engaged in Hr. Grace to guard the booth rooms and the ballot boxes. That is how some of the bills that had to be paid by us were incurred by the late Government. Then again the member for Trinity (Mr. Halfyard) throws up the dole question in my face to-night. Has he forgotten, I wonder, what happened in St. John's in 1923 and how much the Government that he was associated with spent during that year?

Money given out to the crowd to buy groceries.

Now you made a remark about the Railway Commission; about their ordering the Portia to call into Trinity Bay. Might I ask you one question as commissioner of the railroad. You said you saw in the minutes of the present railroad commission about the Portia calling into Trinity Bay.

MR. HALFYARD—Bonavista Bay.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Well Mr. Halfyard, is it not surprising for you to find that the Railroad Commission kept minutes at all.

MR. HALFYARD—I am not surprised.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—You knew there were business men in charge. The railroad commission never kept minutes while you were there.

MR. HALFYARD—We were only consulting the General Manager.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—You were there in the capacity of it, and at the same time you did not keep a minute. If three or four men are running anything even if it is only a chinese laundry, when they sit around a table to have a meeting there ought to be minutes kept. You must have said that Mr. So and So did or said so and so, and there was not a minute kept to let the people know or to tell what one of you said. If you were not there why did you order the things to be done that were done. Why did the General Manager send the Kyle off without the West Coast candidates. The Commissioners or somebody must have told him to do it. The best answer to the railroad commission is that it was a farce and was never meant to accomplish anything. It could never produce a minute if it was asked for. Anybody knows why it was sent up there. It was just to draw a thousand dollars a piece.

MR. HALFYARD—It is more creditable for the men not to keep minutes than for five or six men of the Government to sit in conclave around a board, and then when they are sending ships to the icefields say, "How many berths have you got." And then divide them up and leave Trinity District out.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—The only thing I regret is that I was not able to manipulate and take the whole lot of them for the West End of St. John's. It is great to be honest.

Now tonight Mr. Halfyard in some

way mentioned the West Coast. Now if I were you Mr. Halfyard I would never have mentioned it; if I were a part of the Government that crucified that crowd like they were crucified by the Squires Administration. You know as much about that as I do. And I stood in this House and tried to save the country from what she met in the past, and where did I get off at? Now I don't intend tc go any further.

MR. HALFYARD—You did more than any other man in this House for the Consortio.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Because I had sense enough to sell when the Government decided I should or not. I had sense enough to pay attention to my own business. I sold it to them and enabled the fishermen to make an honest profit.

MR. HALFYARD—In other words you were a traitor to your country.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—I was not a traitor to my country. When it comes to selling my produce, I don't allow any man to dictate to me how I am going to sell it. If I do not sell it legally I will sell it unlawfully. There is something I like about you after all. There are some good traits in you. I have known you a long time. Besides I know that time and time again when we were associated and we often differed, we tried to do the best that we knew how. And when I am criticizing you, Mr. Halfyard, I am not criticizing you as an individual but I am criticizing the Government of Sir Richard Anderson Squires. And if he had died twenty years ago Newfoundland would have been a lot better off than it is to-day. I have nothing personally to say against Sir William Coaker. But it was the leader who did all the harm.

MR. HALFYARD—That is a matter of a difference of opinion.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —A difference of opinion to the extent of two millions. The greatest curse that happened to this country in 1919 was when the crowd associated with Sir Michael Cashin was defeated and Sir Richard Squires took charge. That was a terrible calamity. I am going to do my best to bring this colony back if I can. I may be accused of lots of things but I have yet to be proven guilty.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, I little thought when I twitted the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs yesterday, with not having made a speech equal to that delivered by the Min. of Agriculture & Mines, that this vote would develop a debate as it did. We have listened tonight to a series of recriminations. Gentlemen on both sides of the House are finding fault one with the present administration and the other with the administration of recent years. But I think that there is more to come out of this discussion to-day than this. And it is for that reason that I criticised the speech made by the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs this afternoon. I think by the recollections of everybody that I was identified with the policy of clean up. In pursuance of that policy of clean up alluded to by the Prime Minister, I led a party. As a part of the policy of clean up along with it should go publicity without which it is ineffective. And the only publicity that was given to the work done was given by the Finance Minister this afternoon. There may be a difference of opinion as to the advisability of a member of the Government giving publicity in that manner in this House. Since the present Government have come into office, they have been pursuing that policy of cleaning up, and in doing so they have held enquiries into several departments. They have held an enquiry into the charity departments. In the Post Office, there were rather

two enquiries. One, I take it, was the enquiry into the system by Colonel Ross and the other enquiry was by the Auditor General, the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs into the irregularities. The Prime Minister intimated that further enquiries were to be held at a future date.

Any enquiries that are held in this country from now on will not have the confidence of the people unless the enquiry is made public. Any enquiry that is made especially by gentlemen who must be expected to have party affiliations will lose its worth or value if after the enquiry is finished the report is put in the pigeon hole, and this House and the people outside will know nothing about it. I don't want to go into details, but I do want to say it would be a move in the right direction to give the public an idea of what the commission has been doing. There must necessarily be a feeling of distrust. There must be a feeling that something is being kept back when after the enquiry the result of that enquiry is not given to the public. Further than that. When an enquiry is held into a department or a sub-department naturally and necessarily every official of that department becomes more or less under suspicion. And if some officials are found guilty of irregularities, it may be desirable not to make that public, yet it is hardly fair to the innocent officials that that report should be pigeonholed. There was a famous case before the Courts in England not long ago in which it was thought undesirable not to disclose the name of an Indian prince. The case was a famous one. But eventually the name had to be disclosed for other princes objected to the name being kept secret because it would cast suspicion upon all. For the same reason it is necessary in the interest of the public that this enquiry should be made known.

I hope and trust that that will be the case. The Minister of Posts and Telegraphs referred to the possible outcome and the disclosures which may take place in the courts.

That may be so, but let me say this, that if there are irregularities, and if the man in the public service is going to be tempted he will get over the temptation if he knows that although he may not be convicted by the Supreme Court, yet the lime light of publicity will be thrown on his actions. So much for that view of what the Minister said and it is probable that it will be an eye opener for the Members of this House, and it will be an eye opener for the public when they read of this investigation and the work done by it, and I am sure that what he said is an eye-opener to the members of this House and to the public when they read of the information that was the result of the investigation and the work done by it. Just one word in conclusion as to the cause, or I might say the remedy of some of these irregularities that he has spoken to us about. When I was Prime Minister the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs reported to the Executive Council that there were irregularities in some of the outport offices. We immediately took Mr. Aylward from the position of General Delivery Clerk and made him inspector. He had been only in the position for a period of two months before my regime came to an end, and I do not know what he has been doing since. Whether he is still doing the work or not, I do not know, but I think that whoever is doing the work should be instructed by the Government to make a report in writing every year, and this report should be embodied in the Minister's report to this House. I have heard it said that the Auditor General had little or

nothing to do with the outport offices, and that Mr. Crummy is doing the work, and I want to ask the Minister is Mr. Crummy going to continue that work. Is he going to take over the work of the inspector? But if Mr. Crummy is not going to continue doing this work I think it is absolutely essential that Mr. Aylward should keep up the work of calling on the Post Offices and the Telegraph Offices, and the Money Order Offices, and he should call on them without notice. And as I said before he should report to the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, and the Minister should furnish the report to this House in the usual way. Now among the departments which I asked, or the Government asked Read, Son and Watson to investigate, was the Auditor General's department. Not that there was any suspicions of wrongdoing, but there must be something wrong with a system by which the Auditor cannot find out that thousands of dollars have disappeared under his nose unless the criminal practically comes to him and says "I have done it." I think that the Government ought to take advantage of the present opportunity to investigate the Audit Act. The Act was passed in 1899, nearly thirty years ago, and there must be some improvements that can be made in that act to make it perfect. The Minister of Finance said this afternoon that we did not take the report of the Auditor General seriously and that we never look at it unless we are in the Opposition. Moneys disappear from the Departments of the Government and the Auditor is unable to trace them. There must be something wrong with that. I hope and trust that the Government will take advantage of the present opportunity to have a thorough investigation of the Auditor General's Department and to take care that the limelight is thrown upon those culprits in the course of the clean up.

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, I have no intention of delaying the House very long. A few days ago when I was out of the House I heard afterwards that it was suggested that about forty thousand dollars was spent in Bonavista Bay. I suppose that the Hon. Member for Trinity thought that it was spent there because the election was to take place in October. Far from it. Because we went through the district in the spring when you had spent thousands of dollars the year before and we won the election, and surely when we went back for the bye-election we would be returned without spending forty thousand dollars. But, sir, eight thousand dollars of that money was spent paying the bills which were not paid by the Government to which Mr. Halfyard belonged. Some of them were as far back as 1922. I said on the floors of this House some time ago that it was a pretty hard thing to clean up, and that it would take some time. At least $2700.00 was paid to the Fishermen's Union Trading Co. out of this thirty eight thousand dollars. As I said the other day, I do not like to bring the names of any persons in to any discussion on the floors of this House. There was a wharf in Bonavista Bay that R. G. Winsor hired and did not pay for. It was in ways like that that the money was spent. Four hundred dollars of that money was spent to build a fence around a school house. I am glad it was. I made that promise to the people of Knight's Cove fifteen years ago. When Sir William Coaker went to the district he promised that if he were returned that they would get the money from him. He had his tongue twisted off making these promises. You tried to get me under the Election Act. You brought the man up here from Bona-

vista Bay, but it did not work. There was nothing to it. Knight's Cove is a very small place, Mr. Chairman, and there were big boulders in the road as big as the water filter. The thing was a disgrace. And we hope to do the same thing and relieve those who want to be able to get to and from the schools. The same thing was done in St. John's, and the people of the District of Bonavista paid their proportional part of the taxes of this country, as well as the people of St. John's. And as I happen to be the one of the members for the district of Bonavista Bay I am going to allocate the monies that I have any control of over without consulting anyone on the Opposition side of the House about it. You did it while you were the member of the Government and I am going to do the same thing. I am not going to be dictated to by you or any other man. You can take that right from the start. You are not the man to stand up here on the floors of the House of Assembly and admit that Mr. Monroe was man enough to vote fifteen thousand dollars for the District of Trinity, but you argue that this forty thousand dollars was spent in the district of Bonavista Bay, because we wanted to be sure of winning the election that was to take place there. Any money I spend in the district of Bonavista will be spent in the best interest of the people of this country at large. You called my attention to the fact that the Prospero called at places on the north side of Bonavista Bay going north a couple of times. I was not aware of this before. But I was asked by Father Walker of St. Brendan's to have the Prospero call there for a sick patient to be taken to the Hospital, and I thought that it was my duty to see that this was done. I did know that she called there on a couple of trips during the fall of the year when she was coming from the French Shore. We have on the north side of Bonavista Bay from Flat Island, Gooseberry Island and other places, fifty or sixty men who go down in the spring of the year on the French Shore to fish. In the past these people had to pay their fares to Wesleyville and they had to pay freight to the same place and then they had to wait there for four or five days for the Prospero to come back from St. John's, and then they had to pay another passage down to the French Shore, and in some cases that would take all the fish they could catch to pay for the passages for themselves and their families, and so as to relieve them from the double freight and passage I asked the Government to let the Prospero go there two trips in the Spring of the year, and bring these men down, and also bring them away in two trips in the fall. That, I consider, should have been done years ago.

Now then, I was asked did I think that Bonavista Bay should get a steamer service and that Trinity Bay should not get any. Certainly I do not think it is right. But we were charged in July last with interfering with the Fortune Bay services. Why did we interfere? Because we thought it was costing the Colony too much, and that services were not given for the money. What has happened at the present time? Fortune Bay today has got the best service that it ever had in the history of this country. Therefore, I feel sure that by this time next year the same thing will have happened to the people of Trinity District; and if the honourable member will only give us a chance to fix things up, he will find that we will make the crooked path straight. I say that if she had been taken off Trinity Bay altogether without any intention of putting another one back, and that Bonavista Bay should have both, Iwould not have agreed with it.

But what happened about that boat,

That boat, or another boat like it had been running on Bonavista Bay ever since the Reids came to the country. But when the Government of which the Honourable member for Trinity came into power they took it off Bonavista Bay, and put it on Trinity and Bonavista Bays combined.. What was that done for. To bring her to Pt. Union. What for? For the one specified purpose of having her for the whole, sole benefit of the Union Trading Company. I make that statement without fear of contradiction. For what else was she taken off Bonavista Bay. For the whole sole purpose of bringing grist to the Union Trading Company. If the Government to which I belong should ever attempt to do anything like that, I would sit on them as hard as possible.

As I told you before in the month of July even Captain Day acknowledged to me that it was useless expenditure of money, and it was of no benefit to the people of Trinity Bay to run the Malakoff there the way she was running. He was half afraid to go into some harbours because he got so much abuse from the people there, who said it was a waste of money. Yet you stand up here tonight, and try to persuade the members of this House, and also these people who are listening and also try to broadcast all over the country that we took the Malakoff off for political spite. I say, no we did not. If we were to start now on the floors of this House of Assembly and were to stay here for the next twenty-five years, we could not do half as much through political spite as you did in the four or five years you were in.

You took the Dundee or some other boat that was in her place off Sweet Bay altogether, which was the only means that the people had of communicating with the railway. Then not satisfied with that you took off the ferry boat from there, and then you took away the telegraph office. Yet you get up here and speak of political spite. It was never heard of to such an extent as it was during your administration. It seems to me that you are so thick skinned not to see enough to make you keep your tongue quiet. If I had done as much through political spite as you have, I would be ashamed to stand up on the floors of this House of Assembly and tell anybody else what they should do as far as political spite is concerned.

So far as the Prospero is concerned you do not seem to remember that as well as having her call at places in Bonavista Bay, we were also asked by some fishermen of Trinity Bay, some seven or eight men from Heart's Content, to call there and land them. We gave orders to have the Prospero call at Heart's Content. It never occurred to me then whether they were against the party or not. As Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I interceded for these men and got the boat to land them, just as I did the same thing for people in Bonavista Bay, because I considered that they deserved it.

MR. HALFYARD—They were landed at Trinity and had to beat their way home to Heart's Content.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Yes they were. But that was none of my fault. I will give you a chance to see if I did not order that they were to be landed at Heart's Content. That was the Captain's fault. I could not be responsible for that.

You speak of the Malakoff costing this country five thousand dollars more by being put on Bonavista Bay. If you were a bit sincere at all, when you stand up here, you would give both sides of the story.

MR. HALFYARD—I do not think it is quite in order for any honour-

able member to question the sincerity of another.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, I have just as much right to consider the sincerity of his statements as he has to question mine.

You made a statement that it cost five thousand dollars more to run a boat on Bonavista Bay than if it were run on Bonavista and Trinity Bays. You did not tell the people that you based your calculations on only half of the time—that the boat did not go back to Bonavista Bay till late in the summer, when all the spring trade was done.

MR. HALFYARD—Therefore, if you had run it for the whole year, you would have lost more.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—No, because in the spring of the year there would be three times as much freight carried as in the summer months.

MR. HALFYARD—The only place she ever carried freight from was Port Union.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Do you know what they used to call that boat down at Wesleyville? Whenever they saw her coming they used to say "here comes the rabbit boat." The reason for that is the only thing she had aboard was a few barrels of rabbits from the bottom of the Bay.

MR. HALFYARD—Therefore she was not put on for Port Union.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—If you were man enough to say that she was put on because she got more freight from Port Union than from anywhere else, I would not mind it so much. But you say that she was not put on for Port Union—and I am sure that I am right.

But you need not worry about Trinity Bay. The Monroe Government will look after Trinity Bay. As you know yourself, you have to make a beginning to everything, and we will make a beginning of it as sure as you live, and the people of Trinity Bay will know it before very long. The Monroe Government is just as much interested in Trinity Bay as you are.

MR. HALFYARD—Put it in the estimates.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—You know that you have been charging the Government very strongly here to-night with doing things on executive responsibility. Perhaps we will forget ourselves and do something like that for Trinity District, and give you a chance to spend two hours on the floor of the House of Assembly, telling what bad people we are.

As I told you before, we will not ask you whether we will do it or whether we will not. If it is required, we will put it there, if it is not we will not, and it is no use you wasting your breath talking about that matter. But I certainly think that when honourable members on either side of the House are talking, they should put up the white side of every case as well as the black; and if Mr. Halfyard gets up here, and makes out a black case for the Government, and a good case for his own side, I think he should certainly tell the whole story. But I think that the men of Trinity District have already found out that Mr. Halfyard is not talking all the time in the interests of the people of the Bay, but in his own political interests; because you know, Mr. Chairman, that it is only a few years ago since Mr. Halfyard polled a big vote in Trinity District, but last year that vote was not nearly so big.

MR. HALFYARD—I was elected just the same.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—By the skin of your teeth. But, however, I give the members of

this House all the credit for fighting their own districts; but I think that the Monroe Government deserves great credit when, having been in power for only six months, they turn around and gave Mr. Halfyard's district fifteen thousand dollars. I think that the Monroe Government is not so bad after all, and in future I would ask Mr. Halfyard, when he gets up on the floors of this House and makes a statement in reference to the money spent on Bonavista, I hope he will give both sides of the story. If he does not, he will hear from me again.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I am sure we are all very much interested in the speech of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and it is generally recognized now that he is a fighter in connection with any matter pertaining to his district; but there was one point which he stressed—the matter of political spite. Mr. Chairman, I would ask you whether it was in the interests of any party to take a steamer off Bonavista Bay and arrange that one steamer should serve both Bonavista and Trinity Bays. You know that we did that in spite of protests from the people of Bonavista Bay, and Trinity Bay. The sole object of having one boat perform the services on both bays was to save from thirty to thirty-five thousand dollars. That was why we did it—because the earning power of the boat was very little. We ran the risk of political defeat by doing that, and we know that Sir William Coaker, whose name has been mentioned to-night, lost considerable votes in Bonavista District on account of his action in taking that boat off Bonavista Bay. We did not do it for political spite—because we would only be spiting ourselves. Then when the one boat was serving both bays, Port Union was the most convenient place for a terminus. That was the only reason why we had the boat doing both bays— and we saved that much money, thirty thousand dollars, by making that arrangement, in spite of the opinion of the people in Bonavista Bay. Therefore, it is not right to say that it was done for political spite. I am glad the Minister appreciates the fact that it was done to save expense. I accept his remarks in a spirit of good fellowship, in which I believe they were offered, but I will not take back anything that I have said. I notice in the amount referred to last year there is $2,000.00 for the Government Engineer. You did look after the district well, and whether it had any influence on the electors or not, I do not know, but you certainly attended to the wants of every nook and corner of the District.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, while the discussion is alive and hot, I would like to again bring to the attention of the House, the matter to which I referred this afternoon, that is, the Auditor General's Department. I firmly believe, and we have evidence here now that the irregularities so much in prominence should never have taken place. I have before me now a copy of the Audit Act which reads as follows:

(Quotes Act)

Now I think that covers pretty well every system and every Department in the scope of the Government. Now turn to page 225 and we find:

(Quotes Act)

Under this Act the Auditor General has authority to audit all monies and all offices connected with the Government, and he cannot be removed from his position except by Act of Legislation in the House. Therefore he has nothing to fear from any politician, as to being dismissed if he takes it upon himself to fully carry out the law. I think that outlines fully the position of the Auditor

General, and I really do not see how you could make an Act that would be any fuller, and more comprehensive than the present one. Under the circumstances, and in view of this Act, I think that all the discrepencies which have taken place during the last number of years, the Auditor General's Department is responsible for, and there is no use in shirking the blame on anyone else, and the Auditor General was in a position from which he could not be removed. He should have carried out the Act and had the Departments audited properly. If Mr. Crummey is employed by the Post Office, or any other Department to do outside auditing, he and Mr. Howley or any other men of this class, should be under the Auditor General's control, and should help to make a full report of their work to him. Another section of the Act says he can suspend anyone in his Department, and therefore, has the authority to do this and report to the Governor in Council. He should have audited the Outport Offices.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—There is a clause in the Act which shows that if the Executive does not give him a Clerk if needed, he could not audit the offices in the outports.

MR. HICKMAN—I think he would have been given help. I am bringing up this matter more for the sake of the future than for the past, as what has happened cannot be undone. Under this Act, the Auditor General has very extensive powers, and if he does his duty there will be no irregularities in future.

HONORABLE THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Chairman, I agree with the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition, and think the Auditor General should not be handicapped in any way, but should have clerks to conduct the audit of offices all over the country. But by past Governments—I will not say whether it was the Squires, Cashin, Lloyd, Morris or any other—he was handicapped in not getting the necessary help to do the work. This is one thing on which the Leader of the Opposition and myself agree, if on nothing else, and I am willing to give the Auditor General every assistance, and think the Leader of the Opposition is absolutely right in his remarks this evening.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, in reference to this vote for mail couriers, contractors, etc. Here is a vote for $120,000.00 which we are asked to pass in globo, without being given any particulars of it whatever. The Auditor General in his report suggests that all votes should be itemized. But strange to say this vote was made in globo on the recommendation of the Auditor General in 1921-1922, and gives the Post Office a free hand just as if it were a contingency vote. You may say that we must have confidence in the Manager of a Department, but in order to carry out the Audit Act or the Auditor General's Report, we should go into this vote in detail, even if it does occupy four or five pages of the estimates. I accepted the Auditor General's recommendation at the time I was in the Post Office, and just mention the matter now in passing.

HON. MIN. OF POSTS—It is the intention next year to regulate the vote, so as to know how it is handled, but we must have some experience first, so as to know how to deal with it.

MR. HALFYARD—I quite appreciate that if there is any Department where officials are required to give the minutest attention to the spending of monies, it is the Post Office.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman, while we are discussing this vote for mail couriers I would like to draw the at-

tention of the Min. of Finance to the courier employed in the service between Exploits and Lewisporte in the place of a returned soldier named Sceviour. The Minister of Finance was very eloquent to-night in stating that the Government were not considering the politics of a person at all in connection with the handling of the business of any Department, and he wished to convey to this House that if a man was qualified for a job that was all that was needed and that was all he cared. But that is not what happened in the case of Mr. Sceviour. Nor was it a case of tender, as some member of the Government has suggested. Sceviour was employed on this service for two or three years, during which he had given fullest satisfaction to the Postal Department and nobody complained; but as soon as a change of Government occurred Sceviour found that some other person had been given the job of courier, although the reason given to me for his removal was that a mail bag had been lost the year previous and for which Sceviour was not responsible because if the thing had been investigated properly it would have been found that Sceviour would have been able to give full and satisfactory explanation. Nobody had ever found fault with him before and nobody has any fault to find with him now so far as his services are concerned, and yet a man, who had fought for his country and who bears the scars of battle, was dismissed without reason except because of his politics—and another man put in his place. Further I understand that the man offered Sceviour's position did not want it, and it was forced upon him to take it simply because it was thought that Sceviour was supporting the candidates of the present Opposition and was to be put out, regardless of his services to his country and to the Postal Department. Now if the Minister of Finance is sincere in the statements he made here to-night he ought to find out the reason why Sceviour was dismissed and find out what the value of his services were and compensate him for the injustice done him. I think it is a very poor way indeed to treat such a man who has given such service. He was ready and willing a few years ago to sacrifice his life on the altar of his country, and because it was assumed that he was exercising the right that he fought for he was dismissed. I consider that, if the Government is going to carry out what they are preaching, namely, that a man will be held in a position so long as he is qualified to fill it efficiently, they dealt out a gross act of injustice to this man Sceviour and which they ought to rectify at the earliest opportunity. I think that the attention of the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs has been directed to the matter by the G.W.V.A. What the Minister's reason was for having the man dismissed remains to be known, and I am sorry he is not present now, but at any rate there is no question about the gross injustice that has been done Sceviour, and I trust that the Government will investigate the matter and see that this man gets a square deal.

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 to-morrow.

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on to-morrow.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, April 17, 1925.

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

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of English Harbor, Trinity District, on the subject of a canal. The petitioners ask for the sum of $3000. The building of the canal is for the purpose of affording shelter for the fishermen's boats. The canal is partly completed. The work began about two years ago and a lot of material was secured, which is depreciating in value because the people could not use it up as they were unable to obtain the money to pay the wages. I may say that the people of this place are almost entirely dependent on the fisheries. It is their opinion that if the canal were cut to the nearby pond it would afford a shelter for the motor boats. The petition is signed by all the electors of English Harbor. This request is not new as it has been before the Government since 1919. The Government of that day, before the election, sent down a surveyor to examine the place, and on the urgent request of the people I succeeded in getting the money to begin the work. I could not guarantee that it would be finished as that depended on the finances of the country, but it should be seriously considered as affording a facility to increase the earning power of the people, and, therefore, it would increase our assets as a fishing country. Therefore, I support the petition and ask that it be referred to the Department to which it relates.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker, I have some knowledge of the benefit which would be derived by the people from this canal, and I have very much pleasure in supporting the petition.

MR. GODDEN—Mr. Speaker, I also wish to give the petition my hearty support.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from Joseph Matterface and other people of Boat Harbour, asking for the appointment of a mail courier between that place and Baine Harbour. There is neither Telegraph or Telephone connection at Boat Harbour, and there is no steamer calling there, and I trust immediate steps will be taken to see that a courier is appointed as formerly to carry the mails between the points mentioned.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the Newfoundland Light and Power Company, Limited, asking that Legislation be enacted in connection with the business of that Company. I respectfully suggest that the subject matter of the petition be referred to a Select Committee.

Mr. Speaker appointed the Select Committee as follows: Hon. the Prime Minister, Hon. the Minister of Justice, Mr. W. J. Browne, Mr. Halfyard, Mr. Scammell.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition of a similar nature from the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company, and the Newfoundland Power and Paper Utilities Company Limited, respecting the matter of legislation confirming the titles to certain lands at Corner Brook. I would also ask that this matter be referred to a Select Committee.

Mr. Speaker appointed the Select Committee as follows: Hon. the Minister of Justice, Hon. Mr. Long, Mr. Power, Mr. Hickman, Mr. Grimes.

Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs gave notice that he would on to-morrow move the House into a

Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means.

Hon. the Minister of Customs gave notice that he would on to-morrow move the House into a Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means.

(3) MR. HICKMAN asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries who petitioned or recommended a Light House on Bellehack, Conception Harbour? What price was paid for the land on which it was built? Who is going to have the position of Light Keeper?

Tabled.

(2) MR. HICKMAN asked the Minister of Public Works if his department has made a contract with anyone in Harbour Grace for sand. If so, state quantity and price to be paid per ton or barrel.

THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition I may say that there has been no contract made with any up to the present for sand.

(3) MR. HICKMAN asked the Minister of Public Works if any moneys allotted for Harbour Grace were sentt there since January 1st, 1925. If so, to whom sent, and what amount.

THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Speaker, I beg to say in reply to question No. 3 that no moneys have been allotted for Harbour Grace since January 1st, 1925.

(4) MR. HICKMAN asked the Colonial Secretary to lay on the Table of the House all correspondence between himself and parties in Harbour Grace referring to labour at Harbour Grace and the stopping of work that had commenced.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, I will have the answer to that question to-morrow.

(5) MR. HICKMAN asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay upon the Table of the House all correspondence between the Government and other parties, including the High Commissioners Office in London, in reference to the four million dollar Loan raised in England. To explain why the tenders were asked for in dollars instead of pounds sterling, and why it was afterwards accepted in sterling. To explain why the highest offer was not accepted. To explain why Messrs Glyn, Mills & Co., Financial Agents, were not consulted as in the past.

Tabled.

The Chairman from the Committee of the Whole on Supply reported certain Resolutions which were read a first time as follows:

Department of Posts and Telegraphs $1,220,998.07

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.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MR. HALFYARD—Why this increase?

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Because we find that he is underpaid and that he handles an amount of money something like eight million dollars, and I feel that he is entitled to a great deal more and the increase of $120 is a mere bagatelle. It is Mr. Warwick Smith.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, up to the time that the present minister took charge of the Department of Finance and Customs the public thought that it was a place for the needy supporters of the party in power. Evidently that is the wrong idea, and certainly the present minister would not have any official there

who was unnecessary. I suppose that we cannot blame the general public for thinking thus, because whatever party is in power it is the dumping ground for people who have nothing to do except draw their salaries. Now from the estimates that we are just passing it seems that this idea is wrong altogether, and that the department has only the number of men that are required and many of them are underpaid.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Chairman, I am quite in accord with the remarks that have been passed by the hon. member for Trinity. The great difficulty that I find down in the department at the present time is to get the men fitted into the positions that they are qualified to fill. There are men down there in responsible positions and they are underpaid, and I would like the colony to be in a better position to pay these men better salaries. I may say that just at the present time we are short of help. Some of the men have got sick and there is nobody to take their places. We are doubled up in the Long Room and the Examining Room at the present time. Now the steamers come in and we are busy for a couple of days and then we have a let up and it looks as if the men are doing nothing. It is something that cannot be avoided.

MR. HALFYARD—Port Union—$1300.00, that is the same as last year.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—He is on a straight salary. He did not get any percentage, but has had a straight salary voted all the time.

MR. HALFYARD—I think he is worthy of consideration.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—As far as I know he is a very satisfactory man.

MR. HICKMAN—There is an increase of eighteen thousand dollars in this department.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—I think the total increase will be about elevent thousand dollars.

MR. HICKMAN—There is an increase of ten thousand dollars in St. John's.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—If you will notice on page 181, the total increase for Customs is twelve thousand dollars.

MR. HALFYARD—What is this item for Banking Fishermen's Insurance?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—It is a fund that has been there for some time, why I do not know. I know that every year there is $1,000.00. I think we always pay it out in some way—how I do not know.

MR. WARREN—There is an Act—the Bank Fishermen's Insurance Act, and this is a contribution paid under that Act.

MR. LAKE—There is a Banker's Insurance Act on the statute book. Under the Act the owners of banking schooners have to pay so much for each man, and the fishermen themselves have to pay so much. Then if a fisherman is drowned on the Bankers his family gets eighty dollars. They get eighty dollars once and for all. I think it is fifty cents that is paid by the owners, and twenty cents paid by the men themselves. That is collected by the Custom House.

MR. HALFYARD — There is no steamer on the revenue service yet?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—No, I am not sure what we are going to do about that. We want to vote the amount anyhow.

MR. HICKMAN—There is one little matter arising out of the vote just passed. I would like to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries what the duties of Captain English in his department are?

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Harbour Master.

MR. HICKMAN — I know that is the name under which he holds the position and draws his salary, but I wanted to know what his duties were. My reasons for asking are these: Now that the Railway Commission has charge of the dock, and has all the steamers calling up there, and all steamers coming in here for repairs go up there, both in the night time and in the day time, I think there should be some steps taken to have some sort of order in the Harbour. As it is now anybody who has a schooner is allowed to moor it where he likes, and there are steamers moored out there in the Middle of the stream, with a swing of two to three hundred feet in any wind. Whenever the wind changes these ships swing right around, and may sometimes be very dangerous.

I think that it is high time that the Government formed a Harbour Commission. It is not sufficient to give powers to one man—the harbour master—but there should be a regular harbour commission. There is no reason why the Port of St. John's should be as ridiculous as it is today. Mr. Chairman, it is only a small matter to get things straightened out. It is the overnment's duty to appoint a Harbour Commission and to appoint a place for schooners to moor in the winter and in the summer as well, so that the steamers might have free access to the fair way from the narrows right up to where they want to dock in the West End.

HON. THE MIINISTER OF JUSTICE—I would like to say for the information of the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition that Chap. 181 of the Consolidated Statutes provides for the Working of the Harbour of St. John's. It was found that it was not broad enough in its scope and that point is receiving the attention of the Government. Legislation in connection with that matter is being considered by the Department of Justice. Representations on similar lines were made by the Board of Trade. That very point itself was drawn to our attention by Colonel Mitchell as the importance of having Harbour Regulations. It was brought up in connection with the dock, and the point was raised about Harbour Construction.

I only wish to say that Captain English, the Harbour Master, finds that his powers are not extensive enough under the present law. There is a scheme being thought of by the Government to have a harbour commission on the lines as those that regulate Government harbours of Montreal and other places. That legislation at the present time is under consideration.

MR. HICKMAN—I am very glad to hear that from the Hon. Minister.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, I think that I referred to that matter since the House opened. I think I told the House that after the House closed last session that there was going to be an enquiry into this question. If we started a Sub-department known as the King's Printer Dept. it would involve considerable expense.

I pointed out that the Royal Gazette would have to be transferred and named the "Newfoundland Gazette," and the King's Printer would be responsible for its publication. He would have to see to the printing and the editing of the paper, and generally control the publication of it. That would necessitate the appointment of another official who would require to be paid a decent salary. He would also want some assistance and an office would have to be created. This establishment would be attended to with some considerable expense.

There had been considerable extravagance in the matter of stationary and printing in the past, so that we thought that by intimating to the different departments that every economy should be practised in this direction we may overcome the difficulty without additional expenditure. I must say that we have not spent one extra dollar on the account of that Bill that was passed here last year. I don't think that there has been a dollar expended in the way of stationary in any department unnecessarily. We are running these departments on economical lines. Most of the printing bills come up to the Deputy Colonial Secretary for endorsation before being paid. In that way there is no possiblity of any extravagance with regard to expenditure.

MR. HALFYARD—Does that apply to advertising too?

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Yes, we made a special point to cut out much of the advertising because it is a noticeable fact in the Governments all down through the ages or at least in my time for tremendous sums of money to be spent in useless advertising. There has been a lot of advertising not only in papers in this country, but also in other countries that is absolutely no good; matter out of issue and having no application to present conditions whatever. This was going on for years and a lot of it had to be cut out. Of course it cannot be cut out all at once owing to contracts; it has to be cut out gradually. The publication of notices in two magazines have a special claim on the Government. I submit that the Newfoundland Quarterly, a regularly published periodical, is doing a great deal of good for Newfoundland. If the Government support was withdrawn from this paper it would not be able to continue publication. We have changed our policy with regard to this magazine and we have several articles carefully written with regard to the tourist attraction of this country that has been published as advertising.

The same may be said of the "Veteran." This magazine has a large circulation in Canada and the United States. We have tried to give these magazines every assistance we could. These are the only two. We have cut out all the others. The accounts show that the expenditure this year in advertising will be the lowest in many years. And I don't see that the King's Printer is necessary. Mr. Thistle is doing the work well. He is absolutely reliable. The work is carried out with the utmost despatch. I don't see why there should be an additional expense of seven or eight thousand dollars on the Government.

MR. HICKMAN—I would like to ask the Colonial Secretary why he is voting this amount for stationery and printing if he is cutting out advertising.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—I don't think that the vote any year met the expenditure. I think that there was supplementary supply for stationary and printing. I know the votes taken other years were never adequate.

MAJOR CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, we are now in the last vote. The closing days of the estimates are practically at an end, and I want to make a request to those looking after the pensions to the soldiers and sailors that it is now up before the House. I have been asked by some of the War Veterans, and I suppose the principal reason why they asked me was because I happened to be one of them myself. They asked me to make a plea on their behalf and on behalf of those working down in the Pension Department. Now in looking over the estimates I find that the total increase of pensions for 1925 and 1926 is $104. This means that one

man got a raise and all the others got nothing.

Now while it is immaterial to me personally, in looking over the estimates and considering that there are increases here, there and in every Department, here is a Department which is the last and considered by a lot, no doubt, as the least in the whole book of estimates.

Personally I would like to draw the attention of the House to this fact. There are seven or eight men over there. Some are crippled, laid off and they can't go outside and work in any other sphere. Now I did not get up here to make a speech on the matter and try to advertise the fact or to take up any time through advertising or anything of that nature. It is only my duty and what I owe to the men with whom I was associated on the other side to make some kind of plea on their behalf. I don't think, Mr. Chairman, that I am out of order, I just wish to submit this to the House for their consideration. A lot of people seem to have got tired of the returned soldier. They think because he is a returned soldier they have got to give him a job. And a lot of people think that the returned soldier is no good. Now I don't want to create any feeling over the matter but I do think that as there are increases in other departments, I don't see any reason why that department should be neglected.

I know that there is quite a number of men, who are returned soldiers, who are out of work in this city at the present time, and I know that people are commencing to get tired of hearing that they want jobs. Now I do not want to create any fuss over this matter, but I think that the country owes these men in the Militia Building something. The Government have increased the salaries of a great many officials in other Departments of the Civil Service, and I do not see why these officials who have done their part in civil life as well as in military life are not entitled to, at least, the same consideration. There are people in this House and outside this House and who, when the war was on, were glad to style the soldiers as great fellows; but when the war was over, to use a common expression, with your permission, Mr. Chairman, they "bobbed you to hell." In making this plea on behalf of these officials I think I got the sympathy of this House and the sympathy of this country. In the Estimates for that Department down there there is an increase of $104 a year for one man, whose name even I do not know; but I do not see why the Government should give it to one and not give it to the others who are just as much deserving of it. According to the vote for this Department, I notice that the pensions are decreased by some thirty four thousand dollars, and the cost of running the Department has increased by $104. As already stated, I was asked to make this appeal, and I think it is my duty to do it, and if I did not do it I would not be carrying out the job I was sent here to do.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, in this connection I may say that since the Estimates have been tabled I have received a communication from the Pensions Board and which, with the indulgence of the House, I would like to read. The letter is dated March 27th and I think I got it March 30th. However, the Estimates had passed through the hands of the Executive then. I may say that no votes appear in the Estimates for the two Pension Commissioners, but Mr. Howley and Mr. Pratt have been given a grant of $750 each for their services as Pension Commissioners. When this was done the Finance Minister did

not have time to put them in the Estimates.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—They are being put in now.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I may point out that this was done on the recommendation of the staff of the Pensions Department,and it shows that the staff down there are not selfish, as the following letter from the Pensions Department to me will show:

(Reads letter to House)

Their letter to the Honourable Minister of Finance reads thus:

(Read letter to House).

The table they submit is their own making up, of course, and it is only natural to suppose that the Finance Minister and the Government would take to themselves the right as to what they would give. It must be borne in mind that the work in that department will decrease as the pensions may be applied for and which is going to mean an increased amount of work. I would suggest to the Finance Minister that this matter be reconsidered. I am sure that we all appreciate the work done by the offiicials in that department, and it is our duty to see that these returned soldiers are satisfied with their lot.

MR. BROWNE—Mr. Chairman, I would like to add a few words to what has been stated on behalf of the officials in this Department. Since the Estimates were tabled I was approached by some of the clerks in that Department, and they pointed out to me the salaries they were receiving in other Departments, but that may be accounted for because of the greater variety and volume of work that has to be done in other Departments; but at the same time the officials of the Pensions Department are competent and capable of filling any positions that the Government is paying higher for in other Departments. I have very much pleasure in endorsing what has been said by the hon. and gallant member for Ferryland and the Honourable Colonial Secretary, and I trust that the matter will receive the sympathetic consideration of the Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. THE FINANCE MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say the matter of these salaries referred to by the honourable members for Ferryland, Harbour Grace and St. John's West will be included in the Additional Estimates, as the regulated Estimates were printed when this subject was brought to my attention. As has been pointed out, there has been a considerable decrease in the vote for the Pensions Department and a greater amount of work to be done by the officials there. I have no objection to paying these officials an increase, for I never had to paying a returned soldier, at least, as much salary as anybody else.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, on behalf of these men I want to thank the honourable the Finance Minister and the Government for taking this matter into their serious consideration, and I am sure that these young chaps, who did their jobs so faithfully and well five or six years ago, will appreciate it very much.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I am sure the returned soldiers will appreciate the action of Major Cashin for bringing this matter to the attention of the House. This vote we are considering, I understand, applies, with one exception, to the returned soldiers of the Pensions Department. Now it was generally understood that when the change was made in the Commissioners that one or both of the new Commissioners were going to do the work for the love of doing it, and I understand now that they are each getting a salary. The intention might have been good, but evidently the expectations in that respect were

not well-founded. I have no fault to find with paying an official, military or civil, so long as he is able to do his work properly; but the point I want to make is that if the returned soldiers employed in the Pensions Department are to be considered for increases to their salaries that the same regard should be had for the returned soldiers who are working in other Departments of the Civil Service. For instance, there is a man in the Post Office, a returned soldier, who has given just as good service as any one in the Pensions Department and his salary is reduced from $1200 a year to $846.

MR. CASHIN—That is the Chauffeur.

MR. HALFYARD—Yes; his name is Bursey. I contend that all the soldiers should get the same square deal, and that what applies to these officials in one Department should apply all round.

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 to-morrow.

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

Second reading of Legislative Disabilities Bill.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, before passing into the second reading of this Bill I may say that the object is to remedy the condition of affairs which has arisen in the past and may possibly arise again, namely that members of the House of Assembly could not occupy a seat as Government Director on the Board of the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company.

Section 2 Chap. 4 is to be amended by the addition of the following:

Section 1 of the Disabilities Act reads: (Reads)

As you are aware the Governor in Council has the power to appoint a Director on the Board of that Company as Government Representative. It has been contended that such a position should not disqualify a man from holding a seat in this House, which has been the case formerly. The object therefore is to do away with that.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, this is a very innocent looking Bill, but still there is more behind it than a casual observance would cause one to believe.

(Reads the Bill)

That means that this Bill will qualify members of this legislature to be Directors of the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company. Whether that is wise or not is a question. The appointment is one of the most important I know anything about. The Director of the Newfoundland Power and Paper Co. should be one of the best men that the country can offer. He should be a man of high standing in the first place and a man of great experience. A man who has the confidence of the country. That is for him to do the work that the country expects him to do. It is one of the most important appointments in the gift of the Government. Whether it is wise for a director of that company upon which so much depends to be also a member of the Government of the day I don't know. It may not bring the best results to the country.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—That is possible anyway. Mr. Foote had a seat in this House. He is a Government nominee. He is liable to be shifted at any time. The Government could shift him now. This House of Assembly has nothing to do with Mr. Foote. Under the Debenture Bond if the Governor at any

time decided to alter the nominee he may do so. The Company have got to accept the Government nominee.

MR. HALFYARD—I don't suppose if the Company had a satisfactory man that they would appreciate changing that man. And I don't think that it would be in the best interests of the country either. This needs some consideration, because in my opinion it would be better for any director to be clear of politics altogether. The man appointed by this Government may give good service.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Suppose for argument's sake the Government decided to elect a suitable nominee, that is all the Government can do, remedy the state of affairs that has existed and is improper.

MR. HALFYARD—I do not know the nature of the Bill at present, but think it deserves much consideration, and I do not know whether it is desirable for the Government to appoint one of their members to act as director from time to time. I do not know if it is altogether necessary to put the Bill through the second reading this afternoon. It is only being presented now. I would like to ask the Honourable Introducer if it makes any difference if the second reading is deferred until tomorrow.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—The Government is perfectly frank about it. The Government wants to be in a position that if it decides to nominate a member of this House as a director it is free to do so. Mr. Foote sat on that Board, he also sat in this House and he sat improperly. We do not want to have that situation occurring again. If we wish to nominate a member of this House on the Board of the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company we want to be in a position to do so.

Mr. Foote is not now in politics, therefore he is not disqualified. Supposing he wants to take a seat tomorrow why should we be prejudiced because he is a Government representative.

MR. HALFYARD—This country is so mixed up in politics that there is a lack of confidence when you have any member of the Government on a board as a director. Other things being equal it is better for that man not to be mixed up in politics at all.

I think that it is a very sad condition of affairs when the Government cannot treat with fair play the director of the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company because he has not been a supporter of the Government. The present director is a man of independent means and by education and experience is qualified for the position, and should not be removed for party reasons. I do not speak for Mr. Foote. I speak on the principle of appointing a member of this House to this important position.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—You seem to have changed your views quite a lot.

MR. HALFYARD—I do not know. I was not the whole Government you know. I had only one vote.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—It all depends on whose bull is gored.

MR. HALFYARD—Give me the benefit of the doubt. I am always serious. But forgetting this phase of the position, Mr. Minister of Justice, do you think that it would be alright to postpone the second reading of this bill until the next session.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Hon. member will not misunderstand me. I wish to be courteous, but if we are going to have a debate on this I think that it might take place in the committee stage. As far as the Government is concerned with this business it says simply that this has been done improperly for the past

couple of years and the act has to be changed to meet the requirements. I simply come in here at the request of the Government because it belongs to my department. We are dealing with the principle of it. Mr. Foote improperly occupied the position in our opinion. This has been the state of affairs in the past and we say that it should not be permitted to happen again. There is no sense in waiting until the same thing happens again because it would be too late. The trouble with the Hon. Member is that he does not appreciate the law, if he will excuse my saying so. We merely say that the present state of affairs will not happen again. I want to have every member of this House understand that. We are not doing any mincing about it.

MR. HALFYARD—It almost seems that you are trying to indemnify Mr. Foote. I do not know whether there will be much debate on this bill, but I think that in all fairness to the Members of the Opposition that the Government should give us the opportunity to speak to this tomorrow. I notice that it is the custom of this House at this Session to have the second reading at the same time that the bill is tabled. They have not adopted that course in the Upper House. They give every consideration to the measures that come before them, and amendments are made as a result and they are brought down here, and we have to accept them. I think that the Members of the Opposition should have the courtesy afforded them of having this thing deferred until to-morrow, and we will be in a better position to speak to it then.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, I do not think that we should mince any words in this matter. I say that the appointment of the director of the Nfld. Power and Pulp Co. should be made by the Government and should be a member of the Government if at all possible or certainly a supporter of the Government of the day. It is as reasonable to suppose that the Minister of Finance or the Minister of Marine and Fisheries or the Minister of Public Works need not to be a member of the Government as it is to say that an outsider should represent the country on this directorate. What is the representative on that directorate for? He is there to look after the interests of the country. This country is involved to the extent of ten millions with regard to this enterprise, and the articles of the association of the company provide that the Government of Newfoundland shall have the nomination of one of the directors who is to be paid by the Company and it is a matter of principle that the representative of the Government should be in as close touch with the government as it is possible for him to be. He is there for the specific purpose to see that nothing is done improperly with regard to this country and to see that this country is properly safeguarded. Therefore the man who represents the Government should certainly be in sympathy with the Government and under the control of the Government while he is representing it on that Board.

MR. HALFYARD—The position of this man is not as important as the position of the Justice of the Supreme Court.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—This representative is not the same as a member of the Supreme Court. He is not there in any judicial capacity. He is the watchman for the country and to represent the country's interests. And the man who is to represent the country should of necesity be the nominee of the Government. What did the past Government do? They immediately appointed one

of their own colleagues of the Executive Council and they should not take any exception to it now. They were perfectly right in their day. We are going to get somebody who is in sympathy with this Government. I was nauseated yesterday when hon. members were talking about politics and keeping politics out of this and out of that. If the Government is a political organization it cannot be kept out of politics. What are you here for if you do not like politics. You would thing from the way you speak that to be a politician is something to be ashamed of. I am not ashamed to be called a politician. There are good politicians and bad politicians just as there are good and bad men in every walk of life. Keep this out of politics and keep that out of politics. Why are you in politics at all if they are rotten? And I cannot subscribe to the thought that it is not right to represent the people because it is a political issue. I say that no man because he is a member of this House or a member of the Government or the Opposition has anything to be ashamed of. On the contrary he has something to be proud of. No, Mr. Speaker, I certainly endorse the position put forward by the Minister of Justice in appointing somebody to represent the Board, and we are appointing somebody to a very responsible position, and in my opinion it is not necessary to be a lawyer to be able to go on that directorate. You think that nobody knows anything but lawyers. I would like to know what lawyers know about it. There is no reason why an ordinary layman should not be able to represent us on this board just as well as a lawyer. I have seen good lawyers in this House and bad ones. Four years ago when I was in this House I sat in the seat that is occupied by Mr. Halfyard now and Mr. Higgins was next to me, and perhaps some of the Hon. Members who were in the House at the time will remember what I said. We were speaking about the Labrador Boundary, and I said that the Labrador Boundary question would never be settled as long as there were lawyers in this House. And I said when my friend Mr. Higgins was the Minister of Justice after the next general election that he would be going away some time to carry on the good work in connection with the Labrador Boundary. And I was right, and he is going away about the Labrador Boundary in due time.

MR. BROWN—And is the Colonial Secretary going too?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I am not going to say where I am going just now. Probably I will have to go over and sign the final settlement, but I will be very old, I expect, before I can do that. However, it is not that I have any objection to any lawyer acting in any capacity, but I was going on to say that we can easily get a man who is not a lawyer, who will be quite competent to do the work of director of the Nfld. Power and Paper Co. I reiterate that it is an important position, and I will also say that the present Government has had very little information given them about what is going on on that Board. It may be that the representative of the Government has had very little to tell, at any rate he has told very little. However I hope that things will so transpire that at no time will we be called upon to meet our obligations in that connection. We all hope and trust the enterprise will be entirely successful, and it behoves us all to give every help and assistance to the enterprise, and thereby help to obviate the necessity of providing for the guarantee that we are liable for.

MR. GODDEN—Mr. Speaker, might I ask the Hon. Minister of Justice

what is the amount paid for the director's fee?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I do not know. The Government does not pay it. It is paid by the Company.

MR. GODDEN—I agree with what my colleague, Mr. Halfyard, has said, that we should have overnight to consider this particular Bill. I have already said before in this House that several bills have gone through too quickly, and when they have been forwarded to get the assent of the gentlemen in the Upper House, they have sent them back to us with various amendments; and I think it would be a pity to send another one up merely to have it sent back again.

I do not see anything wrong with this particular bill just at the moment. There is very little to consider in it in point of words. It is a very short Bill, but at the same time I would like to have time to consider it, and find out if there is anything wrong, and I don't think we are asking too much.

MR. W. J. BROWNE—Mr. Speaker, I regret very much to hear this afternoon the aspersions which my friend, the Hon. Colonial Secretary, has seen fit to cast on the legal profession, and I feel quite sure that he was speaking half in jest—or rather more than half in jest when he said—"What does a lawyer know about this—what does he know about anything"—and also in the recital of his prophecy made four or five years ago that the Labrador Boundary question would never be settled as long as there was a lawyer in the House. I fear that he will have to change his mind in that respect, because, if he were correct, I think the question would never be settled. Because, as long as there are laws, and as long as there is legislation, we must have lawyers. I am standing up here principally to-day to speak on behalf of the legal profession, of which I have the honour to be a humble member.

I would like to ask the Hon. Colonial Secretary what is his interpretation of a law passed here some time ago. I wonder if he has read subsection (F) of the Schedule to the Newfoundland Power and Paper Co. Act, to which this bill refers. If he has I would like him to give his ininterpretation of this:—

> (F) That so long as the Government of Newfoundland remains under an obligation in respect of the said guarantee, and so long as any money remains due to the Government of Newfoundland by the Company, the Company will permit the Government of Newfoundland to nominate from time to time one of the directors of the Company, (herein called the "Government Director"). The Government Director shall not 'require any qualification, nor be subject to retirement by rotation during the currency of the Government guarantee, or while any money remains owing by the Company to the Government and he shall be paid by the Company such reasonable fees as the Government may from time to time require. If the Government Director dies or becomes for any reason incapable of acting, the Government shall be entitled to nominate another director to replace him as Government director."

Now that makes a provision for the case of the death of the Government director, or in case he should become incapable for any reason from acting. Does the Honourable Colonial Secretary intimate that the Honourable—or the late Honourable in the respect that he was a member of the late Executive—Mr. Foote, the Gov-

ernment Director, has become incapable of acting; or is it his interpretation of the section that the Government has a right which is not contained in the section itself;

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—It is contained in the Trust Deed.

MR. BROWNE—But this does not refer to the Trust Deed. This refers to the persons mentioned in the Bill bbefore the House at the present time. I have not seen the Trust Deed. What is the necessity of our bringing in this Bill here to indemnify a member or to make it essential that there should be a section in the Act in reference to legislative disabilities, because he happens to be the Government Director. What is the necessity of that if he is appointed only at the nomination of the Government? This Company is a private Company, and its directorate a private body. Might I ask the Hon. Minister of Justice do we pay a portion of the salary, to make it necessary to have a Bill to prevent his being disabled from sitting in the House. He is not paid by the Government, and then he is not a servant of the Government; and, as I understand this matter, he does not seem to be in the pay or service of the Government, as, for example, the Head of a Department. The Head of a Department, under the Legislative Disabilities Act has to seek re-election, to see if the people are opposed to his appointment to that position. If we bring in this Bill, will the Director, who is appointed if he is a member of the House, have to seek re-election? As it stands at the present time, I think that it is not necessary to bring in this Bill, and I must say that I agree with what has been said by Mr. Godden in this respect—that the matter should not be put through immediately; because we have seen that Bills which have even received a great deal of consideration in this House, have gone to the Upper House, and have been turned down, upside down and inside out. I have nothing to say with regard to the contentions of the honourable member who introduced this Bill, but I have a great deal to say with regard to what has happened to certain Bills which have gone through this House, and have been considered subsequently in another place.

We are the representatives of the people, and we ought to give to the matters that come before us sufficient consideration, so that when they go before the Upper Chamber they will not need much qualification. The opinions which we express are the opinions of the people of the country. That is the interpretation which I put upon the representation which I am here for; and I feel that when matters come before us, we should consider them seriously and carefully, and if any honourable member has any suggestions to offer, I think that we should consider them; and they should not be ridiculed whether they come from this side of the House or the other. How is it that Honourable members in the other House are able . . . . .

MR. SPEAKER—I do not wish to interrupt the Honourable member, but I think that these continued references to the deliberation and conduct of the other chamber are out of order.

MR. BROWNE—I bow to your ruling, Mr. Speaker. I was referring to this Bill, and I pointed out that we should give it such consideration that we will not be humiliated as we have been in the past. That is all I wish to point out this afternoon.

I have no other criticism to offer. This is not intended for criticism, but as a defence. It is only because I happen to be a member of the legal profession that these questions strike me from a legal point of view. As

the Hon. Minister of Justice seems to have given this matter some consideration I would like to hear his answers to these matters.

The Second Reading of the Bill was deferred.

Second Reading of Income Tax Amendment Act.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Speaker, and Honourable Members of the House of Assembly, this Bill—as you are all aware—has been on the order paper for some days. There was a previous Bill which was moved off the order paper, and this new act is an act to repeal the Income Tax Act. This new Act will provide for a Bank Tax, an Absentee Landlord tax, and an insurance Companies tax.

I just want to say in connection with this Bill that after grave and thoughtful consideration, the Government decided to do away with the income tax in the interests of the country. I do not think that I need say any more, and I would ask that this Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker, I would like to say the same thing in connection with this Bill that has been said in connection with the preceding one. I do not think that we should have this Bill go to the second reading until we have had time to consider it. I do not wish to delay the House unduly, but the fact of the matter is that we have not yet had time to read the Bill over.

Second reading deferred.

Second Reading of Bill "An Act to Amend Chapter 74 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of Old Age Pensions."

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of explaining the Act now before the House—not because any explanation is necessary, as the few words in the Bill are self explanatory. I mentioned the other afternoon when presenting a petition from the people of Bonavista proper that at a meeting at that place about twelve months ago an old gentleman got up and made the suggestion that the pension should be carried on to the widow after the man died, and he instanced many cases of a pathethic nature where the woman who had borne the heat and burden of the day with her husband, was left alone for several years after the man died at the age of perhaps 78 or 80. The pension is only $50 a year, but in the outports it is useful in assisting the person to get through life, and I felt that night when that old gentleman spoke much more eloquently and affectionately then I can in putting the matter before the House, that it was my duty to bring the subject to the attention of the Legislature. I feel that it is not necessary to say much more, as I believe the members on both sides of the House understand the Bill and will not question its principle, and therefore I think—without any idea whatever of rushing it through its different stages—that it would be a compliment to the Bill if it were now read a second time and allowed to go to Committee. I wish we could see our way clear to also put the single ladies on the pension list, but we do not know yet how the grant will affect the country's finances. The amount however cannot be much as there cannot be many old widows of pensioners so left and I have hope of seeing a scheme worked up at some future date whereby we may be able to do something for the spinsters also. I feel that when the lady members get in the House their efforts will result in something being evolved whereby the women will be given the pension whether married or not, but first of all we must deal with the widow who has been the companion of the pen-

sioner all through the years. I have much pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of the Bill.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker, in reference to this I must say the Hon. the Prime Minister and the Government are to be congratulated on bringing in a Bill of this kind. There is little doubt that when the pensioner dies his wife should receive something. The matter of the age limit I think can be taken up in Committee, and I am glad now to support the motion for the second reading of the Bill and to congratulate the Hon. the Prime Minister in bringing it before the House.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Speaker, this is a Bill to the principle of which I believe every member of the House will give concurrence, and I take this oppor'unity to congratulate the Hon. the Prime Minister on introducing it. Those who have conducted a canvass in the outports will remember that they have often come across such cases of distress as this measure will in some way relieve. While we are on the Bill and dealing with the principle of looking after the old ladies, may I draw attention to a matter which is the cause of much discussion along the West Coast and in Fortune Bay. In that section we have what are termed young widows. We all know we have young and old widows, but up there when a man is lost on the Banks or drowned he often leaves a widow with several young children. Were it not for the Marine Disasters Fund these would be badly off as the widows have to work to support the children. These are the class who are called young widows and they get only $4 or $5 a quarter. Distinct from these are the women of 50 or 60 years of age who probably have a son or daughter to support them, and these are in a different position from the women who are left with helpless children, as they get the same amount from the Government, and I have been asked repeatedly to try and do something in the matter. While I was in the Government I endeavoured to do something and I think it should be possible to increase the amount granted these widows with helpless children. The amount would not be much as the Marine Disasters Fund gives assistance, but I trust the matter will be taken up and I feel that it will receive the whole-hearted support of the members on both side of the House.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 74 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series) entitled 'Of Old Age Pensions'" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Second reading of Bill "An Act Respecting the Records of Pure Bred Animals."

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE—Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this Bill I may say that it is the result of prolonged agitation on the part of farmers in the vicinity of St. John's and other parts of the country. I have found the farmers who have visited my department unanimous on the matter of having some legislation passed, so that when they go to the expense of importing animals which are desirable in their work they will have them registered. In 1919 the Hon. Dr. Campbell made an attempt in this direction and provided some machinery for the carrying out of the same, but he failed to ask the House to put this machinery in working order. At present many animals are being imported and we should enact the Bill to register them. It would not entail any great expenditure, as we do not propose to work out such an elaborate scheme

as they have in Canada. I think it could be put into operation by the employees of my department without any additional expense. It will be noticed that cows, bulls, sheep and other animals come under the scope of the Bill. Some time ago Mr. Bowring visited my office and told me that he had made a sale of a Newfoundland pup to a friend in Montreal at the price of $75. He said that he was making a business of the raising of these dogs. He had sent the animal to Montreal with the understanding that he could have it registered here, but there was no machinery in the department to have that done. The purchaser as soon as he received the dog wrote back for the certifiicate, but there was no machinery to permit me to issue such even though I had known that the animal was thoroughbred. Mr. Harold Macpherson, who is also interested in the raising of Newfoundland dogs, informed me that he had had similar trouble. Many people here and in the outports are breeding these dogs at good prices—$75 is a good figure for a dog—and there is a big demand for them in the States, Canada and other countries. I think that every member on both sides of the House knows as much about this matter as I do. I stated shortly after I assumed office that I did not profess to be an agriculturist, but I think that after they have read the Bill, and with my brief explanation, they will be fully aware of the need of having the registration called for, provided. Since I have entered the office of Agriculture & Mines I have had numerous requests from farmers on the West Coast and at other places for these certificates.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker: We have had only a few minutes to read through this Bill, and after hearing the explanation of the Minister I think the objects are good, and I do not see anything in it that we can object to. But I would like to advise the Minister to take care that he hears tell of this Bill again because some time ago he brought in here three Bills, which, after passing this Chamber, lost their way somewhere, so I hope he will take the precaution of guiding this one along.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity afforded me by the honourable Leader of the Opposition, and I join with him in condemning the attitude taken towards those three Bills, and I propose to move for the return of them. I stated here when introducing them that they were not mine. They were placed in my hands on the same afternoon that I introduced them, and I was told by the Auditor General that they were essential for the proper Auditing of the Department. That was the only explanation I could give and that was the only explanation I did give the House on that occasion. I discovered since that the Auditor General decided that the Bills were not as necessary as he thought at first, and for that reason the Bills died in the Upper House. I am sponsoring this Bill this afternoon and if it does die I want to be at the burial.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Records of 'Pure Bred Animals'" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committe 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 to-morrow afternoon at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, April 8th, 1925.

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

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay on the table of the House the reply to a question asked on the Order Paper of yesterday by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Warren gave notice of question.

Mr. Grimes gave notice of question.

Mr. Scammell gave notice of question.

Pursuant to notice, Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs moved the House into a Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Chairman.—In my Maiden Speech on Ways and Means last year, I expressed great diffidence in approaching the subject. I explained that the short time at my disposal rendered it necessary for me to adopt the Estimates prepared for the Session by my predecessor, and made it very hard for me to speak with any degree of confidence and with a personal knowledge of conditions.

I therefore asked the indulgence of Honourable Members for any shortcomings they may have found in that Speech. May I say, however, that although I have not attained my first birthday as the Colony's Treasurer, I yet feel more competent to address you on this occasion.

Last year I estimated a Revenue of $8,467,000.00 for the fiscal year 1923-1924 as against $9,150,000.00 anticipated by my predecessor, Hon. Mr. Cave. The actual amount collected was $8,401,669.00

As against this Revenue, there was an Expenditure on current account of $10,022,137.45 for the same period. My estimate of last year placed the Expenditure at $10,041,600.00 or $19,462.55 more than was actually expended. I really underestimated this expenditure by the sum of $78,302.85 as the following extract from the report of the Auditor General will show. He says on Page Thirteen:

"Had the rule that all expenditure should be contained in the year in which the liability had been incurred, been observed, and I have to report **that it was not,** the deficit for 1923-1924 would have been much larger. I find that the following amounts properly chargeable to the 1923-1924 accounts, were charged against the votes for 1924-1925 thus necessitating a larger Supplementary Supply for the latter year than would otherwise have been required:

Public Charities .. .. ..$	9,554.55
Pensions Board	836.85
Agriculture and Mines	677.25
Customs	323.35
Public Works	9,574.45
Posts and Telegraphs ..	36,798.95
Audit Act for Relief . ..	40,000.00
	$97,765.40

In other words we must add the sum of $97,765.40 to the actual expenditure given on Page one, namely, $10,022,-137.45, equalling $10,119,902.85, or as I said above, $78,302.85 more than was estimated.

After censuring the several departmental officials concerned, the Auditor General concludes by saying that the deficit on 1923-1924 account instead of being $1,620,468.36 would have been $1,718,233.76 had these sums been charged to the proper year.

The bald effect of this, financially, is that the actual deficit on current account for 1923-1924 is not really the correct one.

Moreover, besides clerically reducing the deficit of the late administration, it actually increased the expenses of the present Government by the amount thus wrongly charged. To

put it into plain language, bills to the amount of $97,765.40 for expenditures incurred by late Governments have been charged to the Monroe administration according to the official report of the Auditor General as tabled in this House; that is to say, $57,765.40 on ordinary current services and $40,000.00 under Special Warrant of the Audit Act.

Turning here to Mr. Cave's Budget, I find that his estimated surplus of $143,846.00 for 1923-1924 becomes in reality a deficit of $1,620,468.36 plus the unpaid bills just referred to. All that my colleagues can say is that the blame is not ours; nevertheless we had to shoulder it and provide means for its payment in last year's Loan Act, which provision by the way is some twenty thousand dollars short of actual requirements.

I do not deem it advisable to detain the House with any further comment on the Revenue and Expenditure for the year 1923-1924. This Government had nothing whatsoever to do with these finances, and any extravagances or erros that may have been committed by late governments in connection with that year, can be left to History. Sufficient for me to say that all the detailed criticism I had to make in this respect is contained in my Budget Speech of last year.

1924-1925.

Let us now turn to a prospect which I am convinced my Honourable friends will consider as holding a far brighter outlook than could be hoped for when I presented the Budget last year. I refer to our financial condition as disclosed by the accounts of the Colony for the current year so far as it has gone. The outlook as I see it for the remainder of the current year seems to be even more satisfactory than the eight months last past. As proof of this, the Customs Revenue figures to March 1924-1925 show an increase of, approximately, $180,000.00 over the same month in 1923-1924.

The following is a comparative statement of revenue collected up to the 28th of February in each year for the years 1923-1924 and 1924-1925:—

.. ..	$4,412,329.99	$4,967.182.02
	1923-1924	**1924-1925**
Customs Duties	28.771.35	26.512.31
Light Dues	760.00	702.50
Harbor Dues	23.920.74	80,395.40
Customs Miscellaneous Revenue	15,586.09	5,395.62
Customs Export Duty	———	74,202.13
Ore Royalties	166,563.86	186,746.14
Postal Revenue	98,343.08	123,796.70
Telegraph Revenue	49,045.96	108,639.33
Crown Lands Revenue	28,602.80	28,206.74
Inland Revenue Stamps	119,243.20	51,662.56
Liquor Revenue	3,394.18	3,803.11
Fines and Forfeitures	1,744.81	3,218.53
Broom Department, Penitentiary, ...	26,387.55	27,714.38
Fees Public Institutions	200,453.61	183,618.60
Income Tax & Profits Tax Arrears	27,295.41	12,031.29
Miscellaneous—General Revenue	———	———
	$5,202,442.61	$5,883,827.36
		5,202,442.61
		———
Increased Revenue for eight months		$ 681,384.75
		———

I think I have every reason to congratulate the Colony upon its excellent recuperative powers as reflected by the above statement. It is nothing more or less than I predicted in my Budget of July 28th last. The result is particularly gratifying when we take into consideration the adverse influence that the reduction in the tariff must have had upon Customs receipts.

I feel it is only right to state that the revenue as shown by the above statement contains the following amounts which were due in previous years but not collected until this Government assumed office:—

Dominion Iron and Steel, for arrears of Royalties on Ore (1921)	$74,202.13
Old arrears collected on account of goods released from Bonded Warehouses (Customs)	20,581.18
Current arrears on account of goods released from Customs Bonded Warehouses	29,755.30
Arrears collected on account of goods released on Temporary Customs Permits ..	38,647.24
Amounts collected on account of Outstanding Customs' Bonds	23,963.32
Amounts collected on account of goods undervalued and short on appraisal ..	22,051.40
	$209,200.57

Some balances also were collected by the Assessor of Taxes which were due from the previous year but as these arrears are paid in every year, the current year's revenue did not profit therefrom to a greater extent than usual.

With regard to the first item on the above list: this sum has been due the Colony since 1921 and, notwithstanding the repeated reports of the Auditor General on the subject, no effort had apparently been made by previous Governments to collect it. Shortly after taking office my attention was called to this indebtedness and after some correspondence between myself and the British Empire Steel Corporation a settlement was reached resulting in the full payment of the royalties due.

The second item on the list represents old outstanding duties on goods taken irregularly from the bonded warehouses some as far back as 1915. I discovered that in many instances goods had been withdrawn from the Government warehouses without the payment of duty collectable thereon and frequently without reference to the records. The result of the enquiries instituted by me into this Department, netted to the Revenue of the Colony the sum of $20,581.19 Number three is an item improperly termed current areas and represents the release of goods from Bond by certain firms, who, it is alleged, made it a practice to settle weekly or monthly. This netted the sum of $29,755.30. There is nothing to be found in the Customs Act to vindicate this procedure so I have ordered its discontinuance.

Another illustration of the neglect to properly and promptly collect the Colony's revenue, was the release of goods on Temporary Permits and the failure to subsequently redeem these permits by the securing of payment. We collected through the enforcement of the payment of duty on goods so released, the sum of $38,647.24 to-date. I am glad to be able to say that the redemption of these Permits is going on every month. Those that are still outstanding are small as compared with the amount collected, and they are in process of collection. The whole question of Temporary Permits is now settled for such time at all events as I shall have the honour of sitting in the Custom House as Departmental Head. With the excep-

tion of such goods as are perishable, no Temporary Permits are being issued by the Department to anyone. It is hardly necessary for me to point out that the issue of these Temporary Permits (except in the case of perishable goods) was absolutely illegal. It is quite evident, also, that those in authority in the Custom House in the past did not know the Customs Act or were indifferent about its carrying out.

Of the balance of $119,024,29 remaining due at the close of the last financial year on account of Customs Bonds, the sum of $23,963.32 has been collected. This leaves an amount of $95,061.96 still outstanding on this account. Every effort is being made by the Government to collect this balance, but I feel certain that the House will appreciate the position that the Government has taken in connection with these outstanding Bonds. Some of the firms can ill-afford to make full and immediate payment of the amounts due and it is not thought desirable to put undue pressure on individuals who are perfectly willing but yet unable to, under present conditions, make immediate payment. Time has been given to settle up; some are paying by instalment, and I have very little doubt that eventually most of them will be paid in full. A loss will certainly occur through the insolvency of some of the firms and, although the Government has preferential claims against them, the realization on their estates will not be sufficient to satisfy the indebtedness. In connection with the extension of bonds beyond due date, it seems to me that poor administrative judgment was shown. The procedure that should have been adopted to my mind was to refuse the giver of a dishonoured bond any extension of time. What did happen, however, was that although the bonds of the persons concerned had been dishonoured,—they were given renewals and extension of the dishonoured bonds—they were still permitted to issue new bonds. One firm whose indebtedness to the Customs ran as high as $50,000.00 in these bonds, was still further accommodated in the sum of $10,000.00, although his neighbours on either hand had to go hat in hand to the Banks for similar accommodation, and were often refused although holding better securities than the firm referred to. The whole Bond question to my mind was a case of discrimination of the most glaring kind. The amount outstanding on these Bonds at the present time is $49,583.58, some of which will never be collected.

Another avenue of escape from the payment of duties was that opened up by the submission of false invoices and carelessness in the examination and appraisal of goods. Enquiry into this fully proved to me that the presentation of false invoices was a frequent occurrence, especially in certain quarters.

I may cite for the information of the House one particular case in which the delinquent tendered a cheque for the sum of twenty thousand dollars in settlement of short paid duties.

There was another instance of goods being delivered on a Temporary Permit which came under my notice. The goods were delivered in the month of June and in the month of August this particular firm presented invoices covering the same shipment of dry goods to the amount of $948.61. My demand to see the goods for appraisement purposes was met with the answer that they were sold. Upon presentation of the invoice for $948.61, we taxed the goods on a value of $3,000.00 on which sum duty was paid.

As a third illustration, certain goods were invoiced in one of the outport stations at $375.00, and upon appraisement duty was collected on $1,450.00. The total saving on these

three items alone amounted to $21,-656.29, in cash but the effect is I imagine reflected in the phenomenal increase in the Customs duties both in St. John's and the Outports during the year.

In connection with the direct possible loss on the above three items, had the duty not been collected, I may say that my action in connection with the latter two meant a saving of $1,656.29. With regard to the first item, that is to say the collection of the $20,000.00 cheque, it is impossible to say what the Colony's total loss really amounted to, as the payment was a compromise one as already pointed out.

While I cannot attest to the fact, at the same time I am reasonably certain that millions must have been lost to the revenue of the Colony during the past 20 years through the presentation of false invoices and the undervaluing of goods generally. There has been a regrettable absence of details as to the contents of packages which have undergone examination, as a result of which the Long Room officials have often had to take too much for granted when entries were passing through in respect of appraised goods.

Before leaving the subject of the present year's revenue and dealing with expenditure, I wish to ask the attention of the House to an item in the Auditor General's report, Page 8 Here appears a summary of arrears of revenue due the Colony on June 30th, 1924, amounting to the considerable sum of $924,541.82, as follows:—

Assessor of Taxes	$321,587.32
Agriculture and Mines . ..	350,907.66
Posts & Telegraphs	88,665.08
Finance Department	52,335.86
Public Works Department	15,230.70
Justice Department	578.23
Marine and Fisheries	175.00
Customs Department	95,061.97
	$924.541.82

Prominent among these arrears is the sum due the Tax Assessor of $321,-287.32. Every effort has been made to collect the amounts due on this account and at the present moment it is engaging my attention. A very large number of persons have not sent in their returns. It is impossible therefore for the Tax Assessor to say definitely the actual amount due the Colony on account of Business Profits and Income Tax arrears. This was felt to be an inequitable state of affairs because of the fact that many people who were taxable under the Act have escaped for years while the ordinary salaried employee had to pay promptly on due date. It was so unfair in this respect that the Government removed the Act from the Statute Book. I may say, however, that steps are being taken to enforce the payment of these arrears.

The Agricultural and Mines shows a balance of arrears due of $350,907.-00. Of this sum, $313,000.00 is on account of leases issued on the disputed territory on the Labrador. I am quite in accord with the recommendation of the Auditor General that these leases should automatically lapse when the rents are not paid and the lands for which money is owed revert to the Crown. The sum of $37,500.00 is due for royalties or for "stumpage," as it is generally called. In the main this is owed by owners of small sawmills and the Government has placed the amounts in the hands of lawyers for collection.

In the Posts and Telegraphs Department there is an amount of $88,-000.00 due on account of the following:—

Money Orders	$37,000.00
Postage Stamps	8,000.00
Telegraphs Outports	22,000.00
Telegraphs City	21,000.00
	$88,000.00

Pressure was brought to bear with

a view to the settlement of these accounts and I am glad to say that they have practically all been paid up. Some balances must necessarily be carried by outport offices to meet money order advices and calls for stamps. A considerable amount of these arrears are due the Telegraphs by city firms and these are collectable. But there are others outstanding in the City Ledger which will, I fear, have to be charged to the Profit and Loss Account of the Colony.

There are considerable amounts owing, also, in respect of the shortages discovered in Outport offices, an investigation of which was instituted by me after a tour of inspection last Fall. These matters are now in the hands of the Justice Department and will no doubt be adjudicated upon in due course. This matter of shortages has been found so serious and far-reaching that the Government felt it necessary to appoint auditing inspectors, whose duty it will be to visit and examine all offices without warning. Under the old system it was impossible to tell, through lack of proper inspection, the condition of any office financially, at any given time.

The Finance Department is owed the sum of $36,282.22 (including interest) by the St. John's Gas Light Company on account of an advance made by the Squires' Government in 1921, for coal. This matter is now being dealt with by the Executive Government. The sum of $2,761.64 is due by the Imperial Cable Service for balance due on Cable Taxes from the 5th November, 1920, to June 30th, 1924. The sum of $13,312.00 is owed by the Harbor Grace Water Company, made up as follows:—Eleven years' interest on $13,700 00 worth of the Company's stock held by the Government at $548 00 per annum, plus eight years' interest on $20,100.00 worth of four per cent stock held by the Newfoundland Savings' Bank at $804.00 per annum, plus loan of $852.00 to pay interest on November, 1923.

The Public Works Department is owed $15,096.00 on account of fees due by sundry persons for Hospital treatment; also $134.70 by the Penitentiary for sale of brooms, etc.

I think it would be advisable here, in connection with the arrears of revenue, to refer to the matter of unpaid dues due the General Hospital. The Auditor General in his report of last year refers to this matter on Page 39 as follows:—

> "Then with regard to the General Hospital it is only necessary for me to state that of the $39,531.96 received for fees during the year ended June 30th last, $27,639.00 was paid by the Department of Public Charities for patients who stated they were unable to pay the modest charge of $1.00 per day for medical attendance, board and (in many cases) operations."

And again in the present year's report he makes the following comment:—

> "It is only necessary to say that two-thirds of the patients admitted to the General Hospital are admitted under applications made in **forma-pauperis.** As to the so-called paying patients, a glance at the list of unpaid fees, mostly collectible, would lead to the belief that the number of paying patients bears but a very small proportion to the number admitted for treatment."

This statement appears somewhat contradictory inasmuch as he infers that the total revenue will lose, but there is a truth behind the argument which I imagine is this: We pay into one Pocket of the Exchequer what we take from the other, namely, the Expenditure side of the account, and what we actually collect from real paying sources is negligible.

To illustrate this fact: On looking

over the account in the Estimates for Hospital Fees, I find that the amount voted for this service of $25,000.00 is overdrawn nearly $5,000. This means that we spend at least $30.000.00 on account of pauper relief which properly should have been paid by people often able to pay but wont. That this is wrong is quite evident, but as a Commission has been appointed by the Executive Government to enquire into matters pertaining to the Department of Charities and the charitable institutions, I reserve comment. As already pointed out, we find the Poor Commissioner paying two-thirds of the bills besides a considerable sum from the Naval and Military Pensions Board, and yet there are arrears to the extent of $15,000.00 approximately, owed by persons well able to pay.

The amount of $578.23 due the Department of Justice on June 30th last represents fines imposed by Magistrates. I understand that most of these have since been paid if not all, and Boiler Inspectors' Fees $175.00 are due the Marine and Fisheries Department; some as far back as 1920.

It seems to me that if proper attention had been paid to the enforcement of these arrears in the past, or, rather, if prompt action had been taken instead of a dependence upon promises to pay, a large amount would unquestionably have been collected; but ,as we are all aware, the steady accumulation of a debt makes for greater difficulty in its eventual payment.

This exhausts what I have to say on the subject of these arrears and the general revenue of the Colony for the period under consideration.

We shall now turn to its expenditure up to the date of the last figures available, viz., February 28th last. The following statement shows the expenditure of the Colony on current account for the eight months of 1924-1925 as compared with the same period of the previous year:—

	1923-1924	1924-1925
Interest on Public Debt	$1,480,218.35	$1,445,836.25
Civil Government	325,372.40	311,705.83
Pensions Civil, Military, Old Age	476,820.31	507,548.99
Administration of Justice	358,824.59	316,000.46
Legislation	10,049.13	27,119.01
Education	533,850.00	537,690.92
Public Charities	755,228.32	675,160.21
Agriculture and Mines	50,325.52	32,759.39
Marine and Fisheries	183,611.67	194,862.11
Public Works	175,585.28	170,271.97
Posts and Telegraphs	945,823,84	899,559.45
Customs	331,638.60	353,933.39
General Contingencies	90,736.74	43,698.25
Elections	22,128.87	7,256.35
Shipping Department (in aid)	25,000.00	———
Audit Act Sec. 33 (b)	171,359.41	48,400.71
	$5,765,213.62	$5,523,402.58

Honourable Members will gather from the above statement of expenditure that a reduction of $364,769.74 has occurred in favour of the present year. This result is most gratifying and the satisfaction of the Govern-

ment at the reduction is not unwarranted.

With regard to expenditure, it will be remembered that in my last Budget I pointed out the great necessity, if we were to make ends meet, or adopting some measures to ensure the enforcement of economy by the several departments. In this connection I may say that the introduction of the pre-audit in certain paying departments has been a step in the right direction. It was very helpful in effecting the reduction above mentioned as it has helped put the curb on extravagance and acted generally as a deterrent.

And here I must express my thanks to departmental heads for their co-operation in this respect and, generally, with regard to the finances of their respective departments. They have been of great assistance and it would have been impossible to attain those more than satisfactory results without their capable and willing help. As is doubtless well known, much indifference has for years been shown in the matter of departmental economy. The Audit Department (while it noted and reported) was unable to provide the remedy; it could do nothing beyond report irregularities to the Legislature. While on the audit I cannot let this opportunity pass without giving especial thanks to the Ministers of Posts and Telegraphs, Public Works, Marine and Fisheries and Agriculture and Mines (as heads of the departments in which pre-audit has been instituted) for their active and willing co-operation in assisting me at all times.

Under the pre-audit, before payment is made that Auditor has to pass the voucher and initial the cheque in payment thereof. Furthermore, he is compelled by the Act to refuse payment in respect of any account overdrawn. We hope to include the other paying departments in the pre-audit later on, for the reason that it acts as a sort of brake in the matter of expenditure; secondly, it sees that the intentions of the Legislature are carried out in effect; and, thirdly, it ensures the fact that no vote of the Legislature may be overdrawn without Executive sanction, and, even in the latter contingency, this House is acquainted of the fact by the Auditor General in his annual reports.

Reviewing the above statement of expenditure, I again call the attention of the House to the fact that according to Mr. Berteau's report quoted by me, we had to pay legacies left by the late administration amounting to, roundly, $100,000.00 chargeable to current account only. To go further I would say that we also had to pay for the ill-advised recommendations of the late Government on capital or loan account; but as this has been referred to in my Speech of last year, it will not be necessary to make further comment here. As I pointed out already, that if, on the other hand, we benefitted to the extent of $209,209.57 by the addition of amounts due but not collected in the past, I have this much to say, that it was due entirely to the efforts of this Government that we did collect the amount referred to. And I am firmly convinced that but for the firm policy adopted by the Monroe Government these debts would never have been collected. On the other hand, the bills left unpaid when we took office had to be met and we had no option but to pay.

Apart from the sums that I have already noted, the Monroe Government had to shoulder the responsibility for the following indebtedness of the Colony, viz:

Balance unpaid of Pit Prop Account	$180,000.00
Housing Scheme, Guarantee and Interest	60,000.00
Militia Department expenditure from September 22, 1922, up to time of closing	90,000.00

Due Imperial Government for fitting up "Lobelia", "Watchful" and "Daisy"	80.000.00
Expenditure in connection with Baloons	5,000.00
Short voted in the 1924 Loan on account of deficit on current account for 1923-1924	20,500.00
In round numbers	$435,500.00

The only means I see of paying off this indebtedness is to collect all we can by the sale of the houses built under the Housing Scheme and to pay the rest by economies on our current account.

LOAN ACCOUNT EXPENDITURE.

I am glad to be able to report also that we have spent considerably less on Loan Account during the eight months under observation as compared with what our predecessors expended during the same period. This will be seen by the following statement:—

EXPENDITURE ON LOAN ACCOUNT FOR EIGHT MONTHS OF FISCAL YEARS 1923-1924; 1924-1925.

	1923-1924	1924-1925
Ablebodied Poor Relief	$133,391.52	————
Marine Works	77,087.76	52,973.42
Roads and Bridges	619,174.63	280,990.71
Normal School	200,000.00	————
Railway (in aid of)	281,898.44	————
New Steamer	————	284,133.30
Registration of Graves	————	20,450.30
Loan to City Council	————	11,129.00
In aid of Patriotic Association	————	2,500.00
	$1,311,552.35	$652,176.73
	652,176.73	
Decrease of	$ 659,375.62	

From this comparison Honourable Members cannot fail to draw the conclusion that the Government have exercised the strictest economy in making allocations on Loan Account during the current year. Such expenditures as have been made for 1924-1925 as shown above, were incurred for absolutely necessary requirements, the need for which was carefully considered by the Government before the expenditure was authorized.

Considering now the balance sheet as between Revenue and Expenditure for the period indicated, that is to say from July 1st, 1924 to February 28th, 1925; our revenue amounted to $5,883,827.36 and our expenditure to $5,571,803.29 In comparison with 1923-1924 we received as revenue 681,384.75 more and we spent $364,769.74 less than in the same period last year

Adding our increase in revenue to the decrease in current expenditure, we find an advantage to the Colony of the sum of $1,046,154.49 in eight months only.

But this is not all, for we have yet to add the decrease in Loan or Capital expenditure As shown on page 16 this amounted to the tremendous sum of $659,375.62.

To sum up, therefore, we find that the result of the present Government's economic policy works out at a total saving to the Colony of $1,705,530.11 as compared with last year. These are the actual official figures and I can

truly assure this House that it gives me the greatest gratification to present them as I have no doubt they will be received by the Legislature and the Colony generally.

It will be noticed moreover, in connection with this eight months comparison, that including the half-year's Interest ending December 31st paid in February last, the current account of the Colony already shows a surplus of $312,024.07 for the period under observation.

A consideration of the future points to the fact that this satisfactory condition of affairs will not only continue but improve. Arguing from the results of the last eight months, and taking into consideration the continually increasing revenue receipts from Customs and other sources, I am fully convinced that the end of the year will show a substantial surplus, the first brought into this House since 1919-1920. I anticipate the revenue for the completed financial year 1924-1925 to realize $9,453,000.00 made up as follows, viz:—

Customs Revenue	$7,800,000.00
Postal Revenue	310,000.00
Telegraph Revenue	215,000.00
Crown Lands Rents, etc..	145,000.00
Inland Revenue Stamps ..	45,000.00
Fines and Forfeitures ..	6,000.00
Liquor Profits	100,000.00
Income Tax Receipts	360,000.00
Fees Public Institutions..	55,000.00
Broom Dept. Penitentiary	8,500.00
Interest on Guaranteed Loans	86,500.00
Estate Duties	45,000.00
Bank Tax	127,000.00
Taxes and Assessments ..	70,000.00
Miscellaneous — General Revenue	80,000.00
	$9,453,000.00

Against these Revenue figures, I set the current expenditure of the Colony on current account for the full financial year at $9,177,503.00. This leaves a balance in favor of the Colony for 1924-25 of $275,497.00, and I may add that the figures given above are conservative to a fine degree.

Peradventure there may be some pessimists who in view of previous Budgets brought down in this House, think that my hopes will not be realized, but as I said the figures are conservative and I base them on the following ideas:—

COD FISHERY

One of the most important reasons for the above favourable condition of affairs I attribute to the firm price of fish, and I think it helped largely in the general result. The price of our staple article increased considerably over the previous season. The price of soft cured Labrador reached $8.00 in the local market, while the shore cured article fetched as high as $11.00 per quintal. The total catch last year amounted to 1,100,000 quintals and the difference between this quantity and the export figures of 1,264,674 quintals is represented by old stocks, stocks in hand at the close of the fiscal year and the quantity of fish used in home consumption. Seven hundred thousand quintals of this was shore or dry fish and four hundred thousand quintals, Labrador. The official value of the 1924 catch is placed at $8,483,735.00.

Speaking generally of the codfishery, the Department reports that at the opening of the 1923-1924 fishing season the fishermen were depressed by the low prices prevailing for a few years past. The low prices anticipated and the high cost of outfitting naturally led them to believe that it was impossible to make any profit at the industry. For this reason a considerable number of them did not prosecute the fisheries but availed themselves of other employment on the land. This was readily obtainable at Corner Brook, Deer Lake and other industrial centres. It is noted also that a

marked increase in the number of foreign fish merchants which have visited Newfoundland and bought direct in the local market, took place. These buyers would of course have the effect of stiffening the price in the local market, but I am of opinion that the enhanced price was the result of improved trading conditions together with increased confidence in the present administration. As in trade generally exchange conditions had a depressing effect in fish shipping circles, but this is a trouble we see adjusting itself daily in the money markets of the world.

Until recently very little has been definitely known as to the value of refined cod liver oil as a medicine. The following extract, taken from a publication by Professor Hess, gives us some idea of the wonderful results obtained from its use:—

"It is now generally recognized that cod liver oil is a specific for the prevention of rickets, and in this respect may be compared to the value of quinine in relation to malaria or of mercury in the treatment of syphillis."

The authority for the above statement is a man eminent in the world of medicine, and it is admitted by experts and proved by application that the Newfoundland Cod Liver Oil is richer in vitamines than all others the world over.

The export fell over nine thousand gallons last year, from 50,962 gallons to 41,389 gallons, but the price obtained for the article increased slightly.

Propaganda in respect of Child Welfare has been broadcasted in recent years ,and in view of the above statement and the source from which it came, I am of opinion that the refined cod liver oil industry will be an annually increasing source of revenue to the Colony.

I would recommend a concerted effort on the part of those interested to increase production. Publicity should be encouraged and every means possible taken to educate people of the neighbouring continent as to the facts. We read of fake medicines from which, through incessant advertising, millions have been made; and surely if dependence can be placed upon unimpeachable authority and the proper publicity campaign instituted by the exporters interested, the right and unquestionably superior article will become universally used. In this connection I have been informed that a local firm is making every effort to open a market in America, and I am of opinion that given publicity and careful inspection, our exports in oils should show a tremendous increase in future years.

LOBSTER FISHERY.

The question of the rapid decline of the Lobster Fishery presented a problem which had to be seriously and promptly dealt with by the Government. Recognizing the importance the Fishery Board, after due deliberation, recommended a close season for three years, dating from January, 1925.

As will be seen from the official figures relating to this industry, to be found in the statements appended to this Speech, the Lobster Export Trade has dropped from 26,047 cases valued at, approximately, $500.000.00 in 1912-1913 to 6,923 cases valued at $170,618.00 in 1923-1924. In the light of these figures and on the recommendation of the Fisheries Board, the Government introduced the Bill for close season which has become law.

While this law may be considered harsh and arbitrary by people who are, or consider themselves, adversely affected, the conservation of the Lobster Fishery as a whole had to be considered if we were not to be faced with the absolute extinction of the lobster in our waters.

I may add that according to the report submitted by the Fisheries Department, the 1923-1924 lobster

catch is one of the lowest on record, and those who claim to know place the responsibility on the fall pack of the previous year for which special permission had been given.

CANNING OF FISH PRODUCTS.

While on this subject, I think it well to inform the House that the Government has under consideration the matter of promoting the canning of fish goods. The idea is to have the fish packed at central depots under supervision of the departmental inspectors instead of the present method of packing in badly equipped and often unsanitary outhouses.

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries is of opinion that Permits or Licenses to pack should not be granted indiscriminately, but should be limited to factories of a certain capacity and with an equipment which has been passed by the Inspectors as efficient.

The Government, on the recommendation of the Fishery Board, has consented to enter into negotiations with Professor Cobb, of the University of Washington, Seattle, U.S.A., with a view of securing a man experienced in the canning trade, but no reply has as yet been received with regard to the matter.

GENERAL TRADE.

From information received from different sources, I observe a clear improvement in our industries generally. Sales are increasing, payments are becoming more regular and industrys show signs of increasing strength. The total trade of the Colony in 1923-1924 increased $8,470,066.-00, caused mainly by the activities on the West Coast. While it is true that we cannot expect to maintain the benefits derived from the Humber project as when construction was at its peak, yet the Plant will have to be maintained and thousands of workmen of all grades employed as at Grand Falls.

There is the Gander proposition also in course of organization, and Grand Falls is steadily extending its plant and increasing its output.

These several industries, not to speak of the minor ones that now exist in Newfoundland, must necessarily furnish employment permanently for an increasing number of people annually. Profitably employed these workmen will have an enhanced value as consumers; greater consumption will mean increased importations and naturally increased revenue.

I shall now lay before this Committee some information upon Loan expenditures and those under Section 33 (b) of the Audit Act; also a statement of the Public Debt.

LOAN EXPENDITURES.

The expenditure on account of the several Loans for the fiscal year 1923-1924 were as follows, viz:

Loan 1911 .. ..$	3,313.18
Loan 1919	56.45
Loan 1921	5,500.00
Loan 1922	1,284,184.46
Loan 1923	1,005,423.04
	$2,298,477 13

In connection with these payments, it must be noted that this adminisration had to provide $1,000,000 on account of the notorious Pit Prop Account.

Apropos of the said Pit Prop Account, I may say here that the Colony still owes somewhere in the neighbourhood of $180,000; as I have just said this is another payment which it will be difficult to meet.

The expenditure on account of Loans and the present position of Loan Account is exhaustively treated in the last two reports of the Auditor General, and these I beg to refer Honourable members for further and more detailed information.

PUBLIC DEBT.

The Public Debt at the close of the fiscal year was as follows:

Gross Debt as on 30th June, 1924		$60,456,965.60
Deduct Debt of Municipal Council	$1,890,569.22	
" Script of Harbor Grace Water Company..	13,700.00	
" Amount paid off by the operation of the Sinking Fund, 56th Vic., Cap. 13	1,435,596.08	
		3,339,965.30
		$57,117,100.30

This is really the Debt as on the 31st December, 1924, inasmuch as the Sinking Fund operations include the cancellations up to that date.

To this amount will have to be added the sum of $4,000,000.00 which has been raised under the Loan Act of last Session.

Referring to the raising of the last mentioned amount I may say that the Loan was raised in London through the Dominion Securities Corporation, Limited, at 97.385 for £822,000 sterling.

Under an arrangement with the Trade Facilities Board in Great Britain, it was provided that if some of our purchases were made in England and the Loan was raised there, a certain amount would be borne by the Imperial Government as a quid pro quo. It was decided in view of this satisfactory concession and the higher rate offered, that the English tender would be accepted.

In compliance with this decision, the order for new rails for the Newfoundland Government Railways was placed in England.

The arrangement with the Trade Facilities Board provides that an allowance of three and three-quarters per cent. on all purchases made in England by the Newfoundland Government will be granted. With this in view and a natural desire to place the Loan in London everything else being equal, the Dominion Securities Corporation's tender was accepted.

Deducting charges for expenses incurred in raising the Loan, such as bonds, etc., the net realization of the Loan will be $95½ to 96.

As promised by me in this House, the Loan was advertised for in London, New York, Montreal and Toronto. Tenders were opened in the Bank of Montreal in St. John's in the presence of the Honourable the Prime Minister, Mr. C. A. C. Bruce, the Assistant Manager of the Bank of Montreal,, Mr. B. C. Gardner, and myself.

EXPENDITURE UNDER THE AUDIT ACT.

During the eight months ending February 28th, 1924, the sum of $171,-359.00 was expended under Section 33 (b) of the Audit Act. A comparison of the expenditure by Special Warrant under this Act for the same period last year and this shows as follows:—

	1923-1924	1924 1925
Able Bodied Pauper Relief	$ 56,042.36	$48,400.71
Relief Works	115,317.05	———
	$171,359.41	$48,400.71

From the above statement it will be seen that we spent $122,958.70 less in the present year than in 1923-1924 under authority of the Audit Act. The total expenditure on this account in 1923-1924 amounted to $418,530.66.

This year to date it amounts to $48,-400.71, and I estimate a further sum of $50,000.00 will cover our requirements in this respect to the end of the fiscal year.

Admitting this estimate to be correct, the total Audit Act expenditure for 1924-1925 will be $98,400.71, or over $320,0$0.00 less than was spent on the same account in 1923-1924.

Before proceeding to lay before you my estimate with regard to the finances of the Colony for the coming fiscal year 1925-1926, I deem it advisable to make a few remarks relative to the cleaning up of the Government Departments.

Perhaps very little may be said here in relation to the Customs' Department, as the publicity with which its conduct has been carried on for some months past, should acquaint Honourable members with the progress made.

The comparative figures which I have already in this Speech quoted you, show that the increase in the general revenue of the Colony is mainly due to the increase in Customs collections. This was brought about by the several reforms instituted by the present Government.

The attitude of our officials for some months past with regard to collecting the revenue has somewhat improved, and a feeling that strong efforts should be made in keeping the work up-to-date and making collections promptly is noticeable amongst the staff.

Of the total increase of $681,384.75 in the general revenue of the Colony, the Customs Department is responsible for $673,021.83, or practically the total increase for the eight months from July to February.

As the Customs Department is being investigated thoroughly, I shall content myself with stating that there was something lacking in its general conduct, that there was a regrettable absence of **esprit de corps** in the several branches and that the general indifference of many of the officials, meant a substantial loss financially to the Institution.

Shortly after his appointment to the office of Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, Hon. Mr. Woodford called upon the Auditor General and me to assist him in enquiring into the then condition of his Department, the accounting system and organization, the morale and discipline of its officials, its interior structural arrangements and sanitation. He wished also to formulate a general plan by which any or all of these could be improved if, upon investigation, it would be found necessary to make such improvement.

We undertook and carried out this enquiry, and I can do no better in the matter of presenting the conditions to this Committee than to quote from our report to the Executive Government.

"With the exception of the Money "Order Department which proved to "be satisfactory (except for the Out-"port check) we found the accounting "system until recently, to be entirely "inadequate as to efficiency, co-"ordination and in respect of the "safeguarding of the Department's "revenue. We say recently, for when "we commenced the enquiry, we found "that the system of accounting which "the Auditor General had planned "and referred to the Government, had "been approved by the Executive and "had been put into effect. This sys-"tem and the institution of the pre-"audit directed by the Government, "have proved most satisfactory. The "accounting system provides a triple-"check, co-ordinates the work of the "several sub-departments and provides "a central control which is under "constant supervision and audit, while "pre-audit renders irregular payment "impossible. This places great re-"sponsibility on the Audit Depart-"ment.

"We found not organization but "disorganization. Clerks who evident- "ly were unaware of what their duties "were, officials in positions for which "they were not fitted, while other of- "ficials, unfit for the positions they held "were in many cases suitable for the "offices held by incumbents who did "not measure up to their particular "work; in other words, 'round pegs "in square holes' and vice versa.

"We also noticed a great lack of "discipline and an entire absence of "that **esprit-de-corps** which should "obtain if good work and proper com- "bination is desired, and that such is "not only desirable but essential in "all public offices, is evident.

"As far as was possible we have "corrected this, but the Honourable "the Executive Council will appreci- "ate the difficulties which impede any "effort to achieve an organization "which will be perfect. With the ma- "terial at our disposal we have, we "hope, done the best possible.

"We found the interior structural "arrangement to be very inconveni- "ent both to the public and for the 'proper carrying out of the duties of "officials as laid down by the attached "organization. We realized this early "in the course of our enquiry and "therefore asked the pemission of the "Executive to effect some necessary "structural changes in the plan of the "Post Office building. This permis- "sion was given. These alterations "have been made with the result that, "as far as possible, proper provision "has been made for the several of- "fices. These have been rendered "more accessible to those having "business with the Department, and "by utilizing the whole of the grill- "enclosed space on the second floor, "the whole work of the officials lo- "cated therein can be under constant "view.

"The expenditure for alterations and "repairs and for the cleaning and "painting is being borne by the bal- "ance in hand of the allocation from "the 1919 Loan for 'Alterations and "Repairs General Post Office' with a "small appropriation by the Governor- "in-Council from the 1922 Loan, should "the same be required.

"We found the sanitary condition "of the building anything but satis "factory. The whole building was "dirty to a degree; dust and accumu- "lation of rubbish were to be found "everywhere. Plaster had fallen from "the walls, which in addition were "scribbled over and otherwise soiled. "The basement was made the resort "of all sorts and conditions of people "who had no official connection with "the Post Office and, generally, the "condition of the building was a dis- "grace to any community. This has "been all changed. The Post Office "basement has been cleaned from "roof to basement and is being paint- "ed. Rubbish has been removed or "burnt. The accumulation of mail "bags and other valuable material "capable of use found scattered with "large quantities of rubbish in the loft "has been cleaned up, all that was "of value having been placed under "the charge of the Storekeeper for "use in outport offices. In this con- "nection we may say that much of "this—such as tables, desks, pigeon "holes, etc., might have been used in "fitting up outport offices instead of "purchasing new material as was fre- "quently done.

"It will be noticed that we have "elaborated a system of inspection in "respect of the several outport of- "fices. We cannot too strongly em- "phasize the necessity for a thorough "inspection, conducted at irregular "intervals. To a lack of this inspec- "tion in the past is due the many "defalcations which have occurred "and are still occurring in outport "offices. These irregularities cannot "be discovered in the central offices "for the reason that outport Post- "masters can falsify their returns,

"They can and do take credit for cash "in hand pay Money Orders, to pay "which money has been transmitted "to them, when they have used such "cash for their personal use. Again, "the receipts for the first week of a "month can be and are transmitted "to cover the balance in hand at the "end of the previous month. It is "quite evident, therefore, that without "direct inspection, these irregulari-"ties are likely to contnue.

"Before concluding we deem it ad-"visable to ask attention to the posi-"tion of the Minister (in connection "with the financial affairs of the De-"partment) in respect of its appropri-"ation votes for the current fiscal "year and this we do in common jus-"tice to him and to the Executive "Council which will have to bear the "responsibility of asking the Legis-"lature for Supplementary Supply. "We refer to the very large expendi-"ture on account of the last fiscal "year which, by reason of the ex-"haustion of that year's votes, had to "be carried on this year's expendi-"ture. Among the many important "items of this are the following, viz:

Post Office Boxes East End Post Office	$ 2,716.00
Post Office for Corner Brook and Deer Lake	1,555.00
Due Canada for Mail Conveyance	9,951.00
Telegraph Poles	2,510.00
Stationery Supplies, etc.	1,542.00
Salaries, increases and appointments	16,000.00
	34,274.00

"Furthermore, a number of new ap-"pointments were made to the De-"partment as well as several increas-"es to salaries, all of which were "made without Executive authority "and without the necessary legisla-"tive provision therefor. All pay-"ments on account of these have na-"turally been disallowed by the Audit "Department and will be reported to 'the Legislature as coming within a "fiscal year for the administration of "the votes of which the present Min-"ister is responsible. He has there-"fore been obliged to obtain an Order-"in-Council legitimizing these irregu-"lar appointments, and he will have "to ask for Supplementary Supply to "cover expenditures for which he is "not really accountable.

"In connection with expenditure, "we beg to advise that the practice "which has obtained in the past of "ordering enormous quantities of "stock sufficient to last for years, "should be discontinued. There are "now in the department hundreds of "thousands of envelopes sufficient to "last for years which apparently have "been overlooked while new stocks "have been purchased, and four large "bales of twine which are absolutely "useless to the Department. These "are only a few of the many instances "which came under our notice.

"We venture to think that with the 'introduction of an improved ac-"counting system, the adoption of a "pre-audit, the changes in interior "structural arrangements, the cleaning "and painting of the building and the "application of the organization sug-"gested by us, together with the "adoption of our recommendations as "to general guidance, the Postal Tele-"graph Department will compare "satisfactorily with any Government "Department, and we trust that its "Executive will see to it that it does "not lose on that comparison in fu-"ture."

I make no apology for quoting thus

lengthily on the investigation held by us into the Department, for I consider it desirable to acquaint Honourable members of the condition into which physically, morally and from a financial point of view past administrations had permitted this Department to fall. I fear the question of Post and Telegraph work has not been given that serious atttention which such an important Department requires.

I understand from the Auditor General, who was associated with myself and the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs in the conduct of the enquiry, that his Department had no authority in respect of the taking of stocks or other internal audit and that the matter of inspection of outport offices was one which was so colossal in its survey that with the small staff at his command it could not be attempted.

As a result of this want of inspection of outport offices, I decided to have a personal inspection last fall, the result of which revealed an utter want of method in the accounting system with regard to the offices visited. There was never a complete audit of these offices taken, so that any Postmaster handling Money Order, Telegraph, Customs and Stamp cash in the one office (and most of them do) might very easily cover a shortage in cash on Money Order by cash from any of the other accounts, and the same thing applied as far as the other accounts were concerned. In other words, there was no concurrent effort on the part of the several inspectors of the Service; the Customs' Inspector simply inspected the Customs; the Money Order Inspector, the Money Orders; the Telegraphs, the Telegraphs and so on. Of course it will be evident to Honourable members that an audit inspection of this kind was useless insofar as the cash check of any combined office in the outports could be taken.

Immediately upon my return to St. John's I arranged with the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs for a complete audit of several offices which had not satisfied me upon visiting them. The reports of the two Inspectors sent to Corner Brook and Deer Lake proved that my suspicions were unfortunately too true. Further inspection has proven that peculation on the part of Postmasters in respect of cash receipts has not been confined to these stations, but exists in other parts of the country. It is only fair for me to say, with regard to Corner Brook and Deer Lake, that the conditions existing there were disgraceful from what I saw. The officials were overworked, they had no facilities despite the fact that they had placed themselves on record as requiring office furniture on several occasions. No notice was taken of their repeated requests for assistance and the blame for the sad condition of affairs in these stations (Corner Brook and Deer Lake) can only be laid to Headquarters at St. John's. To give the House an idea of the facilities, I need only say that the Deer Lake cash drawer consisted of a biscuit box improvised as a cash drawer by Postmaster Boland and that he frequently threw considerable sums of cash under a brin bag in the office as the most unlikely place for a possible thief to discover it. While I can only deplore the neglect displayed by the responsible officials in St. John's, I cannot but express to Honourable members the idea which occurred to the Honourables the Minister of Justice, Mr. Sullivan (who were my companions) and myself, and that was that Newfoundlanders were the most honest people in the world.

Upon return to St. John's I took immediate steps to have all these matters rectified and happily, to-day things are somewhat better than in Septem-

ber last. Arrangements are being made to have suitable offices at both Corner Brook and Deer Lake and I think the Government may feel assured of no recurrence of this state of affairs.

Subsequent to the above discoveries, Colonel Ross, who has had a life-long experience in Canadian Postal matters, was appointed by the Government to go further into Postal, Telegraph and Money Order matters. He has made his report to the Government through the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs but the Executive have not had time to consider same up to the present, owing to other important matters engaging their attention. I may say that it will receive consideration as quickly as possible.

The accounts and management of the Public Charities, including the public institutions thereunder, are at present in the hands of a Committee of Council for enquiry. Upon submission of their report, executive action will be taken, the necessary arrangements made and pre-audit will be introduced.

A complete investigation of the accounts and organization of the Department of Agriculture and Mines has been undertaken. The history of all timber leases was traced from date of issue to the present time and a thorough system of record hitherto, nonexistent, was established. Balances due have been verified. The Auditor General has instituted a new system of accounting which contains a triplicate check with regard to cash receipts and a complete organization of the Department has been provided laying down clearly the duties of each official in the Department.

The Government has decided, upon the recommendation of the Minister, to increase the agricultural vote by the sum of $15,000.00. His recommendation that fertilizers for use of farmers be admitted free of duty has also been approved, and the Railway Commission has under consideration the advisability of giving a flat rate in freights on all agricultural produce passing over the Government railway lines. This will be of assistance to farmers all, over the country and it is hoped to have the matter adjusted within a few days.

The Department of Agriculture and Mines is now working smoothly and efficiently, and I am quite confident that my Honourable friend, the Minister, will corroborate this fact.

The Department of Marine and Fisheries has, under the guidance of its present Head, Captain Winsor, shown considerable activity. On his recommendation, the Government have decided to give particular attention to the Lighthouses around the Island. He has paid personal inspection trips to many of them with the result that the Legislature has been asked to make some additional grants in aid of repairs. He reports that the different lights have been allowed to go into disrepair during the past few years owing to lack of funds. During the past year six new lights, four Acetyline and one Kerosene Light besides improving the light at Bacalhao, have been instalied and erected.

All the other Departments of the Public Service are working satisfactorily and I feel that their respective Heads and Deputies are doing their utmost to preserve discipline, to obtain efficient and effective service and prevent abuses.

And so we write **finis** to the financial history of this Colony for the six years ending June 30th, 1925. For the frenzied finance, the riotous and ineffective expenditure, the gross, indefensible and criminal extravagance therein recorded as relating to the first five years, the present Government is in no way responsible.

The previous history of the Colony's finance reveals nothing that can equal such an exhibition of misgovernment and it is my earnest hope that the

future does not hold for us anything of a like nature.

I may say for the information of the House that all the figures presented in respect of the foregoing statements are official and have been tabled in this House.

The only difference between the statement presented by me and that of Mr. Berteau is that his report ends at the financial year ,and does not refer to the activities of the present Government. That is to say, his report is supposed to cover the work of the late administration whose accounts were closed on June 30th last, which is the end of the fiscal year. But I felt it my duty to the Government and the Legislature to establish comparisons as between last year and this for the purpose of reporting progress, which is not within his province until the end of the current year.

As for the last year, 1924-1925, of the six years referred to, the present Government had to shoulder responsibilities caused by errors not of their making. The evil effects of past misgovernment coloured the financial activities of the year, and if out of the chaotic condition of the Colony's finances as found by this administration on assuming office, order has been evolved, they have every right to take credit for the good they have done during the financial year and to ascribe to the effects of previous mismanagement, their failure to achieve that complete success which their efforts deserved.

And now we come to a consideration of the estimates for the coming year 1925-1926. I hope to be able t: receive as revenue in 1925-1926 the sum of $9,560,000.00 made up as follows:—

ESTIMATED REVENUE 1925-1926.

Customs Revenue $8,250,000.00	
Postal	315,000.00
Telegraphs	250,000.00
Crown Lands	120,000.00
Inland Revenue Stamps ..	45,000.00
Fines and Forfeitures ..	10,000.00
Liquor Profits	120,000.00
Fees Public Institutions	55,000.00
Broom Department Penitentiary	8,500.00
Interest on Guaranteed Loans	86,500.00
Estate Duties	50,000.00
Bank Taxes	70,000.00
Other Taxes and Assessments	70,000.00
Miscellaneous General Revenue	80,000.00
Income Tax and Business Profits Tax Arrears ..	30,000.00
Estimated Total Revenue	9,560,000.00
Expenditure per Estimates	9,353,000,00
Estimated Surplus	$ 207,000.00

The estimated revenue just quoted shows an increase of $107,000.00 over the previous year's estimate and the estimate is as close as it is humanly possible to go.

My estimate of the Expenditure of the Colony for the year 1925-1926 places the sum at $9,323,793.01, and the following is a comparative statement of the Estimates for 1924-1925 and 1925-1926 as originally tabled:—

Department	Voted 1924-1925	To be Voted 1925-1926
Finance Department	$3,441,023.61	$3,667,390.57
Colonial Secretary's	67,179.00	61,527.00
Justice Department	341,479.16	354.619.66
Education Department	836,351.03	877,590.03
Public Charities	443,318.93	457,809.63

Marine and Fisheries	333,589.39	395.997.39
Agriculture and Mines	77,470.00	107,156.66
Public Works	937,098.57	944,719.00
Posts and Telegraphs	1,150,565.83	1,220,998.07
Customs Department	438,726.25	450,783.00
Assessor of Taxes	14,840.00	15,120.00
Contingencies	183,992.00	183,992.00
Pension Commissioners	649,986.00	616,090.00
Total	$8,915,619.77	$9,353,793.01
Total 1924-1925		$8,915,619.77
Increase		$ 438,173.24

Nearly half the increase shown in Estimates is due to the $200 000.00 additional interest, being interest on the new Loan of $4,000,000.00 raised under last year's Loan Act. Some of the increase is due to the inclusion of salaries which were never heretofore incorporated into the Estimates. In my explanation to the House when introducing the new Estimates a few days ago, I explained the reasons for these. They have been actually paid from other accounts such as Contingencies and Supplies, and are not really increases in the strict sense of the word, and that it was the intention of the present Government to see that as far as possible all regular salary votes are placed in the Estimates under their proper heads and not hidden away in the general accounts of the Colony. They form the bulk of these amounts disallowed by the Auditor General from year to year and subsequently passed by the Legislature in the several Supplementary Supply Acts.

Much is also due to short votes which have had to be legislatively supplemented, and more caused by the provisions for Pensions which have also in many instances been covered up in the Contingency votes of the several departments.

Such increases to salaries, in the most cases, as are shown are due to the abolishing of perquisites and extra payments. Salaries in future will be paid as voted.

Honourable members will also notice that the increase in Education of $35,000.00 is for the Augmentation of Teachers' salaries, an increase in the Teachers' Pension Fund and the requirements for upkeep of the Normal School. It is quite evident that the Act will have to be amended in respect to these. And this will be necessary at an early late as regards the Augmentation Grant and the Teachers' Pension Fund. The Augmentation Grant to Teachers' Salaries means an addition to Teachers' Salaries based upon grade and years of service. It is therefore changing annually according to years of service and the grade of the teacher improving. The whole subject is treated exhaustively on Pages 31, 32 and 33 of the Auditor General's Report, and without further comment I beg leave to commend his remarks to the attention of the Committee.

I can assure the House that I have taken great care and no inconsiderable portion of the time at my disposal in the compilation of these Estimates. Every expenditure capable of reduction has been reduced as far as it could possibly be done without

risking the starving of legitimate requirements in the various public services, and I have great hopes that with the assistance of the heads of the several Government departments and of the pre-audit which the Government has established, the Estimates as submitted by me will be sufficient to eliminate all necessity for Supplementary Supply. Of course there will arise occasions when, owing to urgent circumstances, expenditures which no human provision can provide for will have to be met. These, while they can be provided for under Section 33 (b) of the Audit Act, will necessarily increase our total expenditure.

Before concluding I wish to take this opportunity of placing on record the views of the Government in respect of its general financial policy. Its first aim is to reduce expenditure to the lowest possible point at which it can be placed without unduly impairing the welfare, progress and expansion of the Colony. Secondly, to so arrange the taxes as to meet this irreducible minimum of expenditure and at the same time to see that these taxes bear upon the several taxpayers proportionately to their means of paying. We believe that we have already made a very long stride in that direction. Thirdly, we are trying by every possible means to increase the prosperity of the Colony by encouraging every sane project for the development of its resources, mineral, scenic and sporting as well as its fisheries, its pulp anl timber and other industries. Too long has it remained an isolated adjunct of the great British Empire; too long has the undeniable versatility and energy of its people been confined to one pursuit. Recognizing this the Government are determined to give them a chance to exercise these attributes, to encourage any sane measure which will tend to the development of our undoubted resources and to lift the Colony out of the condition of isolation in which it has existed in the past.

Permit me now to make a few remarks in relation to some of the details of this policy.

The Government had decided, as the House is aware, on a road-building policy, for which a sum of $2,000,000 has been voted. The work of constructing the roads contemplated by this policy will be placed in the hands of a Commission appointed for the purpose by the Bill recently passed both Houses. This road-construction policy is so designed as to combine local advantages and tourist attraction. The principal roads of the Peninsula of Avalon will be reconditioned and improved and, where necessary, linked together by the building of sections of new roads which will be advantageous. On the West Coast it is proposed to take in hand the building of roads through its farming, sporting and industrial areas, and in other portions of the country a beginning will be made in the way of connecting important sectons of the coast with other areas and with the main line of the railway system. It is hoped that as a result of this policy there will be an increase of communication between the different sections of the country, that settlement will be stimulated and agriculture encouraged, that fine sporting areas will be rendered accessible, and that the establishment of new industries will naturally follow.

With the Grand Falls and Corner Brook industries actually working and the Gander River project in prospect, roads to facilitate motor communication with these places and the surrounding country will be helpful in rendering these industries more widespread and advantageous to the public generally.

Incidently, it is expected that the improvement in the roal system on

the Peninsula of Avalon and on the West Coast will attract large numbers of tourists to the Island, and the Government look for a steadily increased traffic of this sort. But we are not unmindful that the most direct and probable result will be in the growth of local traffic as these roads are carried farther and farther throughout the country.

The increase in motor traffic in this country during the past ten years has been very great. The desire for better road construction found expression some three or four years ago in the creation of a road commission which functioned parochially in and around St. John's and adjacent districts. It is generally admitted that the Commission did good work, and possibilities of an enlargement of that work were so clearly proven that the Government felt that they could safely embark upon further expansion.

Consequently we decided last year to raise $2,000,000.00 for road-building and at this session to create a Commission as the channel through which to carry on the work. We feel that better work and better value will be secured by appropriating this money to an independent Commission instead of doling out allocations indiscriminately and without regard to the qualifications of the persons handling the money.

We believe that the first fruits of this new policy will be a very substantial increase in the number of motors imported and used by our own people, with a consequent proportional increase in all the accessories that go towards the maintenance of motor traffic, and that by means of this agency our people will be steadily doing more and more travelling in the different sections of the country.

We believe, too, that the movement of the people and of their local freight from place to place will be more and more undertaken by this method, and that in an ever-increasing degree there will be a large expenditure of money brought about by this policy which would not otherwise have been undertaken.

We expect that as the road system improves, this country will enjoy a larger share of the advantages in this regard which are enjoyed at present by all our neighbours on the main land.

Every member of the Legislature who has travelled in late years knows well that I do not exaggerate when I say that the advance made in road construction everywhere on the American Continent since the War has been tremendous. The same tendency is being exhibited on the European Continent and especially in the British Isles where road construction is one of the foremost measures adopted by the Imperial authorities to restore the economic life of the people of the Mother Country.

Both in respect of its local advantages and of its tourist attractions, such a policy here can, I maintain, be abundantly justified Indeed if this policy can be considered in no higher light than that of an extension of the ordinary annual vote for roads, it can stand on its own merits. There is no form of assistance given from the Treasury to the various districts and localities which is so acceptable as money for road extension and road building, and this is all the more desirable from the Colony's standpoint if we can see to it that the money is well spent The House is flooded with petitions every year for road grants; the Members are never free from requests for road improvement and the story of the material well-being of our people is largely becoming a question of better roads and increased facilities for communication.

We are now proposing to make a start in the establishing of a better class of road than heretofore, which on this side if the Island will radiate

from St. John's to the different parts of the Peninsula of Avalon and which, on the West Coast, will link up the most populous centres there, and in other centres of the country will serve the same useful purpose.

I have every confidence that two or three years from now, when these roads have been built or improved, the wisdom of the Government's policy will be evident to even the most hostile critic and that its success will be more than justified in the eyes of the people at large.

In connection with the tourist aspect of this policy, the erection of a modern hotel at St. John's is highly desirable, and the Government are giving the matter of its construction, the very best consideration.

RAILWAY.

The necessity for re-railing the section of railway from St. John's to Clarenville with seventy pound rails has been found extremely urgent. This seventy-pound rail is to replace the fifty-pound rail formerly in use. During the last six months, so I am

1920-1921 Commission Govt. and Reid	
1921-1922 Joint Control 1921 Act . .	
1922-1923 Temporary Operation . .	
1923-1924 Government Commission .	
1924-1925 Present Administration .	

I shall leave these figures of profits and losses for the years indicated for the consideration of the House, and beyond extending congratulations to the present Railway Commission and Management, on the excellent showing for the past six months, make no further comment.

For fuller particulars with regard informed by the General Manager, no less than two hundred and twelve broken rails have been located in the St. John's-Clarenville section, caused by old and dilapidated equipment.

The increased freight traffic demands more cars, as it is impossible even at present to find sufficient and suitable cars to accommodate the business requirements of the Colony. We are building two new sleepers and 1st class cars and converting some of the first class to second class. According to financial statements presented, more money has been spent in repairs to equipment during the present year than in former years The result, so the Railway authorities inform me, is that the rolling stock is in good condition.

The Government propose during the coming year to re-condition and improve the railway road-bed, to introduce proper and efficient methods with regard to railway maintenance and, as already stated, to re-rail the line to Clarenville; all of which will tend to a practical renewal of the system and prepare it to cope with the increasing traffic to be borne over the line consequent upon the establishment of the large paper industries at Corner Brook and elsewhere.

As Honourable Members have already had an opportunity of studying conditions in respect of the Dock for some time past, it will not be necessary for me to say anything on the subject particularly, beyond the fact that the gate entrance has been weakened considerably by age. The timber was put in place there over forty years ago and the Government on expert advice has decided that it is only courting disaster by postponing repairs any longer.

To take care of largely increased suburban traffic in the vicinity of the City as also at Corner Brook, self-contained steam cars will be introduced. They will be much cheaper to operate. If it is at all practicable they will also be used on the Branch railway system, replacing the present train service at greatly reduced cost.

According to the Auditor General's Report, tabled last week, the net profit from July 1st, to October 31st, 1924, on Railway, Steamship and Dock operations, amounted to $149,641.88 for the four months. From the latest

available figures supplied me by the Auditor General, the profit up to December 31st has increased to $152,-137.68 on Operating Account, as follows:

Profit Operation of Railway	$ 64.97
Profit Operation Steamers.	141,487.34
Profit Operation of Dock .	10,585.37
	$152,137.68

In connection with the above statement, I may say that in consequence of the increased tonnage of modern ships the Dock is losing a lot of revenue. Much complaint has been heard, also, of excessive charges for repairs. The Government, carrying out its avowed intention contained in last year's Budget, is asking Honourable Members to consent to its expansion so as to provide for bigger ships and to bring equipment up to-date. We will thus while improving a valuable asset of the Colony provide badly needed employment for hundreds of people and increase the earning power of the Dock which in the past has been negligible.

Referring back to the Railway Statement from July to December quoted above, I beg to supplement it with a statement of the Operating Losses and Gains from 1920-1921 up to the current year, as follows:—

	Profits	Losses
Nfld. Co. ..		$1,776,128.59
.. ..		964,941.90
.. ..		539,830.48
.. ..		6,519.34
.. ..	$152,137,68	

to the finances of the Railway, Steamers and Dock, I refer Honourable Members to the statistics in the addenda to this Speech, that is to say from July 1st to December 31st, last. Other statistical information of interest to the House will also be appended thereto.

Before closing my Speech, there is one last indication of the dawning prosperity for which the Colony has been looking for some years now. I refer to the money in the National stocking, that is to say, the Savings' Bank. And in this connection I would ask the attention of Honourable Members to the five-year comparative statement to December 31st, last. The Savings' deposits, or, in other words, the money put aside for a rainy day in Newfoundland, has increased by the sum of $1,795,005.81 during 1924, being now at the sum of $22,135,229.02. And I do not think I could conclude my Budget without reference to such an auspicious fact. An analysis of the comparative statement referred to, shows that this is the first appreciable increase for years.

I now beg leave to propose to the Committee the following resolutions, viz:

RESOLUTIONS OF WAYS AND MEANS SUBMITTED BY THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS TO A COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE.

RESOLVED that the Act passed in the fifth year of His Late Majesty, King Edward VII., entitled the Revenue Act 1905 ,and the various Acts in amendment thereof, granting to His Majesty certain duties on goods, wares and merchandise, imported into or manufactured in this Colony and its Dependencies, be repealed;

Provided always that all Bonds given, duties due and payments made under the said Acts, or any of them, are hereby confirmed and declared valid, and nothing herein contained shall be construed to effect the same.

RESOLVED that the following Table of Duties on goods, wares and merchandise imported into this Colony and its Dependencies, as well as on local distillation and local manufactures ,and the Table of Drawbacks and Table of Prohibited Goods, be enacted.

RESOLVED—In the case of articles

exported to Newfoundland of a class or kind made in Newfoundland, if the export or actual selling price to an importer in Newfoundland be less than the domestic value of the same article when sold for home consumption in the usual and ordinary course in the country whence exported to Newfoundland at the time of its exportation to Newfoundland there shall, in addition to the duties otherwise established, be levied, collected and paid upon such article on its importation into Newfoundland, a special duty (or dumping duty) equal to the difference between the said selling price of the article for export and the said domestic value thereof for home consumption:

Provided that the said special duty shall not exceed fifteen per cent. ad valorem in any case;

Provided further that the excise duties shall be disregarded in estimating the domestic value of goods for the purposes of special duty.

(2) That the expression "export price" or "selling price" in this section shall be held to mean and include the exporters price for the goods, exclusive of all charges thereon after their shipment from the place whence exported directly to Newfoundland

(3) That if at any time it appears to the satisfaction of the Governor-in-Council, on a report from the Minister of Finance and Customs, that the payment of the special duty by this section provided for is being evaded by the shipment of goods on consignment without sale prior to such shipment, the Governor-in-Council may in any case or class of cases authorize such action as is deemed necessary to collect on such goods, or any of them, the same special duty as if the goods had been sold to an importer in Newfoundland prior to their shipment to Newfoundland.

(4) If the full amount of any special duty of Customs is not paid on goods imported, the Customs entry thereof shall be amended and the deficiency upon the demand of the Collector of Customs.

(5) The Minister of Finance and Customs may make such regulations as are deemed necessary for carrying out the provisions of this section and for the enforcement thereof.

(6) Such regulations may also provide for the temporary exemption from special duty of any article or class of articles, when it is established to the satisfaction of the Minister of Finance and Customs that such articles are not made or sold in Newfoundland in substantial quantities, and offered for sale to all purchasers on equal terms.

(7) Such regulations may also provide for the exemption from special duty of any article when the difference between the current domestic value and the selling price thereof to the importer as aforesaid amounts only to a small percentage of its current domestic value.

RESOLVED—All sums of money payable under this Act as duties, penalties, or forfeitures, shall be deemed, and are hereby declared to be in dollars and cents Newfoundland currency ,and shall be received, taken and paid in such currency, save and except where it is otherwise provided by the provisions of Chapter 22 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd series); and all duties shall be paid and received according to Imperial weights and measures by law established in this Colony, save and except where it is otherwise provided in this Act; and in all cases where such duties are imposed according to any specific quantity or value, the same shall apply in like proportion to any greater or lessquantity or value.

RESOLVED—The several duties imposed in Schedule A. of this Act, shall be paid by the Importer of such articles, respectively, and shall be collected and secured by means of, and under the regulations and penalties,

and in the manner provided by any Act or Acts of the General Assembly of this Colony for collecting the Revenue of this Colony and its Dependencies.

RESOLVED—With respect to goods imported for manufacturing purposes that are admissible for any specific purposes at a lower rate of duty than would otherwise be chargeable, or exempt from duty, the importer claiming such exemption from duty, or proportionate exemption from duty, shall make and subscribe to the following affidavit or affirmation before the Collector of Customs at the port of entry, or before a Notary Public or a Commissioner for taking affidavits.

I (name of importer), the undersigned, importer of the (names of the goods or articles) mentioned in this entry, do solemnly (swear or affirm) that such (names of the goods or articles) are imported by me for the manufacture of (names of the goods to be manufactured in my own factory, situated at (name of place), and that no portion of the same will be used for any purpose or disposed of until so manufactured.

RESOLVED—Whenever the Governor in Council has reason to believe that with regard to any article of commerce there exists any trust, combination, association, or agreement of any kind among manufacturers of such articles or dealers therein, to unduly enhance the price of such article, or in any way to unduly promote the advantage of the manufacturers or dealers at the expense of the consumers, the Governor in Council may commission or empower any Judge of the Supreme Court to enquire in a summary way into and report to the Governor in Council whether such trust, combination, association or agreement exists,

(2) The Judge may compel the attendance of witnesses and examine them under oath and require the production of books and papers, and shall have such other necessary powers as are conferred upon him by the Governor in Council for the purpose of such inquiry.

(3) If the Judge reports that such trust, combination, association or agreement exists, and if it appears to the Governor in Council that such disadvantage to the consumer is facilitated by the duties of Customs imposed on a like article, when imported, then the Governor in Council shall place such article on the free list, or so reduce the duty on it as to give the public the benefit of reasonable competition in such articles.

RESOLVED—In the case of all wines, spirits, or alcoholic liquors subject to duty according to their relative strength of proof, such strength shall be ascertained either by means of Sike's Hydrometer or of the specific gravity bottle, as the Minister of Finance and Customs directs; and in case such relative strength cannot be correctly ascertained by the direct use of the hydrometer or gravity bottle, it shall be ascertained by the distillation of a sample, and the subsequent test in like manner of the distillate.

RESOLVED—All medicinal preparations whether chemical or other, usually imported with the name of the manufacturer, shall have the true name of such manufacturer and the place where they are prepared, and the word "alcoholic" or "non-alcoholic" permanently and legibly affixed to each parcel by stamp, label or otherwise; and all medicinal preparations imported without such names and words so affixed may be forfeited.

RESOLVED—Any person who without lawful excuse, the proof of which shall be on the person accused, sends or brings into this Colony, or who, being in the Colony, has in his pos-

session any bill-heading or other paper appearing to be a heading or blank, capable of being filled up and used as an invoice and bearing any certificate purporting to show or which may be used to show that the invoice which may be made from such bill-heading or blank is correct or authentic, is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to a penalty of Five Hundred Dollars, and to imprisonment for a term not exceeding twelve months, in the discretion of the Court, and the goods entered under any invoice made from any such bill-heading or blank shall be forfeited.

RESOLVED—Coverings, inside and outside, used in covering or holding goods imported therewith, shall be subject to the following provisions, viz:—

(a) Usual coverings, containing free goods only; usual coverings, except receptacles capable of holding liquids, containing goods subject to a specific duty only, N.O.P. free.

(b) Usual coverings, containing goods subject to any ad valorem duty, when not included in the invoice value of the goods they contain, 40 per cent.

(c) Provided that usual coverings containing goods subject to any ad valorem duty, if included in the invoice value of the goods they contain, and not charged separately on the invoice, shall be subject to the same rate of duty ad valorem as the goods they contain, and may be combined with the goods for valuation and duty on the Customs entry;

(d) Provided, further, that receptacles capable of holding liquids, when containing goods subject to a specific duty, shall be charged with a duty of all coverings and receptacles shall be determined in a manner to be prescribed by regulations made by the Minister of Finance and Customs.

(e) Provided further, that usual coverings designed for use other than in the bona fide transportation of goods they contain, shall be charged with the rate of duty to which the same would be subject if imported separately;

(f) Provided also, that the term "coverings" in this Section shall include packing boxes, crates, casks, cases, cartons, wrapping, sacks, bagging, rope, twine, straw or other articles used in covering or holding goods imported therewith, and the labour and charges for packing such goods, subject to regulations made by the Minister of Finance and Customs.

RESOLVED—The duty hereinbefore provided to be levied upon fish is subject to the following proviso, namely: Provided that the Governor may, by Proclamation published in the Nfld. Gazette, remit, as he may deem equitable, the whole or any part of the duty imposed on fish imported into this Colony from countries making such changes or reduction in their Tariff with respect to fish, the produce of fish, or other articles exported from this Colony to such countries.

RESOLVED—In addition to the duties hereinbefore provided to be raised levied, collected and paid on all goods, wares and merchandise imported into this Colony, there shall be raised, levied, collected and paid on the goods wares and merchandise hereinafter in this section mentioned imported into this Colony from Countries the fishermen of which have the privilege of taking codfish upon all parts of the coast of Newfoundland and its Dependencies, and in which countries duties are or hereafter shall be levied upon fish, or the produce of the fisheries, exported from the Colony or

its Dependencies to such countries, the following rates, viz:—

Flour the barrel	$ .75
Pork, the barrel	.75
Butter, the one hundred pounds	75
Tobacco, the one hundred pounds	5.00
Kerosene Oil, the gallon	.05
Corn Meal, the barrel	.25
Hay, the ton	5.00
Oats, the bushel	.10
Potatoes, the bushel	25
Turnips, the bushel	.25
Cabbages, the dozen heads	40

Unenumerated Vegetables, 30 per cent ad val.

Provided always that the Governor in Council may, at any time when it shall be made to appear to him to be for the interest of the Colony, by Proclamation to be published in the Royal Gazette, suspend the operation of this clause for a limited period, the duration of the said period to be stated in the said proclamation, in respect of all or any of the above-mentioned articles.

RESOLVED—In case of any country now imposing, or which may hereafter impose, an import duty on herrings exported from this Colony and imported into such country in vessels belonging to this Colony, when such herring may be imported into such country in vessels belonging to the same free of duty, the Governor in Council may by Proclamation impose an export duty equal to the amount of duty so imposed by such country aforesaid on herring exported from this Colony in Vessels belonging to such country where such import duty is imposed.

RESOLVED—It shall be lawful for the Governor in Council to direct the appropriation of the duties collected upon coal in the port of St. John's to the use of the St. John's Municipal Council, and in the case of Harbor Grace, Carbonear and Placentia, at which places duties are at present collected on coal imported for domestic and other purposes, it shall be lawful for the Governor in Council to appropriate from the duty collected on coal at such places under this Act, for the use of the said towns of Harbor Grace, Carbonear and Placentia, such an amount as will, in the opinion of the Governor in Council be equal to the whole of the duties collected at the said places on coal imported and used for domestic purposes, the said amount shall be paid to such persons as shall be determined by the Governor in Council for the use of the said town respectively. It also shall be lawful for the Governor in Council to direct the appropriation from the duties collected on coal, imported at the port of Bell Island, the sum of four thousand dollars, the said amount to be paid annually to the Bell Island Council.

RESOLVED—Whenever it shall be made to appear to the Governor in Council that it is desirable for the purpose of promoting the importation of potatoes for seed, to abrogate or reduce the duty upon potatoes for such purposes, it shall be lawful for the Governor in Council by Order published in the Newfoundland Gazette to abrogate or reduce such duty.

RESOLVED—Whenever it shall be made to appear to the Governor in Council that it is desirable in the interests of Stock raisers to abrogate or reduce the duty on Hay, it shall be lawful for the Governor in Council, on Order published in the Royal Gazette, to abrogate or reduce such duty.

RESOLVED—Upon the Survey, by an authorized surveyor, of lumber imported into this Colony, for ascertaining the quantity therein, upon which duty is to be collected, the Surveyor shall furnish to the Custom House a certificate setting forth that he has surveyed a cargo of lumber imported in a certain ship, stating name and master, and where from, and giving particulars of such survey, the number of feet, and the

kind and description of the board, plank (dressed or undressed), timber, laths, or shingles as may constitute such cargo; such certificate of survey must be delivered to the proper officer of Customs twenty-four hours after the landing of the cargo under a penalty of twenty dollars to be collected in a summary manner upon complaint before a Justice of the Peace.

For every certificate of survey furnished by an authorized surveyor, he shall be entitled to receive the sum of fifty cents.

RESOLVED—On such articles of machinery, implements or materials as are necessary to the initiation and installation of a manufacture or industry in this Colony, or in connection therewith and used therein, there shall be levied and collected such less duties than the rates prescribed as the Governor in Council may from time to time fix by Order in Council; Provided that such order may prescribe such conditions and regulations concerning the said importations as he may deem wise; and provided that the words machinery, implements and materials shall not include steam boilers, which can be manufacured in this Colony, and tools of trade in general use.

RESOLVED—It shall be lawful for the Governor in Council to remit the whole or any portion of the duties imposed by this Act upon port or other wines, currants and sultana raisins or other articles imported from the country of production into this Colony, when it shall appear to him that the duty of codfish, the product of the Colony, imported into such country has been or will be reciprocally reduced

RESOLVED—Upon the exportation of goods manufactured in this Colony, other than those already mentioned in this Act, there shall be allowed a rebate of such proportion of the duty paid on material used in the manufacture of said goods, as may be determined by and under such conditions as the Governor-in-Council may determine.

RESOLVED — Upon olemargarine, butterine or similar substitutes for butter, and upon tobacco, cigars and cigarettes, imported into this Colony, being reported at the Custom House, and before being entered for consumption, the packages in which such article is contained shall be stamped or marked by a Customs Officer with the name of the article or with some distinguishing mark.

RESOLVED—The importation of such article into consumption before the package containing it is marked as aforesaid, is hereby prohibited and any such goods so imported shall become forfeited to the Crown, and may be seized by a Customs Officer and sold, after stamping or marking, one-half of the proceeds being paid to the informer and seizing officer, one moiety to each, the other half being paid to the consolidated revenue.

RESOLVED—It shall be unlawful to manufacture olemargarine, butterine or a similar substitute for butter, or to manufacture tobacco, cigars or cigarettes except under a license of the Minister of Finance and Customs who may grant such licenses, upon application, on the conditions hereafter set forth.

A Factory for the manufacture of oleomargarine, butterine or a similar substitute for butter, tobacco, cigars or cigarettes shall not be considered as such unless at least ten operators are employed therein. The Manager of such a factory may not obtain a license therefor or operate it unless upon payment of a fee in proportion to the number of operators employed in his factory, such fee shall be paid annually in advance, as follows, viz:

Every factory employing ten operators or up to twenty, $200 per annum.

Every factory employing twenty operators or up to fifty, $500 per annum.

Every factory employing fifty operators or up to one hundred, $800 per annum.

Every Factory employing one hundred or more operators, $1,000.00 per annum.

RESOLVED—Each factory of oleomargarine, butterine and similar substitutes for butter, or of tobacco, cigars or cigarettes, shall be for the purposes hereafter stated, a bonded warehouse; the products manufactured therein being, for the purposes hereinafter set forth, under the control of the Minister of Finance and Customs and such officers as he may appoint from the time of its production in the factory until the packages containing it have been duly stamped or marked, and the excise duty paid thereon.

RESOLVED—It shall be unlawful for any person to take from such factory, or from the part or parts under the control of the officer aforesaid, any product of the factory not contained in packages marked or stamped by the Excise Officer with the name of the article or with some other stamp or mark whereby the product of the factory may be distinguished, except by permission of the Minister of Finance and Customs.

RESOLVED—The excise duty levied and collected upon oleomargarine, butterine or similar compounds, and upon tobacco, cigars and cigarettes, shall be paid in cash in advance from time to time to the Minister of Finance and Customs, or such persons as he may appoint, before a permit shall be granted for the entry of such products into consumption; the Excise Duty so collected being from time to time paid into the consolidated revenue.

RESOLVED—For any violation of the foregoing provisions relating to Excise, complaint may be made before a Stipendiary Magistrate of two Justices of the Peace, and the offender, upon conviction, shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding Five Hundred Dollars, or in default of the payment thereof, to imprisonment for a period not exceeding six months. If the person convicted be the holder of a license, or if it be proven that he was a party to the offence, his license shall be forfeited, and he shall thenceforth be incapable of procuring a license.

RESOLVED—All articles and ingredients except butter imported into Bond for the use and to be used in the manufacture of tobacco, cigars, cigarettes, butterine, oleomargarine, or similar compounds, shall be admitted free of duty under regulations to be made by the Governor-in-Council, which Regulations shall set forth and enumerate the articles and ingredients to be imported into Bond.

RESOLVED—Whenever lard, compound lard, cottolene or similar substances, are manufactured in this Colony, the provision of the 20th, 23rd, 25th and 27th Resolutions shall apply to lard, compound lard, cottolene and similar substances, and to their manufacture, in the same manner as if they were expressed in the said Resolutions

RESOLVED—No drawback or refund of revenue shall be allowed, other than those provided for in these Resolutions and in Chapter 22 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (Third Series).

RESOLVED — These Resolutions shall not affect in any way any right granted to any Company by Statute or under contract with the Government confirmed by the Legislature.

RESOLVED — These Resolutions shall be held to have come into operation on the 9th day of April One Thousand Nine Hundred and Twenty-Four, at the hour of 9.30 a.m.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on to-morrow.

The Chairman from the Committee of the Whole on Supply reported certain Resolutions, which were read a first time, as follows:

Dept. of Customs	$450,783.00
Dept. of Assessors of Taxes	15,120.00
Dept. of Contingencies	196,992.00
Dept. of Pension Board Commissioners	617,590.00

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.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until Monday afternoon next, the 13th inst., at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, April 13th, 1925.

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

At quarter past three of the clock, there being no quorum, Mr. Godden only being present, Mr. Speaker adjourned the House until tomorrow afternoon at three of the clock.

TUESDAY, April 14th, 1925.

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

Presenting Petitions

MR. WARREN—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition which is rather an unusual one; and I do not suppose that a petition such as this has been presented to this House for many years. It is an outcome of the recent act passed providing for the redistribution of seats in the House of Assembly. It is from the inhabitants of Hermitage and Dawson's Cove, at present in the electoral district of Fortune Bay, but eventually it will be in the electoral district of Hermitage. They ask that Hermitage be made the headquarters of the new district. I do not know what power or authority there is to make a town the capital of an electoral district; but in accordance with their request, I present this petition to the House, and ask that it be referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. DUFF—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Victoria in the District of Carbonear. Most of the petitioners are men who were working in the mines at Sydney. They were working on short time last year and spent most of their money in going there and returning. At present they are in distress and ask that they be given work. The petition requests work or food and it appears the situation is serious. The petitioners also say that if the Government is going to undertake road work, there are roads near Victoria that should be put in order. This would give the petitioners honorable employment and I ask that the petition be given every consideration and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a number of petitions from points in the District of Trinity. The first is from the people of Butter Cove and Gooseberry Cove asking that a sum of money be provided to extend the road from Southport to Northern Bight. That road passes through a number of important communities and all the people in the section are interested in the matter. The petition is signed by Alexander Spurrel and thirty-three others. There is also a petition from the people of Little Heart's Ease on the same subject. The second petition is from the inhabitants of New

Chelsea for $500 to repair the road to the river and to rebuild the bridge spanning the river at New Chelsea. This road is on the main line and is used by all who pass that way. The petitioners set forth that the river overflows, making the road impassable, and they ask that the bridge be raised and rebuilt. This is signed by Thomas Belbin and fifty-three others. There is also a petition from Champney's West asking for a sum to repair an important road in that section. The petitioners ask for $300. Another petition from Bay Bulls Arm asks for the allocation of $1000 for the railway connecting road between Bay Bulls Arm and Come By Chance. Part of this would be for repairs to Northern Bight Bridge, which at present is not fit for horses to pass over. It also refers to a hotel. The petitioners point out that Come By Chance Crossing is a suitable location for an hotel, as it would accommodate people from Placentia and Trinity Bays as well as other visitors. I may say that this is one of the beauty spots which we hear so much about, and it is a place where an hotel would serve a great number of people. Again there is a petition from the people of Shoal Harbor asking for $45.00 to rebuild a bridge which is falling into decay, and which is necessary to permit the people to get from one place to another. This is signed by thirty-one people of that section. Still another petition is from the people of Clifton and vicinity asking for $50.00 to repair a mile of road leading to Rock Pond, a road which is very much used by the people of this neighbourhood. If $50.00 would build this road, the Government should not refuse this amount. The petition is signed by Abraham Hobbs and others. There is also one from Winterton signed by fifty-nine people, and setting forth the need of street lighting which would be a boon to the town. I will, therefore, ask that this petition be given every consideration. I beg to support the prayer of these petitions and ask that they be referred to the Departments to which they relate.

CAPTAIN RANDELL—Mr. Speaker, I beg to support the petitions presented by my colleague, Mr. Halfyard.

I also beg to present a petition from the inhabitants of New Harbor on the subject of a road from that place to Spaniard's Bay. This road, I think, extends to a distance of about seven miles, and seeing that there is no medical practitioner at New Harbor this road would be very convenient in getting a man from the other place. I trust, sir, the Government will consider this petition and have it recommended to the dept to which it refers.

MR. HALFYARD—I beg leave to support the petition.

MR. GODDEN—I also wish to support the petition.

Notice of Question.

MR. HALFYARD gave notice of questions (1) and (2).

MR. GODDEN gave notice of questions (1) and (2).

MR. WARREN asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs if any permission to ship or export wood to St. Pierre has been given within the past four months, and to whom such permission has been given.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Permission only had been granted for the export of wood to St. Pierre in the case of birch wood in junks.

MR. SCAMMELL asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs if it is the intention of the Government to retire H. W. LeMessurier as Assistant Collector of Customs, and to appoint Mr. Frank Archibald of Hr. Grace to the position now held by Mr. H. V. Hutchings in the event of

that gentleman being promoted to Mr. LeMessuier's position.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—I have no knowledge of any intention of the Government to retire Mr. H. W. LeMessurier. As to the suggestion of appointing Mr. F. C. Archibald I do not regard it as a compliment to that young and energetic gentleman to be asked to regard him as seeking a Government job.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 83 of the Consolidated Statutes 1916 (Third Series) and Acts in Amendment thereof."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, in introducing this Bill to-day I would merely wish to point out that the provisions of the enactment are simply to assist and simplify the method now followed in dealing with certain cases in the Supreme Court and in the selection of jurors. The bill was drawn up by the Rules Committee of the Supreme Court, including the three judges, the Registrar and two or three of the leading practitioners of the bar. For your information I will read through the various sections, and as we go along I will explain the changes this bill will make.

The first section reads as follows:

(Reads)

and according to Chapter 83 of the Consolidated Statutes (third series) entitled "The Judicature Act" this section governs the holding of trials of a criminal nature, and we are now referring particularly to those of Treason and Capital Felony:

(Reads)

You will see then that in the past three judges sat at the hearing of these Capital charges, but now the provision of the 1st sec. of this bill is to provide that one judge may in future hear cases of this nature. The main underlying object of the change is to leave the other two judges free to deal with criminal appeals which as you are aware must be heard by three judges. So we can readily see that we are at last doing our first legislating in the nature of Criminal Appeals, which is really only of recent enactment in England. And our Laws already provide that all the criminal laws of England shall apply and be the law of this country in so far as the same can be carried out, and that all amendments and changes in the Imperial Law shall not come in force and be the Law of this Country until twelve calendar months have passed. We are therefore setting up the machinery for the independent hearing of Criminal Appeals by Judges who have not previously sat upon the case by having only one Judge required to hear Capital charges instead of three as at present essential under our judicature rules.

MR. WARREN—Does this section provide for the Tribunal necessary to Criminal Appeals or only to the Machinery?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—To the Machinery only, for the Tribunal is already provided for according to the section of the Judicature Act I have just read. The change being made is simply to have one judge hear Capital Charges instead of three.

The next section of the new bill reads as follows:

(Reads)

and against that there is the section of the Judicature Act at present in force, which reads:

(Reads)

You will see then that this section of the bill provides for the qualifications of men liable to be called on juries, both for Grand Juries and for

Petty and Special Juries. This qualification is merely a property one as heretofore, except that the value of the man's property or its rental is increased before he can qualify.

The average man qualifying for a Grand Jury is a man who occupies a rented house. And to-day a house of any value owned by the average class of man is worth at least $5,000. The idea, as I have said, is simply to fix the rental value at $360. As to what may be regarded as the average standard of rental, it would be the rental paid by a man, say, serving in a Water Street store, a man who would be occupying a fairly comfortable house, and it was thought that he would be paying at least thirty dollars per month.

I must explain that the object is just to try and make some division between the Grand and Special Juries.

There are a number of cases where men ought not to be forced to go to a trial with special juries. The Special Jury costs more, and in many instances the case could be equally well dealt with by a pretty jury; but to-day, practically every one, as far as the criminal work goes, is on the Grand Jury, and you find the same people getting summoned repeatedly to act on special juries. In the meantime, the object is to limit the class of Grand Jurors and enlarge the class of Petty Jurors.

Present Section 59 Reads:—

I would like to explain that this particular Section applies only to St. John's. The qualifications of the Grand Jury were that a man should be occupying property to the value of two thousand dollars, or own a house of rental value of $240.00. It is proposed to make this $5,000 and $360.

Section 60 reads:—

That is now made $120.00 or ten dollars per month. The average workingman's home to-day costs ten dollars per month. Years ago when this Act was first introduced the rental value was four or five dollars it is now ten dollars per month.

Section 8 of Section 63 of the old Act reads:— (Reads)

This will be changed to October. The idea is merely to have a jury list which will be taken a little earlier and revised and completed for the Fall term of Court. Sections 9 and 10 and all others of the Bill are in wording new in effect, and I will just run thru them and draw attention to any changes that have been made.

(Reads)

The first provision is this, that instead of drawing (as has been the practice in the past) only twenty three names, thirty six are to be drawn, and as it will be found twenty three of those first called become the Grand Jury. The object must be quite apparent.

With the machinery in existence almost invariably it will be found that you never have anything like the the full Grand Jury. Twenty three names are drawn and the summonses are issued, and it is found some are out of town or sick and cannot attend, and so you have a position in which you have sometimes very little more than half the number of Grand Jurors. As I say, the idea is simply to provide the machinery to start off with a full Grand Jury.

(Reads Act)

Section 10. This is a very important Section in the sense of relieving a lot of awkwardness—what we would call a sort of hard luck of some people who seem to have a knack of being drawn repeatedly to serve on Grand Juries. They have to leave their business, and sometimes they are around the Court all day and are not drawn in the end. This Section of the Act provides that a man will not have to serve more than

once in the same year on a Special Jury.

Section 10 on the bottom of page 3: the idea is that no man is to be allowed to serve on more than one jury except in the case where it is found that there are less than three hundred names to be drawn from. There are three hundred men's names on the list and any man who has already served must stand aside unless the number has gone below three hundred, but when the number has gone below three hundred then a man stands a chance of getting called again. It is the opinion of the Sheriff's office that no man should have to serve more than once on a criminal case in one year. Now section 68 of the present act reads as follows:—

You would almost want the book beside you to understand just how this thing goes. I will read it anyhow. (Reads)

These words are to be stricken out. The present machinery is that to-day a special jury is drawn the same as a petty jury and forty eight men have to serve the whole term. Now the machinery of the drawing is the same, but instead it provides under section 12 which is an amendment to section 69 the following amendment:—

(Reads)

In other words at present in a criminal cause if the Council for the prisoner agrees the jury is limited to forty eight names and the course adopted is as follows:—

(Reads)

In section 14 there is the same provision made as in the previous amendments. Section 15, the amendment to Section 79, is the same idea.

Under the present position when a a judge is on circuit he has not the right although some of them take it upon themselves and others refuse to take it upon themselves, to draw juries at short notice. The regular thing is that forty eight hours' notice be given, but it is thought desirable that where necessary the judge should have power to call the juries when on circuit at shorter notice than at present where the defendant is agreeable to a speedy trial. Section 82 increases the age limit because a man at sixty five is only in his prime. To-day you have men who are in fit condition to go out and play a game of football, and they get up and ask to be excused on the ground of being too old. I have some little experience in criminal defense, and I think that these men around that age are those best capable of doing the right thing. They have mature judgments at that age. Section 18 is the provision that I referred to in the main section of process served in outports. I do not need to go into details. The idea is that it should be made so that there should be sufficient compensation for those who do this work. Under the present case you are not able to get a deputy in the outports, and you have to send a man down from St. John's, and these men who go down from the city have to undergo some hardship and expense, and under this provision for the increase in fees there will be a chance for them to be compensated out of the revenue which will be provided in this way. At present there are a number of men in the outports receiving the nominal sum of say fifty dollars a year, but this is not sufficient to make it worth their while to go to any trouble to do this work. To-day, I understand, there are a great number of writs waiting to be served because people cannot be got to serve them, and it is not worth the extra expense of having a man sent down for the purpose because this would add to the expenses already incurred.

This amendment will be found very useful by those who find themselves forced to resort to ligitigation, and it

is just to the man on whom the process is to be served.

I cannot do more than say that the whole measure is the result of the deliberations mainly of the judges of the court, and they asked to have this done before. It was to have been brought down during the last session. As far as my opinion is concerned I can only say that I think that the amendments are desirable.

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 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.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 74 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of Old Age Pensions."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

Committee of the Whole on Bill "An Act to Amend Chapter 74 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of Old Age Pensions."

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, before this Bill is read I would like to say that some Members on this side of the House have expressed the opinion that the age of the old lady to be entitled to the pension might be put at sixty-five years instead of seventy. I have an open mind on the matter, but as the Bill reads now she must attain the age of seventy years. It is a her husband must be dead. It is a fact that this pension is being apportioned pro rata to the districts and that men who are not seventy years of age have got it on the recommendation of the district members because they were worn out before the allotted time. I think that it is a matter of record that the pension has been given to men of seventy. As a general rule the woman is generally younger than the man when he dies, and if the age for the man is seventy five, I think it might be made sixty-five for the women. Without further comment, Mr. Chairman, I leave the Bill as it now stands.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, I agree that the age should be sixty-five or even sixty, as at that age a woman is helpless and not able to do anything for herself. I think, however, that provision should be made in the Bill as to the case of her re-marrying even at sixty so as to cover the matter of the pension being continued. The Honourable the Prime Minister has made the statement that men at the age of seventy are getting the pension, but as the law stands now, they should be seventy-five. This is rather a serious matter, as there are many men at seventy-two, and even at seventy-four who are not receiving it and the exact age should be stipulated in the Bill. I am prepared to support the proposition of a widow at sixty-five or even sixty getting the grant, and I suppose that by this Bill the woman even if she marries at the age of sixty-five will still receive it.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Chairman, I would like to explain that the Bill does not read that way now. However, I do not see any great risk in falling in line with the suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition and making the Bill read that the pension is cancelled if the woman re-marries. I think it would be better to put in a clause covering re-marriage, as it may happen that some worthless fellow will marry a

woman for the sake of the pension. I would not like to see any woman thrown away on some useless man who would take her for the sake of the fifty dollars a year. I think it would be alright to amend the Bill, so as to deal with this re-marriage question.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Chairman, I agree with the idea that the age of which the women should receive the pension should be sixty-five, and I think this would be a step in the right direction. I also think that the man's age should be reduced to seventy. Only last night on my arrival here I received a message from an old man in my District who was over seventy, and also blind. He says that he is in a state of starvation and asked if anything could be done in his case. Under the present law nothing can be done for him, but I would ask the Honourable the Prime Minister if he could not make the age for men seventy years.

MR. MOORE—Mr. Chairman, I do not know if this Bill appeals to other Members of this House in just the same way that it does to me. We have been legislating here about highroads and other matters of the kind, but in my sixteen years experience in this House I do not think there has ever been a more important measure come before it than the Bill with which we are now dealing. I have in my mind's eye at the moment an incident which occurred when I was canvassing in the Election Campaign in Ferryland District. An old man and his wife were sitting on either side of the fireplace, and he said to me "if I die I do not know what will become of the old lady." The scene was a heart-rending one. But a few days ago I sent that man a wire telling him that the Monroe Government was providing for cases like his, and I know that as a result of that message many a prayer was offered up in that settlement for the Prime Minister and the Government, which was bringing in this measure. There is no Bill to which I would give readier support than this, and the Honourable the Prime Minister and the Government are to be heartily congratulated on introducing it. It is a wonder to me that of all the politicians who have sat in this House in former years, none had the foresight nor wisdom to bring in a Bill that would provide for the ladies in their advanced years, and I, therefore, congratulate the Honourable the Prime Minister, and give the measure my heartiest support.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, before this Bill goes through I would like to add a word or two in support of it. I think it is the most humane bill that has come before this House in very many years. I have listened to Mr. Brown, the Honourable Member for Twillingate, advocating that the age of pensioners be reduced to seventy, and while I would like to see that done, I do not think the Government has provided even enough to look after the men of the age of seventy-five and over. I know that there are many such, and in Ferryland District there are quite a number of that age on the waiting list, and unless the Government can see their way clear to increase the vote, I do not see how they can reduce the age. I support the Bill, however, with every ounce of my strength, as it is one that will be a benefit to the fishermen. For years we have been voting pensions to men who all their lives are drawing high salaries.

To-day we have come in here to ask this House to give to the widows of the Old Age pensioners the pensions after the old men pass away. I think this will go down as a red letter day in the Legislature of Newfoundland. I want to compliment the Prime Minister on bringing in this

Bill and can assure him and this House that tonight there are in Newfoundland old widows for whom this Bill will mean more than any other Bill that has ever come into this House.

Mr. Chairman, I give this Bill my hearty support, and trust that possibly next year when we come in here as a Government or as any other party that we will see our way clear to add further to the Old Age Pensioners of this country. The men who have made this country what it is to-day, not the civil servants who worked for two or three years and then get paid off, they are only a few years in the service, and then when they become unfit they are paid off with one hundred, two hundred or three hundred dollars per month. They did nothing for Newfoundland and they are now paid off, and the poor worn-out fishermen of whom my friend, Mr. Walsh, often talked about in this House—men who haul the fish out of the water at Cape St. Mary's and other places in Placentia Bay, they have to be satisfied with only $50.00 a year and then they have to wait until they are seventy-five years old to get it.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a suggestion, I am quite satisfied to have the age reduced to 65 years. It would be a mistake to make it less than 65. There will then be ten years difference between the ages of the men and the widows. I think that difference will be almost enough. I will be glad sometime to reduce the age; but, as Mr. Cashin has pointed out, there are many districts that have not enough money to take care of the old age pensioners at 75, and, therefore, a suggestion has been made to leave the age at 65 years and to add to the foot of the Section the words "until death or remarriage."

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 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.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Records of 'Pure Bred Animals.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—Mr. Chairman, as I pointed out in the second reading of this Bill I had been in receipt of requests coming from various farmers in the vicinity of St. John's and in other sections of the country interested in the breeding of pure-bred animals. On enquiry it was found that at the present time there are one hundred head of cattle in St. John's, Hr. Grace, Bay St. George and Bonavista, practictally from every district in the Island and requests have been coming to the department dating back seven or eight years asking that the necessary legislation be passed so that enterprising farmers who have gone to the expense and trouble of importing certain breeds of cattle should be able to have this stock registered in this country.

In Canada and other countries the people have been permitted to form themselves into various associations to look after the registration of different classes of stock. I don't think it necessary to have such measures put into effect here. The enactment of this law will not entail any further expense or machinery other than that already at the Department of Agriculture and Mines. In 1919 and 1920 the

then Minister of the Department, Dr. Campbell, had the necessary registration forms printed and completed, and all that was required was the authority of this House so as to be able to put this machinery into effect. I don't think there is any further information I can give the Committee more than to say that certain people recently completed operations at Corner Brook for the raising of several heads of Stock. They intended to purchase these from a man named Ross here in St. John's, but because Mr. Ross is not in a position to give registration papers they refused to purchase the stock from him. This man had gone to considerable expense in importing them. There is no encouragement to spend money on the business unless he can get all there is in it.

MR. HICKMAN—The Minister states that there will be no further expense in carrying out this; but Section 2 says that you may appoint an officer if you deem it necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act. Have you not already employees down in the Department who could do that work?

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—Yes, the Agricultural Department will be able to look after that. There will be no additional staff.

MR. HICKMAN—Will there be any fee for registration?

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—In Canada they do charge a fee from $1.50 up to $5.00; but in Canada the Government gives the vote of one thousand dollars towards this. To offset that a fee is charged. We would not have to charge a fee; the Bill is purely to encourage the breeding of pure-bred cattle.

MR. BROWNE—Might I ask the Hon. Minister whether animals that are here now will be permitted to register here. As the Act reads it refers to the pedigree of pure bred horses. But there are other animals such as sheep and dogs, and foxes, particularly foxes that are being bred here. If they are registered here for the first time will they be considered pure will they be considered pure bred? bred? There are many people in that business now exporting both foxes and dogs.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I think that the last line of Sec. 3 covers that. As it reads now that will be decided by the Minister who is keeping the records.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—I would like to ask the Minister of Justice if there is anything here to cover what we have been talking about.

MR. BROWNE—I suppose that because a man has been interested in the breeding of Newfoundland dogs he will not be discriminated against now because he cannot furnish a pedigree for the animals and so lose the business in which he has been engaged.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —I think that this is a point that is best answered by leaving the section as it is now. The Minister of Agriculture and Mines is not going to give these certificates without some thought and care. It is left to the discretion of the minister.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—Mr. Chairman, the position is this. Mr. Browne refers to the industry of dog raising in Newfoundland and the case of the man who raises a Newfoundland pup and then sells him in some other place, say the United States or Canada for fifty or seventy five dollars. And this man wants something to show that this is a Newfoundland Dog and that it has been bred in Newfoundland. Under the present system we have the printed forms for this work, but we have not the legislative sanction to do this. We have not the power to give these certificates. The Hon. Doctor Campbell prepared the neces-

sarys forms, but did not ask for the legislative authority. I think that Mr. Browne or anybody else who makes an application for a certificate there should be somebody qualified to give it to him. Of course I am not any more conversant with the subject than the Hon. Member for St. John's West. I have to be dependent on the advice of the officers of the department. I have down in the department one man, Mr. Bayly. who has given the best years of his life to agriculture in its every aspect, and I think that if the person who wants the certificate comes to the department all we need is the necessary authority to give it. At the present time we are not able to give these certificates. If there is anything that is not suitable in this bill then there can be an amendment, and the Hon. Member for St. John's West or some other member can bring in the changes and so make any necessary improvement. I will be glad to get any suggestions that may be helpful, but I think that at this outset there is no necessity for looking for obstacles. We can find lots of obstacles if we wish to look for them, but this is the best that can be done under the present circumstances, and I think that every member will agree to it. There will be no unnecessary expenditure, but merely the keeping the accounts of the pedigree of the pure bred animals, and I think that this will show the farmers of this country that the Government is trying to do good for them and for the country.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, before the bill passes the final stage I wish to refer to one thing although we have passed the section. I do not like section two of the bill. It is alright for the present Minister of Agriculture and Mines because he is a very conscientious man, but it seems to me that it is leaving the way open for a new minister some time in the future to make two or three more appointments to the Department of Mines and Agriculture. The Department of Agriculture and Mines had two or three men down there on the agricultural societies and they drew substantial salaries and did nothing for it. And some time in the future there will be some man who is a supporter of the Govt. or perhaps a member of the House of Assembly and he will be attached to the Dept. on the Pure Bred Animals staff and will do nothing at all, and give no returns for the money which he received. It looks to me that Section two leaves the way for some future minister to make these appointments and to pay more salaries in this connection.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—The Minister of Agriculture and Mines will have no authority under this to pay any salaries, because there is no provision made here for that.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—If there is a man appointed to these positions there will have to be salaries provided. Some minister in the future will have to provide for the salaries for the men who are to inspect the pure bred animals. I think that the Hon. Minister of Justice may see that what I say is right. Of course I can understand that it is not the intention of the present Minister to increase the staff, but some other minister will do it. The Minister states that he has in the department Mr. Bayly, a man who is very competent to do the work, but Mr. Bayly has no lease of life, and if he should have to leave the department for that reason or another then the Department will have to make two or three appointments to do this work. I agree with the bill. If a dog can be raised in

Newfoundland and then sold for fifty or seventy-five dollars it is just as good to the country, I suppose, as ten or twelve quintals of fish, because it does not cost so much money to produce the dogs. But I would like to see something done with section two.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, I think that we all agree with the position that the Leader of the Opposition takes. But at the present time the Minister of Agriculture and Mines merely asks for the authority to give the certificates to the owners of pure bred animals. As for the salaries for officials for this work that is a thing that will not have to be considered until the magnitude of the work is revealed, and he says that at the pre sent time they have down in the department men who are able to attend to this work. Of course I do not intend to say that if there is a man in the department who can do this work that he should do it in addition to his present work and receive no salary for it if he has to work over time. I never believe in the principle that a man should work for nothing; the man you have got to look out for is the man who is working for nothing. I take it that what the Minister thinks just at present is that there is no necessity to have one man for this job, but if after two or three years he finds that this thing is taking a tremendous lot of time, then he will come in and ask for a vote. At present, however, he does not think that any such position will arise. But to-day he cannot do anything. To-day he has not power to compensate a man at all; and I would not like this clause to be put down here as any more than it really is. No doubt, we could make the clause read that any official appointed under this Act should not receive any remuneration or emolument. We could do that, but I, for one, do not agree with that principle.

I take it that the position now is that Mr. Bayly in the office is a bit of an enthusiast in agricultural matters; and he will probably do this work, and perform the duties more or less as an outlet for his enthusiasm. But if this thing should ever get to such proportions that it may really require a man to give a lot of his time to it, I do not think that a man should be asked to sit up all night to satisfy this particular hobby. I think that the Leader of the Opposition will agree with me in that. If the Minister should ever come down here, and ask for a vote to pay a man to fill this appointment, I think that both sides of the House would agree that the vote should be given to him.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, the honourable Minister has said exactly what was in my mind—that no man should work without pay; and that being so, why should Mr. Bayly be called upon to work without pay, even if he is looking after agricultural matters that he is interested in; but if the work is only very small, and can be done by the officials of the department, then I think that any future Minister should be prevented from making any appointment. When the Minister of Agriculture and Mines was explaining the Bill, I asked him if there was going to be any fee charged for registration, and he said there would not. I do not see why there should not be a fee charged, and then Mr. Bayly, or anyone else who does the work can be paid out of the fees collected. If a salary should have to be paid, why not provide for a fee in this Bill. I do not see why a man who has good stock, which he wants to have registered should not be prepared to pay a fee for registration, if he is going

to get a benefit by registering the animals.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, I think we are rather wasting time by making a mountain out of a mole-hill, for this reason. I can quite see the point taken by the Leader of the Opposition, but supposing you took the section in question right out of the Bill, does the Leader of the Opposition think that the Government would not have power to appoint somebody to do the job, if they can appoint people to look after bugs and beetles when there is no provision for such appointment, and the salary can be fixed by the Governor in Council, and we will be asked afterwards to ratify the appointment. So after all we may perhaps look upon the section this way, that the Minister anticipates that in the carrying out of this Act he may require some help. At all events he will serve notice upon us that somebody will be required, and if he has asked somebody to help him, it does not matter whether the appointment is provided for in the Act or not.

I agree, however, with the suggestion that a fee should be charged for registration. If the thing is worth having, it is worth paying for. If there are certifiicates granted under this Bill, they will entail a certain amount of clerical work anyhow, and if a salary has to be paid to an official, it is only fair that it should be paid by those who are getting the benefit of the Act. Therefore, I think there ought to be a fee charged for the registration of animals under this Act.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS — Mr. Chairman, I agree to a certain extent with the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, and I think that this thing may develop into quite a big department. I thought that the department would have to do only with agriculture and agricultural animals, but now I find that you are going to register domestic animals—even dogs . . . .

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—And cats. . . . .

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—No doubt all the cats in Harbour Main will be registered. However, I would like to say that the best breed of cats in Harbour Main District were brought up there by the Hon. J. J. Murphy.

I just heard a little dog groan, so to speak, through one of the apertures there. But he was not howling in pain, but in joy, probably because now he can be classed as being of a particular breed. If you are going to have all these animals registered, I expect it will require at least a half dozen officials, such as we have in the Registry of Births, Deaths and Marriages; and I think there may be an opening there for some of our friends to get a nice position. I do not say that it will be immediately. I know that it is not the intention of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines to yield to temptation of that kind.

But I do not think that provision of the same kind should be made in this Bill for agricultural animals and pet animals, because they are two entirely different matters. You should have one measure to deal with dogs and cats, and another to deal with agricultural animals.

This Bill will enable those who are interested in live stock to keep a good breed of animals, and after this people who keep live stock for breeding purposes, will always be able to get good animals, and get well paid for the stock they have.

I was going to say that no fee should be charged for the registration of agricultural animals in the outports. This Bill is looked upon as a measure to help the farmers of St. John's, and those engaged in stock raising in St. John's; but I hope that in a short time these breeders will

have a large amount of good bred animals on hand, so that they will be able to meet the demands of those engaged in agriculture in the outports. I think that this matter is well worth the consideration of the Minister. It is just as important as importing good seeds, good potatoes, good oats and other good seeds which are necessary for successful farmers. I also think that Mr. Bayly of the Agricultural Board is a first class man, who I know would agree with me in the view I take of the situation—that something ought to be done before long to encourage our farmers to keep a better breed of cattle, and the Board of Agriculture should have a number on hand at all times, to be able to supply the demands of the people in the outports.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—Mr. Chairman, I expect to have about fifty applicants tomorrow morning waiting on the door to see me, looking for the job, after what has been said here this afternoon. It is not the intention of the department—it is not the intention of the Government to employ any man, or to expend any money as a result of this Bill. There will be no great hardship imposed upon Mr. Bayly at present at any rate. As far as I know there will be about one hundred head of cattle to be registered, and we will have only about fifty applicants to start with.

With regard to the question of charging a fee—that was discussed by the gentlemen in my office, and also by some correspondents who were in touch with me. They were very much opposed to having the same rules and regulations as they have in Canada put into effect here, whereby anything considerable would be charged for registration. I think that we should be trying to encourage these people as much as possible; and if we were to charge a nominal fee, the small amount that the Treasury would get would hardly be worth while. If it were the intention of the Government to employ any additional help, fifty cents or a dollar on each certificate would be a very small drop in the bucket towards the salary of the official employed. I think that it is not the intention of the department to employ any additional help because of this Act. It is not the intention of the Department to have this cost the colony anything additional. I think that for the sake of the twenty or thirty or forty dollars that would be collected, it would be better to let these people know that we are making an honest attempt to encourage them, free of charge.

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 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.

Second reading of an act to amend the Legislatives Disabilities Bill.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, I do not know that I can say anything differently from what I said when this Bill was introduced last session, and I have learned nothing since to cause me to change my opinion as to the amending of this section of the Statutes so as to qualify a member of this House to become a member of any government subsidized company. I think that if a man is giving satisfactory service he should not be interfered with. I regard this appointment as one of the most important in the gift of the Government, and I do not think the party in question should be removable at the whim of any administration. I do not wish to extend my remarks beyond registering my disapproval of the proposed change in the Act.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Speaker, I beg the privilege of speaking again, as I think it is my duty to allay the misapprehension under which the honorable member and perhaps others seem to be laboring. As I said before, this Bill provides for the very thing to which the honorable member refers. The Bill reads:

(Quotes Bill)

All this Bill does is to openly say that if a member accepts an appointment as a director of a company such as referred to, he shall not be disqualified from sitting in this House. No more power has been given to the Government, nor can it take any more power than it has. I merely speak now so that there will be no more misunderstanding or that people will have the impression that this Government is going to upset the whole apple cart in this connection. That idea is entirely wrong as we are going to do nothing of the kind.

MR. GODDEN—Mr. Speaker, I take it that the whole purpose of the Bill is to make it possible that a member of this House may be a director of the Nfld. Power and Paper Co., and I think it a pity to bring in any measure to upset the existing act. Chapter four of the Consolidated Statutes, 3rd series, was designed to prevent just this sort of thing, the Legislative Disabilities Act is well defined, and an amendment such as this Bill calls for will mar and lessen its efficiency. This country is interested in the Nfld. Power and Paper Co. to the extent of ten million dollars, therefore it is decidedly necessary that we have representation on the directorate board of that company, so that the Government is kept informed at all times as to the progress or otherwise of the Humber Industry. The appointment should be if possible a permanent one, but if a member of the Government is given the appointment, we shall no doubt see a change of directors with each change of Government, which will not make for efficiency in a director. As I have said the present Act is a good one, and no exception should be made just to favor some particular member.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —This is only one of the exceptions. The other cases are different, but in this the salary is not paid by the Government. In the others they are paid out of the Government funds. I do not wish to interrupt the honorable member, but I want to make the matter clear to him. I would ask him to read Section 2 of the Statutes.

(Clerk reads section)

MR. GODDEN—The whole gist of the Act then is that any member other than those holding portfolios is debarred from positions of emolument. Therefore I say that he is not eligible to be a Director of the Newfoundland Power and Paper Co. The position calls for certain fees amounting to about 600 pounds or $3,000.00 in our own currency, I think, and that comes from the Government indirectly. As the appointment by which these fees are derived is under the Government, therefore I think it a pity to spoil a perfectly good law with an amendment such as is suggested.

The other day the Hon. Colonial Secretary in his remarks deplored the suggestion made by another speaker that politicians and politics were looked upon with a certain amount of disfavor these days. and I quite agree with the Hon. Colonial Secretary that it is high time that politics and politicians should be given encouragement, especially when an endeavour is made to do things right and above board. But if you want credit and praise you will have to deserve it, and I say that if you are bringing in this amendment to a perfectly good act for the purpose of giving some nice job to a Government supporter or

member it will not redound to your credit. This is the sort of thing that puts politicians under suspicion. I think that this thing perhaps should be considered in the light. You should put yourself beyond suspicion and seek a director outside the House of Assembly, and by all means get a good man. Not a charwoman, but a man of sound business ability. I consider that man should be chosen from outside the House of Assembly.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —According to the suggestion made by the Hon. Member if we are going to look for a man to take the position of director as the representative of the Government he should not be permitted to be a member of this Assembly.

MR. GODDEN—I did not intend to convey that suggestion. I only wanted to point out that the present act is a perfectly good one and was designed to prevent anything of this kind. By bringing in this amendment it will be clear and obvious to the general public that the amendment was made for the sole purpose of giving some nice job to some man that happened to be a Member of the Government.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 4 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of Legislative Disabilities and the Vacation of Seats in the House of Assembly" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

Mr. Warren gave notice of question.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, April 15th, 1925.

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

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the residents of Ferryland district and which, with your permission, Sir, I shall now read to the House:

(Reads Petition).

This petition is signed by practically every elector on the shore and the petitioners have in view, no doubt, the tourist policy which the Government propose bringing into effect this year and the fact that considerable money will be spent by people going to and from St. John's. While on this subject I would like to draw the attention of the Government to the fact that the outport Road Inspector has reported that these roads that I have referred to are in a poor and delapidated conditions, and I trust that sufficient money will be allocated to put them in a proper state of repair.

MR. MOORE—Mr. Speaker—I rise to support the prayer of the petition and I hope that when the Road Commission takes charge that this will be one of the first matters to receive their attention. This road is used by people from town as well as by people from the district of Ferryland and I trust that the Government will see their way clear to grant the request of the petitioners.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Tilton in the district of Harbour Grace. This is one of the petitions which was designated by the Prime Minister as talking to yourself; but a particular object I have in bringing this matter before the House is to give the Leader of the Opposition an opportunity of supporting it wholeheartedly or otherwise. The petitioners want a telephone established at Tilton. They have been for

many years looking for this privilege, despite the unfulfilled promises of previous politicians. I strongly support the prayer of the petitioners because the people there have to go as far as seven miles to get a doctor or for any other purpose, and I would suggest that the petition be referred to the Department of the Colonial Secretary for attention.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker, I have very much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition presenting by my colleague, the Honourable Colonial Secretary, and I am very glad to see that it comes under the Department of the Colonial Secretary. I was approached by some people belonging to Tilton some time ago with reference to this telephone service, and I advsied them to get up a petition setting forth their request and send it to the Colonial Secretary. This I am glad to say they have done and I give the petition my heart support.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Speaker, I have very much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition presented by my colleague, the honourable Colonial Secretary. I remember in 1919 when I was Leader of the Independent Party (I occupied that position before my honourable friend, Mr. Warren) that I promised telephone extension to the people of Tilton. Tilton has a population of about three hundred people and is isolated from the rest of the district. The people are five to seven miles away from any doctor, and are compelled to walk that distance if they want to get a doctor or a prescription filled.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present petitions from three or four sections of St. Mary's Bay on the subject of telephone extension, and now that we have the statement from the Honourable Colonial Secretary himself that the matter concerns his department, no doubt, the prayer of the petitioners will be probably granted.

Giving Notice of Question.

MR. HICKMAN gave notice of question.

MR. BROWN gave notice of question (2).

MR. DUFF gave notice of question (2).

HON. THE MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—I beg to lay on the table of the House the report of Colonel Ross.

HON. THE MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Conception Harbour, in the olden times known as Cat's Cove. A public meeting was held at Conception Harbour and a committee was appointed, and I was asked to submit the signatures of the inhabitants of the place, praying that the road called I think New Pond Road, be extended in the country 7 or 8 miles. If you remember some years ago there was an allocation of a thousand dollars for that road, but it did not go very far. However it was quite appreciated at the time.

Now they are asking for only ten thousand dollars to complete the road from Conception Harbour to Brigus Junction. This road opens up some very valuable agricultural land and will enable the people to reach the forests and I have no doubt it will eventually become a highway. I have no doubt it will be used by hundreds of motors. Perhaps our worthy friends from the United States and Canada will take in the beauties of the surrounding country there. No doubt I will live long enough to see a very large hotel built there. This petition is largely signed by every person in Conception Harbor. About three thousand inhabitants. Now that the people are taking up farm-

ing and are not prosecuting the fishery like they used to, this road will enable them to reach better agricultural land in the neighbourhood of Brigus Junction. I give this petition my hearty support and trust that after the House is closed the necessary amount will be forthcoming.

MR. CAHILL—I wish to support the petition presented by my colleague.

HON. MINISTER POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present another petition from Northern Arm, in the District of Hr. Main, asking that the sum of five hundred dollars be granted for the purpose of extending a road known as Whelan's Country Road. It leads to the railway line between Brigus Junction and Brigus, and the people on their own account have built a siding at the junction of this road. I hope the Railway Commission will give their best consideration to this fact, and that they will pay them for their labour and time in building this siding. They ask five hundred dollars to complete the road. The road is three miles long and will be of great advantage to the whole district, and will enable them to bring their goods from this siding. The amount of five hundred dollars is very small, and I hope the Finance Minister, after his big surplus this year, will find his way clear to get them this amount.

MR. CAHILL—Mr. Speaker, I wish to give my hearty support to the petition just read.

Answers to Questions

(1) MR. HALFYARD asked Hon. the Colonial Secretary if the Government Engineer or any one in his Department has been asked to give an estimate of the cost of rebuilding the Dry Dock, or the cost of the concrete work in connection therewith. Is it true that the Department has stated that the concrete work can be done for less than seventy thousand dollars.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, the reply to this question is of a two-fold nature. The answer to the first part of the question is in the negative. As regards the second part of the question, the Government has no knowledge that the Department made any statement as regards that.

(2) MR. HALFYARD asked Hon. the Prime Minister when considering the new Tariff why he ignored the services and recommendations of a certain member of the Board of Trade who stated that if given a sheet of paper and a pencil, that he could reduce taxation to the amountof a million and half dollars.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I know of no one who made any such statement, consequently I did not consult him.

(3) MR. HALFYARD asked Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs what disposal was made of four rolls of cloth, about 230 yards, that was taken from Postal Stores and put in the Minister's office shortly after his appointment as Minister.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—These four rolls of cloth were sent to the tailors and four uniforms were to be made up from this cloth. The cloth was not complete; a considerable amount of it was in a damaged condition.

No. 4 Question—Deferred.

No. 5 Question—Deferred.

(6) MR. WARREN asked Hon. the Prime Minister: (1) if the cost of sending the S. S. Sagona to the seal-fishery was borne by public funds, if not, by what fund; (2) did the venture result in a profit or a loss; (3) if loss by whom was it borne.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, the cost of sending the Sagona to the Seal Fishery was borne by the public funds. I have no in-

formation as to whether the venture will prove a loss or not. I am afraid it will. If so the loss will be borne by funds under the control of the Railway Commission.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Bayley's Cove. There is very shallow water there, and in the Spring the fishermen are unable to land their boats, and the sum of four hundred dollars would help to build a wharf there and enable the fishermen to get fish at the present time, thereby increasing the catch by hundreds of quintals of fish. I know the place very well and have no doubt that the Government will see their way clear to grant the four hundred dollars asked for.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 83 Consolidated Statutes 1916 (Third Series) and Acts in Amendment thereof" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 74 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Old Age Pensions'" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Records of 'Pure Bred Animals'" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the 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. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, I do not see how we can proceed with the Ways and Means to-day because the budget has just been put on our desks and we have not yet seen the copy of the tariff. I understand from the Minister of Finance that there has been some change in the tariff in the principal lines of goods, and so that the tariff should be properly considered when it comes before us. I think that the Minister should give us a little time to go into the matters before us. I asked the Minister of Finance and Customs yesterday to let us have a copy of the report of the tariff commission and he promised to send it to me, but I suppose that he must have overlooked it. I have not yet seen it, and I think that is also necessary before we go into this. This is a very serious matter that is before us. It is one that must be gone into carefully and thoughtfully, and I have no doubt that suggestions of value will be offered from the Opposition as well as from the other side of the House. I do not think that there will be any time lost by giving us time to consider these matters, and then we can make our remarks as briefly as we can in the interest of the tariff and the people of the country. So I would ask the Minister of Finance and Customs if he would be good enough to let me have everything in connection with

this, and then I think that we will be able to get through the Ways and Means as quickly as possible.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, and Hon. Members of the House, I want to say that these resolutions are practically complete with the exception of one or two items. Fishermen's Rubber Boots, the Government has decided will come in the same as before. All the other changes are only a matter of misprint. There will be no material difference at all. There is a slight change on tea, but it will make but little difference. There will be no advaloram duty of seven cents on tea. All the rest is practically the same. There is very little change. There may be a few cents one way or the other. Now before rising the committee I would like to say that we as a Government or in my own position as the Minister of Finance and Customs have found that the conditions of the tariff was very obnoxious, and men of business down in the Customs House have found that they are bothered with the super-tax and the super-surtax, and in this tariff we have endeavoured to make it more satisfactory, and we hope clear away some of the difficulty that has been met down there.

(Reads)

By way of explanation in laying the new Tariff before the House, I should like to point out that this has been wholly and solely the work of the late Tariff Commission, and that according to the Commission's report, over two years were spent in its consideration and compilation. It will therefore readily be appreciated that with the many reforms crying for immediate attention, I had not the necessary time to go thoroughly into the work of the Commission. I have therefore taken the revised Tariff as it came from the hands of the Commission, from whose report I gather that the proposed tariff is the work, mainly, of the Deputy Minister of Customs, Mr. H. W. LeMessurier, C.M.G.

Feeling that this Tariff was not an idea born overnight and knowing that Mr. LeMessurier should be well equipped for the task after over thirty years' experience in Customs affairs, I lay the result of the Commission's work before the House for such consideration or criticism as it will no doubt receive.

As honourable members will see, the new Schedule is a very lengthy document, the compilation of which may well account for the two years spent upon it. According to the report of the late Commission it had received the "general and unqualified endorsation of all sections of the Newfoundland trade."

It has been felt for some years that the old Tariff contained too many anomalies, and that many of the items in it were so ambiguous as to require intimate knowledge and expert interpretation. Then, again, the computations required for the super-tax and sales tax, which latter included freight, insurance and other charges, were becoming a nuisance, and so the idea of a straight Tariff for all items was conccived.

In the new Schedule submitted, the various items are grouped in lines of similarity. Take for example, Group 1: Food, Drink and Tobacco. Section (a) Grains and Flour; Section (b), etc., etc. This definite classification and the multiplicity of items listed, will obviate all difficulty in Customs' clerical work in future; and a study of the list will show that in this respect, at any rate, the Commission did their work well.

When this new Schedule was submitted to the Board of Trade, the late Tariff Commission was notified

by their Council that no fault could be found with the compilation.

The report of the Commission goes on to say that similar testimony as to its provisions and general character, was given by practically all representatives of the local trade who came before the Commission from time to time, and adds that the "Schedule is therefore transmitted to His Excellency the Governor bearing the unanimous approval of all concerned therein."

The Board of Trade nominated certain of its members to give evidence before the Commission in order that first-hand information from business men of long experience and recognized standing could be availed of. These were questioned verbally upon points connected with the several trading businesses and industries with which they were connected and about which the Commission desired information, and this verbal evidence was transcribed verbatim by reporters.

But the Committee did not confine itself to the representatives of the Board of Trade. Other statements were taken on various classes of trade and industry not directly connected with that body, such as tinsmiths, sheet metal workers, block makers, candy manufacturers, iron mongers, etc., etc.

Judging from the report of the Commission, which is an exhaustive one, pains were taken to give every representative type of business man an opportunity of presenting his views on the subject of tariff revision. Wherever possible, written statements were the preferential form of expression, and the Report states that no finding in respect of any Tariff matter was made unless and until the Commissioners were fully cognizant of all the facts in relation to the matter and were absolutely satisfied that the information to hand was comprehensive and accurate enough to form a just basis for decision.

In addition to all this Sub-committees of the Commission were formed to go into such branches as the Hardware Trade, Provisions and Groceries, the Supply Trade and Meat and Cattle importations; and the Report states that these Committees were comprised of those members of the Commission best versed in the matters they were delegated to consider.

Further, in order to secure the views of representative outport business men, planters, etc., on the subject of Tariff Revision, a Circular was sent to Magistrates all over the Island, asking them to ascertain the opinions of these persons who might be able to aid the Commission. To this appeal, the Commission reports a fairly general response.

The Commission under their authority from the Governor were powerless to reduce taxation generally; all they could do was remedy to the best of their ability existing conditions and correct certain anomalies which had crept into the old Tariff.

As already indicated, much time and consideration appears to have been devoted to the work; yet I have no doubt in my mind that there are many inequalities still to be corrected. So many theories must of necessity have been advanced in the compilation of this Tariff, that some of them are bound to be exploded upon careful examination; but I submit Honorable Members that this is only a human document and as such bound to contain some oversights. The only way to avoid error in matters of this kind is to do nothing, and I feel that I am voicing the sentiments of the House when I state that the necessary remedies will be applied to assure the country of an ultimate Tariff so balanced as to bear equably upon all and press heavily on none.

Generally speaking the Manufacturers who appeared before the Commission urged increased protection for local industries, but for the most part this application was refused, the Commissioners holding that such an Industrial economical policy was a matter for the Executive Government and not for them to adjudicate upon. Another reason given for this refusal was the lack of information as to the value of local industries to the country, the Commission felt that they were asked to recommend concessions without being furnished with facts as to the exact returns made by our local industries for concessions they already enjoy.

In connection with the evidence obtained from Manufacturers two points were brought out. (1) That existing Industries established and in operation were often seriously affected by tariff concessions granted to new industries either by the Legislature or by the Governor-in-Council. (2) That the free entry of articles for the use of the Government service provided an opportunity for misue of the tariff. Under this item of exemption Government Contractors and Suppliers could import duty free much more material than was actually required and could undersell the surplus in the regular channels of trade at unfair profits.

In connection with these two points the Commission recommend (1) That existing industries be so protected that future concessions to be granted New Industries should not apply or affect the products or articles already being manufactured in the Colony, and (2) that free entry be abolished on articles for the use of the Government.

These appear two very wise recommendations, as in the first case the original protective intention is rendered abortive, and in the second no monetary advantage is gained by the free entry of articles for Government use.

The Commission reports that although the several sub-taxes have all been confined in one straight duty tax the effect of the tariff is practically the same as heretofore.

They could not assent to the many propositions to abolish the Sales Tax.

While the present administration agree that it is impossible to make such a drastic cut, yet they felt that imposition of the Sales Tax should be confined to straight invoice instead of including freight, insurance and other charges in the tax as heretofore.

Such matters as the question of foreign exchange and the dumping clause in the Revenue Act have not been dealt with as these were matters coming under the province of the Legislature and not within the scope of the Commissioners. In a similar way the question of Free entry or lesser duty granted to Corporations has not been considered by the Commissioners.

The recommendation of the Commissioners for better facilities respecting the examination of goods has already been attended to by the taking over of Eden's Building, so that all difficulty in this respect has been overcome.

GROCERY TRADE.

With regard to the Grocery Trade the Commissioners rejected the opinion advocated that specific duty was more effective and more equable than ad valorum. They were of the opinion also that some valuation for duty should be placed on all packages or containers. They concurred in respect to suggestions in relation to tariff rating, and, as proof that their views were very considerate and careful of the commonwealth, I may cite the fact that such every day grocery articles as eggs, tea and coffee were rated at a considerable lower figure

per unit than that suggested by some of the Trade.

DRY GOODS

In connection with the Dry Goods trade fault was found with the listings in the Old Tariff which were described as an absolute farce. Goods used for the same purpose were repeatedly listed at different ratings. Under the new classification these anomalies have been corrected. All Dry Goods are now properly classified and proportionately rated. That is to say cotton goods formerly mixed with woolens have now been separated and put in one class, etc., etc. The Commission conceded that local Manufacturers should continue to enjoy present protection but refused to accept the trade's recommendation that collars, caps, shirts and other readymades not manufactured locally should have the same high protective rates.

The recommendation for higher duty on wool and worsted yarns was rejected as the Commissioners held that these items were much used in the homes of our people for knitting purposes and the same position was held with respect to Spool Cotton, Buttons and other domestic wares of the housewife.

Post Cards, Booklets, etc., were not reduced for the reason that they could be produced locally. Other representations of the Dry Goods representatives to limiting the list of Dry Goods in the tariff could not be acceded to owing to the necessity of supplying statistical information.

READYMADES.

Clothing manufacturers wanted all materials entering into the manufacture of readymades admitted duty free, and that their tariff protection be at an average of fifty per cent. They asked that their machinery, their paper and paper-boxes get free entry and claimed that they were not getting the same treatment meted out to other manufacturers whom they claimed got raw material in free of duty. In favor of their request they urged the many advantages that would accrue, such as lower cost of readymades. The relief thus afforded would, they allege, enable factories to resume operations at full blast and thus help relieve the unemployment situation; that the additional wages would compensate the revenue for direct loss on tariff; that it would ensure the safety of present invested capital; and, lastly, that tariff responsibilities should be more equally divided amongst local industries.

The Commission took the position that the readymade clothing trade built up a highly prosperous business on a ten per cent. tariff rate, while at present there is an additional four per cent. added to the original rate; that unjustifiable inflation and lack of business judgment was responsible for the present condition of the industry. It was also contended that the actual protection afforded certain other industries to which they referred, was misrepresented, as in the case of the Colonial Cordage Company whose net protection on the products of the Company was less than seven per cent. against fourteen per cent. on readymades. Moreover other industries cited by the Readymade Trade are subject to similar tariff conditions. The Commission did not feel impressed with the arguments set forth by the Readymade Clothing Trade. They had not set up a convincing case for ampler protection and, as a matter of fact, the Commission reports that the protection accorded the Clothing Factories is already much greater than that given the industries with which they endeavour to compare their own.

NEWFOUNDLAND BOOT AND SHOE MANUFACTURERS.

It being urged that a tariff wall of 80 p.c. should be raised against the

importation of long rubber boots for fishermen, the point taken by the Commission on this industry was whether it was at present or in prospect valuable enough to the country generally to have our whole fishing class pay tribute, and they felt that the end did not justify the means. Moreover the Commission did not feel like dictating to the fishermen what they should wear, eat or drink.

With regard to the wholesale dumping of foreign made shoes, the Trade's views in this respect have been carried out as far as possible. As pointed out in my Speech of a few days ago the broad avenues of escape presented in this way have been barred by the strict observance of legislation already enacted.

HARDWARE TRADE.

Many anomalies in connection with the Hardware Trade were carefully dealt with and fully remedied. Unduly low hardware rates have been levelled up in order to ensure uniformity in the Schedule. The trade felt that hardware ratings generally were too low for a class of goods which lasted so long and that an increase in the lower hardware ratings would permit of a lower tariff rate on provisions and other like necessities.

The Commission had in mind, however, that many of the items referred to, such as tools, were necessities of life to our mechanics and workingmen generally and should come into the country at the lowest possible rate.

NAIL INDUSTRY.

The Nail Trade urged a uniform rate for nails of all varieties and metals to prevent ambiguities and evasions. They also protested the free entry of materials of construction for Government, Municipal and religious uses, urging the adverse effect on its operation and the consequent loss of hundreds of thousands of dollars to the revenue. The Trade generally recommended (1) the encouragement of labor-giving enterprises through tariff readjustments: (2) the policy of free entry or lower duty on raw materials and higher duty on finished products; and (3) the curtailment of free duty entry.

In reply the Commission set the nail duties at the ratings suggested and the ground nails of all kinds and metals together. They could not however accede to the imposition of higher duty on the finished products and the question of curtailing free entries was outside their jurisdiction.

MOTOR CAR INDUSTRY.

The Commission could not accede to the request of the Motor Trade for the reduction of duty on motor car importations generally. Certain anomalies which existed in the old Tar-off were remedied in order to ensure uniformity in the new Tariff and to assist the repairs and maintenance end of the industry which provides local labor. The Commission could not entertain the doubling of duty on second-hand cars imported into the country as the Customs now carefully appraise the value of such cars and thus safeguard the revenue effectively.

CONSOLIDATED FOUNDARY INDUSTRY.

This industry found no cause for complaint with the present tariff. The items on the free list are pig iron and sand. They strenuously opposed the contention of hardware representatives that cast iron pipe should be reduced from 35 per cent to 10 per cent to place it on the same footing as wrought iron. The Commission agreed with the point taken by the Trade.

COLONIAL CORDAGE COMPANY.

This industry was forced to pay the following duties on articles needed in the manufacture of lines and twines: Machinery Oil, 8c. per gallon; Glues

and Sizing, 35 per cent.; Tar, 15 per cent.; Dextrine, 35 per cent.; Labels, 50 per cent. Yet lines and twines were admitted on the free list. They submitted that their total protection amounted to 6½ per cent. on cordage and represented that the duties above quoted amounted to 3½ per cent. of the total value of the finished product. This really meant that the foreign-made article was being protected and encouraged at the expense of the local. They recommended a ten per cent. tax on all lines and twines imported and suggested that a similar duty of 15 per cent. on fish-hooks be removed to offset the hardship to fishermen, to which the Commission agreed.

NEWFOUNDLAND LUMBER AND PULP INDUSTRIES.

The Lumber and Pulp Trade urged tariff relief in connection with imports of machinery, equipment and supplies essential to its manufacturing activities. Their request for a classification of several of these articles at a rating of 25 per cent. was acceded to and their application in this respect was refused only so far as the importations in question could be used for other purposes than those connected with the pulp and paper industry. This included such items as rubber hose, packing of all kinds, finishing twine and electrical material and fittings. The Commission decided to group all articles for the encouragement of manufacturers into one special item and make the provisions thereof applicable to all such concerns operating in Newfoundland.

BLOCKMAKERS.

The Blockmaking Industry was satisfied with the present tariff until the Encouragement of Shipbuilding Act was so amended as to give free entry to wooden blocks and pumps. Mr. Hampton contended that with the bounty given by the Government to encourage shipbuilding (all blocks and pumps should be manufactured in the country and so contribute to local industry. The Commission had no jurisdiction, but were of opinion that the tariff on wooden blocks and pumps should be restored in accordance with the idea set forth by Mr. Hampton.

CARRIAGE BUILDING INDUSTRY.

The Commission concurred with most of the contentions put forward by the Carriage Industry, considered the rate of duty of 30 per cent. recommended on malleable iron of all qualities too sweeping. It felt also that the demand to increase duty on readymade carriages imported into Newfoundland would scarcely be fair to purchasers outside St. John's.

SHEET METAL WORKERS

This industry requested free importation for all raw materials and machinery connected with the business as well as increased protection in respect to tinware of all kinds, galvanized baths, tubs, etc. As this meant the Commission's endorsation of a tariff protection of 80 per cent. and would be in direct contravention of the representations made from other sources of trade that the present protection was altogether too high, it was decided that the request of the Sheet Metal Workers could not be acceded to.

GENERAL

While the Tariff Commission literally abolished the sur-taxes from the tariff, they did not do so in fact inasmuch as these taxes are contained in the Tariff as at present existing; these surtaxes now being embodied in one straight tax.

The argument will no doubt be raised that the present Tariff contains many items which show an actual increase, but to this I say that practically every item which enters into the daily life of our people in

the way of staple foods not already on the Free List is reduced to the lowest possible minimum.

In this connection it must be borne in mind that such items as pork, flour, kerosene and gasolene are now on the Free List, that the Business Profits and Income Taxes which in the final analysis were borne by the people generally, have been abolished, and that these reductions have had the effect of reviving trade to its present state releasing as it did hundreds of thousands of dollars for investment.

The last few remarks, Mr. Chairman, are my own, but the balance of the address is practically the Report of the Commission. I could not give that report in full as it would take till August to do so, but as the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition asked for it, I have obtained it. This is the only copy available, and owing to its extent it would be impossible to have it typewritten again, so I ask that it not be mislaid. While accepting this tariff I want to make it clear that it is not ours, but we have adopted it from the previous administration. It will take a year or so to see it in operation and find out what improvements can be made, but at present there is nothing left for us but to adopt it. The Commission which prepared it took two years to do so, and so far no Finance Minister has ever come forward who could do better with it in so short a time.

MR. HICKMAN—What do you estimate the increase of duties at?

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Not above $650,000. In this connection I would like to point out that it is a hard proposition to please the trade—we took off the duties on some articles and they were not pleased with that, while they approved of the reduction on others. I have a recollection of one member saying that if the duty were taken off pork he would eat what he had in stock. But what I have been wondering about since, is whether he would have given the trade the benefit if the tax had been the other way. As I know the Honourable Mr. Winter, he would not have done so. To-day we are taking the tax off the value of the goods and putting it straight on the invoice.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, my object in asking that the Committee report progress is that an opportunity may be given for the consideration of the figures. I know these resolutions have to go through, and I do not want to cause delay, but we are not prepared to go right ahead now. I hope when we do start that we will be able to go straight through.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the Committee rising and going ahead to-morrow, provided we do go ahead then.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the Resolutions respecting the Textile Company's agreement, were stricken from the Order Paper.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 4 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Legislative Disabilities and the Vacation of Seats in the House of Assembly.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, in dealing with this Bill I may say that I have little comment to offer on the Bill as it stands. Personally I was a party to the appointment of the Honourable Mr. Foote to the Board of Newfoundland Power and Paper Company, and consequently it cannot be expected of me to argue that such a position should not be held by a member of the House. But as the Chapter is up for Amendment it strikes me that further Amendment could be made to it. It has occurred to me that every once in a while—one year, two years or four years—a General Election is held, and it is perfectly known to every elector in the Island that there is a possibility of certain men elected holding some public office. As a matter of fact the business of the Colony could not be conducted without members elected holding offices of emolument under the Crown. Now we in this country have stuck to the strict letter of the law which is not now in force in other parts of the Empire. At present a member if he takes office as a Minister he has to go back for re-election. But there are some cases where he cannot go back. Take for example the position of Mr. Vinnicombe, who represented St. John's East. He was appointed to the Liquor Control Commission, and he could not sit here even by going back for re-election. Here we have an anomaly which is of no benefit to anybody, is an expense to the public, and only continues and intensifies for six months the bitterness which ought to be over at the conclusion of the election. I refer now to bye-elections, and I think he would be well advised in bringing in some measure like they have in England that no Member need go back for re-election if he accepts office in six months after being elected. Of course, in some cases the public opinion changes very much in six months after the General Election, and sometimes it does not change at all, but generally speaking the people are ready to accept a Government for at least a short time after their election, and the idea of a member going back for re-election in six months is obsolete in other countries, and should not be continued in practice here. When Mr. Ramsay McDonald was elected in England the papers were not filled with the talk of Bye-Elections but he went on and appointed his Ministers. Mr. Baldwin later did the same simply because under the English Law it is not necessary if a man accepts office to go back and face a bye-election within a certain time. The member for St. John's West interjects that McDonald was not a candidate as Prime Minister. That may be so, but take the position here. If to-morrow we have a General Election and say for example the genial Minister of Posts goes back to Harbor Main as Minister of Posts, and the fact is known that he is standing as such, and is returned, it precludes the possibility of going back for re-election. But say Mr. Hawco, an ex-Minister, is going up in that District, and it is announced that if he is returned he will be Minister of Posts. For argument sake I allow what Mr. Cahill is defeated and the members for the District are Messrs. Woodford and Hawco. If the latter's party is returned he has to go back and be elected again, although everybody knew in the first place he would be Minister of Posts if returned. This is the sort of anomaly we have here, and it ought to be corrected. We have been talking during the Session about the Redistribution of Seats and other matters of the kind, but why not wipe out such an anomaly as this re-election, as it would save the holding of bye-

elections and would cut out a lot of useless and unnecessary expense.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I want to say, as Leader of the Government, that the suggestion of the honourable member, especially the Leader of a Party, going back to a constituency in a bye-election is a ridiculous one. As has been carefully pointed out to the House by the honourable member for Fortune Bay, it is perfectly absurd for members to be put to enormous expense for nothing, and I would suggest to the Minister of Justice that the Committee rise in order that consideration might be given to Mr. Warren's amendment, and that something might be arrived at satisfactory to both sides of the House. I am sure the idea ought be more acceptable to the Opposition side than even to the Government side. I do not think that any of us have any reason for opposing this new idea because I feel that if the thing is wrong to send Ministers of the Crown back for re-election immediately after a General Election, it is our duty to make it right and thus save considerable money for members individually and for the Colony as a whole.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, I would have moved an amendment myself, but after consideration I hardly thought it would be right for a private member of the House to move an amendment or to offer an amendment to the constitution.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, I am sure that we all ought to feel grateful to the honourable member for Fortune Bay for bringing this matter up, and I think the time is opportune for such an amendment. The anomalous practice that has existed here is absolutely ridiculous in this respect and within the past couple of years it has been found that the idea of sending members back to a district for re-election has been a very expensive job, as the usual routine, such as the issuing of a Proclamation, etc., just the same as in a General Election, has to be gone through. Last year the Minister of Public Works and myself had the peculiar experience of having to go back to Hr. Grace for re-election, although St. John's East, St. John's West, Harbor Main and Placentia went by acclamation, and the machinery necessary for the carrying on of that Bye-Election cost between four and five thousand dollars. As a rule the electorate do not turn down two departmental heads, especially when the Government is well established in power and I think that the practice that obtains to-day is an absolute absurdity. Then again the Prime Minister and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had to go back to Bonavista Bay for re-election last Fall. Now I always contended that the Prime Minister should be Prime Minister in the natural course of events, without having to go back to his district, even under the present system. Therefore, I think that the House ought to be grateful to the honourable member for Fortune Bay for his suggestion, which, I am glad to know, is going to receive the serious consideration of the Government.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, as far as I am personally concerned, I fully endorse the attitude of the Prime Minister and Colonial Secretary on what I regard as a very admirable suggestion from the honourable member for Fortune Bay. I think we should follow the example of the Mother Country in throwing aside this kind of absurdity. I must say seriously that the principle appeals to me, and I cannot see any argument against it. For example, the idea of having to go through a form of being nominated again for a district that one was returned in a few months previously is a farce if the district is contested, and it is

a worse farce if it is not contested. Invariably the Minister of a Department gets re-elected, and I take the liberty of joining with the Prime Minister in asking that the suggestion receive the unanimous and sympathetic consideration of the House. I, therefore, ask that the Committee rise so as the Government can bring down an amendment at the next session.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on to-morrow.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until tomorrow afternoon at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, April 16th, 1925.

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

Hon. the Prime Minister presented a petition from the Newfoundland Hotel Facilities, Limited, respecting Legislation, which was referred to a Select Committee consisting of Hon. the Prime Minister, Hon the Minister of Justice, Mr. W. J. Browne, Mr. Hickman, Mr. Warren, for the purpose of reporting as to whether the Rules of the House have been complied with.

HON. MR. LONG—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from the Western Railway Limited, incorporated under the laws of Newfoundland with its registered office at Burin, praying that the Government will guarantee the payment of principle and interest on bonds to the amount of $35,000 on their dock.

I might say that in the year 1919 the people of the South West Coast started to build this dock, and as everyone is aware after operations commenced a slump in business took place, and the people who promised to take shares could not do so. Therefore they had to go to the Bank of Nova Scotia and raise 40,000 dollars to complete the dock, and as everyone is aware after operations commenced a slump in business took place, and the people who promised to take shares could not do so. Therefore they had to go to the Bank of Nova Scotia and raise $40,000 to complete the dock, and now the bank is asking for the refunding of the money. There was nothing left for the company to do but to appeal to the Government for help.

I ask that a select Committee be appointed to report.

A Select Committee consisting of Hon. Mr. Long, Hon. the Colonial Secretary, Mr. Cashin, Mr. Halfyard, Mr. Scammell was appointed for the purpose of reporting as to whether the Rules of the House have been complied with.

Following the presentation of this petition on behalf of the Western Marine Railway, Limited, and its reference to a Select Committe to inquire and report as to whether the Rules of the House as to notice had been complied with; Mr. Speaker said:—

In this connection, I wish to revert again and specially direct the attention of the Select Committees to whom this and other similar petitions have been referred, as well as the Select Committees who will have to consider private Bills after second reading, to the importance of the Rules of the House relative to these matters. These rules have been specially designed in the interests, and

for the information and protection of the public, and should be closely adhered to. Particular attention should be paid, amongst other things, (1) to the required notice by advertisement in the Press of the intended application, which should not be a mere casual reference to the proposed enactment, but should clearly and distinctly specify the nature and object of the application; and (2) to the opportunity which should be afforded to those whose interests or property may be affected to come in and take the necessary precautions for their protection. Without wishing to intrude upon the province of the Select Committees whose duty it is to consider whether the rules of the House have been complied with, I would further like to suggest that any recommendation of theirs tending to a relaxation of the rules in question should not be made except in cases of urgent and pressing necessity, and where it is clear that outside rights or interests are not being, and will not be prejudicially effected.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay on the table of the House the report of the Municipal Council for the year ending Dec. 31st, 1924.

Answers to Questions.

MR. HICKMAN asked Hon. the Prime Minister in reference to his reply to my questions on the Order Paper of April 17th re the raising of the Loan that the Government have no connection with Messrs. Glynn Mills & Co. and preferred dealing through their local Bankers (Bank of Montreal); "if the $4,000,000" Loan was raised through the Bank of Montreal or through the representatives of the Dominion Securities Co.; if so, give the name of the representative; (2) if the statement of the manager of the Bank of Montreal is correct that the Minister of Finance and Customs received a bid from London direct from Messrs. Brown Bros. & Co., if so, why this was withheld from the House (3) to submit to the House the bid made to the High Commissioner in London; (4) to answer my question on April 17th Order Paper as to why the highest tender was not accepted.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I beg to table the information.

(3) MR. GODDEN asked Hon. the Minister of Finance to lay upon the table of the House a statement showing the amounts paid out by his Department since June 30th, 1924, for legal services, (including payments in connection with the Death Duties Act), to what legal firm or firms such amounts have been paid and the total amount received by each firm or firms.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Speaker, I may say for the information of the Hon. Member that this answer will be tabled tomorrow.

(4) MR. GODDEN asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs if there should be a reduction in the Custom Tariff during the next few days, will parties who have already passed entries under the New Tariff be allowed a drawback.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Speaker, as far as I know there will be no change whatever, but if there is of course parties will be allowed a drawback.

(5) MR. GODDEN asked Hon. the Prime Minister: (1) if Messrs. G. N. Read, Son & Watson are still employed by the Government, at what rate per month or year are they being paid; (2) how much money has already been paid them since they were were first engaged by the Government; (3) is any money due them at the present time; (4) how much longer does the Government intend to have their service; (5) are they working in conjunction with the Auditor

General and his Department; (6) to whom do they report.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I may say that I can answer all of this question with the exception of clause two. I have not got the particulars of this, and if Mr. Godden will allow the question to stand over until to-morrow the answer will be tabled. There is also the question on the Order Paper of yesterday with regard to the amounts that have been paid to Sir P. T. McGrath. I may say that I have the amounts from the Justice Department which go back as far as 1920, which was the first time that they made any disbursements on this account. But I think that there was some paid from the Colonial Secretary's Department in previous years, and I will have the answer tabled tomorrow.

(6) MR. RANDELL asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the Table of the House the answer to the following questions: Have any appointments been made to date of High Road Commissioners, if so give names of Commissioners and what remuneration is provided for each Commissioner yearly, monthly or otherwise.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, there have been no appointments made to date on the Highroads Commission, and no remunerations have been so far provided for.

(7) MR. RANDELL asked Hon. the Prime Minister what arrangements were made with Messrs. Baine Johnston & Co. re the sale or manufacturing of seals landed from the S. S. Sagona and S. S. Prospero, also to submit bids, if any, tendered by Messrs. Bowring Bros., Ltd., and or Messrs. Job Bros., Ltd., for sale or manufacturing of seals.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I beg to table the reply to this question.

(8) MR. DUFF asked Hon. the Minister of Finance who is Sub Collector at West St. Modiste, Labrador; what duties he collected in 1923-24; what is his salary and expenses.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—That answer is in course of preparation.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the 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. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means.

MR. GODDEN—Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a few comments on Ways and Means. The Hon. Minister of Finance brought down his Budget Speech the other day and said that the change in the tariff was the result of the report of the Tariff Commission, which had been appointed two or three years ago. When I heard the Hon. Minister say that I was inclined to give him the benefit of the doubt, and thought that if this was the case that there would be but little change in the duties that are to be collected on commodities that are imported into this country. I thought that the only difference would be that the changes would be of assistance to the business people generally in getting their goods passed through the Customs. But when it is found that the actual changes that have been made in the tariff by the adoption of the report of this commission are so drastic and so far reaching one wonders that in presenting this Budget to the House the Minister of Finance should intimate that the report of the Commission is adopted only on the recommendation of that Commission. Surely that report warranted a thorough and critical examination by his own Department before being made effective.

As regards the Budget itself, I have no fault to find with the cover of it. The photograph of the Hon. Minister is a very good one. On page 25 of this speech, Mr. Chairman, I find this paragraph saying that it is the intention of the Government among other things:

"To so arrange the taxes as to meet the irreducible minimum of expenditure and at the same time to see that these taxes bear upon the several taxpayers proportionately to their means of paying. We believe that we have already made a very long stride in that direction."

Mr. Chairman, I beileve that you are making a tremendous stride in the wrong direction now that you put the country to the necessity of paying these excessive rates of duties. What does the adoption of this report mean? It means a difference in some of the commodities that I myself am interested in of an increase of from ten to one hundred and thirty five per cent. of duties and these articles are in use in every home in this country. The Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs when he tabled the estimates showed us that he required something over four hundred thousand dollars more this year than last year, and one reason that he required this is that there have been increases made in the salaries of the officials of the various departments. Now I am quite satisfied that the salaries of the civil servants should be increased commensurate with the length of their service and their ability. But the increase of the salaries alone would not amount to all that extra sum I am sure, and the expenditure could have been reduced some what if it had not been for some of the new appointments that were made in the departments which I suggest are not necessary. The Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs wants four hundred thousand dollars more this year, and he also wants two hundred thousand dollars more to pay the interest on the new loan, and that makes a total of six hundred thousand. Very well. It is quite permissbale to put on the duties to collect this extra amount, but why should the Minister ask for three times that amount What does this new Tariff mean? The first thing that I have noted here is butter and cheese. The increase on these two items is 16 p.c., and that means an increase in the revenue of the colony of eleven thousand dollars. Then there is the item of Tea. Even taking into consideration the reduction which the Minister has since made the increase in this is still 16 p.c., and that will mean an increase in the revenue of $17,000.00. There is sugar with a difference of 17 p.c., which is an increase to the revenue of $43,000. Beans and Peas, food stuffs which every working man's family uses, have an increase of 55 p.c., and that is $17,000.00 more increase of the revenue. Rice is increased 135 p.c.; Canned Goods 55 p.c. All these increases will have to be borne by the people who can least afford it, and the Hon. Minister in his Budget Speech says that the taxes are arranged so that they will be paid in proportion to the means of the people who have to pay them under this new tariff. Even the farmers and the truckmen are imposed upon to the extent of fifteen per cent. The increase on cattle feeds and oats is in the neighbourhood of fifteen per cent., which has to be borne by the truckmen and farmers of this country, who have the work of the world now to make ends meet.

There are other things such as shelled nuts and glace fruits, which perhaps can be classed as luxuries, which have gone up to the tune of four hundred per cent. I do not question those at all. People who can afford to have those things can af-

ford to pay four hundred per cent. extra on them. But as regards these other items which I have mentioned, I say that it is a shame that the working classes of this country should be called upon to pay this increase in prices which are entailed under this new tariff.

If we could see any returns for the benefit of Newfoundlanders as the result of this extra taxation, we might not be so critical. If we were to ask the question—what is the Government doing for Newfoundlanders? the Government's reply probably would be, we are building you a nice steamer, that will cost about half a million dollars so that we may induce tourists to come here; and then we intend to spend two million dollars to build nice roads for those tourists to travel over in their motor cars. That is all very nice for the tourists—but what about the Newfoundlanders? We must, or rather under this new tariff the Government must—sweat the revenue out of them, in order to make this building of steamers and road building possible. That is what it looks like now.

I should be glad to hear what the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs has to say in defence of this new tariff which he is bringing in now,—which he has brought into effect. I appeal to the Honourable Minister of Finance and Customs, and I appeal to the Prime Minister, and to every member of the Government, before putting this imposition upon the country to give it further consideration—more consideration than I believe it has been given up to this point. I cannot believe that the Honourable Minister of Finance or any member of the Government had any idea of what an imposition they were forcing upon the public of this country when they adopted this tariff holus bolus, as they have.

One excuse which perhaps the introducer of this budget will give is that he must have revenue to make up for the loss that will be incurcurred as a result of the remission of the duties on beef, pork and flour; but I fail to see where you will miss the revenue from those sources, as, during practically all last year, those articles were on the free list, and molasses besides was on the free list; and now you will be getting new revenue also under the new tariff from lines and twines. I do not know just what amount you will derive from that; but I claim that the increased taxation is not properly placed on the people. If increased taxation is necessary, then do not put it upon the working or middle classes of this country, who are already bearing more than they are able to bear at the present time. If more revenue is necessary, it must be obtained from the wealthy classes, if indeed we have any such class.

Where then is the vaunted policy of the Government, as it was promised last year, when they told us that their idea was to reduce expenditure, and to reduce taxation commensurate with the reduction in expenditure. Instead you have increased your expenditure to an extent, and you have increased taxation to three or four times the extent of your expenditure; which is inexcusable.

I have said that on foodstuffs the percentage of increase ranged from fifteen to one hundred and thirty five per cent.; but to strike an average on all those things, the increase is at least thirty per cent. all around on foodstuffs; and if dry goods and hardware are increased as considerably in proportion, then, taking into consideration what duties were derived last year, you will have an increase of about two million dollars. I suppose the Hon. Minister of Finance is

saying to himself—"time will tell."

The new tariff as we have it is admirable from the point of view of compilation. It gives us an easier method of making up our returns, and for that improvement, I have nothing but praise; but I do claim that the drastic—drastic is hardly an adequate enough expression—that the drastic increase that you are putting on this country to-day is unwarranted; and I hope that you will give it further consideration, in an effort to bring the duty values down as near as possible to what they were under the recent tariff. If you bring in the excuse that this is the report of the Tariff Commission in the days when we had the 10 per cent. and twenty-five per cent. surtax; if you bring in the excuse that this new tariff was fitted to those days—and you had since lost sight of the twenty five per cent.—I want to point out that even leaving in the old twenty five per cent., the present tariff is even ten per cent. in excess of the old one, with that included.

And so I say for the sake of the working men and the middle classes of this country, you must act and act immediately, to remedy this imposition, in spite of the big returns that must accrue under this extra taxation. The Honourable Minister of Finance and Customs says that this will give him a surplus of only $200,000.00. I would like to know how he figures that out. He did not go into details, and did not figure out under this high rate of duties that have now gone into effect. I would suggest that whoever did the figuring for the honourable Minister of Finance, should be given another two or three days to get down to brass tacks and give us proper figures. If that is done, and the statistician who compiled the honourable Minister's figures and the reports for the honourable Minister's department is allowed to do that, I venture to say that he will be able to show as a result of his labours that it is not necessary to bring in such heavy increases on foodstuffs particularly, and on other commodities that are brought into this country. I claim, sir, that the new tariff as put upon us this week is an imposition, and an imposition upon the working people of this country, and should be abolished.

I want to say in regard to Tariffs generally, that for the past two years, at any rate, changes have been made in the tariff, and those changes have been made and have gone into effect at a moment's notice. No warning has been given, and as a result business men have lost thousands of dollars. Perhaps you will claim that if business men had notice of tariff changes, they would take advantage of that fact. But if they did have notice, they would know at least what to do; but as it is now, when you take the duty of any particular article off, one merchant finds himself with a store full of those goods, and his next door neighbour, in the same business, has none; and the result is that a certain section of the business community is up against unfair competition; and I claim that tariff changes here should be announced as they are in other countries. In England a little time ago a decrease was about to be taken off tea; and two months' notice was given to the trade of the decrease. I claim that some such thing should be done in Newfoundland, and I claim that the importers, and the wholesalers and retailers should have adequate notice given them of any proposed tariff changes.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would again ask the Honourable Minister of Finance and Customs, and the Honourable Prime Minister and every member of the Government, to give this tariff further consideration, and

to do their best as quickly as they possibly can to find some remedy for the increase in duties.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, I have a few remarks to make on the Tariff before it passes the House. I have not much to say in connection with the Budget for next year, as I suppose we will talk about it in twelve months' time and see if the estimates and prophecies of the Honourable the Minister of Finance will come through or not. As Mr. Godden has stated, the Budget Speech has a good photo of the Minister of Finance on the first page and another on the inside. But what I want to say about the Tariff is that it is one which has been placed before the people without being properly thought out. The Honourable the Minister of Finance said yesterday that he had adopted the report of the Tariff Commission, and looking at that report which he let me have yesterday, I can see that he has done so. But looking over the evidence of those who were called to give information on the various classes of trade, I can see that they were not guided by this evidence. One reason why the Tariff is unevenly placed is because it effects those who prosecute the fishery so much. Every member of this House knows that this country is depending on the fishermen, not absolutely, but very nearly so. A good or bad fishery effects the revenue of the country more than the outcome of any other industry, and therefore, in placing such a tariff before the country, and inflicting it on the people, the Government should have given more consideration to the man on whom it so largely bears. As I said before unless we can reduce the cost of catching fish, those who catch it will do so at a loss. We can appreciate the fact that steps must be taken to make up the remission of the Profit's Tax, and the increase of the Estimates as well as the interest on the new Loan which was agreed to last Session. The interest on that six million dollars we should never have been called on to pay. There are additions to the estimates by the increase of salaries, pensions, etc., some of which may be warranted, and some of which are not. But the Government saw fit to take this added tax on their shoulders, and it has now been placed on the fishermen. At present the fisherman finds all he can do to live, and when you place on him a proportionate share of the two million dollar tax it is a very heavy burden. And that is what the Government is doing, as they are placing on the fisherman what was taken off before. This tariff is altogether against what the people of the country would have suggested. I have here in my desk a copy of the report of the Tariff Commission.

They drafted a letter as follows and sent it to all the Magistrates throughout the country.

(Reads Letter to House).

The replies that came back are most all the same. Magistrate Freebairn of Ferryland wrote back as follows:

(Reads Letter to House).

Magistrates Janes of Greenspond, Hogan of St. Mary's, Small of Burgeo, McDonald of Grand Bank, Courage of Belleoram, Thompson of Brigus, Giovannini of Trepassey and Mifflen—the latter's opinion the Government must take seeing that they put him in charge of the Liquor Control Board—all wrote to the effect that the duties were too high and emphasized the fact that the duties should be reduced on fishing supplies, and they laid particular stress on sugar. Those magistrates know the conditions under which people live in the outports, and they know what small amount of money the fishermen have to support their families on. As I stated before, the Tar-

iff Commission have not taken into consideration the evidence they received when sitting as a Commission, and the letters of the Magistrates is proof of that, and I will show the House later what the increased duties have been on commodities used by the fishermen, and which will be found to range from twenty-five to one hundred per cent. I also have before me some of the evidence given by those who were called in and who were qualified to give evidence on those commodities. I am giving this information particularly to the Finance Minister, as I understand that he is taking in globo the recommendation of the Tariff Commission, and, perhaps, he has not had time to go into this thing thoroughly and consider the evidence given with reference to the different commodities. Mr. J. E. Dempster was called in from Knowlings and he gave evidence upon what articles duty should be reduced, but the Commission in their Report states:

(Quotes from Report)

Mr. Farndale was called in from the Royal Stores, Limited, and gave evidence with regard to groceries, and this is what the Commission said after hearing his evidence:

(Quotes from Report)

It can, therefore, be seen that the evidence given by these people before the Commission have not been taken into consideration, but the Commission simply brought in figures of their own. Mr. Godden has outlined very clearly to the House the increase on foodstuffs, which is a tremendous increase of from twenty five to one hundred per cent. With reference to hardware the increased duty on ammunition, powder, shot and caps, which are used by the fishermen for providing fresh meats for themselves and their families during the Winter, Spring and Fall seasons of the year, is twenty per cent. The increased duty on axes and edged tools which are used by fishermen, carpenters and tradesmen generally is thirty per cent; the increased duty on fencing wire which is used by the working classes of the country is two hundred per cent; the increased duty on sheet lead which is used by fishermen for patching their boats and dories is forty per cent; on batteries, which the fishermen use for driving their motor engines, the duty is increased twenty per cent; the duty has increased on paint brushes which the fisherman uses for painting his boat by sixteen per cent; the duty has increased on sheath knives and splitting knives which fishermen use for dressing their fish fifty one per cent.; on lanterns which are necessary in every fishing stage the duty has increased fifteen per cent; dory oars are increased by twenty-one per cent.; iron pipe ninety per cent.; alarm clocks. which the fishermen use very much in the conduct of fishery operations, twenty per cent.; hammers and hatchets 15 per cent.; articles of hardware such as hinges and locks, 19 per cent.; shovels that the wives of the fishermen use for tilling their gardens, 15 per cent.; hay forks that they use for pitching up their hay, 200 per cent. All these articles must be used by the fishermen, and the duty is raised from 15 per cent. to 300 per cent. Spikes for building boats, 300 per cent. That is one of my arguments why this country will never be prosperous unless we do something to reduce the cost of catching fish. Hitherto lines and twines have been admitted duty free, but now by this tariff a duty of 10 per cent. has been put upon lines and twines coming into this country. Now to the ordinary man a duty of 10 per cent. does not seem very much, but when you take into consideration that that is the most important thing the fisherman wants to go and catch fish with, and as the the Hon. Member for Burin says, he

requires 45 lines to make a trawl besides the sed lines. and when he has to pay 10 per cent. on all that it is a big increase on the outfit of the Bank fisherman. It is a tremendous increase and there is no necessity for it at all. Because this increase is brought here for nothing else than to further support the industry in this country which makes lines and twines, and to prevent cheaper lines from coming into this country. The industry is already protected, and it has too much protection, like many other industries in this country. And particularly to this extent that they are able to pay 20 per cent. dividends on invested capital and on watered stock, and they have reserves of hundreds of thousands of dollars put by earned out of the manufacture of commodities which the fishermen have to use. Any industry in this country or in any other country which has reserves of that kind is a mighty well protected industry, and when any Government comes in here and puts a further protection on this industry I say it is very unfair. And protection is given at the cost of the fisheries of this country.

Another industry that is protected in this country and protected at the expense of the fisherman is the Tobacco Factory. I pointed out at the last session that on cigarettes alone there is a protection of $115,000. I based this on the figures that I got from the Minister of Finance and Customs after I had asked a question and received an answer from him. The difference between the duty paid by the manufacturers of cigarettes in the country, and the duty that would be received if the cigarettes were brought in and the duty was paid, would amount to $135,000.00. The cigarettes of this country are smoked mostly by the fishermen. The high class cigarettes that are brought in here and the duty paid on them, and then sold at a very high price, are consumed by those who are prepared and can afford to pay for them. There has been no remission of duty, but the same protection has been given cigarettes as heretofore. And furthermore a monopoly has been created in the cigarette business of this country by including in these resolutions the fact that a factory or industry should be constituted of at least ten operators. I know there is a tobacco factory conducted in this city. It has been manufacturing a right good class of cigarette. The proprietor of that factory with a machine, and one or two helpers have been the operators. That man has been running in competition to the big trust. The majority of shares of the Big Trust are held out of this country, and the big dividends are passing out. That little industry has been put out of business I suppose unless the man has sufficient capital to increase his output, and be able to pay the salaries of at least ten operators, so that he can come under the manufacturers' requirements.

In addition to that there has been further protection on tobacco. The duty on imported tobacco has been increased a little, but all the charges are very much in favor of the manufacturer. In one instance there has been an increase of thirteen cents per pound of high grade tobacco, and six cents on lower grades. That means that this industry is further protected to the extent of from six to thirteen cents a pound, and that the price of tobacco is bound to go up accordingly, and that the fisherman who considers tobacco one of the great necessities of the fishermen and one of the great necessities of his life, will have to pay an additional amount of from six to thirteen cents a pound for his inevitable luxury. Yesterday the Minister of Finance

laid on the table of the House the few changes that he had made in the tariff. One change was in relation to tobacco. But even after the reduction, the difference I figured out in the duty on tobacco would still be an increase of 13.65 on high grade tobacco, like the tobacco called B.C. and on cut tobacco put up in packages. The increase on tobacco used by the fishermen would be about 6.7, and my point is this that there is no necessity to protect the industry to that extent, and the Government is getting nothing back for it, except the little increase in the excise duty, which amounts to about 2.6, but the difference between that and the duty on imported tobacco is the increased protection which the Tobacco Factory gets under the new tariff.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—You have got it all wrong.

MR. HICKMAN—That is my figuring out, and I would like the Prime Minister to put it right if it is wrong, but he has got to bring facts and figures to prove what he says. I have the Minister's new tariff with the alterations, and I have also in my calculations made out that the duty on tobacco coming into this country has been that much more than it was before, and if that is the case that is protection for anybody in the country who is manufacturing tobacco. Now has the Prime Minister figured out the difference. The Tobacco Factory which is in operation in this country has a protection of $115,000.00 on cigarettes if the figures that have been given me by the Min. of Finance and Customs are correct. Will the Prime Minister tell me if that is the case? If that is the fact, don't you not think that it is ridiculous that any industry should be protected to that extent at the expense of the people of this country. I think it is. I think yon said that they expend one hundred thousand dollars a year in wages. There is one tobacco factory. There are clothing factories in this town with no protection whatever and they pay out over two hundred and fifty thousand dollars per year in salaries. They get nothing in duty free. They have to pay the duties on all the cloth, tweed, linings, buttons and such things that are used in the making of clothes. There are several hundred people employed in the clothing factories. How many men does the tobacco factory give employment to? It gets a protection of over one hundred thousand dollars a year.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The factory here gets a protection of twenty-five per cent., and in Canada the factories get a protection of eighty per cent.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—But the tobacco factories in Canada cannot get people to work for three or four dollars a week. And they do not get away with the small municipal taxes and other expenses which are very low in this country, and when you take into consideration the difference in the protection that is given in Newfoundland compared to that which is offered in Canada you will find that it is in favour of the factory here in St. John's. I am not trying to strike at any particular industry, but I am trying to show how all these things are bearing upon the fisherman, the labourer and the clerk.

The Prime Minister is an exporter of fish and he knows that because the expense of catching and curing a qtl. of fish is so great that we cannot compete with Norway, and unless a man can get a full cargo he cannot pay his bills and the sharemen are not able to get enough to live on. If they get a voyage of fish the sharemen will get about two hundred dollars and they have to exist on this two hundred dollars for the whole of the twelve months of the year. I do not in a

sense lay the blame for this tariff on the Prime Minister, for although he as the Prime Minister of the Country has to take the blame I do not think that he has had the time to figure the matter out. He just accepted the arrangements that were recommended by the Tariff Commission and brought the suggestions in in globo, and the result is that we find that the people of the country have been unfairly taxed and the people who are unfairly taxed are those who are not in a position to pay these taxes. Now there is a great deal said in this country about the poor fishermen by politicians, but a great deal of this is used for political purposes, but I am talking about the cost of producing a quintal of codfish and what the people of this country will have to depend upon. Everybody in this country has to depend upon the fishery no matter what is his walk of life, whether he is a lawyer or a doctor or a clergyman, or whatever the case may be, his income is more or less effected by the income derived from the fisheries. Now the Government when they came into power found that the duties had been taken off pork, beef, molasses and kerosene, and they immediately came to the conclusion that since this duty had been taken off by executive aauthority it was illegal and they put it back. Now a short time ago they took the duties off again. It looks a big thing to see the duties taken off pork, beef and molasses, but after all it would be better that the duties were left on pork, beef and flour than it is to take the duties off them and so get a revenue of four hundred thousand dollars less and make it up on some other commodities because these other foodstuffs which the fishermen use have been raised a hundred per cent. in some cases to two and three hundred per cent. If a man has an ordinary family and consumes say five barrels of flour a year and the duty on this is only twenty five cents a barrel, then the duties only amount to $1.25 per year. And if he is fairly well to do he can afford to buy a barrel of pork, and it is only a difference of three dollars a barrel, and the ordinary fisherman only consumes a half a barrel of pork a year, and the difference is not the price of one quintal of fish a year. But you have taken the duties off pork, beef and flour which looks a big thing, and then you raise the other food stuffs on which the fishermen are dependent by a hundred and sometimes two and three hundred per cent. And while these things look small, yet they are big when they have to be paid by the man when he has to settle up his accounts. Here you have put up the duties on fishermen's supplies. Axes and ammunition have been put up. When a man goes to the fishery and then comes home he cannot spend all his income on pork and beef and molasses; he has to have tools and other things to mend his boats and traps and yet the duties on these commodities have been increased. The fishermen need these tools just as well as they need molasses and flour, and it is because of that that I say that this tariff is not properly levied. There is something radically wrong with it. Now there is another thing that I want to refer to. The Minister of Finance and Customs has been good enough to take the excise duty off rubber boots. All the bank fishermen use rubber boots and the duty was increased something like fifteen per cent. I suppose on the representation of someone who is supplying these men with rubber boots this duty was taken off. However it is hardly worth talking about. But at the same time it all applies to the original tariff which was not in accord with the requirements of this country and not properly put upon those who are in the best position to

pay it. Now with regard to the flour I want to get a little information from the Minister of Finance and Customs. I think that during the last session of the legislature by which we were to give some concessions to a flour milling company I think that this company was to get a protection of twenty five cents a barrel, and I would like to know from the Minister of Finance and Customs if this tariff will effect the Milling Company or whether there is some especial arrangement with them, and if so how does it effect them. I understood that the company said that they could start operation here if they got protection and that was one of the conditions on which they could get the capital raised that they should be given a protection of twenty five cents a barrel, and if this protection has been taken off what is the effect on this industry.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—They were not given a protection of twenty five cents a barrel.

MR. HICKMAN—I know that twenty five cents a barrel was incorporated in the Bill.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—No, it was only that they could not get a protection of over twenty five cents per barrel if the duty on flour went up.

MR. HICKMAN—My point is this, Mr. Prime Minister—whether this is going to affect that industry?

HON. PRIME MINISTER—It is at present. They are asking now for a protection under the anti-dumping clause, so that foreign mills will not be able to send any flour here so as to be able to put them out of business.

MR. HICKMAN—I am glad to hear that, because if there was any possibility of that industry going ahead, we should not put anything in the way of it. I consider that it will be one of the best industries we will have, if it is established. That has been my opinion from the start, and I would not like to see anything placed in the way of these people in constructing and operating the mill, if it is still their intention to do so.

Now, I do not know what the total amount of the increase in the tariff will be, but it must be a tremendous amount, because I have before me the the old tariff; and I have taken the new tariff and placed it opposite the old tariff; and I find that, beginning at the top and going right down through to the end, there is just increase, increase, increase, in nearly every item there. Starting at the first one there is an increase of from forty per cent. to forty five per cent. The second one is increased from eighty cents to a dollar a tin. The next one is increased from thirty five to fifty per cent. There is one item there which the Minister of Agriculture and Mines might take particular notice of —cows, bulls and horses, and I understand that the Government is not going to allow anything in for the Government, duty free. In the department of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines he will have to pay an increased duty of from twenty to thirty per cent. Calves, pigs and stock have increased from $1.00 to $1.50. Pigs under three months of age from 50 to 70 per cent. Apples per barrel 50 to 70 per cent. Apples, dried, from 2 cents to three cents—an increase of fifty per cent. on dried apples. Barley 10 to 15 per cent. Beans from a half cent to one cent per pound—double.

Leather belting—from 10 to 25 per cent. Used in all our saw mill industries, and in the factories of every kind in this country. Biscuit 10 to 15 per cent. Ships Biscuit two to three cents. Biscuits and bread, from 40 per cent. to 55 per cent. Blocks for ships 30 per cent. to 50 per cent. Brin 20 to 30 per cent. Brooms fifty to seventy per cent. Brushes 40 to

55 per cent. Butter 3½ cents a lb. to 5 cents. Another protection for a couple of industries in this country—for a couple of concerns that are already making big dividends. Oleo Margarine and Butterine 3½ cents a lb. to 5 cents. Another big increase. Cabbage ½ cent to ¾ cent a lb. I don't wish to object to that, because cabbage can be raised in this country. Cabbage from August 1st to 30 April, that is, when cabbage is produced here, 1½ cents a lb. Candles 3 to 4½ cents a pound. Ships' boats 35 to 50 per cent. Carriages, express waggons and buggies 40 to 55 per cent.. Sleigh runners, that are used by all our people on their slides and catamarans, from 50 to 70 p.c. Cement from 25 to 35 p.c. Cheese 5¾ cents a lb. and in packages 50 p.c. ad valorem besides. There is no cheese industry in this country, and the man who wants to consume that commodity has to pay a big increase. Coffee per lb. from 5 to 7 cents. Coffee roasted or ground 7 to 10 cents a lb. All big increases. Dry goods, in a general way, 35 to 50 p.c. Eggs, 7 cents a dozen. Feathers 7 to 10 cents a pound. Fruits from 15 to 25 per cent.

And right through down the whole list, there are comparative increases, some very much greater than those that I have outlined. May I ask the Minister of Finance if stemmed tobacco comes in free?

MINISTER OF FINANCE—Yes.

MR. HICKMAN—One of the chief occupations of any factory is stemming the leaf.

MINISTER OF FINANCE—I do not know if it is.

MR. HICKMAN—I think the Honourable Minister ought to know. If stemming tobacco is part of the occupation of the people in the tobacco factory, and gives a lot of employment to the people up there, I certainly do not think that tobacco should be allowed to come in here partly manufactured. The labour should be given to the people of this country.

Now there is one item here that I think needs some explanation. That is Spanish wines, claret, etc. The duty is raised from 60 to 90 cents, and from 40 to 55 cents. Under a treaty which Britain has with Spain, and which Newfoundland adopted, there is one condition providing that the rate of duty on wines and liquors should not be increased from what it was at the time the treaty was made. I think that the Minister will find that that is one of the stipulations of the treaty. If the Minister has overlooked that I would like to draw the matter to his attention, so that he can see what are the provisions of the British-Spanish agreement.

These are the principal remarks that I intend to make in regard to the duties, and I think that the policy of the Government, or of the Prime Minister when he first took charge of the affairs of this country are quite different to what they are now. If he had carried out his first policy there would be no reason to-day to put these increased duties on the people, because I heard the Prime Minister state in the Board of Trade that there should be no more borrowing, or money spent on roads, and when the House of Assembly opened last session, the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance and Customs came in on the floors of this House and said that we should live within our means, and we should not have any more borrowing; yet before the session was over we were called upon to consent to the Government to put a further burden of six million dollars on the country. The money having been borrowed, we have now to meet the interest, and that has made it necessary to increase duties.

As the resolutions go along and the tariff is read we will have some fur-

ther remarks to make. What I have said this afternoon I have said in what I consider a way of fair criticism, and I think that the Government will clearly understand that we on this side of the House are firmly convinced that they have not given due consideration to the Tariff before laying it on the table, and did not go into it item by item, but adopted a report as presented by the Tariff Commission.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to make any extended references to the differences in the tariff. I was hoping that the Members on this side of the House who have had practical experience with Custom's work, would take up that end of the subject and treat us to some interesting statements in connection therewith. I may say in connection with the Speech of my colleague, Mr. Godden, I was not only interested in hearing him, but was surprised to learn of the great increase on the old duties. I thought if there were to be any change in the tariff it would be lightened to some extent. I am surprised that the Government has had the temerity or heroism to bring in such a Budget. But perhaps the word "heroism" is not properly used in connection with this, and would be better applied if the Government had undertaken to reduce taxation, and use the pruning knife in various directions. The duties should have been reduced, depending on a Government for their salaries,—if the Government shows signs of increasing instead of reducing them. I thought when the Honourable Mr. Monroe became Prime Minister, in view of the circumstances under which he was elected, as Chief Executive of the Colony, and knowing the outcry against the spending of money, the disfavor, ridicule and contempt in which to some extent the outgoing Government was held, in some cases justly and others unjustly, a new order of things would be instituted. The previous Government was unthinkingly condemned in many cases where they were entitled to commendation for the efforts they had made.

But the Prime Minister and those associated with him may have thought that the tide of disfavor against the outgoing Government was so great that the people of the country were willing to put their trust in the present administration with the hope that they would be led from the bondage of taxation and it would be somewhat lessened. That was the hope that was uppermost in the minds of the electorate of this country. The present Prime Minister assumed the leadership at a time when the minds of the majority of the electorate were prepared for a reduction in expenditure and consequently a reduction in taxation, but judging from the Budget Speech and the Tariff Resolutions presented to this House and to this country people who thought along these lines are sadly disappointed. When Mr. Monroe assumed the leadership of the Government circumstances were such and conditions and times were such that it required a strong man and a man with strong councillors to take charge of affairs. One man cannot run this country properly, however well his intentions may be. You cannot keep a Government in this or any other country together unless you have men of strong will and strong determination to bring about changes and to act as a unit. I admit and submit that no Prime Minister can bring about better conditions in this country unless his hands are upheld by men of equally strong determination and by men who are determined to do what is right. Evidently, however, there has been nobody prepared to hold up the hands of the present Prime Minister

in that respect. Certainly there is nothing to show that any pronouncements of his have been put into good effect. But we will give him the benefit of the doubt and say that he has found it difficult to put into effect the ideals and principles that he might have considered previous to assuming his present important position. If ever there was a time in the history of this country when the Prime Minister and his Executive Government would have public opinion behind them, if they had undertaken a drastic curtailment of expenditure, it is now, but the expectations of the electorate are now gone to the four winds since they are finding out that none of the things they expected to be done is being done, particularwhen they properly understand this new Tariff. We have listened to a very elaborate Budget, which is profusive in many respects. It is fairly well gotten up but there is a lot of unnecessary padding about it. For instance, the people of this country are not concerned about someone being sent to the Post Office to clean out the cupboards up there; but what they are deeply interested in is what is contained in these Tariff Resolutions. The fishermen of the country want to know how this tariff will bear upon them when next they go to get outfitted for the fishery, and how the prices this Spring will compare with the prices of last Spring under the old tariff, and they want to know what their chances are, if they get a voyage of fish, of paying for their summer's outfit and providing for their families for the following winter. This new tariff, Mr. Chairman, is a very serious matter. When some of us had something to do with the Government our minds were exercised and our souls agonized finding ways and means to try and do something in connection with the Tariff that would make it appear to the fishermen that their burdens were being somewhat lightened so as to encourage them to live in the country and prosecute the fisheries. That cannot be gainsaid, even though it may be said that an ex-Finance Minister ran the risk of having a deficit. Times were extremely bad then and for two long years, and everything seemed to go against the Government of the day. We fear that the number of men employed up country this year will find out that instead of getting taxation lightened they will have it increased.

That new tariff will not create confidence. Quite the opposite. It will cause the people to wonder where are we and whither tending. We asked for bread and they have given us a stone. And it is more applicable to the present situation than when recorded in Scripture. In July, 1924, when men recorded their votes in favour of the Monroe Government, they did it with the expectation that the burden of taxation would be lightened. That there would be a reduction of expenditure. They were told that the different departments were overstaffed, the officials were tumbling over each other and we shall see that a new order of things will be brought about. The statements in the manifesto might not but the inference was drawn as if have been made in these exact words, these were the exact words. We find now that there has been an increase in expenditure or in the estimates of $438,000. That is one big disappointment. That is the stone instead of the bread. That is something that the people cannot digest. That is the rank and file the big body of the electorate who are influenced by what they experience, not by what they get out of it. There is the minority of course. A certain section who are seeking for Government positions, they have to be contented

with the crumbs falling from the Government table and row the long boat. They are disappointed; because it is shown in this year's budget that there is an increase in expenditure of almost half a million dollars. That will not create confidence. That will not encourage the people to continue and stick to the old party in spite of their disappointed hopes in the Government bringing about a better condition of things. We are not foolish enough to believe it. But thousands of people in this country really believe that the Government has something to do with the price of fish, and that the Government has something to do almost with the condition of the weather. And whether we have good or bad fisheries they attribute it to the Government of the day.

These are facts that cannot be satisfactorily contradicted. The people are disgusted with the Government's policy. As I said when I rose to speak, it takes more than one man to bring about reforms in this country. That is to bring reforms that the politicians preach when they are appealing for votes. But the sadness of the whole thing is this that when they are elected to power they sit up nights finding out how they can keep the party together, and the Premier has to go around with an oil can to keep the Government wheels oiled so as to prevent friction.

These are the conditions that obtain. That is the reason why we have no reduction in taxation at the present time. I was hoping from the semblance of prosperity that obtained last fall and with the greater chance of securing employment for the majority of the people that the Government would be in a position to reduce the number of officials in the different departmnets. But we find the Hon. Minister of Finance saying that it is very difficult to reduce the number of officials in any department. As soon as you begin to do anything like that you will have the relations of that official, even the cousins and wives and the sisters and the aunts, and the grandmothers and even the great-grandmothers coming down to the head of the department and interseding for the official to be retained. And therefore it is very difficult for the head of any department to reduce the number of officials even if the department is overstaffed. Well now, Mr. Chairman, nobody will give me credit for doing anything right in the Post Office. I have been told that from the moment that I went there the Post Office had commenced to go the downward grade. Well, I want to inform this House that during the years that I was there there was just the same occasion for requests to be made for the increase of the staff and for the retention of officials.

I can appreciate the fact that it is difficult to put a man on the street who has been in the Government Departments for some time. But if an official should resign and the office which he held should become vacant, then that is no reason why it should be filled again, and that is one principal that I adhered to, and when there was a vacancy I made no new appointments unless there was an absolute necessity no matter what the position might be. Mr. Chairman, the Government of to-day have not made any dismissals unless it is for a purely political reasons, and I venture to say that one hundred per cent of the positions have been filled again by party supporters, and there is no saving of expenditure because of the appointments which the present Government has made, because the new appointments are sure to get bigger salaries than those men who have been in these departments for twenty years or more, and those who have been in these departments for a long

while will have to get along the best they can on small salaries, while these new appointments will get more than they are getting. Mr. Chairman, I just mention these things because the older politicians in this House know what I say is correct, and it may not be altogether news to even the new members of the executive or even to the Prime Minister himself, but that is the way that things are being done, and I daresay that that is the way that they are being done at the present time. Now referring to that part of Budget which deals with the railway for the six months ending December 1924. Now a casual observer would conclude that the railway during the year of 1924-25 would make a profit. Of course those who have any knowledge of the running of the railway and would take the trouble to read through the Budget would see the difference. But I am taking the viewpoint of the casual observer.

The statement says on page 28 that in 1920-21 the loss of the railway was $1,776,128.58. In 1921-22 the loss was $964,941.00. In 1923 the loss was $539,000 and in 1924 under the Government Commission the loss was $6,519.34. In 1925 under the present administration there was a profit of $152,237.68. But leaving it at that it is altogether misleading, because I could give you a statement of the earnings and the expenditure of the railway from July, 1923, to Feb. 1924, but it is unnecessary for me to do that. But suffice it to say that in the corresponding period named in this budget you show a profit at December 31 of $152,137.00, but in the corresponding period ending December 31, 1923, there was a profit of $163,000.00, and in that there is a difference of eleven thousand and some odd dollars. At the end of January 31, 1924, there was a net profit of $121,949.63, so therefore there was a big loss in January. In February the profits had been reduced to $25,-460.23. There was a big loss in January and February. I have not got the statement beyond that of February 28, but from February 28 to the end of June the loss would be about $31,900. Now I do not think that the operation of the railway and the dock and the steamships is going to make such a good showing at the end of next June as at the end of June, 1924. The dock is idle and has been for some time and during the winter months a big loss obtains on the railway, and therefore I just bring the matter of the statement of the railway to the attention of the House so that it may not be misleading to anybody. When you come to the end of the fiscal year in June 30, 1925, you will surely find that there has been a loss corresponding to what you had last year. Now, I did not intend when I stood to my feet to refer to anything but the part of the budget in connection with the investigation into the Post Office and the Railway of which I have just spoken. I am sorry that the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs is not here. The Prime Minister tabled the report of Colonel Ross which deals . . . .

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The Minister of Posts and Telegraphs tabled the report.

MR. HALFYARD—I hardly know who tabled it, but when I asked the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs for the report some time ago he said that it had been handed over to the Prime Minister. It is no difference who tabled it, anyhow I have it, and I thank the Prime Minister for having succeeded in tabling it. I have not had the time to read the report carefully. It possibly deserves some consideration, but I notice that the report seems to be an indictment against the present management of the Post Office as he states here that

he made certain recommendations that have not been put into effect, and therefore it is worthy of the thought of the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, and I would like to know whether he intends to act upon it or not.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—A great deal of it has been acted upon already.

MR. HALFYARD—Colonel Ross on his way to Newfoundland, when he was in North Sydney visited the Newfoundland post office there. When he first came here he could not begin his duties because the post office was being renovated. He went through the Parcel Post Department and there he found men who were standing about in idleness. He found some of the men standing around with their hands in their pockets doing nothing. Well as long as there is a parcel post there is going to be this kind of thing, because the people will not regulate the sending of the parcels so that they will come at regular intervals during the day when the officials have nothing to do. The men might as well have their hands in their pockets as anywhere else. So the conditions were extremely bad in the Parcel Post Department. Why were they not better? Certainly the new Minister of Posts and Telegraphs had picked up that man on the stairs who was to bring order out of chaos, and he has been at his disposal since June 1924. The outgoing Minister Mr. Hawco, had appointed an inspector. I think that this man was appointed the inspector of offices and is the generalissimo of the whole place up there, and with these new appointments why were things not different? Is it possible that in the short time since I left the post office that everything has gone to the bad? Apparently it has. I left in April 1923. We have had two new Ministers, and they have made appointments to suit themselves; and the present incumbent went in there some time in June, and here in January 1925 we have to get a man from Canada to tell us that he went downstairs, and found the men standing around idle; and he says that there was a serious delay consequent upon the parcels not having been dealt with at the time they came in. The post office, he says, was overstaffed. I do not know whether there has been any reduction in the staff upon the recommendation of Col. Ross or not.

I notice that Col. Ross recommends that parcels coming in via Port aux Basques, for West Coast districts should be distributed from there.

Now that is a question that one of the best men in the Post Office was trying to get settled when I was there —and that is Mr. Bradbury. He had gone into that question, and had even communicated with the Postal authorities in Canada, and had practically made an arrangement, but I do not think we could ever get the Customs people to agree with the suggestion. That was our recommendation, and it should meet with the approval of everyone who knows anything about the matter. At present thousands of parcels for places on the West Coast are brought here to be checked and then sent back. But I am not saying anything against the Assistant Collector of Customs. Perhaps he had his reasons for not agreeing with the suggestion. But I notice that Colonel Ross mentions the same thing. In his report he says: "Continuing my observations re the St. John's staff, it was observed that no regular hours of attendance were observed by the staff. (Reads) . . . . . .absence from duty most pronounced.

I am very sorry that the Post Office did get into such a state of disorder after I left it. It is regrettable, and I am very sorry that Col. Ross

had to be brought down here to bring order out of chaos, because I never thought that there could be such deterioration in such a short time. I do not know what can account for that—whether it is a lack of the esprit de corps that Colonel Ross speaks of or not. How could you expect ot have esprit de corps when you went and picked up men off the street, and put them over the heads of experienced officials, and then you could not conitnue the services of the deputy minister, but you had to go and get a new man who did not know his way about the post office. Mr. Chairman, if there is one thing which causes dissatisfaction amongst any group of officials it is to give outsiders preference.

I am told that, in spite of Colonel Ross's report that the people who are working in the Post Office at the present time were never so dissatisfied over the conditions that obtain there. "The work is done grudgingly, there is a lack of proper interest." If I were to become harsh this afternoon, I might retaliate in the same spirit that was portrayed here by the speaker who took it upon himself to speak on Post Office matters. I could recite you a story that is not at all creditable with regard to the affairs at the Post Office at the present time.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—Let us have the story. I told you there were a good many spies up around there.

MR. HALFYARD—That is the trouble—spies were at the bottom of it. Evidently they caught your ear.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—Yes, and my eyes too.

MR. HALFYARD—And the good men were disrated and penalised. Mr. Chairman, did I understand the Hon. Minister of Posts and Telegraphs to say that they caught his eyes too?

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—Yes.

MR. HALFYARD—What do you mean?

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—I caught them in the act.

MR. HALFYARD—What—spying?

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—Reading my private correspondence.

MR. HALFYARD—You did?

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—Yes, do you want an affidavit?

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, in justice to men who cannot come into this House to defend themselves against accusations that are most damaging to their characters, I will crave your permission to try and justify the character of these men to the House of Assembly and to the public: (Reads affidavit of Bradbury and March).

Mr. Chairman, any honourable member of this House who takes it upon himself to make any accusations against a man who cannot come in here and defend himself, should consider the seriousness of these charges. It is most unfair and most uncalled for—it is despicable and contemptible. If it were a man like Mr. Harris, the manager of the A. N. D. Company—if his actions were brought to book, you would have men from the Government side standing up and defending him against these accusations . . . . .

MR. SULLIVAN—And from the Opposition side too.

MR. HALFYARD—And from the Opposition side. Well, I am here to defend a man against whom accusations have been made. It is a serious matter to make such accusations against any man's character and reputation. "Who steals my purse, steals trash. 'Twas mine—'tis his, and has been slave to thousands; but he who

filches from me my good name robs me of that which not enriches him, but leaves me poor indeed." We do not thank Mr. Sullivan for defending Mr. Harris—certainly he would defend the manager of his own company. Since I have been in this House, myself and those who have been associated with me have been ridiculed if we offered any remarks in defence of certain companies—but now, Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to read this document in justification of men against whom accusations have been made in this House, and who are not able to come in here and defend themselves. I think that document speaks for itself, and does not need any further comment from me.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—Mr. Chairman, may I say a word in reply to that.

MR. HALFYARD—It is now half past six, and you will have an opportunity later of replying. I move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on to-morrow.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs gave notice that he would on to-morrow move the House into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions respecting a Tax on Goods imported into Newfoundland.

Hon. the Prime Minister presented the Report of the Select Committee on the application of the Newfoundland Hotel Facilities, Limited, as follows:

The Select Committee appointed to consider the petition of the Newfoundland Hotel Facilities, Limited, have considered the matter to them referred, and report that in their opinion, notwithstanding that full and sufficient notice has not been given, that the rules of the House in that respect be suspended, and that permission be granted to introduce a Bill to confirm the contract referred to in the said petition.

(Sgd.) W. S. MONROE,
W. J. HIGGINS,
W. J. BROWNE,
W. R. WARREN,
A. E. HICKMAN.

On motion this Report was received and adopted.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on to-morrow move the House into Committee of the Whole on certain resolutions between the Government and the Newfoundland Hotel Facilities Limited. These resolutions have been printed and will be distributed so that honorable members may read and study them to-night. We have been accused of attempting to rush through legislation, but such is not the case, and I do not wish that impression to get abroad in this instance. We have here a definite proposition for the erection of an hotel, the promoters are ready to come here and start almost at once, as an earnest of good faith they have deposited the sum of $25,000 in the bank and we are anxious to have them come on as quickly as may be. Therefore I would ask that the honorable members read these resolutions to-night so that we may all be able to discuss them when they come up for consideration to-morrow. Mr. Speaker, I do now move that the House adjourn till 3 p.m. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, April 17th, 1925.

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

Mr. Brown gave notice of question.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER— Mr. Speaker, I would like to lay on the table of the House the reply to a question asked by Mr. Godden on the order paper of April 15th in respect to the amounts paid to Sir P. T. McGrath since 1919. I would also like to lay on the table of the House the reply to a question asked by Mr. Godden in respect to the amounts paid Read, Son and Watson in connection with the inquiry into the various institutions. I would like to say while I am on my feet in that connection I would like to read a letter from Read, Son and Watson:

(Reads the letter).

I have brought this matter before the House this afternoon, because I think it is apropos to say that as far as the Government is concerned they do not think that at the present moment it is necessary to hold an investigation into these departments. We did have the investigation into these departments. We did have the investigation into the Customs Department which was not one of the Departments which Mr. Warren suggested might be enquired into because we found that an immediate investigation was necessary. But we do find that in our opinion it is not necessary at present to go into these other departments unless the House rules that it should be done. The position of the Auditor General's department as I said the other evening in the Speaker's Room after we had adjourned is the same as the loggers' grievances. Mr. Brown asked to have an investigation into the loggers' conditions at the last session of the House. It will be remembered that Mr. Brown said that the loggers had some grievances and we appointed a commission which consisted of Mr. Warren, and the investigation was held with the result that it turned out exactly as anticipated. Mr. Warren did his work as well as any commission that could have been appointed. The cost of the commission was ten or twelve hundred dollars and the result was exactly what we knew before and that was that the ordinary logger if he was not a good logger preferred to get forty five dollars a month, and if he were a better logger and could earn more he preferred to go on piece work. And that is practically the whole report of the commission. Now it would be exactly the same in my opinion if we were to have an investigation into the Auditor General's Department. I think that the result would be that the Auditors would find that we have not a proper Audit department. In other words that the auditors are not expert auditors and that is the reason that we do not get results from it. The Leader of the Opposition asked the other day what was wrong with the Audit Department and why the audits were not properly done. Now an auditor is the same as a doctor or a lawyer. He has got to be trained in his work. You cannot ask a Doctor to tell you your legal position and you cannot ask a lawyer to tell you what is wrong with your inside, and you cannot expect an auditor to pick an account to pieces and put his finger on the mistakes if he has not been properly trained in his work. In years past men have been simply taken from various positions and if they were not of much use for other positions they were put in the Auditors Department. We have not expert Auditors and therefore we cannot expect advice from the Auditor General's Department. I say that Mr. Burteau has done very good work. He has a tremendous undertaking and his pre-audit has been found to

be very useful. But that is just what an investigation into the Auditor General's department would prove. The same thing applies with regard to the other departments. I have no doubt that the situation was such that Mr. Warren was well advised to order the investigation into the various departments. But I think that we can do nothing better than go along and not investigate these other departments until we find that there is something wrong, and then I am perfectly sure that if we investigate the Auditor General's department that we will find that the only thing wrong is that the men are not sufficiently skilled in the work. So gentlemen in presenting this report of the expenses of the auditors in investigating the departments which we asked them to go into this year I submit that we should not ask them to continue to make a general audit of all the departments.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Speaker, if referring to what has just been said by the Prime Minister, I quite agree with the attitude taken by the Government with regard to the investigations into these departments. But a few words as to the position in which I found myself. At that particular time when I was the leader of the Government my colleages in the Executive and myself considered it necessary to restore the confidence of the public that an investigation should be made into the various departments. Some of them have already been investigated. The Customs Department has been investigated as was outlined by the Minister of Finance the other day, and the same with the Controllers Department, but just before I resigned or was defeated, or whatever you wish to call it, during the Walker Enquiry the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs reported that there were irregularities in his department and accordingly that department was included in the investigations which Read, Son and Watson were asked to make. A further enquiry was obviated by the investigation which was made by the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs and Mr. Burteau, although I do not consider the composition of that commission was altogether a good one. The Auditor General I do not think should have been on that commission because it was clear that the irregularities had occurred of which the Auditor General should have known if his system was a good one. Then in regard to the Department of Agriculture and Mines there was one particular case in which there had been wrong doing found, but the department as a department has not been investigated. The Auditor General's department to which the Prime Minister made a lengthy reference this afternoon has we know perfectly well no wrong doing, but it is also recognised that there is something wrong, and therefore we asked a form of Chartered Accountants to go in and investigate the system and tell the Government how it could be improved. But I say this to-day, that I am one with the Prime Minister in his idea that you want professional men to take charge of the Auditor General's Department, but at the same time, one would hesitate to wipe out the Auditor General's department, and put in a lot of professional chartered accountants, unless the system had been first investigated, and we had found out what was wrong with it, and where it could be improved. Then that would be your justification for wiping out the department and doing what the Prime Minister suggests to-day should be done.

There was nothing wrong with the Auditor General's Department except that it was not functioning properly, and we asked Messrs. Read, Son and

Watson to go in there and find out where and how it could be improved to make it function properly. Then when that was found out, the Government would be in a position to take the necessary steps to bring that department up to the state of efficiency in which it ought to be.

From what the Prime Minister says, I gather that no further investigation is to be held into the department of Posts and Telegraphs and the Department of Agriculture and Mines, or the Auditor General's Department. Now in view of what has taken place, and in view of the fact that the Prime Minister has realised that it is a question more or less of efficiency in the Auditor General's Department, and having in mind what took place during my brief career as Prime Minister, I just want to say that I agree with the Prime Minister in the attitude that he has now taken; but there are others that, I suppose, were wrong.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words in reply to the Prime Minister. Several times during this session I have made reference to the department of the Auditor General. I want now to make myself clear that I was not making any charge against Mr. Berteau as Mr. Berteau, but what I have said is against the Auditor General and the Auditor General's Department. I do not for a minute think that there is any wrong being done in the Auditor General's Department, and I would not for a minute think that he could be charged with anything of that nature. What I said when I last made reference to this subject was what I got from the Statutes. According to the law as it is now on the Statutes, the Auditor General has the power of auditing every department of the Government, and he is at liberty to suspend any employees of the department who are not suitable for their positions, and he is also secured against his position by having on the Statutes a law that he cannot be suspended himself, except by legislation. Therefore, when the Auditor General is protected in that way, and with all that authority laid down, there is no one who can dictate to him. I say, therefore, that any auditor general is responsible for any misconduct that is going on. He is not responsible himself for the actual misconduct, but for not investigating such misconduct.

An auditing system once put into operation and adhered to, is a very simple thing; and if such a system is put into any department of the Government, and that system is properly kept up, there is not any official of the Government, whether he be a Post Master or a sub-collector of Customs, or in any other position, who will be able to defraud the country to the extent of thousands of dollars without being found out, and found out very quickly.

Now I suppose the Prime Minister will give every assistance he possibly can to the Auditor General. I can quite appreciate that in the past perhaps the Auditor General has not been encouraged to audit certain departments of the Government, but he should have had spirit enough to take it upon himself to audit them, and carry out what he thought was right to the Government, because after all this country and the Government are depending upon the Auditor General. He can write a good report—an excellent report, and he can audit the books, and I am sure that with an efficient staff, if he has the encouragement that is necessary, he can give a proper audit; and he can establish a system. If he has not the experience to do it himself, he can get the assistance, and establish a system in the Post Office and the Custom House and in all the other de-

partments, under which in future, if they are carried out, it will be impossible for any official of the Government to rob the funds of this country to any extent.

I just made these few remarks to make myself clear, but I do not want it to be thought that I made any specific charge against Mr. Berteau as Mr. Berteau.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions respecting a contract between the Government and the Newfoundland Hotel Facilities Limited.

The Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. PRIME MINISTER — Mr. Chairman, and gentleman as I stated yesterday I was anxious to get these resolutions before the House as quickly as possible, because the people who are parties to this agreement are expressing their anxiety to get to work on the proposition, and they have already deposited the twenty five thousand dollar cheque as evidence of their good faith in the proposition which they propose to carry out.

I think if you will take page three of the resolutions and go into the agreement itself, it covers pretty well everything.

Clause one says that the Company is to erect a hotel in St. John's having one hundred and fifty rooms, constructed of concrete, etc.

The second clause compels the Company to commence work immediately, or within two months, and to complete the work by the 1st May, 1925. As security for the carrying out of this work they deposit a cheque in the Royal Bank of Canada for twenty five thousand dollars. That cheque is redeemable to them if this House does not pass the Agreement, and the cheque becomes forfeitable to us if they do not carry out the agreement.

Under the third clause the Government agree to give to the Company a grant of that piece of land which is known to you all as the site on which the old hotel was to have been built by the Reids, and is situate on that corner of Cavendish Square, and is carried rount the corner of Plymouth Road in order to allow the hotel people to build tennis courts and lawns to beautify the grounds, and make them more presentable than they otherwise might have been. We give them a free site of that ground, which is Imperial property, and they take possession of the land.

In Clause five we give them free entry of machinery, and for building equipment and for hotel furnishings.

Under clause six, the stock, debentures, etc., of the Company are exempt from taxation. Clause seven exempts them for a period of ten years from Income Tax, Business Profits Tax, etc. Clause eight gives them the right to a permit under the Alcoholic Liquors Law to sell beers and wines. We are giving them nothing more than what is permitted for any hotel under the Alcoholic Liquors Act, but it does provide that they are not to be charged more than one hundred dollars a year for the first ten years, and then after that, it shall not exceed one thousand dollars a year.

Clause nine, which is the important one provides that we guarantee a three per cent. sinking fund for the bond issue of $450,000.00. We have to pay out as a sinking fund, provided the hotel earnings do not provide it, $13,500.00, but for that we get back redeemable bonds. I may say in that connection that this is the best proposition that we have had put up to us and we have been working ever since coming into office to try and get a good hotel proposition.

We have had other propositions

put up by several Montreal firms, and we have had several other offers from people outside. W. I. Bishop made us an offer the other day, but under that proposition there was to be a five per cent. guarantee on the mortgage bonds and a two per cent. sinking fund as well. Consequently this proposition seemed to us almost too good to be true, and until we saw twenty five thousand dollars deposited in the Bank we were a little sceptical that something might happen to prevent it going through; and it was such a good proposition that I was rather anxious to put it through without any hitch, so that the agreement might be confirmed.

I give a great deal of credit to Mr. Blandford and Mr. Stafford, who have been corresponding for over two years in connection with this hotel, with a view to trying to get a hotel company here. I think that to them is to be given in a large measure the credit for getting these people to come down here, and we must always give credit where credit is due.

These promoters were very well pleased with the place, though I was afraid that the week of foggy weather that they experienced here would have frightened them away. However, they were quite satisfied with it, and were confident that the scheme could be carried out successfully; and only this morning I had a message from them, asking when the legislations could be put through, so that they may start at work.

Two of these people are engineers from Quebec, and the man who will be manager of the hotel is a man named Fortier, I think, who built the Victoria Hotel in Quebec. He rose from a bell-boy to a hotel manager. He rose from the position of bell boy, built a hotel, made a success of it, finally erected a large arena at Quebec, is interested in sports and owns several hockey clubs, is a first class hotel man and well known in Canada. Mr. Ahearn tells us that he put $50,000 of his own money into the ordinary stock, and the mortgage bonds are covered by a reputable Quebec company. We are satisfied with the credentials of the promoters and have got excellent references of them from the Bank of Nova Scotia and from their own bank in Quebec which says that they are able to meet their commitments which I think is a very encouraging statement as to their standing. In connection with the Municipal txation on the hotel, we had a conference with the promoters and the Mayor and the latter pointed out that the Council could make no contract that would be binding in future years and only do so for the period during which they held office. He also pointed out that the Government had the power to make what terms they liked in this direction, and so we came to this agreement. We took exception to the request that the hotel be free from taxation for a certain number of years as if that were allowed some other hotel company might come here and want the same concessions. It was therefore suggested that they pay a nominal amount over a period of thirty years and instead of having a tax of 16 p.c. on a building that will cost $700,000, we said suppose we make the value nominally $5000 and tax therefore $800 a year. They agreed to this and also to a sliding scale of taxation reaching over a number of years. Clause 11 merely gives the Government power to nominate a director to the board of the hotel and clause 12 provides for protection for us against the engaging of foreign labor and for the employment of local workers. Clause 13 merely refers to the management and 14 refers all disputes that may arise out of this agreement to arbitration. Clause 15 states that the company

shall not assign or sublet this contract or any part or portion thereof to any person or corporation whomsoever without the consent in writing of the Government first being had and obtained which consent shall not unreasonably be withheld. This gentlemen is the agreement which we submit to you, and as I said before, it seems too good to be true, because even if it fails we get a $13,500.00 interest in the hotel. Unquestionably it would be a great asset to St. John's and the Island generally and be the nucleus of our tourist traffic, and I may say that we are satisfied with the proposition. The hotel cost about $700,000.00 clear of the price of the ground and constructed of reinforced concrete, fire-proof, splendidly fitted up and up to date in every respect. There may be some minor alterations in the plans, as the site is not exactly suited for the purpose of shops, four or five of which were to be placed in the building. This is the best proposition that can be brought forward in the interest of the country, and should be accepted at once. As to promoter's stock, they may probably give out some, that doesn't matter to us. I may say for my own part I am getting nothing—I think Mr. Blandford said he was getting $100.00 in common stock and another gentleman a similar small amount—but as long as the Hotel pays its way this does not interest us.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, I may say that I am in doubt as to how to take this Bill. As a matter of fact I have only had time to glance at it, but I have listened with much interest the description given by the Honourable the Prime Minister. I do not want it to be thought that we are knockers, as we are just as anxious to see the hotel here as are the Members on the other side of the House, and we must have the hotel if we are to have people come here from abroad. But there are some things that I would like to get an explanation on, and I think paragraph 9 is one of the most important in the Bill, and I would like to be enlightened on it. This clause says the Government will guarantee the due payment by the Company of the principal of an issue of a series of mortgage debenture bonds, etc. That means that the Government will be called upon to pay the $13,500.00. If that sum is not made out of the profits, and the Government will get a bond in the hotel to that amount. I think it will be a very easy thing to shift the whole thing over on the Government, if it is not paying. Of course, we cannot talk very intelligently on the matter until we see what the bonds are like. When will the first lot of bonds fall due? And what kind of bonds will be issued, if they are to fall due every year. Who can be expected to invest in a 1925 bond if it falls due in 1926.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The bonds are being placed with the Company in Quebec so as to fall due every year or $13,500.00.

MR. HICKMAN—This clause also says that after work started on the hotel they will have to depend on the public for the debentures.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—They can borrow only for the purpose of building the hotel. The bonds are 6½ p.c.

MR. HICKMAN—And they only guarantee the bonds will be taken up—there is no guarantee of the interest. The danger I see is that they will have great difficulty in raising the money—as 6½ bond will be a mighty hard thing to sell. Such a bond even for a public utility like an electric light Company is very difficult to dispose of them.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—If they are not sold in six months' time

we will benefit to the amount of $25,000.00, and they will be out that sum.

MR. HICKMAN—They may be able to sell some, but not the remainder, and then where will we be? The whole thing is subject to arbitration and delays. A few years ago a hotel was built in Montreal and the bonds were placed at 8 p.c., and it was found they could not be disposed of in Canada. As a matter of fact the Brokers came down here and spent months in trying to sell them for this hotel which was being erected in a place where a large influx of tourists was assured owing to open liquor laws. When a Montreal Hotel Company finds it difficult to sell 8 p.c. bonds, it will be more difficult to sell 6½ bonds here. Possibly all the promoters after raising a certain amount of money will not be able to raise any more and the job will be hung up and there will be a certain delay in arbitration in the building of an hotel in the Spring of 1926.

Now as regards Clause 8:

(Reads Clause)

Supposing something took place that the Liquor Act was rescinded or or changed, what, then would be the effect?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—We have to take our chances on that.

MR. HICKMAN—If the hotel were constructed I suppose that would be a drawback to the further raising of money. Then again, another thing is this, many people might come down here and bring their architects, and they might start to construct a hotel that perhaps would not be suitable from the economic standpoint of this country. If such a party constructed an hotel and then found on account of the construction of the hotel that the hotel was a mistake, they might leave it for somebody else to pay for the work.

If a man constructs a hotel here in Newfoundland it should be constructed in such a way that certain parts of the hotel would be vacant in the winter time, the heat could be turned off and the staff of the hotel could be cut down.

I remember two years ago I was in Leghorn. It was in the winter time. I stopped at a large hotel down by the sea-shore, the place was empty. This was a very large hotel, about the size of what you are contemplating building down here. There was scarcely any one in the hotel, but part of the hotel was cut off. There were only a few servants there. I happened to be there twice and I know the manager. I asked him if the hotel was a paying proposition. He said "yes." It was so constructed and arranged that in the winter time he can cut off a great part of the hotel which is not needed, and he can cut down the staff, to make it pay.

I don't feel as sanguine as the Prime Minister does about this. The fact that I was getting $25,000 would not induce me to think this a good proposition, because $25,000 deposited in the Bank as a guarantee is nothing if the whole thing is a failure, if the Company is unable to carry on the construction. You should build a hotel on a five per cent. guarantee on bonds.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Why is that better than three per cent. sinking funds?

MR. HICKMAN—You would have something substantial behind it. These people may not have the money. The Prime Minister does not know that, and that is the very thing the Prime Minister should know. If we are going to give them a contract to build the hotel the money ought to be in the bank to complete the hotel, otherwise, if the thing is half finished and then the Company falls down on the job, the Government has to find the money to complete it.

I am not going to oppose this Bill.

If I had my way I would not give it to anybody if I did not give it to a reliable concern. There are thousands who would underwrite this money half a million or three-quarters of a million.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—That is how it is going to be done.

MR. HICKMAN—But the money has not been underwritten.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—How are they going to underwrite it if we are debating the Bill to give them the contract?

MR. HICKMAN—Have they any guarantee?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—If the building is not completed we will get $25,000.

MR. HICKMAN—Now I don't want anyone on the other side to misunderstand me. We are not going to oppose this Bill. At least I am not going to oppose it; but I am just pointing out the dangers you are running by not having the proposition worded in such a way that there will be no doubt about the money for the construction.

MR. WARREN—I regard this Bill as the real nucleus of the tourist traffic of the Government, and in view of the advertising it has been given to the policy of tourist traffic of the Government, and in view of the well-known fact advertised by the High Commissioner in England and the various railway companies on this side of the Atlantic that there is no hotel accommodation in Newfoundland, and in view of the appeal to tourists to come in here that are made annually and monthly to would-be tourists it seems to me that the reluctance on the part of the reputable and reliable hotel proprietors to come here and erect a hotel speaks very poorly for the tourist policy that is outlined. Well, as these men are reluctant to come in here and engage in hotel business in spite of all inducements I think the Government is taking a step in the right direction by offering such inducements as they can possibly offer to get this necessity here. I consider that the Government went the wrong way about the tourist traffic. They should have started the hotel first and provided for the roads afterwards. Instead of this they are spending two million dollars on the roads and they do not know whether the tourists are coming here or not, and they are leaving the hotel proposition till the last.

So much for the proposition, generally, Sir. With regard to Section 8. I know perfectly well that it is within the jurisdiction of the Legislature to repeal the Prohibition Act at any time.

If the Hotel Company has been granted a license to sell ale and wines, I say at any time the Legislature may take this particular license away.

I wish to draw attention to the wording of Section 8, and I think the point raised by the Leader of the Opposition has some foundation. Here is a straight agreement to give them a license at a certain fee. Supposing the Legislature afterwards either repeals the Liquor Act or does something to make it abortive, I have doubts of the rights of the Company as to compensation. It is not that the Commission who are empowered under the Liquor Act to do it, but the Government who had such an agreement made agree that under the Liquor Act a license shall be granted to the Company. There is a straight guarantee from the Government that they should have a license. Now, supposing anything happens under that law the Company may come in and ask for compensation if that right is taken from them.

If I had my way I would take great care that I had a license for twenty five years. I am not going into the

principle of the Bill, but just taking the wording of this Section. Give them a license for twenty years as long as the Bonds are outstanding.

I take it that we do not guarantee the interest on the bonds. Now in the event of not guaranteeing the interest on the Bonds, supposing the interest is not paid upon any of the bonds, supposing the Company fails, where does the Government come in?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—What we figure out is that if the Bond owners find they are getting no interest or all the interest they can get at 3 p.c. by way of sinking funds and have to wait thirty years we figure out that the bond holders will say that they are not going to wait thirty years, and they sell out for the present value, we would buy out the bondholders at one-third the value of the bonds. That would be very much less than the cost.

They say something like this:—"The Newfoundland Hotel Facilities, Limited upon the passage of this bill will go to the underwriters and say that the Newfoundland Government guarantees the four hundred and fifty thousand dollars by the passage of this act and then this $450,000 will be underwritten. Somebody will have to underwrite it.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—It is already underwritten.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—They have the promise of having it underwritten.

MR. WARREN—Nobody is going to turn down Newfoundland 6½ p.c., but I do not quite know how they are to be underwritten. They will get the $450,000 from the brokers or the bankers on this guarantee, and then the Government must be liable to whoever underwrites the bonds, but the Government provides only to deliver $13,500.00 or so much in accordance with the construction of the building. But as the building is to be constructed within a year the Government is liable for the $450,000 within the year. I can see quite well that that they have the promise of raising of the money and that they will experience no trouble in this connection, and the Government is assured that the money will be spent by the first of May, 1926, and then they will have the value of the money in the bricks and the mortor and the hotel at Fort William, and these will represent the four hundred thousand dollars. That is clear. The Government liability will be represented by the construction at Fort William. Now I would like to see in this agreement a little more with regard to the management of the hotel after it has been completed. That is the crux of the whole thing. The hotel will be built down there, but it is not going to earn money standing by itself. If the whole business is to be a success it all depends on the management of the hotel, and I would like, but I know that the agreement has been made now, and it is practically impossible to change it now, to have some better agreement as to the future operation.

It does not amount to anything that the building is to be completed by the first of May. The debentures will have to be delivered in a very short time. I would like to ask the Prime Minister this question. "Provisions shall be made for the redemption of the said debentures by means of a sinking fund." What provision is to be made for the sinking fund?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—That is one thing that will have to be left to the trust deed. And that has not been submitted to the Government yet.

MR. WARREN—The next section is absolutely unintelligible to me. Perhaps the Hon. Member for St. John's West will give me a little help on this.

(Reads the section)

This section says that if you fail to redeem the debentures then the debentures so redeemed shall become the property of the company. There is no obligation on the part of the Government to redeem the debentures. I can see no sense in it.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—It is the way the lawyers have got it. I can see Mr. Warren's point, but at the same time I can see what the others mean also.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—We have had Blackwood, Emerson and Winter and four or five other lawyers on this, and I came to the conclusion that if the phraseology satisfied them it was alright.

MR. WARREN—Except for this section. I merely say that this is an extraordinary statement. Now if the $13,500 worth of bonds are to be redeemed each year there is to be a sinking fund.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—The thirteen thousand is the sinking fund each year, but we get the bonds to replace the money.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—But what if all the bonds are all sold?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—If they do not put up the bonds we will not give them the money.

MR. WARREN—It is a most extraordinary statement. When the Prime Minister says that all these lawyers were mixed up in making this agreement all I can say is that they must have been joking when according to Section 11 they have provided that the Government director need have no qualifications whatever.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Now there is one thing that the Government did not know about the bonds. You do not say whether they are ten or fifteen or twenty or twenty-five years, and you talk about setting up a sinking fund every year of $13,500.00 for which you are to get bonds. How are you going to get the bonds if they are all sold? How are you going to get the bonds for the money in that case?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—We will not pay out the money in that case if we do not get the bonds in exchange.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—And it means this, that you will have to pay the whole lot at one time, and take over the hotel if it is not a paying proposition.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Certainly—and get a cheap hotel. I hope that will happen, but I do not think that there are such lunatics in the world as to put up a seven hundred and fifty thousand hotel if they are not going to make money out of it. We will get a seven hundred and fifty thousand dollar hotel for four hundred and fiftfy thousand dollars anyhow.

MR. HICKMAN—What guarantee have you got that they will build a seven hundred and fifty thousand dollar hotel?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Clause fourteen.

MR. HICKMAN—Will you have anyone to check the work?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Certainly—the Government engineer.

MR. HICKMAN—And see that seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars are expended?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Oh yes. I intend to say a few words after the Honourable member has spoken, on that point.

MR. HICKMAN—Do you not think that you ought to know more about the bonds?

MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Frankly, no. All that is not a matter for an agreement of this kind. All that thing will be provided in the trust deed. The agreement says "Debenture Bonds of $450,000.00 to be secured by a trust deed containing, etc."

Then further down in section 9 there are provisions for delivery, etc. All these things will be provided in the trust deed. Honourable members will remember that the other day I produced a trust deed with regard to the Armstrong Whitworth Company's west coast proposition. You can see how much more detailed that is on these matters than the Act itself.

MR. HICKMAN—The agreement says that provision shall be made for redemption of the said debentures by means of a sinking fund. We will have to find that sinking fund every year.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—Might I point out that the position is exactly this, that suppose they put, we will say, two hundred and fifty thousand dollars into the building of the hotel and then stopped. Suppose that four hundred and fifty thousand dollars were put into a seven hundred and fifty thousand dollar hotel, and then they stopped, and the bondholders found out that the hotel was not paying. The bondholders would come together and say that nothing was coming to them but this thirteen thousand five hundred dollars each year. They will say—we can only get our money back out of it, without any interest. What are we going to do about it—we had better sell this out to the Newfoundland Government and get twenty five cents in the dollar out of it.

MR. HICKMAN—If they are twenty year bonds and they are all sold, what are they going to do?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—We do not know just what the bonds are. We cannot—for the reason that I will tell you now.

MR. HICKMAN—Well surely you are not going to find any person to buy a bond that is redeemable in one year. The date of issue and the date of maturity are on all bonds, and as the time of redemption grows longer the bond becomes more valuable, and no body is going to buy a bond that matures in one year.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, I feel sure that we all have only one purpose in our discussions on this proposition—that we want to more or less enlighten ourselves as to just what is the meaning of this measure. The Honourable member says that he does not oppose the hotel proposition, and I do not suppose that any person will deny that if we can get in this town a seven hundred thousand dollar hotel for which the Government has only got to pay thirteen thousand five hundred dollars a year, we have got the cheapest and best kind of investment that ever was offered to this House, for this reason.

So far as a building like that is concerned, I think honourable members will agree that no man is going to put his money into an investment of this kind merely because the principal is guaranteed by the Government. I can understand the man who will say, I will buy stock in this concern because the interest is guaranteed by the Government. I can understand of course the man who invests because principal and interest are guaranteed, but I cannot imagine that there are roving around Canada men who are going to put up money purely because the principal of this investment is guaranteed, unless he is shown that under this plan operation of the hotel is going to be sure. He puts up his money as an investment —not an investment in which his principal alone is guaranteed. The man that is going to put his money into this, thinks that the thing is going to be managed successfully.

Then take the honourable member's own position? Suppose it was a twenty year bond. Suppose a man had a twenty year bond for a thousand dollars, that man is not going to

invest his thousand dollars in a 6½ per cent. bond, unless he feels that he is going to get six and a half per cent. every year, and he cannot get it unless the hotel is in operation. He cannot get it out of the building alone. His interest on the bond depends upon the operation of the hotel; so that what strikes me as remarkable is the confidence of the promoters of this proposition, when they say that they have the money floated. That is a very refreshing surprise for me, and as I intimated the other day, and as members of the Government all felt very doubtful about the truth of the whole proposition until they saw the colour of the money. We were like the man from Missouri—we wanted to be shown, and we still wanted to be shown until these people put up the twenty five thousand dollars. Then they went up in my estimation altogether. When they come forward and say—alright, if you require evidence of our good faith, we will give you a cheque for twenty five thousand dollars, and if we do not get this thing going in a month we will pay you that twenty five thousand dollars.

One thing anyway is sure, if the hotel is not started within the next two months we will get twenty five thousand dollars for passing this bill anyhow. If that same arrangement was applied to all the acts that have been passed through for schemes like this, we would be well off to-day. We have had so many schemes go through, that if we got twenty five thousand dollars for every act that passed this Assembly, our increase in tariff would not be necessary to-day. I want to tell you now, it is about the easiest way I know to replace some of the drops in revenue that we have been trying to make up for by the new tariff. Seriously I would like to say that so far as acts of this nature are concerned I think this is one of the most remarkable I have seen.

The details covering the issue of debentures are so many and so intricate, as will be well illustrated when we consider that in the Act relating to the West Coast industry which passed this House some time, the section covering the issue of debentures occupied only two sections of the Act, and in that case there was an issue of ten million dollars contemplated, but when we take up the trust deed in regard to that issue of ten million dollars, the details occupy something like forty pages of closely printed matter. There are all sorts of conditions and provisions which it would be impossible to incorporate in the Act. Take for instance the question of the Newfoundland director—that is dealt with much more fully in the trust deed than in the Act.

MR. HICKMAN—I do not wish to interrupt the honourable Minister, but if these people have the bonds underwritten, or have a promise to underwrite them, they certainly must have decided what kind of bonds they are going to issue. Nobody is going to underwrite an issue of bonds, unless they know what kind the bonds are and could have told you.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—We did not bother about them. The point that I wanted to emphasise was this, that the concludingg two lines of the paragraph are really the most important as regards the matters that have been discussed. They provide that the Trust Deed shall be subject to the ratification of the Government. Under that provision the next that will happen, if their promises are substantiated, will be that there will be sent down to the Government after the passing of this Act a draft trust deed. Of course no person can think of getting up a trust deed until the Act has gone through. The whole

agreement itself will all be incorporated in the trust deed. It is just like ourselves here to-day. We have to get a bill passed before we can talk about putting it in the Newfoundland Gazette, and having it published as the law.

The only point I want to make is that so far as the building of a hotel is concerned, that this is much the easiest way we could get one, and I hope this thing will be carried out. I cannot imagine any easier way of getting a hotel than by paying thirteen thousand five hundred dollars a year for a hotel that is worth seven hundred thousand dollars.

The trouble about the thing is this that really it is hard to explain—that is why the honourable members opposite me cannot understand just why any concern should be prepared to build a seven hundred thousand dollar hotel here, for which we have to pay only thirteen thousand dollars a year; and if we pay $13,500.00 a year we will be no worse off if they only get up the building, than what has happened in the case of backing other enterprises here in former years. For that matter the penitentiary at the present time is full, and if all comes to all we can use this building for the purpose of accommodating the prisoners. The promoters of this project would not put up so much money unless they were sure the hotel will be operated. The day on which they float their bonds will be one on which we can be sure that a hotel is to be successfully operated in St. John's.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, I do not not wish to aggravate difficulties in connection with this discussion, as the matter is in the hands of more expert lawyers, but I do want to draw attention to the fact that apparently people outside have more confidence in the country than we ourselves have. I do not believe that the proposition is too good to be true, but here are people ready to come in from Canada and do what we have been talking about for years. Mr. Hickman have referred to the Mount Royal Hotel, Montreal, not being a paying proposition.

MR. HICKMAN—I said they could not sell their bonds.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—I am in a position to state that it is not a paying proposition, but it must be remembered that that Hotel cost far more than it should have. The big price had to be paid for the site, and the engineers in connection with the erection were short in their estimate. They had to go down far deeper than expected to reach a proper foundation, and the structure cost three million dollars more than anticipated. In spite of this Montreal is contemplating putting up another hotel, and the Windsor Hotel has also been renovated and enlarged. As the Leader of the Opposition says, he was in a hotel in Leghorn in the winter months when, of course, a great many visitors were not staying there, but he found that it was paying all right, though it was only operating for a few months of the year. Anyone who has travelled will tell you that they have been struck by the vast amount of money which they have seen invested in hotels everywhere. Even in towns quarter the size of St. John's you will find large and well equipped hotels. The people to-day are travelling—it seems they cannot stay still, but have the desire to keep moving about, and are constantly on the go from one place to another,—and, therefore, hotels have been built and equipped every place where the visitors resort. As to the present proposition, I have no interest beyond the desire to see that the country gets a share of the money which is being spent in large amounts by the

many people who are seeking new places in which to pass the time and enjoy themselves. I may say that during the last few months we have had several propositions as to the erection of a hotel here, from parties on both sides of the water, but we turned them down as they wanted concessions which we were not prepared to grant. Through the influence of the gentlemen mentioned by the Honourable the Prime Minister, we got Messrs. Rosseaux and Ahern here, they saw no person before they left Quebec to influence them in the way of holding out hopes for concessions which would not be substantiated, but they came and discussed the proposition which we have now taken up. These gentlemen who came here were not lawyers or hotel-men themselves, but engineers. The first thing that struck me when I met them was that they looked like lawyers, but they said they were not, and "it was only the climate made them look like that." I must say that they were most courteous and reasonable in every way, and were ready to meet any suggestion which was made by the Government. They were not looking for a one-sided bargain, but had the belief that they could do good business here, and I have heard that they intimated that if they could fill the hotel during only four months of the year they would make it pay. If that be so they would have a good dividend, and I believe that when the hotel is properly advertised and becomes known abroad it will be filled for ten months of the year. I think that Honorable Members may look forward to the idea that in the winter months the hotel will be filled, not by guests only, but by those from the city holding entertainments there. It is well known that we are a sporting people and at present we have not many places for the holding of proper social gatherings. There is no place where for instance Mr. Hickman could invite the Members of the House to dinner to-night, but I hope he will be able to do so next year. We have no place where the young people may go to dance and hold cabarets and other shows, and, therefore, they have little chance of enjoyment under proper conditions and surroundings. Therefore from a social standpoint this hotel will have an uplifting influence. We cannot do without the hotel if we are to have people come here from abroad, and the first step in this direction is to go on with the proposed building. With all due respect to those who are conducting the present hotels here, it can hardly be said that we have any adequate accommodation. Everyone has friends abroad, and I know hundreds personally who would come here if they could find suitable accommodation. From a financial standpoint if the hotel has only 150 guests, it will mean a large amount of money being spent here. Therefore, from a point of revenue giving, it will be a big factor—I think the Honorable the Minister of Finance has estimated the amount of money so left here only for food and materials used will be about forty or fifty thousand dollars a year. Is not that worth something? Even if we have to pay the $13,500.00 a year on reclaimed bonds, and we get forty-five or fifty thousand dollars a year from the visitors in revenue, it will be a good proposition. I believe that Messrs. Rosseaux and Ahern have good backing, and they are prepared to come here simply because they believe they can do business. They are taking a chance, and we would be recreant in our duty to the country if we did not assist in building this hotel, and taking a chance till the bonds are taken up. We should not be Cassandras but boosters, and I hope that every facility will be given the promoters by

the Government and citizens generally in this work which will be for the benefit of Newfoundland.

CAPT. RANDELL—Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to delay the House, but there are one or two points in connection with this Bill that I would like to have cleared up. As to Section 8 for instance, I think that if any changes should later be made in the Alcoholic Liquors Act—as for example a return to prohibition—the hotel proprietors would be in a good way to make a heavy claim for damages. Again Section 9 says that the Government shall guarantee the payment of the bonds for $450,000. But if these people come here, fall down on their proposition and go into liquidation, what will happen? Does this country have to pay $450,000?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—At the rate of $13,500 a year. And they would not have to pay it up immediately and only $13,500 under any conditions. That is why we suggest that if anything were to happen the Government would say "if you want to sell out now we will give you the present value for it."

CAPT. RANDELL—They would have to pay at the rate of $13,500 a year until all that is paid up.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—And then they will own the hotel.

CAPT. RANDELL—I am glad to be clear on that point because if people buy these 20 years debentures, at the end of the twenty years they will be looking to somebody for the money.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, in Clause 11. This suggestion has been made by Mr. Warren. (Reads the Section). "The Government shall not require any qualification." After the word qualification insert the words "as to shares."

MR. GODDEN—Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to prolong the discussion, but I would like to say that I am in accord with what has been said by the previous speakers. A big hotel is very necessary in St. John's particularly. And if there is no one to be found to build a hotel independent of Government assistance it is quite alright for the Government of the day to offer some inducements, and I think that according to the Bill that we have before us the Government have been most generous in granting a fairly substantial principle and in giving the promoters a free building site, but I think they will have to draw the line somewhere. In connection with Sec. 5 page 4.

(Reads Section)

I submit that you must draw the line somewhere as to the free entry of the equipment and furniture of the hotel. Because the hotel whether small or large will require certain things in the way of furniture, hardware, dry goods and crockery and if it is not specified how much they can import free of duty there is nothing to prevent them after they have installed and furnished the hotel from further importing things and claiming tax exemption.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Not at all. The word original provides for that. It is only their original requirements that they can get in duty free.

MR. GODDEN—In that case I would suggest that a certain quantity should be defined.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—It would be very hard to tell how much was needed or how little.

MR. GODDEN—Some idea could be obtained, and I still maintain that quantities of furnishing and equipment should be limited.

MR. SCAMMELL—I have no intention of making any lengthy remarks with regard to the resolutions before the chair, but first of all I would like to say that the debate so far has been

conducted in a serio-comic fashion. And from other points of view it seems to me that the Government must have been exercised a great deal so much so that I am inclined to think that it is a pity they did not exercise their abilities in some worthier direction.

There is one fact that stands out in bold relief as a result of the debate this afternoon, and it is that despite all the Government hopes from its boasted policy of tourist traffic the outside world has very little faith in the proposition. The Prime Minister in introducing these resolutions and the subsequent speakers who followed laid stress on the fact that the building of a hotel in St. John's was to be the nucleus of the tourist policy. Hotels as we all know are inseparable from tourist traffic. But I don't think that it augurs well for the future of the tourist traffic in this country when at the very start the nucleus of the proposition has to be subsidised by the Government guaranteeing its policy of building a hotel to-day. They are guaranteeing bonds and the principal to finance the hotel in this country because by so doing they hope to attract tourists here.

The promoters who are erecting the hotel and who have come down here for the past three or four years and looked over the ground that could be obtained in Newfoundland today have not been satisfied that they could raise the money here themselves and so they have come to the Government and asked them to guarantee the bonds.

I have my doubts as to whether a hotel of the size which is contemplated by these resolutions is going to be as successful as the Government would lead us to believe. As the leader of the Opposition pointed out, it is not our intention to oppose these resolutions. I think that the Government and the House owe a great deal of thanks for the manner in which the Leader of the Opposition has drawn attention to certain parts of these resolutions.

Now it seems to me sec. 9 needs some explanation. But as there are so many lawyers engaged on it it would be futile for an ordinary layman to concern himself with this section.

Be that as it may, Mr. Chairman, I want to take occasion to say that while I am not supporting the principle of the building of an hotel under Government guarantee and do not propose to vote against it, I merely rise to say that I have no faith whatever in the tourist policy of the government, and I was brought to my feet because it has started praising this hotel proposition as the nucleus. This country must not expect too much from this boasted tourist policy and it is not at all what the country was expecting from the Government. The spending of millions of dollars on motor roads and the subsidising of a hotel for St. John's is not what the people of Newfoundland are concerned about now, and I want to register my opinion that this tourist policy is not going to bring the returns that are expected. and consequently from the standpoint of guaranteeing money solely with that object in view I have little faith in the scheme.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, it would be presumptious on my part to question the legal phraseology of any resolutions now before the chair. But speaking to the resolution as regards the Government's power of appeal for the erection of a hotel to the extent of $450,000 we all have our opinions and we may express them as we feel so disposed. It is regrettable that we cannot have a hotel erected in St. John's that would meet the requirements of tourists or oth-

ers who may happen to visit the city without having the Government to subsidise the same.

A license for the sale of wines and beers and perhaps other liquors which was taken into consideration in the raising the capital for the erection of the hotel which we have been trying to get for a long time. Evidently the inducement was not enough for capitalists to furnish the money and now we have certain promoters asking the Government to guarantee the principal. There have been so many Government guarantees during the last few years that the public has become to feel shy of accepting any of these propositions which have been put forward as other than liabilities which the Government has undertaken. We cannot wonder at the general public considering the result of anything that the Government had to do, with such propositions is a financial manner. Therefore we are suspicious with regard to this undertaking as to its financial success. We hope that it will be a financial success so that the Government will not lose anything in connection therewith. It is a pity that the promoters of all hotels cannot be treated exactly the same. Here we are granting concessions to this company that have been withheld from the ordinary hotel keeper. Therefore it will be a case of unfair competition with the ordinary hotel keepers who have to make their livings in this manner in this city. That is the regrettable feature. We are encouraging unfair competition and treatment of the ordinary hotel keepers. That is the point of view that I take now.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE Do you regard it as unfair?

MR. HALFYARD—You take the position of the Balsam and the Cochrane. I think that they are discriminated against. They pay more than $266.00 in Municipal taxes.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —They pay eight hundred and eighty.

MR. HALFYARD—Without opposing the resolutions I would just simply offer these few remarks, and I feel sure that the whole House hopes that this will be more successful than any other thing of this nature that the Government has been mixed up with. Now the ordinary man when he hears the lawyers disagree as to the interpretation of the different clauses are inclined to wonder what it is all about, and clauses 8 and 9 have been referred to by the learned lawyers of this House, and I trust that if there is anyway of making the phraseology anyway different so that it will be more easily interpreted it would be well to have it done. Now Clause 8 with regard to the granting of the license for wines and beers: I do not know whether the Hon. Minister of Justice gave that clause any further consideration as to whether if in the future Prohibition came into effect again the company might have any claim against the Government. It is a matter that should be given attention.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—We deliberately drafted it that way. That promise can only be granted according to the act. I would like to say for the information of the Hon. Gentleman that we expressly worded it so that it would be subject to the act.

MR. HALFYARD—The Company will be subject to the act? The Clause 9 will be governed by the trust deeds. I suppose that the promoters of the company have been so short a time in the city that they did not have the time to have them prepared. Of course in the case of the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company when they laid the trust deeds on the table of the House they had them prepared for a long time because the matter was under consideration for some time.

But because of the circumstances of the case the Government cannot have the trust deeds and it will have to be left to the Executive Government to see that the deeds are properly drawn up and to see that the Government is protected on all points. With regard to the $13,500.00 which is the annual sinking fund I can quite understand that it is an annual sinking fund and that the Government will receive the bonds for the cash that they put up. But how is the company going to have the bonds to give the Government if they have been all sold. Are they going to buy them back from the individuals that have the bonds. That is a matter that will have to be provided for. However our position with regard to the tourist traffic is not as encouraging as it might be. We have undertaken to raise the two million dollars for the roads and we have to give this guarantee for the erection of this hotel. Anyway we cannot do anything by talking and I wish the new company every measure of success, and I hope that the more its success the greater benefit that it will be for the country.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to see that steps are being taken to erect a modern hotel in St. John's. I feel that we are all as one on that matter, but I think that Hon. Members of the House should be given more information with regard to this contract. We have heard some kind of explanation by the Minister of Justice, but it looks as though we are entering into a contract that we know very little about. It may be alright to say that if there is anything irregular in the bill it is to the other fellow's disadvantage, but I think that the Government ought not to enter into a contract in that spirit. It is not enough to say that if the agreement is loose and indefinite the Company will be the sufferer. An important point has been raised by the Leader of the Opposition and Mr. Halfyard. This Company is issuing $450,000.00 worth of bonds for the erection of this hotel, and you say these bonds are sold and at the same we are told that the Government is to get $13,500 worth of bonds every year for the same amount of money which is to form a sinking fund. If the whole issue is sold where are the bonds going to come from that the the Government is expecting to get?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—They have to provide a scheme for that.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Why worry about that if they have to find the scheme.

MR. HIBBS—But if the Company have not the Bonds to give there is a possibility of a tie up. Are those bonds twenty year bonds?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—That is not provided.

MR. HIBBS—Of course this scheme means that we are to become the largest shareholders in this enterprise. I think that it is a pity that we are so poor that we cannot now say to the promoters, here is the $450,000.00, give us the bonds and we will take over the whole thing, for that is really what it means eventually. At the present moment it looks as if we are giving them a subsidy of thirteen thousand five hundred dollars a year, but in reality we are paying for this hotel on the installment plan. Candidly I am glad that steps have been taken to put up a hotel here. If this scheme materializes and we get a decent hotel it will be a step in the right direction; but if we could see more daylight through this agreement it would be much more satisfactory to the House.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word or two with regard to what I consider is a very, very im-

portant measure, before the Committee rises. In the first place in discussing a proposition whereby we are giving certain encouragement to a company for the erection of a hotel in St. John's, it is only reasonable that we should ask ourselves why? My answer would be that it is part of a policy embarked upon by the Government in regard to the encouragement of tourist traffic. Ever since I have held a seat in this House, for about twelve years, some man has each year spent hours debating the possibilities of this country of ours, and how it could be made attractive for tourists who are anxious to come to some new country, where they will spend their money. This Government has decided to embark upon a policy, and has already made provision for the expenditure of two million dollars, and has made provision whereby a Highroad Commission has been appointed and this two million dollars put at their disposal, so that they will be able to build highways to the various attractive spots in the country, and so as to be able to take these people who are tired of going to the countries of Europe into some new places, where they will be able to appreciate the beauties of our Island.

Only this morning I received a letter from a Barrister in New York. I am very sorry that I have not got that letter with me now to read to the House. That letter was addressed to me as Minister of the Interior, St. John's, and the writer wanted to know if it was possible to make hotel reservations for himself, and his family and friends, who wished to come down here and spend two months of the summer, near some of the rivers of this country, and mentioning a particular district where they would like to go; and he asked me if I had in my possession any pamphlet dealing with the district referred to, and showing the various rivers, roads and so on.

I am not concerned with the technical clauses in the Bill. I am prepared to leave that to those in this House who are more competent to deal with it, and I take it that these gentlemen are just as anxious to secure the interests of Newfoundland as any of the men who have spoken on this measure, or any man who will speak from either side of the House. But I am interested in what the general result of the expenditure of such a large amount of money will be for Newfoundland. Some of us on both sides of the House within my own memory have got up here and painted pictures of the beautiful scenery in Newfoundland, and the various pools and rivers where the trout and salmon are in abundance, and the partridge and black duck, and all the other attractions that must be an inducement to those wealthy people who are anxious to come to some country where they can get away from the hustle and bustle of city life, and spend their money, which they an afford to spend on the which they can afford to spend on the

I was somewhat sceptical when this hotel proposition was first mooted, as to whether we would be successful in getting outside capitalists to come in here and invest their money in the erection of a three quarter of a million dollar building; and I was agreeably surprised when the Government intimated that it had been successful in getting reputable people who have engaged in various large propositions in the Province of Quebec and other places to come down here and put up this hotel; and when I find that the only guarantee asked of the Government for this three quarter of a million proposition was thirteen thousand five hundred dollars a year, I was agreeably surprised and delighted. Not only am I inter-

ested in all the kudos that this hotel is going to bring in the sense of bringing additional visitors to St. John's, but I see in the inauguration of this hotel the nucleus of a system of hotels that will extend all over the country to our various beauty spots, and will encourage the class of men we want to come down here and spend their money with us.

It has been more ably pointed out than I am able to do what certain people have done for Bermuda in the way of encouraging tourist traffic. There is no gainsaying the fact that we must look around for other avenues of revenue if Newfoundland is going to exist, and in this I think we have taken a right step. We have to make a start. It would serve no good purpose for honourable members of this House to get up and paint blue pictures of the various obstacles that we would be confronted with. We have got to take the rosy side of the picture. Without wishing to delay the time of the House I want to take advantage of this opportunity of placing myself on record as being absolutely in accord with the actions of the Government in this regard.

Before I sit down I want to say that when I read that letter this morning it struck me very forcibly that in connection with a project of this kind, and in connection with the general policy we have embarked on for the encouragement of tourist traffic, we should also have hand in hand with that policy a policy of advertisement. I remember in the early stages of this Session of the Assembly, one honourable member on one side of the House, I cannot remember who it was, however he said a word on behalf of a fellow countryman of ours, who is at present living in the United States. I refer to Mr. J. M. Devine. Somebody here suggested that if we should employ the services of Mr. Devine, we should be able to profitably advertise the beauties of this country. I think it was Mr. Grimes who suggested that. I know Mr. Devine intimately and I would like to avail of this opportunity to say that I agree with Mr. Grimes' suggestion. Mr. Devine is a well educated and thoroughly qualified Newfoundlander, living in the United States at the present time, and, as far as I know, making a good living for himself and his family; but as a matter of sentiment, he would perhaps sooner be working under the control and in the interests of his native country that for the foreigners he is working for at the present moment. I think that the Government would do well to give some attention to the recommendation or suggestion handed out by Mr. Grimes in reference to Mr. Devine; and it struck me very forcibly this morning that the services of such a man are required.

I feel certain that the Government will give due consideration to the fact that we have to spend a certain amount of money on advertising. There is no business or no proposition, however good that does not require a good deal of advertising to make it a success, and God knows that we need all the success that we can get. We are bound to the expenditure of two million dollars for highroads, and we are binding ourselves for an additional amount this afternoon for the erection of an hotel; and it is our duty to see that these people will make every effort to put this proposition through properly, and that it will not be a failure. I do not anticipate that it will. I think that it is only the foreruner of a system of hotels that will be erected on the peninsula of Avalon, in the district of St. George's and up in the North. Some of the finest rivers that we have in this country are to be found in the North. Take the Indian Brook in Hall's Bay, and several other rivers in the Northern part of the

Island which are splendid salmon rivers; but because of the hardship of getting there at the present time, and because very few of our local anglers resort to those spots, they are very little advertised. But now that we have embarked upon a general policy of encouraging tourist traffic over the whole Island, I hope and trust that every part of Newfoundland where salmon and trout are to be found will be given every consideration.

Before taking my seat, I would like to add a word of praise to what has been already said in regard to the promoters of this project. I think that Mr. Blandford and Mr. Stafford deserve the best praise of this House, and of the public at large for their persistency and consistency, and sometimes against great odds, but they kept on, and finally this afternoon they have the pleasure of seeing the result of their labours in the Resolutions that the Prime Minister has brought before this House; which show that they have induced a reputable company to put up twenty five thousand dollars as an absolute guarantee of their sincerity.

The amount of employment, that it will give is also a big feature, but not, in my opinion, anything to be compared with what I see in the erection of this Hotel. I believe that we are going to have a large number of tourists come here from the United States, who will spend two or three days at that hotel, and will enquire what is the best possible place to put in a week or a month with their friends on some of the beauty spots around the Island.

Personally I am delighted to avail of this opportunitw of giving this proposition my heartiest support, and I believe that it is one of the best measures that has been introduced into this House during the present session, and this is an important session. As I said before, we are already bound to the expenditure of two million dollars on highroads. I think it would be wasted if we did not provide accommodation for the people that we expect, to try and encourage them to come down here and swell the revenue of the country.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Agriculture has said something with which I can very well agree, and that is that it is madness to spend the two million dollars on roads unless we can get the people from outside to come here, and that he thinks the best way to get these people here to see our scenic attractions is to have a chain of hotels. I also agree with the idea of advertising our beauty spots, fishing, etc., which has not been done in the past to any great extent, and as he and other speakers suggested, if our attractions were properly advertised in reputable magazines or through the movies abroad, I am convinced it would make a very big difference in the numbers who would come here to visit our rivers, lakes, etc., which the Minister has spoken about at length. There seems to be a doubt in the minds of many as to whether hotels can be built profitably, and the fact of these promoters asking for Government guarantees suggests to the man with the money to invest that they themselves are doubtful. Why should guarantees be asked for here any more than in Montreal or Quebec if we have such attractions as described. In British Columbia and various other points throughout Canada, hotels have been built without asking for guarantees, and yet with all the great attractions spoken of here for the edification of visitors, these people are not prepared to go ahead with their project without Government backing. That suggests clearly that the Government should go slowly in spending this two mil-

lion dollars for roads unless and until they can see the people will come here. It would be only wasting the money on visionary schemes as it has been pointed out that this tourist traffic will depend on the erection of a hotel or chain of hotels. If the influx of visitors depends on this, then the Government is not justified in going on with their highways policy till the hotel is established.

Another thing about this Bill which does not seem fair to me is that we are going to give privileges of a special nature. The people already here who built up hotels with their own money and by their own energy, were given no Government help, while those from outside the country are to come in and Government guarantees on the capital of the company are to be provided for. I do not see any fairness in this helping of the large business man and not the small one. Why should we give guarantees and assistance to one and not to another when both are interested in the same enterprise. Before embarking on this highways policy which has been so much talked about, according to the opinions expressed here we would be only safeguarding that the money would not be wasted if we had the hotels erected first. Before going ahead with that road policy involving as it does the outlay of two millions, I say the Government should wait and see how the hotel project will work out.

MR. HICKMAN—Does the Government have to pay a rental on that.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—No.

MR. HICKMAN—Does that Section not mean that you undertake to give a license to sell wines or beers for ten years.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Not if the law is rescinded. It is only in accordance with what the liquor act may be at the time. The license will be renewed each year. If there are any new regulations brought in in connection with the Liquor Act they have got to conform to them. If at any time they could not sell wines they would have to sell beer only.

MR. HICKMAN—Under the Liquor Act is there any fee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Yes. It is at the option of the Liquor Control Board to nominate the fee.

MR. HICKMAN—What would be the position of the Government supposing this hotel was built and then the Government had to redeem the $450,000 bonds. Supposing the hotel was not a paying proposition and the hotel management had contracted liabilities up to 3 or 4 hundred thousand dollars. What then?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The bonds of the hotel are first mortgage bonds and naturally they have got to find security.

MR. HICKMAN — Supposing the Government had to pay all the bonds and take over the hotel, and certainly if it is not a paying proposition they will try and shift it over on the Government.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—They can't shift it over on the Government except at the rate of 13,500 dollars a year for thirty years.

Is it not very plain that if we have $13,500 interest in that hotel and somebody else has the most of the risk that these other people are going to be very anxious as to whether they are going to get their money back, and they see no way except at the rate of $13,500 for thirty years. That is not good enough, they say. "We have got to wait for thirty years to get our money back." And rather than do that they say "Can't we make some arrangement with the Government and get them to take over the hotel." They say "We will take 20c. in the dollar down and give you the hotel." That is where these people

are taking all their risk and we are taking none.

Mr. Cahill has just drawn my attention to the Clause which relates to the selling in the hotel or hotels wines or beers. That should read "and, or, beers."

MR. SCAMMELL—I would like to ask the Prime Minister if there is any possibility of the members seeing the plans of this hotel before the Legislature is finally disposed of. Have the Government seen the plans.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—We have not seen the plans. Only the proposed plans to give us an indication of the construction of the building. The plans had to be changed after seeing the ground. The actual lay out of the building will not be materially altered, but it will be changed to some extent so that the plans are not available at the present time.

The hotel is of the usually large nature. The entrance and the office are in front. There is a big dining room that runs the whole length of the building and a reception room that runs the whole length of the building on the other side. There are 150 rooms more than half of which have baths.

MR. BROWN—There is one thing that I would like to be clear on. I would like to ask the Prime Minister supposing in the event of this company going into liquidation and the hotel reverts to the Government, would not the creditors have the first claim on that building.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The bond holders would have the first claim on that building. The first Mortgage Bonds take precedent.

MR. SCAMMELL—What would the Government consider as a reasonable pretext for permitting the company to sublet the contract.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—We would want to know to whom they are subletting it and see that they are the right people.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed the said Resolutions with some amendment, 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 for the Confirmation of a Contract between the Government and the Newfoundland Hotel Facilities, Limited" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they have passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to Amend the Terra Nova Sulphite Company Act, 1920" without amendment.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—There is to be a meeting tonight in the Legislative Chamber which has been called by the President of the Council and the Speaker of this House, so there will not be any session of this House to-night. I move that this House do adjourn until Monday at three o'clock.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, April 20th., 1925.

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

Presenting Petitions

MR. LAKE—Mr. Speaker I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Lamaline, regarding the

famous Bar bridge, which was started there two or three years ago. With your permission I will read the petition to the House.

(Reads)

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that this matter was started two or three years ago, when there was a matter of ten thousand dollars put in the hands of the Government engineer, but that was spent for other purposes since. I now beg leave to present this petition, and I think most honourable members of this House know that it is well worthy of consideration. I ask that this petition be referred to the department to which it relates.

I also beg leave to present a petition from the residents of Grand Bank. (Reads petition). This petition, I might say is signed by all the residents of Grand Bank, and there is also a letter attached from the Board of Health, dealing with the matter, and stating the conditions as they exist at Grand Bank. I thought that under a Bill which was to have been dealt with the town of Grand Bank would have become a municipality under the new Bill. Seeing that that Bill has not been brought in, I ask leave to present this petition, and ask that it be referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from Burnt Arm, asking to have a road built from Norris Arm to Burnt Arm. The petitioners state that this road would skirt one of the most attractive districts as regards scenery in Newfoundland; and will be a source of enjoyment and pleasure to tourists passing over it. They want to have this road built so that they can have easier access to the railroad in Notre Dame Bay; not only for the sake of the tourists, but also for the development of agriculture.

I ask that this petition be referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to support this petition, and I ask that an amount of money for this purpose be taken out of the amount which has been allocated for highroads. The district of Notre Dame Bay has some of the most beautiful scenery in Newfoundland, and I heartily support this petition.

Mr. Godden presented a petition from the residents of New Melbourne on the subject of a road.

Giving Notice of Motion and Question

Mr. Scammell gave notice of question.

Mr. Scammell gave notice of question.

Mr. Duff gave notice of question.

Mr. Godden gave notice of question.

Hon. the Prime Minister presented a petition from the Avalon Telephone Company, on the subject of Legislation.

On motion a Select Committee was appointed to enquire and report as to whether the Rules of the House have been complied with in respect to private Bills.

Mr. Speaker appointed the Select Committee as follows: Hon. the Prime Minister, Hon. the Colonial Secretary, Mr. Puddester, Mr. Hickman, Mr. Duff.

Mr. Hickman gave notice of question 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works for an answer to my question as to the amount spent in connection with the Kenmount Road.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—The answer was tabled on Thursday or Friday.

MR. GRIMES—I beg to give notice of question.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on to-morrow ask leave

to introduce a Bill to amend the Industrial Societies' Act of 1919.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions respecting a Tax on Goods Imported into Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Chairman, these resolutions are only in connection with the Sales Tax. They simply mean that instead of a tax on the whole invoice there will be a tax of five per centum on the invoice cost of the goods. These resolutions have been before the House before, and I think we may now go on and deal with them.

(Clerk reads resolutions)

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed the said Resolutions without amendment, 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 Respecting a Tax on Goods Imported into Newfoundland" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Notice of Question.

(1) MR. BROWN asked Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs to lay on the Table of the House copies of all correspondence having reference to the retirement of Thos. Hynes, Jr., of St. Brendan's, B.B., late Mail Courier between there and Traytown, B.B.; also to ask if any complaints have been made against the said Thos. Hynes as regards the manner in which he performed the service, and if so, to name the persons who complained and to lay on the Table of the House any letters or telegrams received in connection with such complaints; also to ask if Thos. Hynes has been paid in full by the Department for services rendered during the Winter of 1924 and if not why not; also to ask what Thos. Hynes was paid per trip or per week and what is his successor being paid.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman, in the absence of Mr. Brown, I beg leave to ask that question.

HON. THE MINISTER OF POSTS —I beg to table the reply.

(2) MR. DUFF asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the names of Fishery Wardens and Game Wardens for the District of Bay de Verde for 1924 and the salaries of each.

MINISTER OF MARINE — Mr. Chairman, in reply, I beg to state there were none employed in 1924.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 4 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Legislative Disabilities and the Vacation of Seats in the House of Assembly.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman: Honourable Members will remember that at the suggestion of the honourable member for Fortune Bay at the last day of the session the Committee rose to take into consideration an idea which appeared to commend itself to the whole House on that occasion, and that was to incorporate into the Bill the practice that obtains in England to-day, namely, the non-necessity of Ministers of the Crown having to go back to a district for re-election after a General Election. In England the period, as has been set forth already

by the member for Fortune Bay, is nine months, and I would suggest that, in line with what has been advanced, a section like this be inserted into this Bill. The suggestion now is to take verbatim the section of the English Statute and add it to section (3) of our Act. The amendment reads as follows:

> "Provided further that this section shall not apply to any member of the House of Assembly by reason only of his acceptance of an office of profit if that office is an office the holder of which is capable of being elected to, or sitting or voting in that House, and if such acceptance has taken place within six months after the issue of a proclamation summoning a new House of Assembly."

If honourable members desire an opportunity of considering the matter further, I shall ask that the Committee rise, but I did not think it worth while to have the Bill reprinted. The amendment has been taken from the English Act of 1919. It has not been discussed by the Government, and it is only introduced now in view of the discussion that took place a few days ago when the Bill was last in Committee.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, perhaps it might be in keeping to repeat what I said a few days ago that I would have moved the amendment myself, but that I hardly thought it right for a private member to do so; but the amendment submitted by the Attorney General covers the point exactly and will do away with the present anomalous condition of affairs so far as re-elections are concerned.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that I was not in the House when the honourable member for Fortune Bay made his observations and suggestion in regard to this Bill; and it is very difficult for the ordinary individual to see through in a moment what the honourable Attorney General has submitted in legal phraseology, and I, consequently, would ask that the Committee rise and give some of us an opportunity to look into the whole matter.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I am only too glad to meet the wishes of the honourable member and have the Bill reprinted, although it only means the printing of one section, still I move that the Committee rise in order to meet his desires.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on to-morrow.

Second reading of Bill "An Act Respecting a Tax on Certain Incomes."

HON. THE FINANCE MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I think that I have explained the Income Tax at different times already during the present session of the House. The only addition to the Bill is at the bottom of Section (7) and reads as follows:—

> "And such repeal shall not affect anything done under, or any right, title or thing to be done which to any extent depends upon the Acts or parts or Provisions of the Acts so repealed in relation to liability for a collection of Income Taxes upon profits made up to and including the 31st day of December, A.D., 1924."

I, therefore, move the Second Reading of this Bill.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Speaker, the abolition of the Income Tax, with the exception of the observations of the honourable Minister of Finance in

connection with this Bill, is, in my opinion, altogether wrong. It is un-British in its character and no British Dominion to-day, not even Great Britain herself or any of her Statesmen would ever agree to the total repeal of her Income Tax. The Income Tax is one of the ways by which a man pays according to his ability to pay. Indirect taxation bears more heavily on the people with the smaller incomes than on the people with the larger incomes, and I do not think that this House should consider this a fair way of dealing with taxation in this country. The revenue of Great Britain is raised chiefly from taxation on incomes, and the same applies to the Dependencies of Australia and New Zealand and a considerable amount of money was also raised in that way in Canada, and I do not know of any other British Dominion where the same has not or does not apply. It may be true, as stated by the Finance Minister, that the Government want all the money possible and that only eleven hundred persons, or approximately $180,000 paid last year; but I do not think that the business of the country is going to suffer by the imposition of this Income Tax, because I think that a pile of money has been going out of this country every year in consequence of people who have invested in stocks and such like. I think we ought follow on the lines laid down by a British Statesman, who had control of the destinies of the Empire and who felt that the only fair way in which you can legitimately tax people is to tax them according to the incomes they earn. If a man gets here say from $600 to $1000 a year, he should not have to pay a tax, because in order to save money out of that he does without the necessaries of life for himself and his family; but I contend and insist that the man who earns twenty, thirty and forty thousand dollars a year and who saves thirty or forty per cent of it should be taxed in some degree, and I consider it very unfair if he is not. I repeat that the present Bill before the House is un-British and should never be entertained by the House, as it bears heavier on those with the small incomes.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER— Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words, because as this is a policy of the Government I feel that it is up to me to defend it. Now I quite agree with Mr. Grimes that it is unfair to take off the tax off the rich man and put it on the poor man. We hesitated for a long time before we considered taking this tax off at all. But as we pointed out to this House before the income tax is an impossible tax to work rightly in this country.

At the present time we are only collecting this tax from 1200 people in the whole island and everybody knows that there are a great deal more than 1200 people in this country that ought to be paying their income tax. It is easy enough with regard to the Municipality. They can continue to collect it right here in the city from the men who ought to pay. But when you take the whole island it cannot be done. You find that there is a man doing business down in the bottom of White Bay. He keeps no books. He is doing a large business but there is no way of tracing what business he is doing. He gets his goods down and pays cash against invoices, and has no books at all. There is a lot of people doing business on that basis. There is no assessor that could get at them and find out what business they really are doing. The cost of sending people down to examine into the books would be more than the receipts,

because the people in this country are so scattered and so isolated.

I claim, Mr. Speaker that the only way to collect taxes is through the Custom House. Take the case of the ordinary fisherman. They went to the fishery last year and got eight and ten dollars a quintal. In two or three cases they made enough to pay for the entire schooner. If you went to a fisherman and asked him for an income tax he would almost eat you. You cannot collect it from the fisherman.

Now you are talking about putting the tax on to the poor man as against the rich man. But I think that that tax is put on to the poor man as against the poor man. Take the ordinary clerk in an office in this country. What happens? The amount of salary paid to the clerk by his employer is handed in by the employer to the Assessor's Department, and the assessor has the opportunity of knowing every amount that is paid to the clerk whether in the shape of bonuses or otherwise. Consequently that man has no chance of escaping the tax, if his salary is big enough to make him liable for tax.

Now take the case of the rich man or the better off man who has been paying his income tax to the Government. Are we to conclude that this money will now go out of the country and be lost to the revenue. I say no. The merchant or the better off man who saves his income tax you will find in nine cases out of ten reinvesting the money thus saved in further enterprises. It comes as extra revenue through the Customs. I am quite satisfied that three-fourths of the money that does not go out in income tax will be returnable to the country in some other way by the people who have saved their income tax.

So I say that in my opinion it is a great deal better to dispense with the proposition. We have given it every consideration and find it costs a lot of money to collect the revenue. It cost $12,000 last year besides the cost of the percentages to the lawyers for collecting the amounts that had not been paid. So I am quite satisfied that it is a great deal better in this country at least to collect our entire revenue through the Customs Department. I feel sure that when the result is known you will be astonished at the small amount that is really lost to the country by the taking off of the income tax. We will see the returns in the Custom House instead of through the Assessor's Office. So I am ready to stand by the policy that we have adopted.

MR. GODDEN—Mr. Speaker, in connection with this income tax I quite agree with Mr. Grimes. The income tax is a very fair tax to collect. At the same time I quite agree with what the Prime Minister has said as to the difficulty of collecting the tax in this country. Perhaps it is a fair move on the part of the Government, under the circumstances, to take it off. In connection with the taking off of the income tax I submit that it is hardly fair to make those few people who have been paying the last few years pay it now when it is well known to the Government that only about a quarter of those who should pay the income tax have paid it. I would suggest that the repeal of the act should take effect from Jan. 1st, 1924, not at the end of that year. And by all means get after those delinquents and make them pay up. That would be fairer than to take action against clerks and all others who have an income just sufficient to bring them under the act. I would suggest that if it is impossible to collect the tax from those who should pay it then be square with those who have paid it

and make the act effective from January 1st, 1924.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, with regard to the question now before the chair. Of course when this measure was first introduced here it was introduced as a War Measure Act. I remember distinctly well when I sat in my place in this House supporting this measure. As I contended at that time that the country had to find ways and means of paying her debts, and therefore those who had money or incomes should be called upon to pay in due proportion. This principle I think existed right through the empire and in parts of the British Empire to-day still exists. In Great Britain the income tax is an enormous one. And from an economic standpoint it could be argued whether it is a desirable one, or whether England is really benefiting from the income tax. Men with large incomes are in great numbers in the United Kingdom and they have to pay such enormous taxes, 50 or 60 or 70 p.c. goes out in income tax that the result is that England to-day is almost suffering from industrial paralysis. The money collected from the capitalists has to be handed out again in dole to support the eunemployed, and as a consequence the country is suffering to-day. The trade that should be carried on in England, the industries that should be in the act of operation, the ship-building yards to-day are paralysed, and the money is going to other countries. Even these boats that this country is getting built, they are getting them built in Holland, owing to the conditions of labor in England. The Furness Withy have placed an enormous order for steamers, I think about six of them, on the continent that should of necessity be built in England, or Scotland or Ireland. The result is that it is a question whether the economic conditions of England is not due to the fact that the capitalists are paralysed by taxation. Now in this country it may be alright to go along Water Street or go to the industries operating in this country and to the man who copies the balance sheets, and I have no hesitation in saying that 90 p.c. of the taxes paid are paid from those sources, while the great balance of the people who must be earning large sums of money are going practically free.

Now it has been contended by many people in business and particularly in industrial institutions that this tax was becoming so burdensome and aggravating that it made the business men and the industrialists entirely against investing more money or developing their business. This is not a blow at the poor man. The man on Water Street if he has a business profits tax puts it on to his goods. Therefore there is not argument in the point that this tax is taking it off the rich man and putting it on the poor man. Very often the man in medium circumstances has to pay in a large proportion more than his more favoured neighbour or associate. And the difficulties that we had to contend with as regards people getting clear of giving the correct returns were insurmountable. We found that it was not possible to carry out the income tax act in a way that would give justice and fair play to all.

The Prime Minister said that the Government had considered it. On the face of it it was a drastic change to make. Some may even say that it was a mistake from a political standpoint. But we want in this country to get business and industry on a stable basis and remove as far as possible all aggravating circumstances that make that need harder to attain.

I would strongly endorse the income tax if everybody was paying their due proportion. I quite agree with Mr. Godden it is unfair and discriminating legislation where a certain section of the people are paying their tax and others who are just as liable for the tax are able to escape and not pay anything. I don't think in the long run that the country will lose. It will come back indirectly probably in ways that are little known of to-day. I believe this will help to consolidate and establish business houses and industries in the country more than anything else could possibly do. Time was when the country wanted the money and did not care how it got it, but I think that we are safe in saying that we have passed that point and are getting down to more sane and sensible legislation. Therefore I want to take this opporotunity this afternoon to explain why as a member of this Government I support this bill, and I do it for the very fullest public and impartial reasons. I do not do it because I will have to pay a few dollars less income tax myself, but I do it because it is the best for the country and for the industrial life of Newfoundland as well.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the bill entitled "An Act Respecting a Tax on Certain Incomes" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Second reading of Hotel Facilities Bill.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Speaker, when the resolutions were before the House the other day we on this side of the House said that we would not oppose the construction of a hotel in St. John's. But I think that we are going too fast. The Prime Minister thinks that we have got a good thing here when we have got some people to put up this hotel, but I understand that the Government have not any plans or specifications of any kind for reference as to what is going to be erected, and I do not think that we should pass this bill without knowing something about what is going to be constructed. It is a very easy matter for a company to erect a very cheap structure and put in very cheap furnishings that will not cost them more than two hundred thousand dollars and the guarantee that is to be given them by the Government is four hundred and fifty thousand dollars, and we will have to pay the amount of thirteen thousand five hundred dollars a year as a sinking fund. And for this I think that the members on both sides of this House should hesitate before putting a bill through this House, giving these people carte blanche to erect a building of which we know absolutely nothing about as to the specifications of the hotel or the furnishings that will be in it or of the material of which it is to be built. And while the Government considers that it is important to rush this bill through the Legislature I think that we could very possibly make a very grave mistake to rush it through before all the plans and specifications necessary, and they are necessary, are put on the table of this House. Nobody would give a contract for the building of anything and so make himself responsible for the amount of the cost of the building if the plans and specifications for the materials and the furnishings and the number of bathrooms and the class of the fixtures and everything in connection with it were not first submitted, and that should be done here, so that we may know that we are getting something for the money we have to guarantee or pay.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I think that I pointed out when these resolutions were before the House the other day that these people were committed to put up a hotel for which there is to be a bond issue of four hundred and fifty thousand dollars, and for that reason is it reasonable to suppose that they can get a company to underwrite four hundred and fifty thousand dollars of bonds to put up a seven hundred thousand dollar hotel if they are only going to spend two hundred and fifty thousand dollars. We have not got the plans and the specifications. We did have a photograph or a copy of some plans of the hotel, but they are changing the plans again and we cannot get them for another week. Are we going to hold up the building of the hotel for another week simply because the members of this House want to look at the plans.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Yes, hold it up for a year.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—We on this side of the House are determined we are not going to hold it up for a year. We have got a chance, and it is a very good one, of getting this hotel built, and we mean to see it through. It is the finest proposition that we have had from any contracting company. We have to pay only thirteen thousand five hundred dollars a year for which we are to get bonds in return, and under the worst circumstances we have to pay this thirteen thousand for thirty years of the bond issue which is only half the interest on the bonds, and for that we get the hotel. Of course if the hotel is a success, which I expect it will be, we have nothing to pay, although the members on the other side of the House and even members of my own party are not inclined to talk about the success of it. I am perfectly satisfied that there is room in St. John's for a hotel. I am perfectly satisfied that it is going to pay.

The people of St. John's spend their money freely and the tourists will come here and spend their money and we want to have something in the shape of a hotel that they have seen in their own countries, and I feel perfectly certain that the hotel that we have in contemplation will be up to our expectations in this respect. So, I say, Mr. Speaker, that this matter should not be deferred because we have not the plans and the specifications to put before the members of this House. I do not think that they would be any the wiser if they did see the plans and the specifications. They cannot see the walls going up and we are satisfied that there is no company fool enough to put up twenty five thousand dollars as a security if they are not of the impression that they are going to make the hotel pay. Mr. Ahern said to me "We do not want to lose twenty five thousand dollars any more than you do." When I said that we would want some security that the hotel would go up, he said he was quite satisfied. He said "How much do you want us to put up I said twenty five thousand dollars. Perhaps if I had asked for a hundred thousand dollars he would have put it up, but I did not think that it was necessary to ask a man for a hundred thousand dollars and to put it aside in a certified cheque when it might be earning good interest, and for that reason we did not want to impose on the people any more than we could help. So I say, Mr. Speaker, that I feel that the Opposition should not be a stumbling block to the building of this hotel, and I feel that it is not right to say that because we cannot have the plans and the specifications on the table of the House that we should not proceed with the building of the Hotel.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Speaker, as this question is a matter of interest to the whole country I consider it my duty to discuss it because it effects the people of the outports as well as the people of St. John's. As far as I can see the erection of a hotel in the city of St. John's is not going to be beneficial to the people of the outports to any great extent, but they have to pay their proportional part of the thirteen thousand five hundred dollars and what returns are they going to get? In the first part of the session we passed a bill for the spending of two million dollars on the construction of roads and by and bye before we go much farther we will not know where we are. First it is two million dollars for the building of the roads and then it is more money for the erection of the hotels, and soon it will be something else, and I have not heard one person in the outports speak in favour of the spending of the two million dollars for the building of roads. As regards the spending of the seven hundred thousand dollars for the erection of the hotel, I consider it my duty as a member for the outports to say that I am against it because I think that such a large hotel here will not pay. I do not want to be a stumbling block and I do not want to obstruct the erection of this hotel, but I deem it my duty to stand up here and take the place of the ordinary taxpayer of this country who wants to know where the money is being spent and how he is going to derive a benefit from it. I fail to see how the outports are going to be beneficially affected to any material extent by having a hotel in St. John's. We have today in St. John's hotels which are very comfortable, and even though they may not be as elaborate as those that some of the tourists may be used to, yet their charges are very reasonable.

I do not believe that the majority of people who come here from the outports will be able to stay at the proposed hotel, which will likely be charging from 6 to 10 or 15 dollars a day; and on account of that, and because the season here is so short for tourists, I fail to see where this is going to be a paying proposition, and hence, Mr. Speaker, I consider it my duty to place my sentiments on record in this regard on record.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I just want to make a few remarks in reference to what the Prime Minister has stated. He said that we were obstructing this Bill, that we were trying to stop the building of the hotel. We do not, but we are trying to put the Government in a position so that they will not be coming to this house next session and eat all the words that they have been saying about this hotel. It is alright for a man to come here to the Government with some flowery proposition. These men are out to make money any way they can, and there must be some restrictions made upon them so that the country will not suffer. This Bill will be in committee, and I will have an opportunity then to say more about this.

MR. SCAMMELL — Mr. Speaker, there is not much point, perhaps, to be gained by repeating sentiments that have been expressed here the other day when this Bill was in the form of resolutions before the House. I want to say, however, this afternoon that I very much regret that the Prime Minister should have got so heated over the very sensible and very reasonable proposal which the Leader of the Opposition has made, namely, that before we proceed with any undue haste in connection with this proposition we should have something of a more definite nature before us with regard to what these

people really mean to do in connection with this hotel.

I feel sure that every business man within the confines of this House this afternoon must realize that even though we were not disputing the good will and good intentions of the promoters of this scheme, still the point which Mr. Hickman has made this afternoonn is well taken, that this proposition leaves open the way for all sorts of situations.

We do not oppose the erection of an up to date hotel in St. John's, though the remarks of Mr. Ashbourne are much to the point, when he says that the average man finds it hard to see what is the necessity of this hotel in the city; and that the average man fails to see what is the urgent necessity for the Government to spend thirteen thousand five hundred dollars annually for the next thirty years in order that they may foster the proposition, and make it work down here.

The Hon. Prime Minister has said that the people of St. John's spend their money freely, and that the tourists are going to spend their money freely. I think that the last word to be said in connection with this proposition is that the Government is spending the people's money very freely. The last thing in the world that the people of this country expected from the Government of today was that they were going to foster a scheme of this sort, and what do they think the people throughout the length and breadth of this country think of this proposition of spending thirteen thousand five hundred dollars a year towards the fostering of a hotel proposition in St. John's? If this tourist traffic is going to be the great benefit to the country that the Government says it is, why then are not these promoters themselves satisfied that there are behind this proposition all the benefits that they think will result. Why are they not satisfied to put their money into it themselves, without asking the Government to subsidise them to the extent of thirteen thousand five hundred dollars a year. I want to say now that we have no faith in this tourist traffic business, and the country has no faith in it, and that is why I am opposed to the idea of the Government subsidising the proposition. One of the most cogent reasons that the Government has put forward for this hotel propositions is that it is part of their tourist policy. We may have no argument against a hotel being built in St. John's, but we have no faith in the tourist policy of the Government, especially when it means that we are being asked to make the taxpayers of this country pay thirteen thousand five hundred dollars, in order to foster this fanciful and visionary scheme.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE— Mr. Speaker, I think that it would be a pity if the second reading of this Bill should pass without a few remarks on the suggestions of the honourable members opposite. We heard a great deal of suggestions from the opposite side, made with the best of intentions no doubt, but none of them are opposed to the principle of having a hotel erected in St. John's. There are several different ways of choking a dog, and of opposing the idea of a hotel in St. John's.

A couple of questions will occur to honourable members in regard to this bill, and I want to say that you need a large amount of public sentiment to inspire a proposition of this sort. I can accept what the honourable member for St. Barbe says, when he declared that he had no faith in the tourist policy of the Government, but it is quite another matter when he says that the people of this country have no faith in the

proposition. I regret very much to say that neither himself nor myself can presume to talk for the people of Newfoundland, but this I will say, that I have as much right to say that the people of Newfoundland will benefit under a tourist policy as he has to say that they will not.

The time has come when this country has got to capitalise its natural advantages, and its scenic attractions. We have to sell these things as it were, and we have to exploit them. If we are to make any success at that, we must not disparage our resources. That is not what the Government is doing. The Governmnet, by giving this guarantee, is letting the outside world see that Newfoundland, and the people of Newfoundland have faith in their country as a place where anyone can come. That is one of the best advantages possibly the promoters of this scheme could have. The first thing that a man who is asked to buy stock says is that the people of Newfoundland through its Government have shown that they have faith in the proposition; but if we are all going to sit down here and sing the Lamentations so to speak, and say no one is going to come down here, then of course no one is going to come down here. Why is it to-day that little one horse towns in Nova Scotia that are not quarter the size of St. John's are sticking out their chests, and flooding the continents with literature of all kinds. You hear so much about them, you would imagine they were Montreal's or something like that. It is because of their public spirit that they are like that; and I say to the honourable members that when they make remarks showing that they have no faith in the tourist policy of the Government they are doing their best to ruin any chance of success that that policy ever had.

Mr. Ashbourne says that this hotel is not needed for the outport man coming to town, he will not be able to stay there. No, that is not the kind of man that we are trying to get the money out of. That has unfortunately been the trouble with our country for too long. We have been getting all our revenue from our own people, and too little from outside. We have got to go outside for it, and now we are going to adopt the policy that has made smaller countries great, by getting some people to come into the country who have no other recreation in life but spending money. That is the kind of man that the Government wants to get the money out of, not out of Mr. Ashbourne and his friends coming in from the outports. When they come into town they do not spend their money going to big hotels, they have far too much sense for that—they are content to leave that to the foolish tourists who come here.

However speaking personally, the point I want to make is that we have got to view this thing as simply a broad national principle of boosting the place. This idea did not originate with this Government—not with this administration. Previous administrations to this, and previous organisations—boards of trade, and almost every congregation of people that got together have been talking about this idea of tourist traffic. Why it is what every man you talk to about the thing tells you—it is a great pity you have not got a modern hotel here. After all this thing ought not to be viewed as though it were a partisan measure, as though the present administration had any particular desire to get a hotel in St. John's. We are not going to get free board and lodging down there, you know. The thing is a better thing than a mere party act, a mere act of the administration of the day. This policy has nothing new about it; it has been dis-

cussed by many administrations before—and now that some definite step is being taken to bring these discussions into effect, it should have the support of all the members.

As regards the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition, out of deference to him, I think that he will agree himself that section one of the agreement in the Bill meets all the difficulties that he seems to have in his mind. (Reads section 1 of the Schedule to the Bill). Now I ask the Leader of the Opposition as a reasonable and a sensible man if to-morrow he would expect that we would be able to get more than that from any promoter who comes down here to put up a hotel. He comes down here with his general scheme, and a kind of rough general plan, and he says "that is the general make up of the building that I propose to put up—here are some rough drawings." No promoter is going to come down here with detailed plans and specifications, and embark on architects fees to that extent unless he feels that there is a reasonable chance of doing business.

He simply comes down here, and gives the rough plans, and says that if we agree to his proposition, he will agree that the detailed plans and specifications which he will subsequently draw up will be subject to the approval of the Government.

So far as all the Honourable Members of this House are concerned we might read these plans and specifications for years before we would understand whether they represented the worth of the money or not. What nonsense it is to talk of having these plans before the House. The Leader of the Opposition and other Honourable members could merely say, "yes, I see the general scheme of the building," but as to suggesting that we could sit down here and decide to-day the proper architecture of the thing, or the lay out of the rooms—whether a room ought to be on the right side or on the left side, that is ridiculous. Are we going to get into discussions like that. The Honourable gentleman himself knows that we are doing what has always been done in contracts, namely, that we provide as we are giving a guarantee, that we shall have the opportunity and authority to pass upon the plans through the Government engineer.

This clause covers the very thing the Honorable the Leader of the Opposition anticipates—the Government has a right to go down there and say to these people—"these are not plans that we approved of," you are building a theatre instead of a hotel, or you are putting up a rink instead of a bowling alley, or whatever it may be. Does anybody think for a moment that these men who are behind the enterprise are going to invest $700,000.00 in a hotel without being fully posted as to the cost and everything else in connection with it. The trouble with the Honorable gentleman is that he seems to have the idea in the back of his head that these people will make a lot of money. He misses the point entirely —the promoters of this project cannot build what they like, they must spend $700,000.00, that is the contract. We should look this thing in the face as far as the contract is concerned, and I would like to say to the Honorable Member for Twillingate that as far as being a tax on the people of the Outports, I am convinced the building of this hotel will only give them another chance to put more money in the Bank. That will happen, as it cannot be a tax on the Outport people, because if the hotel is built it will be built because the people behind the project are convinced that they can fill it with guests, not our own people, but those who

come in from outside. The matter of who stays there is no concern of ours, they can turn it into an ice house if they like, but it is their job to fill it. If as the promoters claim, and as we have all heard, hotels can be made pay even when they are filled for only four months of the year, why should we worry? I believe that what will happen when the Honorable Member for Twillingate is in St. John's that he will go there. Publicly I want to put him down as a very saving man, but privately he is fond of a little comfort like all the rest of us, and he will go to this hotel where he can get it. And I will say for him too that there is nothing too good for him. As to the manner in which we approach this subject, I think we should all get together, and as in the case when we have little domestic troubles with our wives we keep them to ourselves, we should not now keep up the cry that people are not going to come here, but start in to boost. What is the matter with our country, isn't it as good as any other? Isn't our air and scenery as good as can be found anywhere else. If we keep on saying that no one will come here, you may deepnd that nobody will. It is like the case of the man who thinks he is sick—if he meets enough people to tell him he is sick he will begin to believe that he really is, and the next thing he will do is go to a doctor. It is time for us to change our slogan, and I say that we want not only one hotel, but ten if we can get them. It is no use in us lying down and dying, and I believe that the Honorable Member for Twillingate is convinced in his innermost heart that the Government is right in this project. If the promoters feel that they can make the hotel pay, well that is their job. I support this Bill, and I believe that every Member of the Opposition feels in his heart that the Government in this connection is adopting the right policy.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Speaker, in listening to the warm and enthusiastic speech of the Honorable the Minister of Justice, I fancied myself in the Casino Theatre hearing him make a political address, and trying to make out as good a case as possible as to whether he was sticking to the point or not. Now I think he missed the point in his remarks just now, as we have to guarantee $13,500.00 annually for thirty years, and he says that because we do not like this we are not boosters of the country. But we on this side are boosters as much as any on the Government side and have the interests of the country just as much at heart. I think my colleague, Mr. Ashbourne, made himself perfectly clear in his remarks. He is opposed to the spending of two million dollars on roads and not to the building of a hotel provided it is done without the giving of Government guarantees. Why should these people expect from us what they do not get from their own Government. They do not get Government guarantees in Quebec or in any other province of Canada or British Columbia, and what has been done in these places has been done by people who took it upon themselves to boost the hotels or whatever they wanted in their own towns. I think there are many people who would put up hotels here on a guarantee like you are giving. A few years ago some private parties in this city endeavoured to have a hotel erected, but their plans failed as the Government would give them no guarantee.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—If this Government had been in power they would have got it.

MR. GRIMES—The giving of these guarantees for everything proposed should be stopped at once. I am not decrying the erection of a hotel as I

would welcome all the tourists that may come here, but the taxpayers should not be burdened to pay for it. I think that the position taken by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition is the right one and that we ought to be given more particulars as to this hotel and be told more as to how the money is to be spent. It may be true as the Hon. the Minister of Justice has said that we are not able to figure as to the placing of baths or as to furnishings, but we ought to know something of the material that is going into this hotel which is to attract the millionaires from abroad. If the Government have this information we should be given it too, as we represent large constituencies and should be given some idea as to the furnishings with which this hotel is to be provided. There is no reason why we should not be given this idea and if we cannot do it ourselves, there are numbers of men right in the city who can pass a qualified opinion on this class of work. I therefore support the contention of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition and think we should have more information on this subject before rushing the Bill through the House.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Speaker, regarding the suggestion of the Hon. the Minister of Justice that I am not a booster I would like to say that I am as good a booster as any man on either side of the House and I will stand to Newfoundland to the last ditch. I have considerable business interests in the outports and I considered it my duty to stand up here this evening and voice my opinion on this subject. I am not against tourists coming here and as a matter of fact I would like to see them come here in their millions. But all will not come to St. John's, which will be only the stepping off point for them on their way to the interior, the West Coast and the other beauty spots throughout the country, and it is at these points that I think pavillions or the like should be built for the trouters, etc., instead of having one large hotel in St. John's which will cost us $13,500 a year. I am prepared to boost Newfoundland in every way, but I do not believe that the average man in the outports cares whether there is a hotel here or not if taxation is reduced so that he can make both ends meet and make a living instead of having to go abroad to do so, as is too frequently the case at present. That is what we meet with in the outports—the men cannot make both ends meet—and before the Government places any more irons in the fire it should be very careful as they are the custodians of the people's money, and if they vote for this project which means a cost of $13,500 a year for 30 years they will find the concensus of opinion against it. I am opposed to subsidizing the building of this hotel not because I am not a booster, but because I feel that if this tourist traffic is coming here—as I sincerely hope it will—the hotel could be put up without the aid or guarantee of the Government.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, the honourable member who has just sat down has either got a bad memory or he is very inconsistent. Of course we do not want only the people in St. John's to occupy the hotel that is going to be built in St. John's. We are going to build roads. But why are we going to build roads? Because we want to attract people to come to the hotel in St. John's, and with this hotel project in hand we must have headquarters somewhere, and I would like to know what better quarters could we have than here in St. John's? One would imagine this afternoon on listening to the honourable member for Twillingate (Mr. Ashbourne) that he

had heard of this matter for the first time. Why the argument and debate on this topic is hackneyed and worn with age. Let me remind the honourable member that the late Government were prepared to subsidize this hotel with five per cent. interest on seven hundred thousand dollars and which would have meant seventy five thousand dollars annually without any bonds or any terms of security at all. The Squires administration entered into an agreement with the very same people that we made an agreement with for a hotel, if they could get the money, but they could not get the money then. Mr. S. D. Blandford and Mr. B. B. Stafford and those associated with them had been working on this thing for the past four years. I know that they went to Toronto and spent a month there and got certain people interested to a certain degree, and then I think the matter fell down and collapsed. They were working on it this year and through some fortunate circumstances they got in touch with those people in the city of Quebec with the result that those people came down here, and if any man with a fair mind, after reading this contract, can see where this country risks anything, well all I have to say is that I have a very poor opinion of his judgment. The only concessions that those people are getting is that we are allowing in free of duty the material and the equipment for the hotel just as we would allow material and equipments in for any other industry, and I contend that this is an industry that is going to start here and an industry that is going to justify its existence here. There are people in this House and outside this House who argue that we are going to lose $13,500 a year by giving concessions to those hotel promoters; but what about the amount of money they are going to spend on the construction of the hotel and what about the amount of money that the building of this structure will yield to this country in years to come? Only to-day I had letters from New York from people—wealthy people — who are sick and tired of going to Europe and other places holidaying and who want to come to Newfoundland, having heard so much about our beauties and attractions. Now the question is are we going to continue in our present backward condition or do we place any value on the natural beauties and natural attractions and resources of the Island. It is well known to members of this House that the verdict of people who have visited here from abroad already that our attractions and resources are unique. Hundreds of thousands of Americans flock to Bermuda every year, although Bermuda has not the one-fiftieth part of the variety of attractions that Newfoundland has to offer. So I think it is high time that we got beyond this sing-song of the impossibilities of our own country. I was very pleased to receive a few days ago, in my capacity as Colonial Secretary, a delegation of young business men of this town. These three young men propose to start a voluntary organization known as a Tourist Bureau for young men—and I hope for old men too—to become boosters of Newfoundland, and they anticipate having a membership of one thousand young Newfoundlanders before they are through. They want to be helpful in a way that they believe is going to be helpful to somebody else and helpful to the country in which they live. This delegation are prosperous and successful young business men at present and why are they taking that interest just now? In every town and in every particular section of Canada, Mr. Speaker, you will find young men vieing with each other in this idea of boosting their

own country. Our local Tourist Bureau intend to have permanent officials to meet strangers and tourists who come here and direct them to the most comfortable and attractive places and give them every possible information as regards scenery accommodation and fishing points. In other words our local Tourist Association are going to try, if possible, and get the word "welcome" across the Narrows and get the same spirit resounding throughout the length and breadth of the country and then some of us may be able to see what can be got out of the tourist traffic. Personally, I think it is the biggest industry we have, if we have faith in our own country, and I am sorry to say this evening that I know of strangers who have visited our shores and who have greater faith and greater confidence in the resources and future of this country than some Newfoundlanders and some members of this House. Of course, the trouble is here that some people are so hard-shelled politicians that they cannot get out of their shell even once in a while, and if the reports of the debate on this question, as they have expressed themselves, go abroad, they will have the effect of deterring tourists from coming here. I think it a good and very admirable purpose to try and get the Yankee millionaire to come here and spend some of his money. We want a lot of outside money to come in here. Take Norway. Norway is situatd in the Old World just as Newfoundland is situated in the New World. Look at the enormous returns Norway got as a result of the tourist traffic policy. But Norway has had its day in that direction and we have greater possibilities in this country than ever Norway had. Now I hope that the Jeremiahs who see nothing but losses for us in this hotel project will cease their lamentations and remain quiet until they see whether or not their prophesies are going to come true, realise the necessity for concluding this agreement, get right down to business and start labour which is so badly needed in this country at the present time and not have the hands of the clock go back another year.

MR. GODDEN—Mr. Speaker, I had not intended saying anything on this particular matter, but I am invited into the discussion by memories of what happened a week or so ago when the Dry Dock project was before us. Seemingly just now the Prime Minister and other Honourable Members of the Government are just as sure that everything in connection with this Hotel scheme is a hundred per cent. perfect, just as they were over the Dock scheme. Now if I am not mistaken they have changed their minds somewhat regarding the Dock proposition since it was first introduced, and there is no reason why the Prime Minister will not have a different view of this Hotel matter a year hence than he has now.

If we all felt so sure about this business, perhaps we should not bother so much now whether the hotel proposition is a good one or not. At the same time the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has said there is great doubt as to whether it is advisable for this scheme to be adopted without every conceivable consideration being given to from all points of view. I submit to-day that I am quite satisfied that as regards St. John's we want a hotel, perhaps more than anyone. Also if you cannot find anyone to start the hotel on their own hook it is quite permissable for the Government to offer some inducements. And I still stick to that. I do not know what the value of the building site is, but that is given free Then the guaranteeing of nearly half a million dollars. That is a serious guarantee in spite of the fact that you are getting bonds in exchange for

yearly payments. These bonds may not be worth their face value in a year or two from now. I rose to my feet to offer a word of warning. And you should be absolutely sure of what you are doing before you pass legislation of this kind.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER— Mr. Speaker, usually these bills are considered and then sent back to a Select Committee. But I would ask the indulgence of the House to go into Committee on this Bill tomorrow. I would like to say one word in reply to the Leader of the Opposition.

I don't think in justice to him that he really fully realised the position when he suggested that the plans and specifications should first be put in here and that we should if necessary wait a year for them. It is stipulated in the Bill that the plans and specifications have got to be approved by the Government before we commit ourselves to anything. Surely the leader of the Opposition can trust us as a Government to see that the plans are alright and to approve of the contract that is being entered into. It is clearly stipulated that the hotel is to be a $700,000 building. Concrete and fireproof. With the help of the Government Engineer surely we could be left to approve of the plans and specifications without waiting for 12 months for approval of the Opposition. The Leader of the Opposition said that he should see the plans. I trust that he will withdraw that stipulation and permit us the very small concession of being able to decide on the plans and specifications through the engineer without putting the matter before the Opposition benches for their approval.

I would just like to say one word more. Mr. Godden made the remark that we would probably go back on our opinions the same as we did on the dock. Perhaps it would be no harm to explain what our position is right here with regard to the dock.

Some time ago we put two propositions before the House. We recommended No. 2 proposition as suggested by Mr. Bishop and asked to be allowed to repair the dock under agreement to be entered into. We had concluded that No. 1 proposition was a poor one, and not worth spending half a million dollars on. When this Bill went to the Upper House many of the members criticised it more than it was criticised down here. They went so far as to say that we should not be spending so much money on the dock. They were quite satisfied that a wooden dock would be good enough. And many people outside the House confirmed what had been said and told us that it was madness to spend so much money in this way.

Now we wanted to justify ourselves before the public. We said "Alright, we may be wrong and we will get another opinion on it." We delayed the agreement eight or ten days and asked the Prime Minister of Canada to send down a dock expert engineer to look into the proposition and tell us whether we were right or wrong as regards what had been already suggested. We asked Mr. Mackenzie King to send down a man and he told us that he was sending down the Engineer of the Public Works Department of Canada, Mr. Gray. He came down here. He is not here today because I sent him away on Saturday night to have a look at Old Days Pond, Bonavista. But he is coming back to-morrow. His report has been handed in and Mr. Grey's report practically confirms in every respect the suggestions of Number two proposition.

I may say that since Mr. Bishop went to Canada he sent us a message to say that after looking over the plans and specifications he found that he could bring the concrete work right up to the coping, making a full

concrete dock for the same expenditure.

That is practically what Mr. Gray suggested when he came here without knowing what Mr. Bishop had telegraphed. We went through the machine shops because they had been the subject of a great deal of criticism in the Upper House. They said that the dock with the alterations would be out of all proportion to the machine shops and that it would take $150,000 to get machine shops that would conform with the dock at those dimensions. Mr. Bishop told me that there would be very little required in the way of addition to the machine shops. He also said that the pattern shops would be moved up to the head of the dock. For an expenditure of $50,000 we could have the shops fully equipped with everything absolutely necessary. Mr. Mitchell, on page 15 of his report, referred to the necessity of grain elevators, but he was only speaking from a port standpoint. Mr. Gray says there is no such thing as grain elevators being a part of the necessary equipment of any dock. In St. John, N.B., where they have got the biggest dock on this side of the Atlantic there are no grain elevators. They are provided by private enterprise when the necessity arises. We accepted Mr. Bishop's suggestion and I hope that the community are now satisfied that we are not entering into any agreement without a thorough knowledge of what we are doing.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the indulgence of the House be given to allow us to approve of the plans and specifications for the Hotel and when we go into Committee on the bill to-morrow further discussion can take place.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act for the Confirmation of an Agreemnet between the Government and the Newfoundland Hotel Facilities, Limited," was read a second time.

On motion the Rule of the House as it relates to a Private Bill was suspended, and it was ordered that the said Bill 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 to-morrow afternoon at three o'clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, April 21st, 1925.

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

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present two petitions from the District of St. John's East. One is from the residents of Outer Cove on the subject of a winch. As is generally known, this place is very exposed, especially to a north-east wind, and the people have to haul up their boats each night to save them from the sea. I have much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition and hope the necessary allocation will be granted. The second is from the people of Biscayan Bay, near Cape St. Francis, on the subject of a launchway, which is in need of repairs. Those who are acquainted with this shore are aware that it is a very difficult place to fish from and the people have much trouble in handling their boats. I would therefore ask that the Dept. of Marine and Fisheries would have the repairs made as soon as possible so that the benefit may be derived this season.

MR. MOORE—Mr. Speaker, a number of the people of this settlement which is an important fishing one

have spoken to me on the need of this assistance in plying their avocation, and I therefore give this petition my heartiest support.

MR. ASHOURNE gave notice of questions 1, 2.

MR. SCAMMELL gave notice of questions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5.

Notice of Motion

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—To ask leave to introduce a Bill to Amend "The Industrial and Provident Societies' Act, 1919."

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce this Bill and to save the time of the House as to what it means I may say that in 1919 when the Act was passed, through an oversight the amount of $200 was inserted instead of £200 as it is in England. We now propose to make the amount $1,000 instead of $200. This is only a copy of the English Act.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the Bill to Amend "The Industrial and Provident Societies Act, 1919" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Notice of Question.

(1) MR. SCAMMELL asked Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs if new Post Offices were constructed last season at Brooklyn and Bloomfield, .PB., and what they cost completed in each case and to whom was the contract for building the same in each case awarded, also if tenders were called for each building or one of them and to lay on the Table a copy of all such tenders and if an offer was received for construction of the office at Brooklyn for $200.00, and if so, why such tender was not accepted.

HON. THE MINISTER OF POSTS—Mr. Speaker, in reply I beg to state that the new Post Office buildings at Brookly and Bloomfield, P.B., were completed last year, but the contracts were not arranged by the Postal and Telegraph Dept.

(2) MR. SCAMMELL asked Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs to lay on the Table of the House copies of all correspondence relative to the removal of the late Postmaster at Brooklyn, P.B., also if any charges re mismanagement were made against the late Postmaster, and if so to state who made the charges and to lay copies of the same on the Table. Also to ask if the Department has received any report re careless handling of mails under the present Postmaster, and if so, what action the Department has taken in connection therewith.

HON. THE MINISTER OF POSTS—Mr. Speaker, in reply, I wish to state that the change in postmasters was made at the request of the representatives of the District as the man could not continue the work when the office was removed from his private dwelling. The present postmaster has given every satisfaction in the handling of the mails.

(3) MR. DUFF asked Hon. the Colonial Secretary if it is correct that the Evening Telegram and Daily News are being paid for publishing the Synopsis of the Debates in the House of Assembly for this session.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, in reply, I wish to say that the Evening Telegram and Daily News are not being paid for publishing the synopsis of the debates in the House of Assembly this session.

(4) MR. GODDEN asked Hon. the Prime Minister: (a) if it is correct that Mr. Joseph Peters, Liquor Commissioner, has been deputed to visit Canada, and what is the purpose of his visit; (b) what is the result financially in the Liquor Controller's Department since the present Com-

mission took office, state what nett profit or nett loss was derived to December 31st, 1924, also from January 1st to March 31st, 1925.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, in reply, I wish to state that Mr. Peters has not been deputed to visit Canada officially.

(5) MR. GODDEN asked Hon. the Prime Minister what Members of the Government have been given orders for liquor (as Principals or Agents for Principals) by the Commission since June, 1924, to date; state kinds, brands and quantities together with prices paid; statement to be signed by Mr. Mifflen, Chairman of the Board.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The information will be forthcoming to-morrow.

(6) MR. HICKMAN asked Hon. the Colonial Secretary if we have a Board of Health? Give names. What is the contribution by Government to salaries? Is there an Inspector? What is his salary? What does he do? Does he furnish report, if so, lay it on the Table of the House. Is there a report from the Superintendent of Child Welfare Association?

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—In reply, I wish to say that there is now no Board of Health in the Colony, all matters relating to this subject being dealt with by the Department of Public Health, which is presided over by Dr. R. A. Brehm, Medical Health Officer. The inspection of food, milk, meats, etc., is undertaken by special inspectors attached to that Department, whose salaries are those voted in the estimates. Reports are furnished by those Inspectors upon any particular matters which may arise. Health matters in the various Outports are under the immediate care of the respective magistrates, they being constituted under the act as Boards of Health. The Government has received no report from the Superintendent of the Child Welfare Association.

MR. HICKMAN asked (1) Hon. the Prime Minister to Table all Tenders and quotations which were submitted in connection with recent purchase of Rails and Accessories, also names of Tenderers and local Agents if any; (2) Was contract made direct with successful tenderer or through said agents, or through Trade Facilities Board or through others? If the latter, give names of said parties, also state if they were acting on behalf of tenderer or Railway Commission; (3) If the latter, what remuneration was given or is to be given for services in connection therewith? (4) To what extent, if any, is The Trade Facilities Board financing said purchae? Does their connection with the matter take the form of a direct contribution towards purchase price, or is it only in the nature of taking care of a portion of the interest on recent loan for a stated time? (5) If the latter what proportion, and how long? (6) Lay on the Table all correspondence in connection therewith; (7) What quality of Rails are being supplied? Is quality specified best suited for service in this country, that is, taking into consideration climatic conditions? (8) Did the Railway Commission take any steps to ascertain if above quality was best suited under conditions mentioned? (9) If not, why not? (10) What was actual tonnage of Rails, also tonnage of each item of Accessories ordered? (11) What mileage of track is quantity of Rails ordered supposed to replace? (12) Are there any Sidings included in above? If so, state mileage of said Sidings; (13) What price is actually being paid for each item? Are Rails and Splice Bars being supplied at an average price? If so, what is length of each Angle Fishplate, and weight of same per pair?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—

Mr. Speaker, it will take some considerable time to get ready this information, but the railway officials are preparing it to-day, and I hope to be able to table the information within the course of a few days.

(8) MR. HICKMAN asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay upon the Table of the House latest report on the Dock by the Canadian Government Engineer.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I think I intimated yesterday that Mr. Gray would be back today when his report was expected to be ready, but I find now that his report will not be ready until tomorrow.

(9) MR. GRIMES asked Hon. the Minister of Education if anyone is now employed at the Normal School other than the teaching staff and the janitor. If so, to give the name of the party or parties so employed, the salaries paid and whether they are to be permanent employees of the Department.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, the only person employed in connection with the Normal School building, other than the teaching staff and the janitor is Mr. Thomas, who was clerk of works during the construction of the building, and who is still employed at the rate of $5 per day, pending the settlement of some outstanding differences between contractors and the Government. At present Mr. Thomas is engaged supervising the grading of the grounds of the building.

Committee of the Whole on Bill "An Act to amend Chapter (4) of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Legislative Disabilities and the Vacation of Seats in the House of Assembly.'"

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, before the House is moved into Committee I may say that I have had the Act reprinted and distributed, but I would like to suggest that the Order stand deferred until to-morrow, as there are one or two additional suggestions respecting it that I would like to have consideration given to. I take it that honourable members opposite have been furnished with a copy of the new draft of the Act.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Cusrtoms, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting a Tax on Certain Incomes."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, in reference to this Bill there are a few things contained therein that I am not quite clear on. For instance Section (2) says "Every bank, banking corporation or trust company, except the Newfoundland Savings Bank, shall pay an annual tax of three-sixteenths of one per cent., to be computed on all business of such bank, bank corporation or trust company, that is to say on all moneys on deposit in and loans by such bank, banking corporation or trust company to be computed monthly and paid on the average amount of moneys on deposit and loans." Now I would like to know what is meant by the words "moneys on deposit in and loans" and also I would like to know if Banks will tax their customers this charge of three-sixteenths of one per cent. on all moneys that are negotiated through the banks and which may be loked upon as loans? If they do, it is certainly going to mean a large amount of moneys for the banks. Section (3) also says that a person residing outside the Colony and receiving rents on prop-

erty within the Colony shall have such rents taxed five per cent. on the net rents received. Supposing you have an office on Water Street and the lease for it is made out in such a way that the lessee has to pay all the taxes. I think that absentee landlords who are spending their money here making improvements to their property should be exempt from this tax. Another matter I would like to refer to is contained in Section (3) also with regard to the accounting period. I think you will find that the accounting period should be made longer than fifteen days of any year. With respect to Section (2) again I think that the prevailing custom here in St. John's is to make a draft upon a loan on account of the draft..

MR. DUFF—With regard to section one in connection with the insurance:

(Reads)

What about these taxes on the insurance that is collected in the outports?

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Part of it goes to the council and part of it goes to the Government.

MR. DUFF—Thanks very much, I am very glad to know that.

MR. WARREN—Two per cent. goes to the Municipal Council. Out of the forty thousand dollars that is collected about twenty two thousand dollars goes to the Council.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that I agree with the Leader of the Opposition in connection with the taxes on grants of land properties. Now in this town the buildings in which Messrs. Knowlings and Ayre & Sons carry on their businesses are owned by absentee landlords, and while I agree on the principal that there should be a tax on the absentee landlords I think that it is not very encouraging to these landlords to come here and provide labour and work by building because they know that they are going to be taxed 5 p.c. It is not very encouraging to these people to come in and have to do that.

(Reads the section)

Now the Minister says that they are already paying the income tax but they are not. They are only paying up to a certain amount and I know of my own knowledge that there are four women, widows, who have to do the best they can to subsist on a little money that comes from the rentals that is derived from property left them by their fathers or their grandfathers or somebody else. I know that in this particular case the amount is something like four hundred dollars, and I think that it is a pity to be collecting a 5 p.c. tax on an amount of this size, and I would suggest to the Minister that he make some minimum amount which would not make it a hardship on people who have to live on such a very small amount on the interest of their property. Under the income tax they are relieved up to two thousand dollars, and I would suggest to the Minister, as I said before that he made a minimum on which the absentee landlords should be taxed.

HON. MR. CRAMM—With reference to what the Hon. Member for Fortune Bay has just said I do not think that there is any amount of rental exempt from income tax under the Income Tax Act now in force. There is a clause in the Act that is somewhat ambiguous. The Act says that '.in lieu of" the normal tax and super-tax that shall be a straight tax of 5 p.c. The assessor does not interpret this to mean that any amount is exempt; and I must say that I agree with his legal interpretation of that section of the Act.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words on the subject of the absentee

landlords, and in connection with this bill generally. The idea that the Government had in putting these taxes back was that we were getting the money out of people who are not in the country. I claim that if we take off the income tax we are not dispossessing the country of any money because those people who live in the country and have to pay the income tax will now spend the money in some other way in the development of some business propositions or to some other good purpose, and I do not think that any money will be lost in this way; but in the case of the money that is paid to people living out of the country, if these people have not to pay any income tax the country does not get any benefit from it. Because of this I would put the absentee landlords in the same class as the insurance companies and the banks. That is money that is going out of the country and we ought to get our percentage out of it before it goes, and I think that it is justifiable to tax the absentee landlords like the insurance companies and the banks. There was a great deal of criticism about the taking taxes off the banks. The taxes were absolutely out of proportion with the other taxes paid in Newfoundland and it was the right thing to do. Even now it is a great deal more in proportion than the insurance companies have to pay, or are likely to pay. In the case of the absentee landlords I cannot see how we can take the taxes off the little man and leave it on the big man, because the small man is not able to erect on his property a big building, and if we took the tax off him it would encourage the big man not to put up any big buildings. I think that it is the best thing to have the absentee landlords pay the same tax all round.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, I am like the Prime Minister and I believe that there should be an equitable tax on outside landlords who own land in St. John's. I do not think that there should be the same amount of tax on those persons living out of the country and who have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars and go to great expense to erect buildings here. They have helped to improve the city and they have spent a great deal of money in this way. It would go a great distance to discourage any one who has properties here at the present time from putting up any more. It is alright for the people of St. John's who have money to construct buildings, but there are a great many cases where the firms have not sufficient capital, and they are very glad to have the city built up and are grateful for the wealth of the absentee landlord. Now while the Prime Minister was on his feet I thought that we would hear a little explanation from him as to the meaning of a loan, and I would like very much for the Prime Minister to give us his opinion on that. What is meant by a bank loan? It is well to have a good understanding as to what this means.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I know very well what it means.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—I have dealt with the same bank as the Prime Minister and I have my own experience as to what a loan is. We are not all as fortunate as the Minister of Finance & Customs. I claim that if you make a draft for produce in very full cases will the banks buy the draft outright. If you make a draft for five thousand pounds on a firm abroad the bank takes the draft and discounts it and gives a loan under it, and then adjusts it when the draft is paid. Is that a loan on which the bank will have to pay three sixteenths of one per cent?

Now in that case loans in the country will amount to tremendous sums of money. The proceeds of your draft will take up part of the loan which you have already from the bank. Sometimes it does not take it all up, still you have a loan which you are responsible for; and if, in case the draft is not paid on the outside, it will be charged up to your account. If the Honorable the Prime Minister has a bank which takes drafts for cargoes of fish, and buys those drafts outright without any recourse to the condition when the cargo of fish arrives damaged. Supposing the claim is for ten thousand or twenty thousand or fifty thousand dollars, the bank would still come back on him and claim the balance. My point is just to ascertain what is meant by loans.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I might explain to the Leader of the Opposition that the object of the Bill, whether it is worded rightly or wrongly I cannot now say, is to make a charge on the banks for their entire business. Before, we only charged the banks on their deposits, and we claim that that was the wrong way of putting a tax on the banks. One bank might have a large amount of deposits, and another bank might be lending a large amount of money to the trade of the country, and one concern would be making money one way and another concern in another way, and so after consultation we came to the conclusion that the right way to tax the banks was to tax them on their entire business; and that was the object of this Bill, whether it is properly worded or not. Every time a bank lends out money or takes in money it has to pay taxes.

MR. HICKMAN—That is not provided in this case. It only says in the Bill "On deposits and on loans." I am trying to ascertain what is meant by loans.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—All I have to say is that we had better raise the Committee and consider this again, as these were the conditions that were made with the banks; and when I say loans I really mean the business done.

MR. HICKMAN—If you sell a draft the bank has to pay nothing on it?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—But this means all the money that the bank pays out irrespective of loans or the discountnig of bills.

MR. HICKMAN—That has not been provided in the Bill.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I cannot tell just what the difference is. I cannot see it myself at the present moment. It is only intended to cover the money that the bank pays out, and takes in.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, but if I go down to the bank to-morrow and I want to buy a draft on London, and I take down a certain amount of money and place it in the bank, that is a transaction of the bank but it is not a loan. If I have a Banker's draft on London, I take it down to the bank, they buy it from me and make a commission on it, and they make a commission again when they are selling the draft, and in this way they make profits, and very substantial profits at that. The Prime Minister knows very well that there are in this town three or four banks and they are all asking the same rate of discount. If I have a Bill or a draft on London and I want to sell it, and if I go to the Bank of Nova Scotia or the Bank of Canada they give me the same rate. If I were doing business in Montreal or Halifax or any large city in the United States or Canada, and I have a bill on London which is negotiable and I want to sell it, I try all the banks doing business there and I get a different rate from every one of them, and I sell it to the bank that gives me the best

rate. If the Government's intention is to cover all transactions of the banks they should include this in the bill because the banks make substantaal profits on every bill that they buy or sell.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, I cannot agree with the Honorable Leader of the Opposition on the grounds of buying or selling bills. I don't think there is any combine amongst the banks.

MR. HICKMAN—I did not say there was any combine.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—One bank the other day gave me six points.

MR. HICKMAN—It must have been six points of the compass.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—No, it wasn't six points of the compass. It was six points of real money on a Brazil bill. I don't sell my bill of exchange to any one bank. I get the best exchange from any of them.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—It appears to me that this Section provides on all the business of the banks. That is what the paragraph means.

(Reads the Act.)

That is on all money on deposit.

MR. HICKMAN—It defines there what the bank has to pay out, but that is not covered in the Bill. If it is the intention of the Government that the tax should be computed on all the business of the banks, well then deposits and loans should not be defined.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—I think that the intention of the Government is to put a tax on all the business done by the banks, both deposits and loans and negotiable loans.

MR. HICKMAN—Well then it defeats its purpose. My point is this that if you intend to collect a tax on all the business of the banks then you have left the main point out, the most profitable part of its business, the buying and selling of sight drafts.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, I want to say a word in reference to another matter. The point raised by the Hon. Member for Fortune, Mr. Warren. This matter of absentee landlords is an old grievance, and I think that it caused more agitation and more trouble, particularly in St. John's, than any other question. As far back as I can remember this question has been aggravating the people of this country more than anything else. Because absentee landlords is a case of heads I win and tails you lose. And they win every time. If the absentee landlord has a piece of land here and he leases or rents it to the man who wants to put up a business premises he makes provision in the agreement of lease that the lessee has to pay all the taxes. That has been tried to be gotten over by the Municipal Council and the Legislature, but they still go merrily on making provision in their leases and these people are masters of the situation. And those people who belong to the country and who are living in their own country are absolutely helpless in the hands of these outside landlords, who have done nothing to improve the conditions of this town. They came here in ages past by some fluke of circumstances and acquired the land in this town or in this harbour. They probably bought it for a song. And then through the enterprise and the industry of the people of the country from being a barren they made that land immensely valuable. And these very people are the people who have got to pay the taxes on that land, and these outside landlords getting every dollar in it out of it. And I only hope that we will bring about legislation that will protect the people here and make those

who are outside pay what they should pay. And then they pay nothing in to the upkeep of this town.

Now the small man is hardly worth considering because the amount of taxes from them under this act is very small indeed. But the man who is getting $50,000 a year, and more than that, out of the profits produced by the people of the country, these are the men we ought to try and get after. I have been dealing with this question for twenty years and I have always seen this question come up during some time in the term of the legislature, about absentee landlords. And to-day the money for rental is going out of the country and we are not getting that much in return.

MR. HICKMAN—Put a little more on the man who owns the land.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—I quite agree. Now when I was a member of the Municipal Council there were certain lands on Water Street, and although it is not generally known the lands on Water Street such as the Clapp Estate they had to pay a certain amount per foot for the land on both streets. The amount of the assessment amounted to about 40 or 50 cents per foot. It was forty or fifty on Water Street and about half that on Duckworth Street. I don't know what it is to-day. But the man living in England and holding up the land here and waiting for the time when no other land will be available, I think that he should be taxed highly.

I therefore have no hesitation in opposing any attempt that might be made to reduce the taxation on absentee landlords, and I hope the Bill will be so framed that they cannot come back on the tenant and make him pay. That is one of the dangers that I see about this thing, and I hope that my legal friends on this side of the House have seen to it that that is not possible under this Act.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Chairman, I suggest that we leave out that second clause, as I think there is something in the remarks made by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. I suggest that we leave out that second clause, and go on with the Bill.

MR. HICKMAN—I just wanted to know what was the intention.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Well, the intention was not to tax the money going out like that, or as the Hon. member has said, we don't know where we would go.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Honourable Minister of Finance & Customs under what authority the fire insurance companies now collect this five per cent tax in the outports. Is there an act at present on the statute book? It seems ridiculous that these companies should collect this large amount from the outports and pay it over to the Municipal Council?

HON. MR. CRAMM—Mr. Chairman, I might say for the information of the honourable member for Carbonear that the Fire Insurance Companies are simply adding to their regular fire insurance premiums the 5 p.c. income tax that is placed upon them by the Government, and the 2 p.c. that is intended to meet the cost of the new fire apparatus. The 5 p.c. income tax is clearly intended to be a tax on the companies and I doubt very much if they could force the people to whom they issue insurance to pay it. But if the people don't pay it they simply won't give the insurance. So that really you have no alternative if you want the insurance but to pay the additional tax. They cannot compel you to pay the additional 5 p.c. and you can't compel them to issue the insurance to you.

MR. DUFF—Does that mean that the people in the outports have to pay this extra five per cent. in order

to provide a fire apparatus for St. John's.

HON. MR. CRAMM—That is what I understand the extra charge is for. I agree with you that it is manifestly unfair.

MR. HICKMAN—I think that there is a Municipal Tax on the premiums collected in the city, and there is a general tax of five per cent. which goes to the Government. That goes to the Government and the other tax goes to the Municipal Council. I do not think that that five per cent. which goes to the Government is particularly earmarked for the upkeep of the fire apparatus in St. John's.

HON. MR. CRAMM—No, that is the 2 p.c.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman, just one more word in relation to this fire insurance tax. The idea is, I presume, to collect this amount of money from the Fire Insurance Companies. But that is not the effect of the law at all. They collect it in turn from the people. Only a few years ago the rate in the outports rose from one and a half per cent to two per cent. and as far as I know, at the present time, you cannot get a lower rate than two per cent. on property in the outports, with the exception of dwelling houses.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—One and a half per cent. I think on large premises in the outports.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Well, I have been trying to get one and a half per cent., and I have been told that two per cent. is the rate that has been fixed by the outports.

There is just one other point about this Bill about which I would like to ask the Hon. Minister of Justice. In the first section of the Act, does the word "property" include merchandise.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Yes.

MR. HICKMAN—I think the matter is explained in this way. There is a Board of Fire Underwriters here, which is under the control of a Board in England, who decide the rates for this country, and if the rates are increased in the outports from one and a half to two per cent., as Mr. Ashbourne states, it has not been done by the Government, or by anybody in St. John's. It has been done by the Board of Fire Underwriters, at the suggestion of one of the Board.

MR. SCAMMELL—I would like to ask the Finance Minister if he has made any estimate of the revenue he is likely to receive as a result of this tax on Banks?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—The Budget forecast was $70,000.00.

CAPT. RANDELL—Section 5 of this Bill provides that these taxes shall be a debt due to the crown, and are to be a first charge on the property. Does that mean that they will have priority over a first mortgage on the property?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Yes. In other words, that simply gives the Crown a preferential claim. There is nothing unusual about that.

MR. GODDEN—Mr. Chairman, I want to reiterate what I said yesterday about the Income Tax—that I consider it is very unfair to those of us who have paid our Income Tax ever since it has been in force. We have paid our income tax, as the law has required us to do, and now we are asked to pay it for one year more, in spite of the fact that it is well known, and has been admitted by the Government that thousands of others who come under this Act, and who have evaded the law will still evade it. I contend that it is unfair to us that we should have to pay again while others are allowed to go free. I suggest that Section 7 should read "up to and including the 31st day of December, 1923." I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister of Finance

really believes in his own heart that that would be only fair, and I ask him to accept that suggestion.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, I must say that I do not think it is fair, and I must say that I can see Mr. Godden's position. But I am in the position that the Finance Minister has brought that down here as part of his financial proposal for the ensuing year. I think that everyone will see that if you could carry out an income tax properly throughout the entire country it would be the fairest form of taxation. But in the light of the experience that throughout the whole Island only twelve hundred people were paying the Income tax,, it was an absolute anomaly. It was working most unfairly; and it is equally unfair, as the honourable member has said that, now that the tax is wiped out, the same corporal's guard only will pay it for the last year. The people who are howling most to-day about the change of tariff are the very kind of people who won't pay their income tax although they have money in the bank to pay it; while the salaried clerk has to pay. They have not been paying it, though they have money in the Bank and are well able to pay it.

As the honourable member has said, it is very unfair, but I have to support it, because it is part of the budget proposals of the Hon. Minister of Finance; even though it means that those who have paid will still have to pay for one more year, while those who have never paid will still be able to keep clear. There cannot be much difference of opinion that it is an unfortunate position. I can only say to the honourable member, as one of those who have been honest enough to pay the tax, that there will be a special reward for them in Heaven.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Chairman, for the information of the House and the benefit of Mr. Godden I wish to assure him that a lot of people who now think they are clear of the tax are not clear of it at all yet. When I get an opportunity to start in work in the Custom House we are going to have a lot of fun with those who could pay up but did not do so.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act for the Confirmation of an Agreement between the Government and the Newfoundland Hotel Facilities, Limited."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester tok the Chair of

(Clerk reads agreement).

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, I would like to raise a point in connection with Section 7. Take the case of a man who holds stock in this hotel proposition. If he has an income by this dividend, does he pay a tax on the dividend?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—He does, so far as that particular investment is concerned. At present we have no Income Tax. This clause was put in as an inducement to people to take stock in the project.

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 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.

Second reading of Bill "An Act Respecting a Tax on Goods imported into Newfoundland."

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move the second reading of this Bill.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Hon. Minister of Finance the amount of money he expects to raise by this five per cent. sales tax?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—About one million dollars, that is, provided the importations are up to what they were last year.

On motion of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs the bill "An Act Respecting a tax on goods imported into Newfoundland" was read a second time and ordered that it be referred to a committee of the House on to-morrow.

Mr. Scammell gave notice of question.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works for an answer to my question of March 30th as to why Mr. George Gosse, Outport Road Inspector, was dismissed?

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Speaker, in reply to the honourable member, the only answer I can give is that the Government thought it necessary to remove Mr. George Gosse and they put Mr. Josiah Gosse in his place.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Speaker, I would also like to ask the Honourable Colonial Secretary for an answer to my question of April 6th as to when Mr. N. J. Vinnicombe resigned his seat?

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, in answer to the honourable member I may say that Mr. Vinnicombe sent in his resignation, which was accepted, to the Government the day after his commission was issued as a member of the Board of Liquor Control. I think it was on February 3rd, the day after the Act came into force.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, April 22nd, 1925.

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

Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Report of the Select Committee on the Avalon Telephone Company's petition.

Hon. the Prime Minister presented the Report of the Select Committee on the petition of The Avalon Telephone Company's application for Legislation, as follows:

"The Select Committee appointed to consider the petition of The Avalon Telephone Company have considered the matter to them referred, and report that in their opinion, notwithstanding that full and sufficient notice has not been given, that the Rules of the House in that respect be suspended, and that leave be granted for the introduction of the Bill referred to."

(Sgd.) A. E. HICKMAN,
W. S. MONROE,
J. C. PUDDESTER,
J. R. BENNETT.

On motion this Report was received and adopted.

MR. DUFF——Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to a letter that appeared in yester-

day's "Evening Telegram" headed "Private Bills." It reads as follows in the opening paragraph: "And still they come. This time it is the Avalon Telephone Company that is asking for certain legislation." Now, Sir, the same people asking for concessions to-day are the people who received some years ago privileges that were serious indeed for the people, and I protest against this Company being given any further privileges without first giving the people in the communities in which that Company operates an opportunity to know what is wanted. Mr. McNeily in his letter also says "I respectfully suggest that the rule of the House of Assembly should be strictly enforced, particularly with respect to petitions by Companies having control of Public Utilities, and that these matters should not be dealt with this session. The Government will then have an opportunity to settle a policy on this question and particularly to consider the establishment of a Public Utilities Board to regulate charges and to see to the provision of services. A study of present Public Utilities legislation on the Statute Book will show that there are particularly no laws to compel performance of the duties in consideration of which valuable franchises have been conferred." Now, Sir, there is no question, but these are the same people who received a fifty years franchise for an Electric Light Company in Conception and Trinity Bays. When that Electric Light Company started business they gave a light for fifteen cents each or 3.2 per kilowatt; to-day they are demanding twelve cents per kilowatt. I may say that at present I am not now speaking for myself but for the people of the entire country. I should certainly like to see that agreement that was made between the Government and the Avalon Telephone Company. It was called afterwards the Telephone Service Act, but I have never seen that Act, and I should like to have that Act tabled here so that honourable members may know what they are giving away. I also certainly think that if that Company cannot carry out that agreement they should lose their franchise. With regard to the Electric Light Company they were given their concessions by the Bond Government over twenty years ago to operate in Carbonear, Harbor Grace and other nearby places in Conception Bay. Now in the interest of the people of that section of the country I maintain that that Company needs close watching and I think that we should have the necessary time to consider this Bill and the Telephone Service Act.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER— Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that the Select Committee were called upon to do nothing else but to consider whether or not the rules of the House were complied with. The Select Committee only dealt with the petition; they have not dealt with the Bill. I do not know where the Bill that the honourable member for Carbonear has now in his possession comes from, because the Bill dealing with the subject matter now before the Chair is not yet ready to put before the House, and various amendments and suggestions in connection with it are now being put forward to Mr. Murphy. As I said before, the Select Committee only dealt with the question of whether or not the rules of the House were complied with and they decided that they were. In the meantime it is a very easy matter to turn down the Bill when it arrives.

Giving Notice of Motion and Question.

Mr. Duff gave notice of question.

(1) MR. ASHBOURNE asked Hon. the Colonial Secretary to lay upon the Table of the House a copy of the Commission issued under the Great

Seal appointing the Tariff Commission.

Answer tabled.

(2) Deferred.

(3) MR. SCAMMELL asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs: (a) who is the present Sub Collector at Rose Blanche; (b) who was the predecessor of the present Sub Collector, and when was he retired or dismissed by the present Government; (c) is it true that a Mr. Furneaux had to be brought from Sydney, C.B., to instruct the present Sub Collector in his duties; (d) were Mr. Fureaux's expenses paid by the Government or the Department of Finance and Customs, and if so, what were they, including any salary paid him for the time he spent instructing the present Sub-Collector.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—In reply to Mr. Scammell, I may say that Mr. Vatcher is the collector there. John Kane was the predecessor, and was dismissed on December 31st. In regard to section (c) of the question the answer is yes, and there was sixty dollars paid by the Customs Department for his expenses and services.

(4) MR. SCAMMELL asked Hon. the Prime Minister if the Government has as yet received any Report from Mr. Gray, Canadian Engineer, on the Old Day's Pond project at Bonavista and if so to lay a copy of the Report on the Table of the House.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—I beg to table the report of Mr. Gray on the Old Day's Pond proposition, and I regret to say that his report indicates that the seventy thousand dollars already spent is all money thrown away, and he advises the discontinuation of the project.

(5) Deferred.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—I would like to lay on the table of the House the answer to question 5 on yesterday's order paper asked by Mr. Godden.

I would also like to lay on the table of the House the answer to question Number 7 on yesterday's order paper, asked by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

I would also like to lay on the table of the House the report of Mr. Gray, the engineer of the Public Works Department of Canada, on the dock; as asked for by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition yesterday.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—I beg to lay on the table of the House the answer to the question number 3 on the Order Paper of April 16th, 1925.

I also beg to lay on the table of the House the answer to the question asked by Mr. Duff on yesterday's order paper.

(2) MR. HICKMAN asked the Minister of Agriculture and Mines if the following amounts stated in the Auditor General's Report as unpaid have been collected:—

M. E. Martin, 1st contract..	$ 8,720.00
M. E. Martin, 2nd contract..	35,000.00
	$43,720.00
Wm. Dawe & Son, Pitprops	610.00
Wm. Dawe & Son, Hardwood	5,199.44
Wm. Dawe & Son, per J. J. McKay	2,672.00
	$8,841.44
Geo. C. Tulk, per J. J. McKay	$ 4,932.34
S. Budden & Bros. per J. J. McKay	6,260.26
John Gillard, per J. J. McKay	2,081.40
Geo. Jennings, per J. J. McKay	4,299.00
H. A. Russell	850.00
D. M. Groves	3,816.00
Wm. Brown	787.00
H. J. Crowe, rossing machines..	6,000.00
F. G. House & Co., due on oil casks	300.00

If not collected what steps are being taken to collect same?

Reply to Question of Mr. Hickman, No. 2, Order Paper April 16th, 1925.

With reference to the amounts due by M. E. Martin; counter claims in connection with this matter are under consideration.

The Government has accepted a compromise of $1642.00 in payment of the claim against Wm. Dawe & Sons.

The amounts due by John Gillard and George Jennings have been placed in the hands of a solicitor for collection.

The amount due by F. G. House & Co. has been paid.

H. J. Crowe: counter claim in connection with this amount is under consideration.

The question of the collection of the other amounts referred to has been referred to the Government for decision.

Orders of The Day

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill, "An Act for the Confirmation of an Agreement between the Government and the Newfoundland Hotel Facilities Limited was read a third time; and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill 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.

Committee of the Whole on Supply was deferred.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Finance the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker lef tthe Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Hon. Minister of Fniance a couple of questions. These resolutions were tabled a fortnight ago to-day; and it was resolved, as is the custom according to the Rules of the House, that the tariff went into force as it was laid upon the table of this House. I understand that alterations have been made to the tariff since then, and I would like to ask the Hon. Minister by what authority the duty on tea, for instance, which I understand has been changed, and the duty on rubber boots have been altered. I would like to ask the Hon. Minister if there is a minute of Council, or by what authority the duties were changed and altered, after having been laid on the table of this House?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—By order of the Government.

MR. WARREN—Was there an order in Council—a minute of Council?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Yes.

MR. WARREN—Thank goodness that I was not the only person that was guilty of an illegal practice in removing duties. That is all I have to say.

I have a few remarks to make on the Budget, and I may as well do it now as later, but I want to say this, that later on I propose to move an amendment to these resolutions.

First of all, sir, I want to congratulate the Hon. Minister of Finance on the showing that he has made. Whether the figures that he has brought before the House can be borne out by facts, or by actual experience later on is a matter which must be left to the future; but I do take exception to the tone of the speech. It was a most provocative speech, and as a member of the last administration, I would not be worth my salt if I sat in this House and did not take exception to the tone of that speech.

The late Government was blamed for everything that could possibly happen. We were accused of criminal negligence—we were careless; we did not do this, we did not do that; we

did not collect things: perhaps we collected too much. But while the Hon. Minister in his budget speech and in his figures puts all the debits that could possibly be put against the late Government, anybody perusing that speech would find it very hard to find any credits to the late Government.

Now if the Hon. Minister is going to debit the late Government with everything that happened, even the new tariff I, at all events, owe it to those who sat with me in that Government to as far as I can defend them.

I admit that there were abuses in recent years. I admit it, but we tried to clean them up when we found them out, and I ruined myself politically in trying to clean them up. No account was taken of the experience that this country shared with every other country in the world, from 1919 on. We did our best in spite of abuses, and we kept this country going. It was not the policy that was wrong, it was the way it was handled. And I owe it to those men who were not in the Executive Government, though in the party, that I should take the responsibility for some of those things, but there are certain things that I will not take responsibility for. We kept the country going, although we were up against it just as other countries were. Perhaps we were wrong in doing some things, but in 1923, the country sent us back again; and if we had not gone, and if the party I was associwith had not tried to purge itself, those who are opposite me to-day would not be sitting in those seats, and we would not be sitting on this side; and it was only a sense of duty that inspired those who were with me for the short nine months that I was Prime Minister, that put us on this side to-day. Look at the times we were up against. We tried to do our best—certainly we did. We may not have had very much experience—I had never been in an executive Government before. Some others had. And to be faced with the trials that we were faced with was enough to try any man. Now then, what were we up against? We were up against a slump in the price of fish. What could we do? It was through purchasing fish that we kept up the price. I do not know if it was done rightly. The policy was right. The country was short of salt. The Government purchased salt. Immediately it was done charges were made against the members of the Government by men on this side of the House. We had an inquiry into it and found that there was nothing to substantiate it. But at all events let me say this that the last administration made it very easy for the present administration. When we found that we were up against it properly the proposition was made to the Leader of the Government or the Squires Government for the development on the West Coast, and if we had to swim and not sink we had to turn every drop of water and every stick of wood in this country into gold, and we went to work and got the British Government to help, and now that it is all over and now that all the work in that connection is finished and now that the industry is proceeding all the criticism we hear is that they are bringing in too many outsiders to do the work, and there is no word or mede of praise for the exercise of the ingenuity that got the thing here. And I want to tell you, Mr. Chairman, that it was this that put this Government and this country on its feet. You would think that all there was to it was that these people came to us and said that we want to spend some money in your country, and then we guaranteed this and that and the other thing,

and all there was to it was to go right ahead with it. I want to say that the Government went into the thing thoroughly in a business like way. We had to exercise our ingenuity to get the British Government to stand behind the thing, and we knew, or at least I knew that unless the British Government was behind the thing it would not be acceptable to the people of this country, and I have here in my desk a private letter written by me to Mr. Winston Churchill, then Secretary of State for the Colonies, which was the beginning of the whole thing. It was the start of the Humber industry which has brought millions to this country and put the revenue to the figure that it is to-day. But one gets no credit for that. We were only guilty of criminal negligence, because we did not do this or that or another thing. And that is what I complain of in the Budget speech as a whole. But Mr. Chairman, I think that it is generally acknowledged that the Government at that time was up against it, and they had to do the best under the circumstances, and I say that they worked wonders, and I say that we and the men on this side of the House at the present time made it easy for the Minister of Finance and the present Government. Some thing has happened to the Budget. Since it was first introduced two weeks have passed. There was the Easter recess and except a more or less desultry debate in which the Leader of the Opposition and the Hon. Meember for Trinity Mr. Halfyard took part nothing more happened. Is this new tariff as popular as it is supposed to be? No, Sir. It is not simply for the reason that although the late Government was reckless and careless and extravagant the present Government have been following in their footsteps, if I have to admit that the past Government was careless or anything else. The present budget was not considered. It was taken hot from the oven of the Tariff Commission. It was not allowed to cool and it was brought down here and laid on the table of the House, and we must take it or leave it, and it seemed that there was no explanation necessary. That it is not popular and that it cannot go on in its present form is shown by the fact that the duties on tea have been reduced and the duties on rubber boots have been reduced, and it was said in this House that because I took the duty off flour and molasses and kerosene I was acting illegally. But the Minister of Finance can go down and reduce the duties on tea and rubber boots and he is not acting illegally. I do not propose to stand here and have it said that it was illegal for me to have the duties taken off flour and molasses and kerosene, and then have it said that the Minister of Finance can do it and then it is alright. And I would like therefore to have the resolutions of the Treasury Board which was required under the Audit Act and I would like to have the Minute of Council put on the table of the House. Or did the Minister take the duties off himself? What we did was illegal, but anybody else can go down and reduce these duties alright. Now I want to speak in two phases. First as a member of the late Government and secondly as I said on the opening as the man in the street. I have no party affiliations and no allegiance to anybody except the people who sent me here, and they only sent me here as against a Government candidate and an Opposition because they thought I suppose that I could express their views and their desires better than a member of the Government or of the Opposition. But they do not want anything from the Government or the Opposition. But they have to pay. We have a complaint and it is

out of this budget, and that is that we have been taxed on the West Coast to pay the dole here in St. John's. They are working up there on the West Coast. The bankers are back after the first trip and they are catching herring, and they are selling the produce while the dole is still being given out here. I have every right to stand up here and speak about this that the people are working up there to pay the dole here in St. John's. Take the recent disaster. I spoke about it on the opening day of the House. Men went out last spring and not only did they lose their gear and their boats, but they lost their lives as well and they appealed to the public generosity, but what has the Government done? While these people have lost their gear and cannot go fishing although they want to, there is a dole of ten dollars being given in St. John's, and still these people got hardly a thing.

The West Coast is working while the rest of the place is asleep. But what do they get for it? I wish that I could read to the House some of the letters that I have received with regard to that. And then there is the amount that is being paid to the widows up on the West Coast compared with the amount of the dole in St. John's. One would think that under this new tariff that there would be no more dole. The Rope Walk and the Tobacco Factory are so protected that they should be able to give a great deal of employment. But a Government must have a policy, and the main part of the policy is the financial policy. Now I have very carefully read the budget speech. I have followed the actions of this Government since it was put in power and I have failed to find any settled policy that has been laid down except one of frills. Absolute frills. We have a vote for motor roads that have yet to be built. These in my opinion will not bring in any great returns and at all events they should have been left until we were in the position to pay for them. They are going to spend two million dollars on, I was going to say motor roads, but they will not be motor roads. They will be made wherever the Governor in Council thinks that they should be, as I would do myself. I think that there have been plans outlined in which there is going to be a road down the North Side of Bonavista Bay so as to encourage the tourist traffic and because these people should have had a branch railway and never got it. On the West Coast, where there is no branch railway, there is already a road bed over which there was a railway, and that I suppose will be used to provide a road down the northern part of Bonavista Bay. Now I started to say, Mr. Chairman that the Government must have a policy and that to that policy the most important part was the financial policy. Have the Government made any attempt to grapple with the main industry of this country, the fisheries? The Leader of the Opposition a few days ago said that the trouble with our fisheries was that we could not afford to catch any more fish. It is not a question of catching more fish, but of catching the fish as cheaply as we possibly can. Well, he is a man who knows. I do not know much about it myself; but he is a man who has been engaged in that industry. I can be corrected and he can be corrected if that is wrong; but surely a statement coming from a man like him must carry some weight. He says deliberately as a merchant and a man who has got money invested in the industry, he says that we cannot afford to catch any more fish. What we have to do is to catch fish more cheaply than at present. If he is right how can this tariff in the

financial policy of the Government help the situation? I know he is right, because when I was Prime Minister, representation was made to me by the present Prime Minister's constituents down in Bonavista Bay; they came to me and asked me either to give them a bonus on fish, or to take off the duties on certain articles to make the fisheries worth while; make it so that they could make a profit on it. I called the merchants together, and after a meeting we took the duties off flour, molasses, kerosene and other articles that the fishermen use. I think now that that was a mistake, and I say to-day that the duty should be on flour and pork and beef. We import to-day 300,000 barrels of flour a year, and the twenty five cents duty on the barrel would give the Government $75,000.00, and the flour fluctuates or jumps up and down, and the twenty five cents would not be worth taking off. Three months ago flour was about three or four dollar a barrel less than it is to-day, now the fishermen have to pay three or four dollars more for it to-day, and the twenty-five cents duty would not amount to a row of shucks. But I want to say this, that the tariff that is on the Table to-day absolutely precludes any chance of a bonus on fish.

To pay a bonus on fish we have to raise more taxes, and we can easily see how very difficult it is to raise any more. According to the Prime Minister's argument there is no necessity to pay a bonus on fish unless the price of fish goes down. Well, if the price of fish goes down, and we stick to the present tariff we will never get enough to pay the bonus. I say, Sir, and I say it advisedly, that it was unfortunate that while this Government was returned and elected on a strict policy of retrenchment—returned so that there would be no more frills, no more of the Squires or the Warren extravagance—that was all to be done away with—this Government was returned because there was a business man at the head. You have been in the House for twelve months, and nothing has been done. The Prime Minister's name is considered just as good as ever it was; he has the voice of Jacob but there is the hand of Esau, and you will find out as we found out twenty five years ago that with Esau this present Government is getting unpopular. Unfortunately for the people of this country, and unfortunately for the Government such a beautiful atmosphere had been created that the shock of increased taxation has been a very heavy blow. What do we find the Minister of Finance doing? He did what we did not do because we could not do it. He took care to publish in the daily papers every week a statement of figures showing how the revenue was increasing and proclaiming what a surplus he had over the Squires surplus and over the Warren surplus, and he allowed this feeling to get abroad that this country had at last reached a turning-point. There was increased revenue so much better than in the Warren or Squires time, and in addition to all that we heard of the decreased expenditure with the result that everybody that picked up the papers was led to believe that when the budget was introduced the sales tax would come off, and a reduction would be made at last. What we find is, that having created that atmosphere, having led everybody to believe that everything in the garden was lovely, we find that the roses have thorns on them and there are nettles and weeds everywhere.

We find that this surplus revenue we had under the old taxation, not under the new one, we find that all that surplus is not sufficient to pay the increased expenditure. Although the expenditure is decreased we find

that the income, the surplus, the extra expenditure which is increased. Who decreased it? I said last year and I say again that the estimates that were brought in last year were those of the Warren Government and those were decreased by seven hundred thousand dollars. The present Government added to that about two hundred thousand. Now the revenue has increased, so has expenditure. Let me take the Minister's own figures. In his budget speech the Minister says "I anticipate the revenue for the years 1924 and 1925 to realize so much." Now, that is what he anticipates. It is now the 22nd of April, he anticipates on the 30th of June next, in about six weeks or two months that we will have a revenue of about nine million odd dollars made up of seven million eight hundred thousand dollars worth of duties from the Customs, that is this year. Now he says for next year on the 30th of June 1926 "I am going to have a revenue of $9,560,000.00 or about $100,000 more than this year, and in that $9,560,000.00 he is going to get from the Customs revenue $8,250,000.00. In other words, the Minister budgets for an increase by the new tariff of a difference between $7,800,000.00 this year and $8,260,-000.00 next year. In other words, he has been calculating for next year a revenue of $9,560,000.00, "and this tariffff that I have brought in will bring me in $450,000.00 extra." Well, will it?

Now as far as I can find out this tariff is going to bring in an extra one and a quarter milloin dollars. Now, if quarter million dollars. Now, if the the Minister says "All that I require from this tariff is $450,000.00 according to my budget," then he has no right to put this tariff through the House that he is going to bring in three times as much as he wants because he is striking a blow to the fishing industry which is just beginning to recover after the setback of the last four or five years. Now take some figures that I have made up. Beans is a commodity which is used by those who are engaged in the fishing industry, and as far as I can find out, and I have carefully checked those figures, beans will bring in under the new tariff $8,700 more than was brought in last year. Butter under the new tariff will bring in $6,000 more. A man who is trying to furnish his house requires cabinet ware and these will bring in $5,000 more than last year. That is wrong, but as the Minister wiped off duty on these by a wave of the pen these figures are right. But under the duty as it was there have brought in $30,000 more.

An increased amount on sugar will bring in $33,000 next year. Ready made clothes $55,000 more. Dry fruits 21,000 more. Groceries under the Customs Returns in the Blue Book $38,000. Hats and Caps $13,000. Hardware $23,000. Machinery $34,-000. Small Ware $9,000. Cotton Fabrics $49,000. Dry Goods $36,000. Tweeds $7,000. Other goods $10,000. Boots and shoes $29,000. Stationery $26,000. And out of 200 odd items included in the new tariff, I have here about 28 and those show an increase in the money that is taken from the people of $688,000, when the Minister says in the Budget Speech that he only wants $450,000. Now the Minister is wrong in his figures, and I would venture to bet that this tariff instead of bringing in $450,000 as budgeted for is going to bring in over a million, it is unnecessary, he does not want a million dollars. I think that he does not. If he does want the money he should have told the House before he laid this tariff on the table why he wants a million dollars more.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—I will tell you soon enough.

MR. WARREN—It is too late now. If the Minister had told this House before laying this Tariff on the table that the raising of 1½ million dollars was necessary and that he had to get it . . . . .

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—I think that Mr. Warren should have been fair enough to tell this House that we are putting on one million and taking off a million and eight thousand.

MR. WARREN—I put it two ways. He never said that he was taking off 1¼ million dollars. If he had said before he laid this tariff on the table that he was taking off that amount . . . . .

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—In the Speech from the Throne you were told that that amount was to be taken off.

MR. WARREN—But the Speech from the Throne is not the Minister of Finance's Speech. In this particular case the Minister of Finance is responsible and he is the Minister to lay the financial situation of the country before the House; and I only say this that if the Minister before tabling this budget had explained the necessity for it, instead of simply saying it was drawn up by the Squires Commission and we adopted it, he would have allayed all anxiety, and there would not be the criticism there is to-day. Everyone who heard him must admit that while he gave the speech which is now in printed form before us, he also laid on the table of this House the Resolutions without a word of explanation, and I say that he made a grave mistake in doing so. Now it is quite clear to all that the policy of the Government—the financial policy—is to benefit the small local industrial concerns of the Colony as is clearly marked by the Tariff presented in this House. It is patent to all that if a man invest in the fisheries he will get nothing in the way of assistance, but a mine or other local industry will get all the protection it wants. The man buying an engine for his boat finds that the duty has been put up, but the Ropewalk can import all the machinery it likes duty free. Early in the Session I asked that the duty be taken off dories, such as the fishermen along the West Coast use, but the answer I got was "No"—the duty was kept on these, but is taken off machinery. It seems that the fisheries have to pay for all. Take the Tobacco Factory and the Ropewalk—I am satisfied, and I believe everyone else is satisfied to give these concerns adequate protection, if necessary. But is there any likelihood of them going out of business? If there is, I say protect them, but it is clearly evident that they are able to hold their own, and unless they increase their business and give more employment, they have no right to the protection that is given them under the Tariff. I sat on that side of the House for four and a half years, and I, and those associated with me were most severely criticized because we dabbled in trade—we bought fish and salt and gave out supplies,because as the people said they could not get them anywhere else. We were told repeatedly that it was wrong to do this, and that we had no right to engage in trade or commerce or in the business of the country. But what happened? We were put out of power, and those who are most pronounced in their criticism of us were given the reins of Government. The first thing they did after being only a few months in office was to send the coastal steamers to the ice. We were wrong to do anything like that, but it was arranged that the Prospero, Sagona and Glencoe were to be sent to the ice, and the Government was to become a merchant. We sent the Sagona to the ice be-

cause she was built for that purpose, but we chartered her to a mercantile firm. At first this season the Glencoe was to be sent out but certain conditions of affairs kept her home. The Prospero and Sagona went, and what happened? Instead of some merchant or firm being in control of them, the Government took charge, and the giving of berths was left to Members and their Supporters. What was the result?—the men went to the ice, rose in revolt, told the Captain to go to blazes, and made him bring them in again. It was wrong for us to do anything in the way of sending out a steamer, but it was right for those who criticized us to do the self same thing.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Do you state you chartered the Sagona to another firm.

MR. HALFYARD—It was alright under the War Measures Act.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—I saw the cheque for $5,000.00 that was given for her.

MR. WARREN—If I am not critically correct I am prepared to take it back, but we could have lost as much as you did on the ships.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—How do you know the Sagona made any loss. Her agreement was different from any you ever made.

MR. WARREN—We all know how much seals and oil was landed to Murray & Crawford at Harbor Grace, and also the prices for the same, so that it is not very hard to figure it out. Even allowing that there is no loss everybody knows that there will certainly be no profit on the trip of those ships. But it is the principle of the whole thing that is wrong. The man who told us we were wrong does the same thing, and says it is right, because he does it. Now further I would like to know just where Captain Little fits in in this business —whether or not he has not vacated his Seat by going out as Captain of the Steamer?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Who was it that was urging that Captain Winsor should not be kept home from the ice.

MR. WARREN—That has nothing to do with the effect of the going. If Captian Winsor was going he would have asked me if he was right in doing so, and I would have told him "No." In his case there might have been a doubt about it, but in the case of Mr. Little there was a difference.

MINISTER OF MARINE—It is no more for me to go to the ice than for you to go across to England on trips.

MR. WARREN—Let me tell you this —your own Prime Minister wants fifteen million dollars for the very thing that I went across to England about.

MINISTER OF MARINE—I am not speaking of you personally.

MR. WARREN—I thought you were, but anyway I am ready to take all that is coming to me about my conduct. Now Mr. Chairman, I was only referring to this matter of sending ships to the ice, because we were assailed and criticized for doing the self same thing. We were also told that the appointment of Agricultural Commissioners was wrong, and after consideration we stopped it, but the case of Mr. Little is very different. The appointment of Members as Agricultural Commissioners was wrong, and we repealed the Act altogether. Now the present condition of anxiety and unrset has been brought about, as I said before, by the Honorable the Minister of Finance introducing his Budget and in a manner saying "Thank heaven this writes finish to our financial history." Perhaps it is so, but if this budget goes through as it stands at present, I say that he will have to write preface to a new financial story. There are only one or two things else in the Resolutions

in regard to dumping and a few other matters that I would like to refer to, but there is one thing I hesitate to vote for, and it is this. Since the Fordney Tariff was put on, of course the duty has been raised on our products, herring, etc., going into the United States.

Now I do not think that it is wise for a small country like this to be the first to indulge in a game of retaliation with the United States. Canada, next door to the United States and which has already fought an election over the question of reciprocity with the United States, has not retaliated and probably there are wise minds in Canada who have thought the matter out and have thought it absolutely unwise to indulge in retaliatory measures on account of the Fordney Tariff. The same thing applied in England. No duties were put on in retaliation of the American Tariff. Here we take that extraordinary step and I hesitate to vote for the Resolutions. You say, Mr. Chairman, that if the United States imposes a duty on Newfoundland herring going into that country that you will put an export duty, if necessary, on any herring taken out of Newfoundland in American bottoms. In other words, if a cargo of herring leaves Fortune Bay in an American bottom, an export duty will be levied on it. Now what I cannot understand is this: that, if the result of the Fordney Tariff in the United States prevents the sale of Newfoundland herring to any extent, how is the putting on of an extra duty on such herring going to increase the sale of them. I suppose there have been threats enough made in the newspapers of Canada and England warning the United States that they may expect some sort of retaliation on account of the Fordney Tariff but how on earth a threat of the present Newfoundland Government is going to prove advantageous to us passes my comprehension and I am only fearful that the exportation of our Newfoundland herring to the United States may be stopped altogether by the Governor-In-Council putting extra duty on herring going out in American bottoms. I frankly would like to see the duty taken off by the American Government, but I am afraid that, if we use retaliatory measures, that we will lose the American market, as it is, for our herring. As I said before, I propose to make an Amendment to these Resolutions when the proper time comes; but at the present time I merely took the opportunity of getting off my chest some of the load that was put there by a careful perusal of the Budget Speech of the Finance Minister. I trust—as all those who have any interest in the country must trust—that his figures will prove correct, but I do say that the country will not be satisfied until he explains them, because, instead of getting $460,000.00 through these Tariffff Resolutions, according to his Estimate in his Budget, he is going to get a Customs revenue of at least $1,250,-000.00.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, just a word in reply to a point raised by the honourable member for Fortune Bay and which, perhaps, if not amplified, might be misunderstood by the House. As he knows, and I think every honourable member of the House knows that a Tariff is not law at all until it is accepted and passed in Committee. We are simply following out here the practice that is followed in the Imperial Parliament and generally in Parliaments throughout the British Empire, namely, that when new Duties are submitted they are simply put into effect in anticipation, and these Resolutions that we have before us to-day are not the law. So that it might be thoroughly understood, it

is concisely put here in Burineaux's Parliamentary Practice, as follows:

(Quotes Authority)

I propose later to say a word or two as regards this whole tariff subject; but it must be borne in mind that to-day the Finance Minister comes down with a Tariffff which was the result of the work of a Tariff Commission and he tables that Tariff. Of course, it is beyond the powers of human wisdom as to what the result of that Tariff is going to be and it certainly would require a super-man to go to work here and do more than he has done. If, as he states, there are any anomalies found in the Tariff he will endeavour and try to readjust them so as not to upset the financial structure. The Finance Minister told the House in his Budget some time ago that he anticipated that his revenue would be so much over his expenditure for next year, and in the nature of a new Tariff he says that this is the way he is going to get the increased revenue. Now whilst the House is in Committee, surely it is within his province, if he can discover that the duties he is collecting in anticipation on a certain line of article is going to produce more than he thought or is going to produce less than he thought, to make a reduction. I think that is quite proper and quite right, and the only regret I have is that he will not continue making reductions, and I think that all of us would like to see reductions made and sweeping reductions made. Now it must be remembered that any Finance Minister who brings in a Tariff is going to have bouquets thrown at him. It is hard to please all, and if he allowed everything to be brought into the country free of duty he would be criticised. There are some people who would not want to work at all, but live in comfort and get fed with a spoon. The levying of extra duties is never the kind of thing that a man is going to be thanked for and nobody is going to call the present Finance Minister a wonderful man for doing it. If he takes off duties you have a crowd abusing him for doing it, and if he puts on duties he is abused by another crowd. In the meantime, as I have already pointed out, it ought be borne in mind that what is being done now is the English practice, and, in my opinion, it is perfectly sound and wise for the Finance Minister, if he finds he can make adjustments in his Tariff before we agree to it, to make them, and my only hope is that he will continue making them, but, as I remarked a moment ago, it is impossible to reconcile all the conflicting views.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE— Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to reply at any length at the present moment to the remarks of the honourable member for Fortune Bay; but just one or two observations. As the Minister of Justice has pointed out, we are trying to adjust matters so that the tariff will bear equally on all hands. If the honourable member for Fortune Bay had been fair in his criticisms, I would not have a word to say; but when he gets up in this House and tells this country that this Government are putting on a million and a quarter dollars of extra duties and without explaining them, I am somewhat astounded, because if you will remember, Mr. Chairman, I was two and a half hours on my feet delivering the Budget, and if the honourable member for Fortune Bay will turn up the "Daily News" of Friday last he will see what I said. As to what he said or Jacob said or Esau said, I shall have something to say later. Now the way we stand in this Colony to-day is that you have got to find money to pay your bills. Here

are the figures to be collected as specific duty under the new tariff, as compared with average collections made in the years 1921-1922 and 1922-1923:

Total average collections for 1921-22 and 1922-23	$4,086,486	
Total collections New Tariff based on collections for these years ...	4,683,267	$ 601,781
Additional increase from Sales Tax 5 per cent. on invoice value only	1,000,000	$1,601,781
Deductions as Follows:		
Free entry on flour, pork, beef, kero., etc.	476,161	
Estimated loss on 5 per cent. sales tax on duty, freight, etc.	350,000	
Estimated loss by abrogation of Income and Bank tax	649,000	1,510,161
Nett gain to the Colony as a result of increases and decreases of revenue		$91,620

What I simply said was that the duties would total on the average a collection of $4,486,086. Now these figures have been arrived at by an expert. I don't claim to be an expert myself, and to be able to go down there and adjust the thing. Why that would take two years to go into the details of the Department, with the assistance of ten or twelve men. There are certain things that we all know are wrong, but the thing is to adjust them. This tariff is estimated to give us $1,601,000. That is provided the trade remains about equal for the three years. Now take off the reductions from that. The loss through the reduction of the duty on pork, etc., is $466,661. Take off the loss of duty on the freight $350,000. Then the income tax means a loss of $694,000 and you have a net gain of $91,000.

Now I don't want the country to misunderstand me. I don't want it to go abroad into the world that we are asking this country to pay any more taxes than are necessary. Now at the time that this tariff was suggested and made up it was the intention of the Leader of the Government at the time, Sir Richard Squires, to leave the income tax and every other tax on as well. And if that be so I think we are doing moderately well to be able to take off these taxes.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, I think that I have done the Minister a service. All I said was that if he had explained when he brought in this tariff that it would bring in so much more, he would have allayed the criticism that has been levied against the tariff.

Now according to this report his figures were wrong. I get it to-day that instead of anticipating a revenue of $8,250,000 it is now $9,000,000. That must bring in more than $450,000.

I think it is generally accepted by all that I have been speaking to that there is a necessity for the Minister to collect an increased revenue. But the only thing to criticise is the particular incidents of the taxation. For instance I think that now everybody, nearly 99 p.c. of the people who realize that the Government has to collect this Tariff they say, put back the duty on pork, beef and flour and try and take it off of clothes and ready-mades, or cut out the articles that

are now on the free list. I don't think that it is the amount that is causing this anxiety. I think that it is the particular incidents of taxation under the various parts of the tariff that has been brought in.

MR. DUFF—Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Finance prefaces his tariff by saying it is a human document, and we can only add "To err is human." With regard to the encouragement of home industries. I would like to say that I hope these industries will flourish. But not at too great cost to the taxpayer. That is what it looks like to-day in regard to tobacco.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Duff, as I have already said by the new tariff there will be certain changes. The figures that were brought in the other day are not absolutely correct. By the new tariff the duty on tobacco is only slightly increased.

MR. DUFF—Well, even then it does not make a big difference. After all we can all remember the time when we could buy tobacco for 40 or 50 cents a pound; and now the duty is 50 cents per pound and p.c. advalorem. I feel sure that the Minister of Finance will do his best to give the fishermen their tobacco at a more moderate price than they are getting it to-day.

We find in looking over the tariff that there is a duty of 10 p.c. on lines and twines. We also find that shop twines are now 55 p.c. Then again we see that small ware such as bootlaces are increased 62 p.c. In the olden days one used to see fishing lines in poor people's boots, and we wonder if the Government want us to go back and use factory lines in this way. The duty on readymades is increased 20 p.c. Readymades cost 35 p.c., to-day cost 5 p.c., showday they cost 75 p.c. Dry Goods that cost 35 p.c., to-day cost 5 p.c., showing an increase of 20 p.c. Readymades from 58 p.c. to 75 p.c. You have to take into consideration that about 95 p.c. of the people of the country wear readymade clothes. Then again take the duty on boots. It is now about 60 p.c. Take fruit. I think that the people should get a much lower duty on fruit. After all is said and done our working men don't get enough of this very necessary food. The duty is 25 p.c. Then again Mr. Warren informs us that the increase in the duty on sugar amounts to about $33,000. The duty on sugar and molasses will this year be about $50,000 more than last year. Articles such as rice and beans, the common necessaries of life, are increased. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the Government at the present time should be considering a matter of retrenchment and not the increasing of the duties. The people of the country will be very disappointed when they find the duty is greater than in the past. The hope that the people entertained when they put the present Government in power was that they would reduce expenditure and taxation. They will be very disappointed.

As I said before the fisheries of this country to-day cannot compete with the other fishing countries of the world because they cannot market the fish sufficiently cheap to enable them to hold the market. If you go down to Harvey's wharf to-day you will see a steamer leaving for Canada or the States, and you will see 150 or 200 men, the bone and sinew of the country, leaving for other countries because Newfoundland cannot give them a living.

Mr. Chairman, I want to catch a train this evening, so I won't be able to say much more now. But I would just like to mention that the Government came in here on a policy of clean up and keep clean. And we find a substantial increase on the duties

on baths, soap, towels, etc., and when one pulls on the readymades there is the exorbitant 75 p.c. No encouragement there to clean up. Now Mr. Chairman, I would like the Government and the Minister of Finance to consider these matters. This country to-day can't stand any more duties than have been charged in the past, and I would ask the Minister to try and reduce expenditure and taxes and give us the chance to live in our native land.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER— Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word on the tariff while it is before the Chair. To begin with, the Leader of the Opposition stood up here and read out the rates at which the duties were assessed last year and then compared it with the tariffff today, which is an entirely erroneous position, in as much as 25 p.c. and 10 p.c. were added to the tariff, which he read out and should have been added before he made any comparison with the tariff to-day. It is a source of great regret to me that we should have to make any increase in the duties. But we could not take off a million dollars taxation and at the same time be sure of getting sufficent revenue without having to put duty on something else. And as the Minister of Finance pointed out when this tariff was framed it was with the intention of increasing taxation.

The Opposition side of the House has spoken quite a lot about the Cordage Company and the Tobacco Company, and because I happen to be a director of those two companies I feel that it is up to me to say a word in connection with the business of those two companies. Away back thirty years ago when I came to this country the greatest political bugbear was the Colonial Cordage Company. It was used as a political tool to hit at my uncle who was then in political life, and ever since then there has been a cry against putting taxes on lines and twines. Now for all these years the lines and twines that have come into this country from Norway have been free of duty including the tar and the glue and the wrappings of the packages, while the Colonial Cordage Company has had to pay as high as from twenty to forty per cent. on their glue and their wrappings and the paper and everything that they want for the manufacture of the twines, and still they have to compete against companies in Norway. I want to say that as a very matter of principal it is only right that they should get a protection of ten per cent., and this means a net per cent. of six and a half per cent. on lines and twines. I want it clearly understood that this was not the action of this Government here because I happened to be a shareholder of the Colonial Cordage Company, but it was the recommendation of the Tariff Commission that was appointed and with which I had nothing to do whatever and had nothing whatever to say in connection with. It sat during the last two years and Mr. Le-Messurier wrote a letter to the Minister of Finance and Customs and told him that the tariff commission had decided this policy because they thought it was the right thing to do. The Colonial Cordage Company is doing a wonderful service to this country. They are carrying an enormous stock of every sort of lines and twines and cordage that is needed in this country and they are put to an enormous expenditure to do this. Again when people get into difficulties and they want time for the payment for their goods they can get sixty or ninety days, and they can get their notes extended when they fall due, and this is something that everybody knows that cannot be done with the imported article. In Norway they are being paid a bounty by the Gov-

ernment so that they may be able to compete with us here, and the Norwegians have actually drawn on their customers a month before the goods arrive. So I say, Mr. Chairman, that the Cordage Company is an enormous benefit to this country, and it has a right, a moral right to have a protection of six and a half per cent. There are factories in this country that are being protected to the extent of forty and fifty per cent., and why in the name of fortune should not the Colonial Cordage Company have the little percentage of protection that they ask for? I have taken the stand with the party, and I take the stand here that they are only asking for what is reasonable and for what is their moral right. Now the other concern that has been spoken about is the Tobacco Factory, and I want to say a word about that because I happen to be the President of that particular Company. I was the Managing Director of that concern before it passed over to the control of the British American Tobacco Company, and I went to Sir Edward Morris and asked him if he could not give some more protection, and if he could not we would have to close up shop. The Hon. Member for Fortune Bay said that if a company is about to go out of business they should be given some protection by the Government|. I do not think that at all. I think that if a company cannot carry on business because the management is bad that it should not be given the protection because it was not able to properly take advantage of the protection. But if the Company is properly managed and it cannot get along, then I think that it is the right thing to help it along. But because a company is properly managed and is earning some money I do not think that that is a reason why we should say that we will have to take something out of it. I say that every concern should be taxed a reasonable amount, and then if it can make money, then it is all the better for the country and better for the shareholders. Perhaps it may not be known to a great many in this House that the Imperial Tobacco Co. is paying into the revenue of this country four hundred and fifty thousand dollars every year. Last year the excise duty that was paid by the Imperial Tobacco Company was four hundred and fifty thousand dollars. Now if there was no Imperial Tobacco Co., or if there was no local company we would be dependent on the tobacco that came in through the customs, and the Minister of Finance knows perfectly well from his experience since he became the Minister of Finance from the amount of tobacco seized, the large amount of tobacco that comes in without paying duty at all. You can realise the great amount that is paid by the Tobacco Factory in the way of excise duties, and I claim that the Tobacco Factory today is bringing more money into the revenue of this colony than was the case when Harvey and Pitts were running and before this concern got going. We are making some money on cigarettes, which the Leader of the Opposition criticised very considerably. But we are also making a great deal of money for the Government. There were comparatively no cigarettes consumed in this country until this company was organised and drummed up the business and therefore they are a benefit to the country as well as themselves. Of every package of cigarettes that is consumed in this country nearly three quarters of the value goes to the revenue of the country, and the rest is made up of the cost of the material and profit. Mr. Chairman, I submit that the Tobacco Factory and the Colonial Cordage Company are the two most valuable concerns

that we have in this country. The Cordage Company employs five hundred people. And the Imperial Tobacco Company is paying out annually over one hundred thousand dollars in wages. The Leader of the Opposition said that the Clothing Companies were paying out two hundred and fifty thousand dollars a year in wages. I challenge his statement in that respect. I do not believe that all the factories in this town together, not including the Cordage Company and the Tobacco Company, pay out over two hundred and fifty thousand dollars a year in wages. But Mr. Chairman, every member of the Opposition who has spoken has referred to these companies in this debate, and I take it as a personal matter because I am a director of them and I want to claim that the rearrangement of the tariff was made not by us but by the Tariff Commission that was appointed by Mr. Warren or Sir Richard Squires or by some other Government. I want to say that as far as this Government is concerned it is a serious regret to the entire party and to the Executive that we should have to put further taxes on the country. We came in with the intention of having the taxes reduced and of having reduced expenditure and then we find the whole country crying for increased expenditure and it is the hardest thing in the world to know what to do. I dare say that members on the Opposition and on this side recognise the position. I did not recognise it before but I recognise it now. It is rather disheartening to have everybody coming into the office to look for a Government job and everybody looking for money to be spent in their districts and everybody looking for improvements that will take a great deal of the public moneys. It is distressing that we have to pay out sixty thousand dollars during the last two months in St. John's for dole. But I still take the position that it is better to do that than to try to start some Government work, and I think that it is better for the moral side of the people of St. John's that they should take the dole than they should be paid for Government work that they do not do. I claim that this is better than in the past when there were government works and the labour that was provided was not properly served. In the past when the rock-sheds were opened, possibly with the best intentions on the part of the Government of the time, I know that there were cases where it was absolutely prostituted. Absolutely men were told that this was a Government work and that they were not to work. I know that there were men who wanted to work and that they were not allowed to work. And from this I claim that it is impossible for us to expect to get proper returns from Government work. And so I say gentlemen that while we are putting this tariff in force at the present time that we are doing it because we have taken the tax off in other directions, and because we cannot help it until we see where we stand, I think that our main object at the present time should be cut down expenditure. I believe that if we could go into some of the Government departments and had the time to do it; I was appointed on a commission to enquire into the public institutions and we have been only able to meet for a half dozen meetings before the House came into session and we cannot possibly take the matter up while the House is in session; I have not had five minutes to attend to my own business and I have been working from nine o'clock in the morning and sometimes until twelve o'clock at night in the interest of the Government, and as I said before, I think that it

will take the four years to clean the matters that we have brought before us up; but I think that if we could go into these public institutions that we could save four hundred thousand dollars in the Public Charities Department alone. I believe that a large amount of money could be saved in connection with the other departments. We have not had a moment to spare because we have been so busy endeavouring to get ready this legislation that we have brought in. I do not think that the country should judge us on what we have been able to do for the eight months that we have been in power, and I believe that the people of the country will bear with the tariff and wait and see what we can do when we have more time to settle down and do what we can for the interest of the country.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, I want to disabuse the mind of the Prime Minister in connection with my remarks about the Colonial Cordage Company and the Imperial Tobacco Company. I said nothing in any personal way. Nothing whatever. I specially repeat what I said then, that there was an impression abroad that these two particular concerns did not require the protection that was given them; and that increased protection would mean increased prices to the fishermen, the ordinary men of this country, the man who buys the goods; and I elaborated that a bit by saying that if these Companies went out of business, and therefore wanted protection, then I would be prepared to give it to them. As I said, there is an impression around that neither of these two concerns wants protection, and that was the only reason I mentioned these two concerns; and it was not because of the circumstance that the Prime Minister happens to be mixed up in these concerns.

HON. PRIME MINISTER — Mr. Chairman, I just want to say a word or two further on this matter, on a point that has been raised by the Hon. member for Fortune. I gave a promise to our party the other night that the protection on lines and twines would not mean any increase in price. I promised them that as long as the price on the raw materials did not increase, the price of lines and twines or cordage would not increase. For this year the Cordage Co. have provided their raw materials and there will be no advance in price. The Colonial Cordage Company heard of much adverse criticism against them, and they determined as there was a certain margin between their price and the imported article they would advance prices. I will give the House my word to-day that there will not be any increase on the price of lines and twines on account of this protection, as long as the price of raw materials is the same.

I may say also as regards the Tobacco Company, that when I saw the report of the Tariff Commission for the first time, I saw that there was a difference of four or five cents, I think, between the excise and the import duty, and $1.50 extra protection on cigarettes. The Minister of Finance and Customs will bear me out in this, that I went down to the Custom House at nine o'clock in the morning, and insisted on these duties being taken off, and no protection being given to the Tobacco Factory. After making further investigation into the matter, I found that there was still one and a half cents in favour of the Tobacco Factory on Plug Tobacco, and I suggested to the Council last night that there should be an amendment placed before the House. It means taking off two cents on the imported article, and so giving less protection to the Tobacco Factory than it had before.

We do not want any protection, as far as the Cordage Co. is concerned, except as reasonably suggested, for the Company's protection against foreign manufacturers.. The consumers will not have to pay any more now than before the Colonial Cordage Company had this protection.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman, the Prime Minister might be able to give an undertaking on behalf of the Colonial Cordage Company that they will not increase the price; but he cannot give a similar undertaking for the Norwegian Company. Has he got an assurance from those people that they are prepared to do with ten per cent. less profit than they had last year. Certainly they are going to increase their prices on lines and twines if they are going to be taxed ten per cent. more on the price of getting them into the country.

HON. RIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Hon. Member if he thinks that it is right that a Norwegian concern should be subsidised to bring lines and twines here to compete with local firms—because that is what is happening today?

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, I am not going to make a very lengthy speech. There has been a great deal of discussion about lines and twines, and naturally being a fisherman, I like to trouble myself to see that the fishermen are not called upon to pay any more for these things. I am glad that the Prime Minister stated that they would not. But while the hon. member for Fortune, Mr. Warren, was on his feet, my name was mentioned, and he also made reference to the way in which the Sagona and the Prospero were operated when they went to the seal fishery this spring. I am glad he did mention it. He spoke about the politicians putting the men there, and when they got out to the ice, those men took charge of the Captain and made him come in. I may say that the same thing was done last Spring. If Captain Randell were here this evening I would make the same remark. The Sagona was sent out to the Seal Fishery last Spring by the Government, although she was chartered to Bowring's for $500 a day. I say that the politicians put the men on that ship last spring, and if the members of this House had been in White Bay and saw the conditions there in reference to the seal fishery, as regards Captain Randell's crew last spring, I think there would be very few of them who would ask a sealing captain to take a man out in that ship again. Last year both Captain Randell, Captain Kean and myself were in White Bay. Captain Kean got ten thousand seals, I got twelve thousand and Captain Randell got only five thousand, although he was just as good a man as either one of us. What happened with him was there were only twenty five men that would go over the side of the ship and haul any seals. The very same thing will happen to any ship that the Government sends out, if the politicians put the men into it.

What I do say now is that the Government made a far better bargain this year; and that is that we are to get the profit on the manufacture of the seals, which no other Government ever got. Where other Governments sent out a ship and only got the bare five dollars a quintal, this Government will get three times as much on the profits of manufacturing.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the time will come when every politician will have common sense enough not to ask any captain to put any man into his ship, just because of politics. I am not saying now that some of the men put in like that are not just as good as the others; but they realize that it is

a Government ship, and they own it, and then you have no control over them.

The Hon. Member for Fortune spoke in reference to Capt. Little going to the seal fishery, and he was agitating on the floors of this House some time ago for me to go. Before this evening I had great confidence in Mr. Warren, and I thought he was a straightforward man, but from his remarks this evening I consider that he was trying to encourage Mr. Monroe and the members of this Government party to let me go to the seal fishery so that I would lose my seat. If that is correct, I only want to say that I thought that although he was with a bad bunch he had not become tainted, but now I think that he must have got tainted and tainted pretty badly.

I shall have a little more to say later on in reference to the tariff that is now laid on the table.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I rise just to make a few remarks in reference to the remarks made by the last speaker, the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in connection with the prosecution of the seal fishery in Government ships, or ships that were owned by the Government last year. One ship was chartered last year, while this year two ships were sent out solely by the Government.

Now I am supposed to know something about the chartering of the Sagona last year. That is in the year of Our Lord One thousand nine hundred and twenty four, and to know something in reference to what happened in that year. The Government had nothing whatever to do with the prosecution of the seal fishery last year, any more than if they had chartered a steamer to go on the coal trade.

HON. MR. CRAMM—Was there not a contract?

MR. HALFYARD — The steamer Sagona was chartered to Messrs. Bowring Brothers, at so much per day, and there was a time limit of one month, at so much a day. I am not conversant with the charter party altogether, and what was to happen after the thirty days I do not just know, but we were not running any risk; and we had nothing at all to do with the ship, or with the crewing of the ship. Absolutely nothing.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Did you get any berths in her?

MR. HALFYARD—I got five berths, and previous to that when the Reid Newfoundland Company were sending her out, I had twenty five berths. Last year I got five, but my colleague, Capt. Randell, was captain of the ship, and like all other captains he had his proportion of berths, but he could not confine the men to whom he gave berths solely to Trinity District. He had his friends. Capt. Randell had his friends, and as all captains know, before he knew where he was all his berths were gone. We did not sit on a Commission in solemn conclave and invite the Captain of the Sagona into our presence, and ask him, "how many berths have you at your disposal?" as was done this year by the Railway Commission.

MR. SULLIVAN—Not in connection with the Sagona.

MR. HALFYARD—That was done in connection with the Prospero. I do not know what was done with the Sagona, but I do know that there were very few men from Trinity District got berths on the Sagona, or on the Prospero either. What the make up of the crew of the Sagona was last year under the command of Capt. Randell, I do not know, but I don't think the Government should be blamed for the personnel of the crew, or of the kind of men that went into that ship at that time, but

I dare say there is a certain amount of truth in what the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Capt. Winsor, says, that they got the idea into their heads that it was a Government ship, although the Government had nothing at all to do with her.

Now this is what was done this year; the eighty berths were divided up in this way—Brigus, 6; Placentia, 12; Ferryland, 12.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—We did not get it.

MR. HALFYARD—Were you at the meeting?

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Yes.

MR. HALFYARD—And you as a good politician looked after your district.

It was divided up as follows: Brigus 6, Placentia and St. Mary's 12, Ferryland 12, St. John's East 12, St. John's West 12, Harbour Main 6, Harbour Grace 12 and Bay de Verde 12.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—And neither one for Bonavista Bay.

MR. HALFYARD—None for Bonavista Bay.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—I don't think that is correct.

MR. CASHIN—It is correct.

MR. HALFYARD—We all know that. It is unnecessary for the Hon. Member for Placentia and St. Mary's to quibble, or in any way question that. We know that wherever he is in connection with Government work that Placentia District with him is first, last and all the time. He is an excellent politician in that respect. And now he asserts he got no berths for men from Placentia District. The Minister of Fisheries has said that the contract this year in connection with the sending of the Government boats to the sealfishery, was a better one than any formerly made as they were part owners in the venture. I believe that the agreement was the same as Murray and Crawford would make with anyone else, as they are anxious to get the seals. They would simply say, give us your seals, we will manufacture them, and we will go fifty-fifty on the output. But as was remarked by the Honorable Member for Fortune, if we had done anything like that we would have been told, we were interfering with ligitimate trade or going into business, and accordingly criticized. And if the venture were not successful we would be anathemized. I am sorry that this year the venture did not turn out better. There are some people connected with the Government who are inclined to think they should have a fleet of sealing steamers, and I fear this year's results has been a setback in this respect. It is regretable that the venture was not more successful for the sake of the men, the Government, and all concerned. Now I think that the Honorable Minister of Finance is also astray as to the Government having anything to do with the Sagona last year. He must be referring to her trip of the year before.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—I am not particular about the trip, but I know the first thing I found facing me in the Customs was a cheque for $5,000.00 which was paid to Bowring Brothers for the loss on the Sagona.

MR. HALFYARD—That refers to the sealing voyage of 1923, and I admit that I know little about the arrangements of that year. Of course it is unfortunate that the Ex-Railway Commissioners were not allowed to continue as such as they were above suspicion, and the thought of doing anything wrong never entered their minds at any time. I am serious in making that statement. I may say that if anyone asked us to do anything we would try to do all possible for him, whether he was a supporter

of the Government or not. If a man were looking for a berth, we would simply give him a note, and there the transaction would begin and end. I got no more for the men of Trinity than for those of other Districts. It has been said here that the Railway Commission is only a consulting body, and that is what we were,—conferring with the Manager and trying to assist him in running the Railway. I appreciate the remarks of the Honorable the Prime Minister in connection with his good intentions as to the increase with price of lines and twines, or tobacco. But these rates are only for one year, and nobody knows what would happen if that is to be the regular tariff. The Honorable the Prime Minister is very unfortunate in being now compelled to take the attitude in connection with the tariff, which he should have taken at the first. Personally, I had no idea that he was connected with the Tobacco Company, but I thought that he had some interest in the Ropewalk. It is not my intention to elaborate on the financial policy of the Government, but they made a huge mistake in tabling these Resolutions. They now realize the mistake, and if modifications are introduced, other than the resolutions now tabled, they will not get the credit they would have been given, had they given serious consideration to the tariff before bringing it down All that is being done now as to the reduction of taxation for the alteration of the tariffff is not being done of the Government's free will, but I venture to say it is because they want to remain as a Government a few months longer. I venture to say that that is the reason, and the sole reason, why the changes are being made. It is certainly a most humiliating position for any Minister of Finance to be placed in. The Resolutions are tabled, it is announced that this is the tariff and a few hours later they cannot be put into effect. Pressure has been brought on the Government from outside and inside, and has become so strong that they cannot remain longer as an administration with the tariff as it stands and, therefore, a compromise has to be made. Whether the Honorable the Minister of Finance is going to stand for this or not, I do not know. It is his tariffff, he knows he does not want to face a deficit, and has to make both ends meet, but he did not consider the Tariff at the proper time, or the estimates would have been different. It is impossible to change the estimates. Now we got an extra expenditure of half a million dollars, and this is the first mistake the Government made. The country cannot stand this, and you will not exist very long as a Government. The Honorable the Prime Minister said that the people would not judge the Government by their actions of seven or eight months. But I say you are judged at the present moment, by your deeds you are known, and it is not what you are going to do that will save you, or the request to give you time, which after all is only a cowardly plea. The opportune time for you to do the right thing is at the beginning of your term allotted, and you should now start in at once and try to redeem yourselves. I know it is no picnic for you or for anyone else to manage the affairs of the country, but you have come to the judgment seat only eight months after being elected, and if the electorate had an opportunity to record their opinion of you tomorrow, you would be no longer a Government, and the financial records of Squires and Warren would not be the only ones to have finis written over them, but it would be over yours also. You are judged already, and some of the people to-day are clamouring for the return of the Squires administration. You know nothing of public opinion or you would not come in here with this policy. Every day

there is trouble at the Custom House, as no business man knows what tariff you are acting on. You do not know whether to charge duties on the old or the new scale, and everything is in a tangle. I know a man who went down there to pass entries for some engine parts, and he was told you were not acting on the new tariff. Then the Government tells us, through the Minister of Justice, that we must follow the custom all the time and their only excuse in order to save their own faces is a quotation from an English Act. When this Budget and this New Tariff was tabled you had no idea of altering the duties, but now you are trying to hand out flimsy excuses to save yourselves from going to pieces. There are other men in the Government besides the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Justice, and I dare say that these two Ministers have swallowed a dose of that certain kind of medicine that we have heard so much talk about. Now you cannot expect the rank and file of the Government to be continually shouldering the sins of omission and commission that were brought about by experienced Ministers of the Crown and which Ministers are parties to bringing down such a tariff as the one we have before us now. When we were in office we were spoken of by these same Ministers as a crowd of incapables. Still in spite of the fact that the present Government have a half dozen Lawyers in their Party, the most insignificant bit of legislation that they brought in this year was sent back from the Upper House amended almost beyond recognition. As to the financial side of their policy, why they give no consideration to it than they would treat an act respecting the picking of partridge berries. We were hoping and the people throughout this country thought that conditions were on the upgrade, that we were getting somewhat stabilized, that, according to the Finance Minister the revenue had increased, there would be no more deficits to be met with and that it was hoped that conditions generally would improve. Still here we are to-day faced with a Tariff that dislocates everything, and where there is confidence shown there is want of confidence because every class of people in the community thought that there would be no increase in taxation this year. It is fortunate for the country, however, that it is necessary for the House to be in session to deal with the Budget and the financial policy of the Government. Otherwise, if it was left to the Executive Council to be dealt with, this country would be saddled with this new tariff and the rank and file of the Government would be blamed just as well as the members of the Executive. Therefore, I do not wonder at there being a want of confidence in the Government at the present moment and the country do not know what you are going to do next. Your initial mistake, as I said before, was made by not giving the financial condition of this country that consideration and thought that should have been given in preparing the Estimates and in providing ways and means so that the Finance Minister would be able to balance his books at the end of the fiscal year without increasing taxation. Now I would like, in all sincerity, to ask the Prime Minister when he intends to carry out his Manifesto. Up to the present time instead of the retrenchment he preached we have increased expenditure all round and that is the question that is agitating the minds of his friends and foes alike in this country at present. Now I fail to see when the Government could have a more opportune time to reduce expenditure than at present. To accomplish it is a task I admit, but with a strong party it should be faced during the first year of office, and this

Government should face, no matter how herculean a task it is, because they were elected to power on the plea of retrenchment. Now take the money that was spent last year on Executive authority in connection with the Marine and Fisheries Department. We know that it is a grand thing to have harbours around the coast dredged. But it costs money. There was no vote to have the dredge in operation but still the Minister of Marine and Fisheries asked the Executive to put the dredge working, and she went just the same as if the money had been voted by this House. Then there were certain things done that cost considerable money on the Labrador. It was a case of go to it whether the money was voted by this House or not, because the voting of that money by the Executive supplied jobs for Government supporters. Perhaps, it was an accident that the men who were sent there happened to belong to the Prime Minister's district, but any how they went there and got paid for going, not because they were any better men than the men from Trinity district, but, as I said before, because they belonged to Bonavista district and, no doubt, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries acted like a good god-father in looking after his children. But the fault that I find is that it is contrary to the expectations of the country and contrary to the policy of the Government, at least the pronounced policy. The country will judge you by your actions. The country can size up your actions when the matter is brought to their attention. And speaking of the fisheries. They are in touch with these conditions more so than we are, who live in the city. They move about amongst these people and know what they do. They know whether the country can afford it or not. They are forced to criticize the Government for spending money on things that they think could be done without, or providing services that are not absolutely necessary.

We cannot afford to spend any more monies. We cannord afford to spend any more money than is voted in this House. We talk about the roads and the two million dollars that is to be spent on the roads. This country cannot afford to have good roads. The population of 260,000 people scattered over the coast, settled down in coves and crevices do not want roads except the main roads at certain localities where the people reside, depending solely from what they can get from the sea and from the land within a radius of three or four hundred rods from the dwelling house. And we are talking about the tourist traffic. You would think that we were living in a prairie country. And that we had to connect up with wheat fields, country as flat as the floor of this Assembly. It is most ridiculous. Outrageously ridiculous. When we anticipate a further taxation of a million and a quarter dollars according to the tariff as tabled and then about two million to build roads and at the present time there are localities not further away than Trinity District where the people cannot get to the railway station in a horse and waggon, a two wheeled waggon, without the two wheels going down to the axles in the gutter. And then when they get to the bridges they are fraid to remain on the cart, they have to get off and walk for fear the bridge may break on the way across.

These are actual facts. I had a man the other day at my residence from Trinity Bay. He told me that the only way to get freight is by the railway from Long Harbour Crossing, 4 or 5 miles away.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—If I remember rightly we tried to get money for that road but we could not get it. The money was spent in the country.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I don't want this debate to be more ridiculous than it is. But the Hon. Member for Placentia is talking about something that happened four or five years ago, about a road that was built up there. We were talking about the actual conditions in some parts of the country. Now this man made a point of seeing me and he told me that he would have to take a great risk and go across there. These are the conditions that obtain in several districts in the island. I don't know what the Government intends to do this year with regard to road building. But I would like to take advantage of this opportunity to ask the Prime Minister will he be good enough to give authority to the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to send the ordinary grants that have been voted by this House, as at Trinity we need to fix up certain roads and bridges after the winter snows. There are some people there who are very badly off, but it is no good appealing to the Relieving Officer, they can get no help from that source. I understand that there are some people in St. John's that are still being fed by the dole system. And Spaniards' Bay, in Harbour Grace District, is very badly off also, and it is no good to ask the Relieving Officer for assistance. They have to suffer and put up with it. They have to live as best they can. That is another thing that is not increasing the popularity of the Government. Whether you think that that's a better plan than getting rocks broken or work done. It would be a much better plan and certainly you would be getting some returns which can't be gotten by giving out money to keep people alive. If the people were given work on the roads, for every dollar received they would be giving something in return. And I believe that the policy is wrong to give out money and to get no returns for it. Now the two millions that is being spent on the roads is a mistake under the present conditions of this country. You have got to increase taxation by a million and a quarter dollars. That action alone would defeat you, and I am sure that the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries does not want to be defeated in Bonavista District.

HON. THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—I am quite easy in my mind about it.

MR. HALFYARD — Perhaps you are. It is just as well to be easy as anything else. You will have to put up with it anyway, according to the views that obtain in the country at the present time from those who supported and also those who did not. I am sure you are disappointed in the Government, and if you were a member of the executive I feel sure that the Government would be acting very differently. I know that if certain members of the Government were members of the executive we would not have this tariff as it is submitted to-day.

There is nothing commendable about the policy of the Government. The only commendable thing that they did was when the Railway Commission put the coal out to tender. And from putting it out to tendr they are getting it cheaper than I thought it could be got in this country. That is the only redeeming feature about the railway deal. But the Minister of Finance has told me this afternoon that there are certain changes to be made in the tariff, and I thought that by talking until halfpast six and the House adjourned until next week, and further changes would be made, I think that I would be doing my country a service. You will have a longer time to think it over, and I trust that when this tariff is finally passed and adopted that you will have

cut off the million from the taxation. A million and a quarter is too much because the people cannot stand it.

Now I quite believe that there are certain districts in the country with regard to roads and bridges are fairly well off. But the roads in Trinity District, some of them are impassable.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—You know that we spent more last year on your district that you did when you were in power.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—You spent $52,000 in pauper relief in the District of Harbour Grace in 1922.

MR. HALFYARD—Hon. the Colonial Secretary mentioned the district of Harbour Grace. For any man who represents Harbour Grace he must not know what he is talking about. Are you not ashamed of what you spent over there. I heard someone say that you spent $25,000 over there.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—We did not spend a quarter of that.

MR. HALFYARD—I do not intend to get out of this House, Mr. Chairman, for the Colonial Secretary, and he cannot put me out. I am not depending on him for my seat in this House, and it would give me great delight to have the opportunity of opposing him in Trinity district, and the unseemly manner in which he has acted this evening towards me is not worthy of him. I do not think that I said anything that is in any way objectionable. I was speaking of the policy of the Government when the first thing we get is an uncalled for discourteous remark thrown across the floors. And this is not the first time during this session that such has happened. Earlier in the session I heard the words "brains not functioning properly." The idea of the Colonial Secretary talking in this House on the matter of brains. Did not the Prime Minister tell the people of Bonavista last year that he took Mr. Morine into his Cabinet because he wanted some brains in the Government. Now the Prime Minister had the Colonial Secretary associated with him and sitting at his elbow, and still he had to go outside and get Mr. Morine to be his guide, philosopher and friend and make him Leader of the Government in the Upper House. As it was wittingly remarked by the honourable member for Fortune Bay, we have now the voice of Jacob and the hand of Esau. With regard to the Tariff again, whether you pass this Tariff or not, I do say that it was the premeditated policy of the Government not to cut down expenditure because they had to placate the crowd, as the Prime Minister himself said that people were appealing every hour of the day for Government positions, and you are not big enough to give them a negative answer. If the policy of the Government was one of retrenchment you would not have to make such increases in your Estimates and if the country continues to get revenue within the next year as they have within the past ten months you will be able to meet your obligations without any increased taxation and by being conservative, careful and cautious. I was a member of a Government in this country when surpluses were being piled up, and this much I will say to the credit of the then Finance Minister, that despite increased revenues and surpluses piling up and despite the incessant demands that were made for expenditures of money, still there was no undue expenditures made. There is great credit to be given to a man of such initiative who thinks he must be doing something in the interest of the people of the country, but the history of men in Governments in this country during the past half dozen years is like what it has been in other countries and it would be

much better to have men with much less ability and who have the backbone to say no to those who go jading them for position and pay. But the present Government, after their eight months' regime, are condemned in the eyes of the electorate, and if they went to the country to-morrow they would not get enough members to form a corporal's guard.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Finance Minister if he would let me have a copy of the changes that have taken place in connection with the Tariff now before the House? I understand some changes have been made, and personally, I would like to know what they are. I would also like to be furnished with a copy of the Report of the Tariff Commission?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—With regard to the tariff I have only one copy of the alteration and I shall make arrangements to let you have a copy of the changes in the tariff; and with regard to the Tariff Commission Report I shall let you have a copy of it on Friday.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word or two in reply to the honourable member for Trinity (Mr. Halfyard) who referred here this evening to all the money that was spent in Bonavista Bay. Now it has been stated here also that a million and a quarter dollars will be got through the new Tariff, but I am afraid that if the Finance Minister holds on much longer that it will be necessary for him to devise ways and means to get another million and a quarter because of all the bills that are coming into my Department—bills that were incurred by certain members of the late Government. For instance, I have here on my desk a bill that just came in for $800.00 for hire of coastal wharf at Port Union. Now the Union Trading Company should pay that bill, Sir, because the steamer called there on private business for the Union Trading Company. The Government has got a wharf at Catalina and one at Port Union, and neither the Union Trading Company or any other private individual or corporation should be paid for their wharf when it is used for their own benefit.

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 to sit again on to-morrow.

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

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Avalon Telephone Company."

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until Friday afternoon next, the 24th inst., at 3.00 p.m.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, April 24th., 1925.

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

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I beg to ask the indulgence of the House to ask from the Upper Chamber the return of a Bill on Shipbuilding. The Executive, in giving this Bill consideration, found that it was not so full as it might be, and it was therefore thought that it might be enacted in conjunction with other Bills. We only took up the matter of the inspection of sealing steamers, but it was found better to have the inspection of Coastal and Labrador boats included, and we want to insert clauses to take care of this,

As to the Shipbuilding Bill, some amendments were made to it in the Upper Chamber, and we thought it better to pass legislation, for it as well as for the Rebuilding Bill, and I therefore ask leave to request the Council to send back the amended Bills and get these new ones in place of them.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, and with unanimous consent, it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council requesting return of the Bills sent up entitled respectively "An Act for the Encouragement of Shipbuilding," and "An Act to Amend Chapter 172 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Survey of Foreign Going and Labrador Vessels.'"

THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, I ask the leave of the House to present a petition of unusual importance. Reference has been made during the discussion of the Estimates to the position of the police. In this petition every non-commissioned man of the force is asking for an increase in salary. I realize the difficulty it may mean to meet this request, and it may be urged that it will take a considerable sum, but I think I am right when I say that I believe every member on either side of the House will agree with the merits of the petition. The fitness and competency of those asking the increase will not be questioned by anybody, and the element in connection with the work of these men to which I drew attention before should be a big factor in getting their request granted. As regards graft, the force has a remarkable record behind it. What happens now is that the moment a man is trained, he resigns. and if we are to have an efficient force the men must get fair and reasonable remuneration. The policeman as a rule has nobody as a friend till they want to utilize him. In the police and fire departments we have a splendid body of men in every way, and in submitting this petition I ask that the Government at the first possible moment give it the most earnest consideration and state that I am in full accord with the prayer of the petitioners.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Lush's Bight, Three Arms and Little Bay on the matter of a road between the latter two places. The portion of the road which they want rebuilt is about four miles and forms a connecting link with Badger. They claim that it is an important road as a large number of people travel over it to connect with the train, and at present the country through which it goes is often times forbidding. The sum of $2,000 would help out to a large extent, and I would ask that this petition for that sum be acceded to.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to heartily support the petition presented by the honorable member for Twillingate.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Summerford, in electoral district of Twillingate on the matter of a road. This road connects Summerford and Virgin Arm and is one of the most travelled highroads in the district. This road is much used in the late fall and in the early spring, and in fact all the winter, and at the present time it is in such a condition that it is almost impassible, and for that reason the people are petitioning for the sum of two thousand dollars to remake and repair the road and put it in good condition. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that there are several roads in Twillingate district that are in need of considerable repairs, and I hope that when the Highway Commission gets working they will find some money to spend

on the roads that we have at the present time, because it is useless to make more roads if we cannot keep up what we have now. I might say for the information of the House that while I was on my way to Twillingate for the Easter recess I happened to be travelling with the mailman and when he came to one of the brook that were to be crossed we found that the bridge was in such a condition that it was impossible for the horse to get over, and the result was that the horse and the mail cart had to take to the water, and in crossing, the horse went down first and then the cart, and the mailman got his foot caught between the ice and the cart, with the result that he had to go back to Lewisporte. I would like to draw this petition to the attention of the House and ask that this petition be referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. GRIMES—I beg to support that petition.

Mr. Grimes gave notice of question.

Mr. Godden gave notice of question.

Capt. Rendell gave notice of question.

Mr. Ashbourne gave notice of question.

Mr. Scammell gave notice of question.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—I would like to ask the Minister of Mines & Agriculture if he has the reply to the question of the Order Paper of April 16th ready yet?

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—I beg to table the reply.

Hon. the Leader of the Opposition gave notice of question.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Speaker, I might explain the reason for putting that question on the Order Paper so many times. On Feb. 26th I asked the question to have the correspondence tabled that had taken place between the Government and Hon. M. S. Sullivan in connection with the raising of the recent loan.

I asked the Prime Minister the question, because he is the Leader of the Government and should know everything in connection with the departments. I understand that there is correspondence existing between the Hon. M. S. Sullivan and the office of Finance and Customs in reference to the raising of the loan. Before that I asked the Prime Minister to lay on the table of the House the correspondence between the High Commissioner's Office and the Newfoundland Government in reference to the raising of the loan. I have the reply that there was no correspondence between the High Commissioner's office and the Newfoundland Government in reference to the loan. I have it from very good authority that there is a good deal of correspondence between the High Commissioner's office and the Finance Department. Further on I asked the same question of the Leader of the Government, and I got the same reply, so if the information that I have is correct the Prime Minister has been giving unreliable information to the House and therefore . . . .

MR. SPEAKER—The Hon. Member might want to amend that statement.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—I want to say that the information that the Prime Minister gave the house was not the correct information. I might use the word incorrect.

MR. SPEAKER—No reflections may be made by one Hon. member against another and unfortunately the statement of the Leader of the Opposition conveyed that impression even though he had no intention that it should have.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—I want to convey that the information that I have is altogether different to that which I have received from the Prime Minister, and

I would like to give him the opportunity to investigate the matter and let the House know if he has got the information, and if it is correct or not. I do not want to cast any reflections against the Prime Minister himself, and I just want to say that I would like to have him find out from the High Commissioner's Office in London what correspondence has passed, and I would like to have him lay the whole matter on the table of the House.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I want to say first of all that I think that it is very wrong for the Leader of the Opposition to put these questions to me that relate to other departments. The Hon. the Leader of the Opposition says that I should know everything about all the departments. If I had to know all about every department I would certainly not like to undertake the job for four thousand dollars a year. It is practically impossible for me to know one half of what is going on in all the departments. There never was a Prime Minister who knew everything about every department. I still contend that these questions should have been asked of the Finance Minister because that is the department to which they belong. I answered the questions that were asked of me as best I could, and I have no intention of paying any more intention to them or doing any more about them. If the Leader of the Opposition can refute the statement that I have made he should say what he has to say to the House.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Well if the Hon. the Prime Minister knew or knows nothing about the departments of the Government he has no right to answer my questions unless he can give the information that I want. Otherwise he has no right to answer the question.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—You forced the answer from me.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION — The Prime Minister makes the statement that he will answer no more questions and that he did not care whether there was any information here or not.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Give your proof that there is anything wrong and then we will begin to talk about it.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—I make the statement here that there is correspondence existing between the High Commissioner's office in London and the Department of Finance and Customs in this city, and in that correspondence there is a tender for the loan of four millions, and I make that statement and ask the Prime Minsiter to make an investigation.

Mr. Ashbourne gave notice of question.

(1) MR. DUFF asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs the amount collected by the Government from the Fire Insurance Companies, that is the five per cent. charged on premiums, and the disposition of the amount received; also, is it correct, as stated in the House yesterday, that this 5 p.c. collected over this Colony goes to the upkeep of the St. John's Fire Brigade or St. John's Municipal Council.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I beg leave to table the reply to that question.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting The Avalon Telephone Company," was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the 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. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman, when the Budget Speech was presented here last week we had before us a very frank, clear, and open statement as to the conditions in which the various departments were functioning to-day, as seen by the eyes of the Hon. Minister of Finance. We also had a pretty clear exposition as to the condition in which the country finds itself to-day, as well as a complete statement of the finances of the country; what we are up against, the heavy expenditure that we are faced with, and how the Hon. Minister of Finance proposes to meet these expenditures, by putting into execution a tariff which means squeezing out of the people of this country still more taxes, in order to carry on the present Government.

When one considers the policy of the Government, or the policy of the party at present in control of the Government, when it went to the country last Spring on the cry of retrenchment and economy, and then finds to-day a tariff which asks for an increase of practically one million dollars in taxation, one can well understand why the country stands aghast at the proposals, and the bitter disappointment that exists in the minds of all the people in the country about the Government in presenting such a Tariff as is before us today.

I say the people of this country are bitterly disappointed in the hopes which they had in the present Government; and these hopes were encouraged by the practical unanimity that existed on both sides about the necessity that there was for a reduction in expenditure and a reduction in taxation. It was not only the members of the Government that went to the country with a plea of reduction in expenditure and taxation. The experience of the last three years had shown to the members of the Opposition the necessity there was for preparing the minds of the people to look for reduction as outlined by the Premier in his manifesto. There never was a greater opportunity for any Government—there was never any Government in the last twenty five or thirty years that had the opportunity that the present Government had to put that policy into effect.

From 1921 to 1923 the country was faced with extremely hard times, and that necessitated a lot of borrowing and a lot of expenditure on roads, and other public works which, like everything else conducted by any Government, meant a lot of money wasted. I do not think that any Government is any better in that respect than another. In all Government expenditure for a long, long time there has been a considerable amount of waste going on. At any rate we had got to this position, that if we were to go on at the rate we had been going for those three years to 1923 this country would be faced with bankruptcy or ruin; and the only conclusion that any sane minded person would come to was this—that the time had come for economy and retrenchment; and naturally the people expected that when this party was returned to power that they would see that that policy was put into effect.

The present Government owes its success largely to the fact that it had as its leader a man who had a very good reputation in the business world. His name had gone round the country as one whose word could be depended upon, and when he issued that manifesto on behalf of his party the conclusion of the people was: "Well, we are likely to see this policy carried out." There was considerable

discussion amongst the voters of the country over what had happened, and practically one third of the electors in 1924 never went to the polls at all, and a number of the supporters of the past Government had changed over to the present Government, which gave the present Government the reins of power. Well they changed over because, as I have already stated, they were acting on the belief that they were going to have a Government that was going to carry out a policy of economy and retrenchment that had been preached on the platforms throughout the Northern districts particularly during the last three years.

The present party in control of the Government to-day had their agents travelling over the Northern districts, and their theme was the one of economy and retrenchment, and they gave a lot of facts and figures with regard to all the money that was being expended, and the result of that agitation was, as I have said before, it was not without its good effect. It accomplished a certain amount of good. It had helped to prepare the minds of the people to look forward to a reduction in the number of the employees of the Civil Service, because that was one of the things harked on more than anything else. There were too many Civil Servants, too much money wasted on unnecessary roads, and on unnecessary bridges and wharves; and I heard it stated that you could go into a settlement and find three wharves where one would serve the people just as well, but because there was a division between the people in that settlement, one division had to have a wharf on one side of the harbour, while another had to have one on the other side.

The consequence was that right throughout the country there was a multitude of unnecessary works in the districts. It increased the burden of the taxpayers. The people, not seeing when they made their demands for these public works that the money was not coming from some one else but themselves, they were surprised to find that there was one million more dollars more added on to the taxation. When they found that out, they began to howl.

I have said that the people of this country had had their minds prepared for a reduction in expenditure and taxation, and they were prepared to see a lot of economies effected, and to-day, looking forwards as they have been for the last twelve months, giving the Government time since last June to go through the various departments and investigate the Civil Service throughout the country, they come in and they find practically no change whatever. It is true that we have employed Commissioners to come from outside countries and examine into some departments, and you have not abided by their decisions in some cases..

The Civil Service was to have been reformed. How are you going to reform it. You say that you want greater efficiency in the departments. You stated that you employed these Commissioners in order to bring about great efficiency in these departments. We have not seen any. In fact if the truth were known, it would be this, that there is less efficiency in some of the departments than ever there was before. Why? You cannot expect anything different, just as long as you bring in men from outside the department, and put them over the heads of men in the department. Over men who have given long service to the Government, men who have merited promotion; and find themselves turned down for persons who have no experience. Well you can only expect discontent. You can only expect dissatisfaction. You cannot expect that esprit de corps that the

Minister of Finance has talked about in his Budget Speech. If that be so, all the money that you have expended on these Commissions has been so much money wasted. It has been of no service to the country, and has been entirely lost to the taxpayers.

The Premier when addressing himself to the electorate in 1924 made some very fine remarks from the standpoint of many, by which, if he had practised them, he would have accomplished a great deal of good. This is what he said:

"The condition of the public finances is very bad. I fear that it is worse than is generally known. Public expenditure must be drastically reduced . . . . . .

We have not seen it.

"The Public Expenditure must be drastically reduced. The Customs Tariff must be rearranged, with a view particularly to encourage the prosecution of the fisheries."

I would like to know what rearrangement has been made in the Tariff to encourage the prosecution of the Fisheries. The tariff, if anything, is in a worse position than it was before. If ten per cent. on lines and twines is an evidence of that, I I can't see how the Prime Minister or any other person can say that this is an encouragement to the fishermen of this country, and not only in connection with lines and twines; but I say that practically every article that is used in connection with the fisheries stands much higher according to the tariff that has been brought into this House than it did last year. There is nothing there to encourage the prosecution of the fisheries.

"The cost of the public services must be reduced and efficiency must be increased." Well, we have not seen yet where the public service has been reduced or its efficiency increased. It is not for me to enter into details in this connection.

(Reads from manifesto)

Well I could well understand the Prime Minister if he had been imbued with that energy that he speaks of in his manifesto. There would have been some reforms carried out along these lines.

(Reads from manifesto)

I can quite understand why the people to-day are disappointed; why they feel so sore over the actions of the Government in presenting this tariff that came into the House last week. Everywhere, it does not matter which side of politics they belong, people are affected by this tariff, the women just as much as the men.

I have some opinions to offer.

(Reads from Manifesto)

Then he comes on and criticises the past Government.

(Reads)

Well now, if the past Government are deserving of all that criticism, what can be said of the present Government? Have they done any better, I ask? Up to the present time I have not seen that the Government has made any step in the direction in which the Prime Minister said he was going to carry on the Government of the country. Of course, one can well understand why this thing is not happening, because the political expediency of the Government has to be considered in the interest of the country.

The tariff that we have before us, as I have stated, is directly opposite to what the Prime Minister pointed out was going to be done. Instead of reduction of taxation we are witnessing an increased amount to about one million dollars. This means that not only will the people of the country be taxed a million dollars more upon the necessities of life, but they will have to pay profit on the taxes of a million dollars; for every man in business knows that the merchant who is selling goods adds taxes on his

goods; and if the taxation is one million dollars, and if there is twenty five per cent. profit added to this, it will mean another two hundred and fifty thousand dollars; and instead of the million dollars taxation it will mean a million dollars more; and the people of this country are expected to take these things quietly. To verify this I have gone to some extent to the tariff of last year and compared it with this year's tariff. We have an article like ready-made clothes. Who buys ready-made clothes? Is it the rich man, is it the well-to-do man that goes down to Water Street and looks for a suit of ready-made clothes? No, it is the man with the small income who cannot afford to go to a tailor and pay twenty or thirty dollars to have a suit made. He has to go and buy a ready-made suit; and the tax on ready-made clothes is increased.

MR. BRADLEY—That is not true. You know that it is not true.

MR. GRIMES—You will agree that the tariff is increased on readymade clothing.

MR. BRADLEY—It is not increased to that amount.

MR. GRIMES—Well the duty on ready-made clothes is 45 p.c. Added to that is a tax of ten per cent. and five per cent. That brings up practically to an increase of twenty per cent. The total increase is really about 27 p.c. I have had that figured out by one who imports readymade clothes showing the amount of duty that was paid last year as compared with this year, under the new tariff.

HON. MR. BRADLEY—You don't know what duty will be paid this year.

MR. HALFYARD—Well, what are we supposed to go by? What are we wasting our time here for? If that is not the tariff that is going to be put in force, well then, adjourn the House and put in a new tariff.

MR. GRIMES—Do I understand that there are to be some amendments made to the tariff?

MR. CHAIRMAN—Yes, quite a number.

PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I think that the tariff that is laid on the table holds good. There are some amendments to be made by the Minister of Finance, and it is up to this House to either reject them or adopt them as they come along.

MR. GRIMES—Well, why not present the amendments to the House?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The tariff has to be read, and I take it that the Minister of Finance, when he gets to each item, will mention the amendment to be made in the tariff; but as I understand it, the tariff that the Minister of Finance has laid on the Table of the House becomes law until it is amended in this House.

MR. HALFYARD—Well then it is quite in order for the member to speak to the present tariff.

MR. GRIMES—Now, the increase in the tax on ready-made clothes means an additional taxation of about $16,000.00 over last year's taxes. In other words, to give the figures exactly, last year the Customs collected on ready-made $253,990.00, and the duty that will be collected this year at the rate of 70 p.c. will be $300,000.00 or an increase of $46,000.00.

On dry goods, which takes in blankets and quilts and other household necessities of a similar kind, the imports for 1923-24 amountd to $800,000.00. The duty on that plus the surtax was $370,000.00, the increased tax will mean about $440,000.00 more, or an increase of $73,000.00 on that item. Then we have an article as shirt material used for the making of shirts of various kinds on which was collected, last year, about $240,000.00. Under the new tariff there will be collected $286,000.00 or $47,000.00 more. Flannelettes and serges used

for making dresses for the women and children of the country, last year, was imported about $80,000.00 worth of these goods, on which was collected in duty, plus surtax, $37,000.00. This year $45,000.00 will be collected, an increase of $7,400.00. Hats and caps imported last year amounted to $155,000.00, the duty was $80,000.00. Under the new rate it will be about $93,000.00 or an increase of $13,000.00. You have materials such as tweeds and cottons that are used in making clothes for boys and men. Last year $180,000.00 worth was imported on which was collected $83,000.00. This year with the new duty $100,000.00 worth more will be imported, and the increased duty will be $17,000.00. Of dress goods you imported $113,000.00, with the surtax the duty was $52,000.00 this year it is $63,000.00 or practically $11,000.00 more than last year. Articles such as baking powder and pickles which are used by every householder in this country, $418,000.-00 worth was imported last year, $230,000.00 worth more will be imported this year, and the increase of duty will be $40,000.00. On such articles, as everybody knows is used in every household in the country, last year was imported $325,000 worth and you collected duty to the extent of $150,000. Owing to the increased duty this year, the amount is $29,000 more than it was last year; fifteen per cent or $100,000 is being asked to be paid on sewing machines and knitting machines more than last year; on Radway's Ready Relief, a Patent Medicine used in every household, the duty has increased from thirty to forty to forty-five per cent. or something like $10,000 this year; on paints the duty has increased $19,000; tobacco is outrageously increased from forty five to fifty per cent and ad valorem, and means an additional expense of twenty thousand dollars per year on the consumers. Take tinware. Tinware is used by the poorer class of people, while aluminum is used by the rich people. The duty is increased from fifty eight per cent. to sixty seven per cent. This mean an additional tax on the poorer classes of about eight thousand dollars. You have increased molasses from five to seven cents per gallon, and that means that another eight thousand dollars has to come out of the pockets of the working class of people of the country because very little of the well-to-do class of the community use molasses. Now the Finance Minister said that he was arranging this Tariff according to one's ability to pay. Well, certainly he did not arrange on this basis when he put up the duty twenty five per cent on axes and edged tools. Surely then such is not the sort of tariff that is going to encourage the fisheries of the country because a man who owns a vessel to-day has to spend a great deal more than he did last year to outfit for this year's voyage by reason of the increase of duty on the material that he useses of about fifteen p.c. Then again furniture, which is used in every home, is increased from forty five to fifty five per cent. Last year $103,000 worth of furniture was imported and on which duty was collected amounting to $54,000 and the increased rate of duty will bring it up to a duty of another $10,000. Now everybody has got to have crockeryware in his home, be he rich or poor; but there is no difference as between the duty on common crockeryware and the duty on expensive crockeryware, and, therefore, I do not see how the tariff falls equally on the rich and poor, as we were told by the Finance Minister, because the duty anticipated to be collected this year from chinaware and crockeryware is practically about six hundred dollars more than last year.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FIN-.

ANCE—You know that the duty on chinaware will be more than on crockeryware.

MR. GRIMES—If you make a difference in the price here, why not make a difference in the duty on other articles in the same proportion?

As regards wall paper. Every householder has to use wall paper whether he is rich or poor, if he would have his house look tidy and decent. The amount of duty last year was $28,000.00 this year it is $33,000.00 or practically $6,000.00 more. Every householder and every person uses such a necessity as elastic and boot laces. The duty on those things increased from 25 p.c. to 50 p.c., that is practically double. Again, everybody likes to write a letter to his friends or his sweetheart, and I am sure that the Minister of Finance does not want to discourage things of that kind. I think that he ought to be pleased to encourage such things. But according to this tariff he wants to discourage this sort of thing. You are increasing the duty on wrapping paper and envelopes and writing paper. There is another item. Baby carriages, etc. The duty on these is increased from 40 p.c. to 60 p.c. I don't know whether the Finance Minister wants the people to adopt the French method of having small families and happy homes. Well, according to this tariff, that is just what it will do. I think that the Minister ought to consider that the population is not increasing very much. The duty amounts to about $6,000. Matches have been increased from 30 p.c. to 50 p.c. Well that is going some. Everybody in the home uses matches. Boots and shoes were imported last year to the value of $300,000. The duty collected was $180,000. The duty under the new tariff will be 210,000 or an increase in taxation of 29,000. Brushes were imported last year. Now everybody wants boot brushes or clothes brushes. Last year they imported $20,000 worth. The duty was $9,000. This year it is $11,000. Practically 16 p.c. more than last year.

There is a lot of other items which would take a considerable time to comment upon, but I have totalled up the increase in taxation under the new tariff; and the amount according to the estimates made here, and I have got it nearly correct, is $800,000. Now I have not included every item upon which there is an increase in taxation. When you consider that there are a great many articles that have risen in value since last year. Woollen goods have risen 10 or 20 p.c. We will have an increased duty on the imports on account of the increased value of all these articles. Same thing applies to hardware. There is an increase over last year on which we will get an increased duty on the increased value. I have estimated that you are going to have $70,000 or $80,000 more in taxes due to the increased value of the goods coming in to the country.

Mr. Chairman I submit that there is no reason whatever for such a drastic change in the tariff. There is no reason to impose such a heavy increase in taxes upon the people of this country. It is entirely unfair. The Minister of Finance has not given a good and justifiable reason why he wants this heavy increase in taxation. It is true that a loan of two million dollars was raised last year, upon which the Government will have to pay $100,000 extra in interest. And the people have got to pay for it. This country did not ask for a policy of that kind in connection with the building up of agriculture or the bringing about an increase in the tariff of this country. This tourist traffic policy has been discussed several times during the session, and I still contend that we have the means at our disposal that can bring more

tourists in this country than have come in before without placing the country under the expense of spending another two million dollars, which necessitates an increased interest charge of $100,000 and probably $70,000 or $80,000 a year for the upkeep of the roads. The people of this country want to see the money spent wisely and well, and not upon visionary schemes. We have said that we have the fisheries in this country that have never been developed to the extent that they have been in Norway or Canada or the United States, and that practically this industry has been ignored. Now there are 50,000 people engaged in this industry and almost everybody of this country outside of the lumber mills and the pulp mills which are productive industries, outside of these everybody is practically dependent on the fishing industry of this country. We have seen that the catch of fish on the Labrador was 600 quintals 20 or 30 years ago, and it is practically half to-day. About 150 schooners are prosecuting the fishery now compared to 300 twenty or thirty years ago. The Bank fishery has now only about 30 or 40 vessels compared to 150 ten or twenty years ago. At the same time there has been no serious attempt made on the part of the Government in order to encourage the people to stay at the fisheries, upon which our country depends so largely. Every steamer going out at the prescnt time takes a number of our young men from the northern districts to the United States and Canada to find employment, because the returns from the fisheries does not warrant them in remaining home. And we are doing nothing to arrest that emigration from this country from year to year. Then again there is practically no canning industry in this country. We have decided that there will be a close season with regard to the lobster fishery for a number of years; and the canning industry in connection with that fishery is done for that period. I suggest that the Government should try and popularize fish as a food, and to put up all sorts of fish. In some cases good subsidies are given, or they are helped out in other ways in order to get that product before the people of the country. We have witnessed in Canada during the past year, and in the United States not only the past year, but also the previous year, persons experienced in the art of cooking food, and they are going around trying to popularize fish as a food. I submit that if we encourage the fishing industry to that extent we would be able to utilize in Newfoundland more fish than we did last year. How can we expect the people of other countries to take up the buying of our fish if we show that we value it so little ourselves. We are not enthusiastic about the chief industry of this country, and if we are not enthusiastiv about it ourselves how can we expect others to be so; and I say that the Government is negligent of this matter at this session of the legislature for not giving more attention to the fisheries of this country than it is doing. There is another question that I would like to ask the Minister of Finance, in connection with his budget. There was to be collected twenty-five cents a barrel on flour, and that has been removed, and I understand that there was an agreement with the Newfoundland Milling Company that the tax of twenty five cents a barrel would not be removed off the floor. Now are we going to dishonour our agreement with this company?

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Any agreement that is made by the Newfoundland Government is not going to be dishonoured. But I might say that that is a matter that

is being adjusted at the present time by the Government.

MR. GRIMES—Now in reference to the income tax, Mr. Chairman, seeing that that has been brought up, that is another thing that I think that the Government has been making a mistake in removing. About two hundred thousand dollars was collected last year from this source for the revenue of the colony. And this was from the people who are willing to pay and who should not complain after all. They are getting more benefits out of the country than the poor man, and it is only right that they should pay according to the benefits that they receive. Now if it is a hardship to pay five per cent, then it might have been reduced to two and a half per cent, and then you could have collected a hundred thousand dollars or more. It was stated here by the Colonial Secretary that the income tax was one of the reasons why the steamship that this country had built was built in Holland instead of in Great Britain; and the reason was that the income tax was bearing so heavily on the industries of Great Britain that the cost of the steamship was much greater in Great Britain than in Holland, and as a consequence the shipbuilding firms of Holland were able to underbid the firms of Great Britain. Now I do not think that the Colonial Secretary was quite correct in this, because they pay practically the same income tax in Holland as in Great Britain. In Germany they pay income taxes on certain incomes just as high as they do in Great Britain.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—The Capitalists of Great Britain are looking for opportunities to invest their capital in other parts of the world because of the income taxes in Great Britain.

MR. GRIMES—No matter what part of the world you look at you will find that they are paying the income taxes. But the reason that the Germans can outbid the English firms is because of the better organisation. Their organisation is far ahead of the British Shipbuilding firms, and I am told on very good authority that British steel sells cheaper in Germany than in Great Britain.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—The strikes are the things that make the English prices so much higher than any others.

MR. GRIMES—That is a statement that will have to be verified. There are certain classes of mechanics in Germany that are paid just as big salaries as the men of Great Britain, and I have these figures from the International Labour Bureau on which there is a British representative. That is a matter that we all know about, but we are loath to admit it, that the British manufacturers are slow in catching up to the ideas of the modern times. The English make the more solid article I am prepared to admit, but the Germans and the Americans make the article that is most useful to the people, and that is the answer why at the present time the British article is not the cheapest article. Well now the point that I want to get at is this, Mr. Chairman, that the British people are paying the income tax without very much complaint. According to Mr. Winston Churchill, there are eighty nine thousand people of Great Britain with incomes that amount to five hundred and eleven million pounds on which they pay income taxes that amount to one hundred and seventy seven million pounds or about thirty five per cent. of their incomes. And in regard to the collection of the income taxes in Canada the amount that is collected there is so much greater in comparison to the number of people. The total income tax in Canada which was collected there up to the ending

of the official year at March 31, 1925, was fifty six millions of dollars. After deductions had been made from this the net amount was $54,205,000. Now we talk about the fishermen of this country, but they are in the same position as the farmer is in Canada, and out of this only 4663 were not farmers who paid the income tax as compared with 140,000 who paid it altogether. There were 240,000 persons paid the income tax in Canada and only about four thousand five hundred of these people were not farmers. In the case of the fisherman, he makes two or three thousand dollars this year, and perhaps the next year is a bad one, and then he makes only perhaps five or six hundred dollars, and you cannot collect an income tax on such an uncertain income. In Canada twenty one thousand of the professionals paid income taxes amounting to two million three hundred thousand dollars. Of employers 177,000 paid an income tax amounting to thirteen millions, and the merchants of whom 17,000 paid the taxes, paid two millions eight hundred and sixteen thousand dollars. 1923 manufacturers paid $740,000 income taxes. And this made a total of twenty five millions that was received from income taxes for the revenue of the Canadian Government. Now take the Province of New Brunswick. They collected an income tax last year amounting to $679,000.00, and the province of Nova Scotia with a population only one and a half times that of Newfoundland paid income taxes amounting to $1,074,000. And these were the income returns of 180,000 people. And there is no repeal of the Nova Scotia income tax in that province, and we have no repeal of the income tax in the Dominion of Canada for the taxes of the Province of Nova Scotia. So, I think, Mr. Chairman, that the Government is acting very unwisely and very unjustly in removing the income taxes from the incomes of the people of this country. And it seems that there is to be no provision on the part of the Government for the placing of the man, the smaller man with a large family in a better position than he was in last year or in any other year, and that is the business that is taking up the time of the Governments of every country, and they are endeavouring to devise ways and means to make it easier for the labouring man and the producer and his family so that they can live better than they did formerly. We have done absolutely nothing to make conditions better for the labouring man of Newfoundland; and in so far as the unemployed are concerned, I think it is a disgrace—an absolute disgrace to give out a dole to people who are sick of being treated as people receiving charity, and who are looking for employment and not doles. Men today are seeking to be independent, and do not want to be going round with their fingers in their mouths, and getting a note to go down and get groceries at a store. They want to be independent men who can get the cold cash in their hands, and go round and buy what they like, and any Government that conducts government on a different basis from that deserves the same condemnation which was given in the Old Country the other day by Sir Edward Cooke, of New Zealand, when he saw the demoralizing conditions to which the people of Great Britain, to the extent of one million two hundred and fifty thousand, had descended by the receiving of the dole in that country; and you have got the means in your hands to relieve that condition. You did not have to keep the people in that manner. You have means at your disposal—you have loans at your disposal; and you can put them to work and let them go home with some money

to provide for the needs of themselves and their families.

The Minister of Finance gives us another reason for the increase in taxation, namely, that the salaries of officials were partly paid out of contingencies, instead of salaries account. In his budget speech the Minister said:

"Some of the increase is due to the inclusion of salaries which were never heretofore imported into the Estimates. In my explanation to the House when introducing the Estimates a few days ago, I explained the reasons for these. They have been actually paid from other accounts such as Contingencies and Supplies, and are not really increases in the strict sense of the word, and that it was the intention of the present Government to see that as far as possible all regular salary votes are placed in the Estimates under their proper heads . . . . . ."

But we do not find any reduction in the Contingencies Account in consequence. If that account has been used for the purpose of paying the salaries of some of the officials, why are not the Contingencies Accounts reduced to that extent. We find that that account is this year the same as it was last year. So that this is another instance to show that there has been really no serious consideration of the Tariff, or even of the Estimates, or to the increases that must have been effected.

Mr. Chairman, I say that I see no justification for the putting on of duties that will bring in an extra revenue of one million dollars this year. The income tax, if left where it was, would have provided three hundred thousand dollars. And the excuse given is that you cannot enforce the law in this country. A very lame excuse. Really you don't want to do anything that is likely to give offence to some of your supporters. What is the use of our passing laws, if you do not do anything to enforce them. Decreased expenditure—that was the cry of the last election. If you retained that Income Tax you would have had at least three hundred thousand dollars coming into your revenue.

And if you had abided by the agreement with the Milling Company you would have had another one hundred thousand dollars from that source, which makes another bit. And those increased duties—the increased prices without the duties on some of those articles, the increased duty that would come from the increased prices that would have to be paid on goods coming into this country today, would bring in at least another one hundred thousand dollars.

Not only that Mr. Chairman, but if you are going to enforce the Customs Act and make everybody pay duty on the goods that they import into this country, which they should pay, it would mean more. I have not any hesitancy in saying that if the Customs Act were enforced, and the people who import goods into this country were made to pay their proper share of duty, you would collect one hundred and fifty thousand dollars more from that source alone, and perhaps even more. There is no doubt that the inattention which has been paid all through the country to the collection of duties, has not been for the good of the country. Some people have being paying duties, and others practically nothing. They are getting in goods on false invoices, or by some other wrong means. I will commend the Minister of Finance and Customs on having done something in that connection; but now that he has started to do it, he cannot afford to let up on it. He will have to go through with it; and if he goes through with it, I have no doubt that

there will be at least another two hundred thousand dollars coming into the revenue of the country that has been lost to it for the last two or three years.

If you put those things down you have:

From the Income Tax $300,000.00
From your agreement with
the Knitting Mills 100,000.00
And from the enforcement
of the Customs Act 200,000.00

And you have in the neighbourhood of six hundred thousand dollars more for your revenue without having to make any increase on the tariff—without placing any more burden on the people of this country—or adding to an already overburdened people.

I do not know that any reason can be given for the removal of the Bank Tax. Of course, there are reasons given, I know. It has been reduced from $128,000.00 down to about $50,000, a saving of about $70,000.00. Whether the people of this country will be any better off, or whether the trade will be any better off, for that remains to be seen, but at any rate, it seems to me that if the Banks are receiving consideraiton, and the men who are paying income tax are receiving consideration, I cannot see why in the world the men living on small incomes are not receiving more consideration. They had a hard enough time before, but it is going to be much harder for them now. Is that fair or just. There is no one sitting in this chamber to-day that will say that taxation arranged upon that basis is a just and fair way of collecting revenue.

Mr. Chairman, the people of this country have looked forward to this Government bringing not an increase in taxation, but a reduction of taxation. A reduction in taxation can only come about, as the Prime Minister stated a few days ago, by a reduction in expenditure. It may not be carried out to any large extent, but I submit that if the laws of this country are enforced properly in connection with the Customs, and in connection with the carrying out of the Income Tax, that you would never need to put on a solitary cent on the duty on any article of necessity in this country, and the Government would stand discredited in the eyes of the people, it stands discredited to-day, if it attempts to put a tariff like this into force. You will never alter the minds of the people if you put this tariff into force. It will mean that the man of the small income will have to pay another twenty five or thirty dollars a year out of his income over and above what he had to pay last year, and some may have to pay more than that. The people are looking for relief and not for heavier expenditure, or heavier burdens. They are looking for lighter burdens; and the people of this country are a long suffering people, and a patient people, but you should not take advantage of them to the extent that you are doing by imposing upon them to the extent shown in this new Tariff.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I would call the attention of the Hon. Minister of Finance to a remark made, when he was not in the House, by Mr. Grimes, when he first began to speak. His figures were questioned by the Hon. Member for Port de Grave, Mr. Bradley, who said that Mr. Grimes did not know what the tariff was, and we do not like to go any further until we know what the tariff is. It is a very funny situation of course to be considering a tariff when a member of the Executive Government will tell us that we are debating something that we do not know anything about. If this tariff is not the one that we have to debate, I would like the Hon. Minister to tell us what are the changes.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Chairman, this tariff is the tariff that we are debating, with one or two changes of very minor importance, and if you allow the tariff to be read, you will see the changes as you go along. The only way we can get this tariff right is to lay it on the table of the House and hear the criticisms. I am glad the Hon. Member for Twillingate said this. I will have a little more to say later on, in connection with this tariff. But I want to hear the criticism.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Chairman, on that point, I think it would be better for the Minister of Finance and Customs to give a clear explanation of just what the Government has done in connection with the tariff. I for one do not feel like standing up and debating it until I know what alterations, if any, have been made.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, the following are the only alterations that have been made in the new tariff since it has been introduced:

Clause 72—Candy is changed from 25 to 35 p.c.

Clause 74—Tea, the ad valorem is taken off.

Clause 77—Is changed only in the verbage.

Clause 79—Tobacco is changed from 50 cents a pound to 48 cents and 10 p.c.

Clause 81—On cigarettes, manufactured, the duty of 10 p.c. is still on.

Clause 85—The words Tin-Tags, Tinfoil and Wrapping Paper come out.

Clause 96—Oak, for the manufacture of oil barrels, is free.

Clause 101—The words "To be used in manufacturing" are crossed out.

Clause 140—Add the words "Iron" and "Steel."

Clause 173—Add the words "Zinc" —the duty is 48 p.c, instead of 55 p.c.

Clause 190—Dry Cell Batteries (Single and Multiple Cell) imported solely for the use of fishermen, are reduced from 50 p.c. to 40 p.c.

Clause 198—A clause is added, namely, parts of machinery for motor boats engaged in the fisheries—the ad valorem duty is 30 p.c. instead of 50 p.c.

Clause 200—A clause is added, viz., "And patent sealers for use of canners.

Clause 202—There is an addition to include Ruling, Pageing, Perforating Machines, and Ruling Pads.

Clause 229—The words "Dressed Feathers" are stricken out.

Clause 237—Add men's and youths' long rubber boots. The duty is reduced from 55 p.c. to 44 p.c.

Clause 247—Sole Leather in the hide or side is reduced from 25 p.c. to 20 p.c. Sole Leather in strips imported by manufacturers for use in their factories is now 25 p.c.

Clause 250—After the last line add "Cement," "Glues," and "Paste."

Clause 257—Add Binding Cloth, Marking Paper.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman, relative to the discussion of the Budget, I would like to state first of all that at the present time, which is about the closing hours of the Legislature, it is a most inopportune time to spring upon this country the tariff that we are now discussing. Had the tariff been introduced and put before this House at an earlier date so that honourable members might have an opportunity of going into the matter thoroughly, and whereby the Government might have looked upon themselves as having done something towards the re-classification of duties, there might have been some excuse.

But as it is, Mr. Chairman, I submit that this report of the Tariff Commission that was appointed on the 29th of April, 1922, and made its

report on March 11th, 1924, which took over two years to prepare, should not be hurried through this House within a week or ten days of its closing. I consider, Mr. Chairman, that it is very unfair in this regard. I asked the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs a few days ago whether it was the intention of the Government to print this report. It is a very important document, and one which should be kept for reference; I understand that the Commission cost somewhere in the vicinity of $13,000.00, and I do not think that the amount which would be necessary to print their findings should be looked upon as a waste and not essential.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that the Government in bringing in the report of the Tariff Commission and accepting its findings in toto is to-day springing upon the country which I beg to claim it has not given the consideration which the Government should have. I would like to know how these members opposite have had a chance to read it. I doubt whether anybody with the exception of perhaps the Minister of Finance has gone into the matter at all. I consider that this thing should have been gone into thoroughly by the Executive Government first of all and then by the members of the Government as well. I have just had a few minutes to look over a few of the remarks that are included here in this report. I find that their powers were limited. They were called upon to investigate and enquire into the rearrangement of the tariff and they were not given any authority to reduce the tariff. They were asked to keep within the estimates of 1921. They had certain duties to perform and they naturally have gone into the matter and they have done their duty. But it was within the premises of the Government to have gone into this matter thoroughly and to have taken off the taxes or to have adjusted or brought to the consideration of this House any anomalies that may have existed and which the Hon. Minister might have changed.

Now I can see, Mr. Chairman, and the Members of this House can see what has happened. It had been figured out that this tariff would give an increased revenue. Certain alterations such as the duty on pork, beef and gasolene had been taken off, also the income tax removed and the bank tax reduced. It was hoped to have made up for these reductions by bringing in the report of the tariff Commission and accepting its findings in toto. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance if he has the answer to my question yet.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—I am still busy preparing it.

MR. ASHBOURNE—I had hoped to have had that information before speaking on this question this afternoon. As I said before, I think that this is a most inopportune time for the Government to be introducing this new tariff. We have heard a lot about increased revenue, and after having looked at the tariff and after having read through some of the report of the Commission I find, or I am lead to believe, that a great deal of the published revenue that recently came in to the country probably on account of the people fearing that the tariff would be increased, and they got their goods in very early this year. Now as I said before, we are at the moment starting on the fisheries and there will be considerable confusion amongst the merchants and the business men who are supplying for the fisheries now that the duties are being increased. I was speaking to a party this morning about certain engine parts and I said to him in a jocular manner that I supposed that

he had all his stock in before the new duties came in. He said no, that he had just passed entries for them after the duties had been increased.

To say that St. John's is disappointed is a very weak term and when I say St. John's is disappointed I consider that those are the least disappointed people in the island. When the Hon. Members go back to their outport constituencies I know the story that they will have to tell. I know what they will have to face and they will have to put up very good arguments in my opinion to try and convince the fishermen as to the necessity of bringing in these new duties and increasing taxation. Well, Sir, as I said before, they are not only disappointed, but the majority of the people, I believe, have lost faith in the present Government, chiefly owing to what the Government has done the past session. They went to the country and promised less expenditure and reduced taxation and what do we find to-day. We find to-day that the taxes are increased. We also find that they are being shifted from the shoulders of the people who were better able to pay the taxes than the people on whose shoulders they are now placed. And I feel sure to-day that if the present Government went to the polls to-day many of them would not save their nomination fee.

I consider that the Government in appointing a tariff commission did a very wise thing. But I don't think that it is a right thing for nine or ten men to go and judge and take evidence and bring in a tariff, and without consideration by the Government, force it on the whole of the Island. As I said before, it was not within their power to reduce the tariff. They had to carry out their instructions.

I would like to read some remarks that are appended to the report of the Commission as regards the outports, and anyone that has any desire to judge the expression of feeling of the outports will find it here. The Commission stated that it was anxious to get the sentiment of the outports and they sent to the different magistrates to get any evidence that would help the Commission to come to a decision. (Reads.)

The outports all asked for a decrease in taxation. Now what do we find. We find that the 25 p.c. that has been taken off has been placed on again. Now this is a very broad report and to discuss it intelligently would take up a great deal of time. I do not desire to prolong the House to any great extent. I do however consider it my duty to stand up and defend the man whose voice should be heard and cannot be heard. We see ample evidence of men who have been in the position to make their weight, money and their power felt, but the man on the street, the ordinary man, I doubt whether his voice is heard at all. Now let me read some of the Tariff Commission's report. It is only natural to try and protect the revenue. No doubt we have to get a revenue, but when the revenue is collected from the people for the benefit of a few to the detrimnet of the masses, then the question is opened up as to whether it is right to give increased protection. As I said before, Mr. Chairman, the Government had one of the finest chances in the world to cut down the tariff and to have reduced the anomalies which may have existed. This Commissioner's report brings conditions back to 1921 with the ten per cent surtax, and the twenty five per cent supertax and the five per cent sales tax and this Government, if they had carried out their promises, would have cut down the expenditure and they could have reduced to a very grati-

fying extent the duties which this new tariff, as laid bfore us, calls for. It goes on to say:—

(Reads the Budget Speech)

Now, I submit Mr. Chairman, that as far as the business men and the trade are concerned there may be some in favour of this tariff, but as far as the man on the street is concerned I can assure the present Government that they have lost caste and the man on the street has lost confidence in the government and to-day looks upon it as a merchants' Government. (Reads).

This tariff is a document that has taken two years to complete and then was submitted a year ago and now it is brought into this House and embodied in the Budget Speech of the Minister. As far as I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, I think that the Government was very illadvised not to have given the matter the consideration that it should have. As far as I can see we have not been able to see anything from the present Government that we were told by them that we were going to see. The Government has no well founded policy. It is dabbling here and dabbling there, but as far as a well founded policy is concerned there is none, and that is why the public to-day is beginning to lose confidence in it. To-day things are in a flux. We are in a period even at the present time of reconstruction and to bring in at the present time a new tariff when the business of the country is not settled down shows, I consider, that the Government has made a very grave mistake. In fact I do not know but that the best thing that could happen to Newfoundland would be to reduce the customs taxes and then there might be more goods imported. There are opinions as to whether this might or might not be the best way. There would then be a greater importation of goods and they could sell more cheaply. The purchasing power of the dollar would be increased and the working man's earnings would go further, so that as the importations would increase the customs would also benefit. What is going to be the effect of this duty? I think that the Minister is going to see an almost immediate reduction in the customs revenue of the country. If you will compare the customs returns of May, June and July of 1925 with the corresponding months of the last year I submit, Mr. Chairman, that we shall see a very considerable falling off. As regards the protection. If we were a manufacturing country, which we are not and never will be; I mean a manufacturing country to such an extent that most of the people were employed in the manufacturing trades and we had a big export trade, then there might be some reason why we should have some increased protection, but to-day in Newfoundland we are a fishing population, and to-day the great necessity is a reduction of taxation so that fish may be caught more cheaply. How can you compete against Norway or Iceland or France or any others of these countries if we do not do something to reduce the cost of the production of our fish? We all know that it costs more for us to catch fish than it does in these other countries, and that is the reason why this thing should be gone into more thoroughly and have it seen to that the cost of fish is cut down to an irreducible minimum. And I don't think that the present Government is going to get any thanks from the fishermen of the country for giving this protection to the local companies. As far as I can see, Mr. Chairman, if things keep on going as they are we will soon be reduced to the position of a Crown Colony or have to go into confederation because the time will soon come when our expenditure will be more than our income, and then there will have to

be another way out. Mr. Grimes this afternoon referred to the cviil service and he brought out several points that appealed to me. We were told that a great many of the increases in the salaries of the civil service were formerly paid out of the contingencies, and yet to-day we find that the vote for contingencies is the same as it was before. I thought just now that when the Hon. Member for Twillingate was interrupted that the Hon. Minister of Finance was going to give us some interesting information and that there had been some alteration in the duties on readymades. But there is an increase of forty six thousand dollars. And yet there are people in this country who are unable to earn their living, and the result is that they have to leave the country. They go up to Canada or some other place and there they earn money and send it down to their families to keep them from being hungry, and yet what do we find? We find that instead of being reduced the taxes and the difficulty to earn a living have increased, and I do not see where the sense of the Government came in to increase this duty on articles of clothing which are badly needed by these people of the outports. The duties have gone up on the clothing for men, women and children of the outports, and these who have had enough to feed themselves and their wives and their children are to-day going without as much clothing as they would like to have. I can assure the members of this House, and I know the conditions of the outports better perhaps than a large number of the members of this House, that some of the fishermen are going to need clothing in the near future. I can already see the handwriting on the wall. I can see that their term is short and I want to say that their incompetence is the reason why the Government has lost out as far as the sentiments of the people are concerned. I can assure them that the consensus of opinion in the outports is strongly against the new tariff bill, and also against a great many of the other schemes that have been brought before the House this session.

Take for instance the matter of tourist roads. I do not wish it to seem that I am harping on one particular thing all the time; but nevertheless I am constrained to do so; I feel that it is my duty, and that I would be a very poor representative indeed if I did not stand up here and take the place of the man in the outports, whose voice cannot be heard, and the position of the man in the street who cannot make himself heard. We see here evidence, ample evidence of companies, big companies, making their voices heard, and asking for protection, and receiving some; but there has not been the same chance given the fisherman, the man in the outport, to have his voice heard.

The matter of spending this money on tourist roads, as I have said here before this afternoon when presenting a petition from Twillingate District on the subject of a road—as I said then—we all know that our roads in Newfoundland have fallen into disrepair during the last few years, on account of the high cost of labour, of lumber and timber, wages, nails, etc.; and also due to the fact that the annual grant—the road grant—has been altogether insufficient to take care of the requirements which have been necessitated by our roads. The result is that wherever you go to-day in the outports you see that the roads have practically gone to rock bed.

I contend, Mr. Chairman, that this money should be spent, or a large proportion of it should be spent on reconditioning the roads that we have

at the present time. There are stumps sticking up through them; there is mud that is almost ankle deep; and still we see that the grant is not increased. I do not know what is going to happen to the roads. They will sink out of sight—they will be lost in oblivion—that is what is going to happen to them. But still we are called upon to—or the Government is going to formulate a policy of spending money on building other roads. I contend, Mr. Chairman, that the only fair way of spending this money will be to spend it on a per capita basis; to spend it on contract, so that value will be got out of it, because that is the only way that it is going to be done fairly.

MR. CASHIN—Pardon me, I don't wish to interrupt you—but what did you say you figured was the increase on readymades? What did you make it per cent?

MR. ASHBOURNE—It was 58 per cent. and now it is 70 per cent.

MR. CASHIN—Did you include the five per cent. and the ten per cent. in your calculation, because I thought at first that it was a very big increase, but I find on calculation that it is not so big after all. Suppose a suit of clothes cost twenty dollars. Take 45 p.c. of that—that would be nine dollars. Take ten per cent of that—90 cents, and then five per cent. of the total, plus the freight. The freight on a suit of clothes would be about one dollar.

MR. ASHBOURNE—There is an increase of from twelve to twenty per cent. That is how I figured it out.

MR. CASHIN—I think if the Hon. Member figures it out again he will find that the increase is not so great.

MR. ASHBOURNE—There is an increase of from 12 to 20 p.c.

MR. CASHIN—I figure it out at an increase of about 2½ p.c.

MR. ASHBOURNE—What are your figures? It is sixty five per cent now and 5 p.c. sales tax?

MR. CASHIN—And 5 p.c. that is 70 p.c. Under the new rate a suit of clothes costing twenty dollars would cost thirty four dollars to land. Now take the old rate. Take the 45 p.c.—that amounts to $9.00, and 10 p.c. on that, 90c., and 5 p.c. on the total, that is $1.62. That is altogether—$33.52. That is to say that under the new tariff there will be an increase of 48 cents on a suit.

MR. ASHBOURNE—I will go into it later at my leisure. Even 48 cents is an increase, which the man in the outports can ill afford. He has enough calls upon his income without having to pay an increased price for his clothes. Anyhow, he was looking for a decrease under the Monroe Government, and he has got instead an increase.

As I said before, Mr. Chairman, and as the Prime Minister said the other day, it is a source of great regret to us. In that regard I concur with him —that it is a source of the greatest regret to me. I hoped that the time had come when we were going to see reduced expenditure, when we were going to see economy; but instead of that we see greater estimates, and more revenue levied. We see to-day by the budget speech speech of the Hon. Minister that he needs more revenue; and it is as much as the fisherman in the outports can do to get along. This year the prospects for the fishery, for outfitting for the fishery are not as good as they were a year ago. I think that any business man to-day is at a loss to know whether or not it will be advantageous to go into the fishery business to the same extent this year as last year. I think, sir, that the time has come when the Government should lead the way, when the Government should do everything possible to help the industries of the country, and

institute economy, and show the people that they are starting to clean up, that they are starting to reduce, that they are giving a good example to the people; but instead of that we find higher expenditures, we find that there are increases given when increases are unnecessary, and we find that there is more money being spent instead of less.

Mr. Chairman, I contend that it is alright to protect an industry to a certain extent, but when that protection assumes such a large proportion that it gives protection to a certain class or to a certain company to the detriment of a larger class of people, then I think that the Government should not increase the protection. I consider that the time has come—we should realize that to-day is the time, that if ever there was a time for economy it is the present moment; and now it is your bounden duty to cut down, pare down, reduce your expenditure further, and this is the time when you should keep your promises that you made to the people. It is no good to say that you hoped to have been able to reduce, but on every hand you find that the people want increases. I maintain that those in charge of the Government to-day ought to know that, though it is a hard job, they have to refuse; that they cannot afford to be giving increases; that we cannot afford to be passing out the Colony's money to everybody who asks for it; that you can not be currying favor—you cannot take the country's money and pass it out pell mell to every Tom, Dick and Harry who comes and asks for an increase.

The Committee rose to sit again at eight o'clock.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman, a few moments before recess we were discussing the question of the duties on a suit of clothes costing $20.00. I have gone into this in the meantime and I find that instead of 48 cents that has been spoken of, there has been an increase of $2.56. I am convinced in my own mind that if the members of the Government had any idea that a thing like this would occur I feel sure that they would not have come in here and ask us to sanction such an increase. I am sure that now that the House realises that that steps will be taken immediately to have it adjusted. What is the idea? Is it put there to protect our local industries or is it put there to give revenue? I am sure that when this news gets to the fishermen in the outports that they will be up in arms over it. The Prime Minister said the other day that the people of the country would not judge him by his eight months of administration with a view to returning him again; but I feel sure that the country will say to-night that he will not go there any more, because I am confident that the people who previously had confidence in him, because he promised to give a square deal to all, have lost that confidence at the present time. I have no doubt but that a certain crowd have been appeased; but on the other hand you have the great bulk of the people of the country up in arms against you. Now if this is the result of eight months' work, what will be the result of four years' work —but I do not think that this Government will last for as long a period as four years. Here is an instance of readymade goods that were passed for to-day. They were valued at $131.58. Under the old tariff the duty on that would be $75.08. The duty today, under the new tariff, is $92.09 or an increase of $17.01, which is equivalent to an increase in the rate of duty of 22¾ p.c. Now I feel sure that the members of the Government, including the Prime Minister, in view of what I have stated, have not gone into this matter of the

tariff to any appreciable extent whatever. As I stated this afternoon, I think it is most unreasonable to expect nine men to make a report and have it thrown on the country, without any discussion, without any investigation and without having giving it any consideration. As far as the concensus of opinion goes, people would be much better prepared to have the old tariff in preference to the one we have now submitted to us, no matter what the anomalies are. Now I do not blame the tariff commission for this thing, but I blame the Government for accepting it and for trying to make it the law of the land without having considered it. We sitting here as members of the Opposition it is our bounden duty to look after every man, woman and child in the country and see that their interests are protected, and see that their rights are not interefered with. No doubt arguments were used and evidence was adduced to try and get the commissioners to make a report in order that they might get more increased protection than they had before, and, after all, it would be only natural for any business firm to do that. But if the Executive Council, of nine men, accepted that report, that is no reason why the Opposition should accept it. Therefore, I contend that the Prime Minister and his associates in the Executive should consider this matter and see that, at least, this extra taxation on ready-made clothing should be altered. We know that we are wise in giving certain protection to our local industries, but by doing so we feel that we are keeping the outsiders from dumping goods here and also that we are providing labour for our own people; but when it comes to a question of whether it is right and proper to give added rights and privileges to large corporations it is time to draw the line, I think. Now I say that in fairness to all Companies. I say also in fairness to the man who buys, that the ordinary fisherman does not care very much whom he buys his lines and twines from if he can get them cheaper, whether they are made here or whether they are imported, but naturally we want to encourage and foster our home industries.

I doubt very much whether the members of the Tariff Commission ever had the idea in their heads that this report would be taken and thrown on the country without the consideration which such an important document warrants. There are several items in this tariff which have been reduced. I am glad to see that a reduction has taken place on such things as rubber boots, motor engine parts, etc. These things are much in use in the fisheries. The report states that they were asked to recommend concessions without having the exact returns of the various businesses laid before them. Now you as a Government and we as representatives owe a duty to these people, and if we do not give these things careful consideration we are derelict in our duty. The Prime Minister said the country was crying for increased expenditure. Perhaps there is a large proportion of the country who want an increased expenditure, but I think that the fact that the Prime Minister went to the country on lower expenditure and seeing that he was returned, would tend to disprove that. There may be a certain minority asking for increased expenditure, but the great majority of the people of the country to-day are asking for taxes to be reduced and expenditure to be cut down.

Now let us take up the Budget Speech. The Speech on the Whole is a comparison between the old and the new Government. I don't know that the Minister of Finance will have to

say in the next Budget because then he will not have another Government to criticise. I suppose he will talk about the past year and the present. (Reads)

It is a fact that members of the trade and business firms who were watching the actions of the present Government and knowing that the tariff Commission's report would likely be tabled and accepted and knowing as they did that the taxes were increased they naturally went to work and got their stock in early.

This is a very inopportune time to bring in the new tariff. There are large stocks being held on Water Street and also in other places, and there is no doubt but to-day the business man will probably reason in this way—he has gone to the cost of importing at an advance of 10 or 20 p.c., and if he has to replace the goods he has to pay that extra amount and is entitled to ask that from the fisherman—just at the time when expenditure should be reduced, when the fisheries are about to start. This is a most important time. To-day if you go in to any of the stores along Water Street he hardly knows what the prices are, he does not know whether to quote the old or the new prices.

As I said before, as far as I have heard everybody is contented to go back to the old tariff. Now I don't intend to take any more of the time of the House, except to say that these increases are astounding. Beans, butter, tea, readymades, sugar, dried fruits, hats and caps, etc, all these things have been increased at the time when the public was expecting that there would be a considerable decrease in expenditure.

I am confident that to-day that the people have lost faith in the present Government. Instead of the people getting some of the good things that were promised they are let in for an increase in taxation.

MR. GODDEN—Before reading Section 73, I would like to say that the person responsible for that section must have suffered a brain-storm. I notice the item marmalade has been reduced, and in the same section Nestle's food and other foods of that sort; medically prepared food for infants have been increased. Surely those goods should not be increased in duty. Where has there been that great consideration given to this tariff when it is proposed to adversely affect even the children of the country. I wonder what the Child Welfare Association would have to say if this matter was brought to their attention. This is a great imposition on the infant life of the country. I want to say that these particular foods such as Neave's, Benger's and Allenbury's are greatly needed by the poorer class of people in this country, by the poor woman who cannot naturally feed her infant. This is rather an embarrassing subject, perhaps, to speak upon, but it is nevertheless necessary, and these poor women must have these medical foods for their infants, and now when they go to their grocers and ask for them and find that they have to pay about 20 p.c. more than they had to pay two or three months ago what must they think. I say, Mr. Chairman, that it is this sort of thing that is making the tariff obnoxious to the people of this country. I repeat, you have not given this the serious consideration that it deserves.

Now as regards Sec. 73. I don't know the actual increase in the medical food, but on the surface it shows about 20 p.c., and you have taken that much duty off a commodity that is very little imported. Most people make their own marmalade. And I suggest that these medical goods that I have mentioned are the items that ought to be remedied from an increase

to a decrease in duty. I had been hoping the last few days that the Government had been, shall I say, afraid to carry on this discussion, which they have deferred so often. I had been hoping from day to day that they had come to see the error of their ways or at least that they had made up their minds that they had made a mistake, and that they were going to admit it and to remedy this imposition.

When Mr. Ashbourne was reading the extracts from the report this afternoon I was struck by these words which were contained in that report: "It was the Commissioner's job to find a simple method of applying the duties. It was the prerogative of the Government to increase the taxes." And therefore it is the Government of the day and the Government only who is to blame for the new tariff that we have to-day. The Tariff Commission cannot be blamed for the increase of taxation that has been put on the people of the country today. And right here a sentence has occurred to me in that report, which, if the question was not so serious, one would consider it a huge joke. It was stated that this tariff was a monument to the ability and the knowledge of one man. I wonder are we to take that sentence seriously that this tariff is a monument to any gentleman's knowledge. It is just the reverse. I only rose to my feet to draw the Minister's attention to Sec. 73, and I hope that the reremarks that I have made regarding infant foods will be considered by the Government, and I would say the reverse. I have made these few remarks on this section of the Budget, and I hope that my recommendations will be considered.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Chairman, nearly all the members on this side of the House have been talking about this new tariff and I will also give expression to a few remarks. I think that the worst taxation, Mr. Chairman, is the taxation on lines and twines. This is the article that the fishermen of this country find to be the most expensive of the lot and every encouragement should be given to the fishermen, and instead of the duty being put on it should be taken off. Of course I understand that there was no duty on lines and twines and I think that the fishermen should be given every encouragement. This is what was asked of the Government and this is the square deal that was expected of it. This is not a square deal on the taxation of the lines and twines. This is a thing that will keep perhaps hundreds of the fishermen of the country from prosecuting the fishery this summer. Then, again, there is the increased taxation on rubber boots. That is another item that the fishermen use. There are few men in the country besides the fishermen who use rubber boots, and yet there is an increased taxation of 15 per cent. on them. I say that there should be no increase of taxation on rubber boots and lines and twines. Now, getting away from that, let us look at the duties that have been placed on everything else. I am not going to name the articles that have been increased. I am not a business man and I have no idea of what it will meaan to the men of the country and the working class and the fishermen of the country. How are we going to get around the corner? And the taxation is going up. And the duties are going to amount to somewhere betweeen one and two million dollars more this year than last. If the labouring man of this country to-morrow goes to the boss and asks him for money and tells him that he cannot get along on what he is gettting, he is going to be told that he cannot get any more and that he is not going to get any increase in wages. He has to get along on what

he is getting, which is not sufficient to keep body and soul together. Two years ago I heard the Hon. Minister of Posts and Telegraphs speak from the Opposition side of the House about the section men of this country. They are getting twenty-two and a half cents an hour and they have to live an exile's life. And they have as a rule from three to eight or nine children. What are they going to live on now that the tariff has gone up? He still gets the twenty-two cents, unless the Government increases the wages what is he going to do? What is he going to get to clothe him? He is not going to get enough to do it. And while I am on this point I might speak about the section foremen of this country. I cannot speak too strongly in their favour. A section man gets twenty-two and one-half cents and the foreman gets twenty-five.

MR. CASHIN—That has been increased. The section men get twenty-five and the foremen get thirty.

MR. BROWN—I am very glad to hear that, because these men have a great responsibility on them to keep the railway in condition over which thousands of people have to pass. Mr. Chairman, two or three years ago there was a committee of the United Fishermen of this country who went through the country lecturing for the reduction of taxation, and when they came to Grand Falls I got a letter from one of them, I think it was from Alpheus Stanford. They had a public meeting at Grand Falls and they asked me to speak, and I did. But these same men are the supporters of the present Government who sat on the opposition side of the House at that time, and now where is their condemnation of the increased taxation? With your permission I will read a paragraph of this petition.

(Reads the paragraph.)

I presume that the nonproductive works they refer to are the rock sheds and the building of the road around Green Bay. I do not call that nonproductive. If the presentt Government had some productive works as the rock sheds they might have some stone that is very useful in the repairing of the dock. And at the present time the railroad is crying for rock of that kind.

(Reads.)

Now if they were paying that money then what are they doing to-day? They are taxing them beyond their means. We are borrowing two million dollars for the highroads that will never bring in one-sixteenth of what is to be spent on them. And still they are increasing taxation.

(Reads.)

May I ask again if there have been any new offices formed since the present Government came into power? Perhaps some of the hon. members on that side of the House can tell me. If the United Fishermen of that day thought that there was too great an expenditure of public money in that way, then what do they think now?

(Reads.)

The taxes of that day were nothing to what they are now, and where are the United Fishermen now? They were talking about the taxation of the Squires Government, but what have they to say about the taxation of the present Government? I say that it is a sin and a crime the way the people of this country are being taxed.

(Reads.)

Well, now, I haave no intention of holding up the House for a very long time because I am getting tired of it, but I think that we should continue this session until this thing is fixed or until the extra taxation is taken off and we get back to where we were before. This is not a square deal. It is not a square deal to the fishermen and the labouring men of this country. Raise the standard of living and give the people a chance. The poor woman

to-day has to go on the flake and handle the fish and she has to go on the farm and handle the ground, so give her a chance. It is alright for the wealthy woman. She can go abroad and tour the continent of Europe and she can get her articles in duty free because she brings them in free as wearing apparel. Give the poor woman a chance. One half of the poor people are starved and the other half are naked. That is what is happening to-day throughout the country and the Government is doing very little about it. What is our dollar worth to-day? I say that it is not worth more than forty-five cents And yet the Government has put seventy per cent. on the readymades. It is an outrage. Where is the working man going to get off? He will never get anywhere and he will never get anything. This Government has promised a square deal and where is the square deal? Where does the square deal come in the increase of a million or two in taxation?

Mr. Chairman, this tax is not a just one. It is not fair on the part of the Government to put this taxation in force. They acepted the report of the Tariff Commission holus bolus apparently without giving it any consideration at all. If they did consider it, it was very little consideration it got.

And then we have to be content with what is handed out to us, and undoubtedly this tariff is going to go through no matter what we say about it. Whether we oppose it or say nothing about it, it does not matter—we have to take it.

Here is the man of St. John's who has been fed all this winter and doing no work. They are not earning their money, and they would rather earn their money than work for nothing and get the dole. What are they going to do when they start to work and find out that their dollar is only forty-five cents? It may be worth fifty cents but not a cent more. Who are they going to blame for the taxation in this country? It is ridiculous, it is scandalous, and the labouring man as well as the fisherman all over the country is crying out against it.

The taxation as it at present stands —the tariff should be wiped off and the old tariff should come into force.

I am not going to talk long on the subject. I think our side have said nearly enough on it, though they know that it does not matter what we say or what we do not say. The Government is not prepared to accept any recommendation from this side of the House whether it is on the tariff or any other bill that is before the House. The Opposition is so few in number that they are almost looked upon as nothing at all; but the day is coming, and it is not very far distant, when the present Government will realize that they are making a big mistake by increasing taxation and the burdens of the labouring men of this country.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to go on record as being absolutely opposed to the tariff, and especially in its present form. I would like to say to the Government not to take off duty on one or two different things, but to take it off as a whole and to give us the old tariff that was in force in 1924.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to speak, but there is a matter which Mr. Godden has spoken of that I would say a few words in support of. I certainly think that the Government should be prepared to give it some more consideration, because if there is anything that should be imported into this country without duty it is the food upon which the lives of the children of the country depend. I trust that the Government, as the Finance Minister has suggested that this section should stand over, will see their way clear to take off the fifty per cent. altogether.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, we have had a lot of discussion on the tariff, and the further we get on with it, the more complicated it becomes to some of us, because we all realize that it is about 25 years since we have had a whole new tariff brought into this House, such as this one; and this is a completely new tariff, which deals with practically every article which is imported into the country. Consequently, I maintain that it needs considerable consideration, and it is one which, to my mind, should be gone through most carefully.

In looking over the tariff, and over the list which the Minister of Finance furnished me with this afternoon, I notice that several changes have taken place in the tariff. I must admit that I think the Government has acted wisely in reference to some of the items which are absolutely essential to the prosecution of the fishery, which is the mainstay of the country, no matter what people may say to the contrary. Those items are absolutely essential to the prosecution of the fishery—such as paint, tobacco. batteries for motor engines, together with several other items.

But there is one point on which I would like to be more clear. In going over the tariff I find down on page 39, a resolution which provides "In addition to the duties herein before provided to be raised....., etc., and after that there is a list of flour, pork, and so on. As far as I can gather. as an ordinary lay man, the House is invited to grant permission to the Executive Government to put on duty on pork, etc., if they see fit. I would like to be made clear on that point, and also on the tobacco, five dollars a hundred pounds. I would like the Minister of Finance to explain that to me.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Mr. Chairman, that is what we call a retaliatory clause. The clause reads:

"In addition to the duties hereinbefore provided to be levied, raised, collected, and paid on all goods, wares and merchandise imported into this Colony, there shall be raised, levied, collected, and paid on the goods, wares and merchandise hereinafter in this section mentioned imported into this Colony from countries the fishermen of which have the privilege of taking codfish upon all parts of the coast of Newfoundland and its dependencies, and in which countries duties are or hereafter shall be levied upon fish, or the produce of the fisheries, exported from the Colony or its dependencies to such countries, the following rates....."

In other words, as has already been discussed here the other day it is a clause properly called a retaliatory clause, whereby, if America, for instance, were to impose a tax upon fish exported to there from here, or on the products of the fisheries, we are allowed to levy duties on certain of the imports from that country. As to the application of the section, it is a matter which the hon. member has very properly drawn attention to. As to how far that clause goes into effect—I believe it is nothing new in tariffs at all. In all protective tariffs that is a usual clause. We export fish to a country, and import goods from that country. If they put a duty on our fish, we have the right to put a duty on the produce of their country imported into ours.

MR. CASHIN—Coming back to that clause, I can see the effect of it alright. It is how I figure it out. It appears that the United States, under the Fordney Tariff, I think it was, has put a protective duty on fish. They charge a tax on our fish exported from Newfoundland to the United States, of $1.25 a quintal. This resolution here gives to the Government—to the Executive Government if it feels like it as soon as the House is closed and we are away, to put a retaliatory tax of seventy-five cents a barrel on pork coming from the United States. I do not think that we get pork in

any other country in the world only the United States, and therefore I thought, when I read it over, that it was unnecessary to have it there from my point of view. I think that tobacco is more or less the same. All the tobacco that we use here, other than the tobacco manufactured in this country, comes from the United States. There is another item— flour. I agree that our four comes mostly from Canada, but sometimes we may be able to get it cheaper in the United States than in Canada, and therefore, we would like to take advantage of the lower price, rather than buy from Canada.

HON. MINISTER OF JUUSTICE—As a matter of fact it is really like this. When we came to that resolution we really put on the duty, and the Governor in Council is given the power to suspend it.

MR. CASHIN—That is how I thought it was. I had quite an argument about that, and I am glad to have it cleared up. Therefore, if we put on that clause as it is now, we are really putting on seventy-five cents a barrel on pork. Therefore, I think that that clause should be obliterated. To a great extent, I think the clause is unnecessary.

While I am on my feet I may as well have a few words to say on the Tariff. In considering the tariff. first of all, I must apologise to Mr. Ashbourne for my error in calculation this afternoon on readymades. Several people figured it out with me, and I suppose we got muddled up. However, the best of us is liable to make an error, and I am not ashamed to say that I made a mistake; and that I find that the duty has gone up on readymades as Mr. Ashbourne stated. I think too that it should be reduced, because readymades are an absolute necessity to the poor people of this Island. They have to have clothes—they are not like the people of Fiji. They cannot go naked. We have to wear clothes in this country. Therefore I think the Government should see its way clear to make a little reduction on that kind of clothing.

In making up a tariff, the Government has certainly got quite a number of difficulties. There are going to be people come in every day saying—"this injures my business." I imagine that the Government has had representations from almost every class of business man in the country, who are hurt by the new tariff. But I should not say that they are hurt, because they really are not. It is always the consumer that has to pay the piper.

The most unfortunate part of the tariff is this—that the tariff, when it is laid upon the table of the House, becomes law. They collect duties under the New Tariff at the Custom House the next morning. The trade on Water Street have been importing goods from time to time, and they have possibly laid in heavy stocks of goods, and the consumer who buys from him has had to pay his money. If there is a change in the tariff the next morning, the merchant on Water Street goes down to the Custom House and gets his rebate, but I do not think that the customer going back to the merchant the next day is going to get any drawback from the merchant. He certainly would have a hard time to get it. I do not take the trade into consideration at all to-day. I am considering the unfortunate consumer.

I must admit that the Government has acted wisely in bringing the duties down practically to where they were before on necessary items in regard to the fishery, such for instance, as tea, and tobacco, on which I see a little decrease—batteries for engines.

MR. GODDEN—How much is tea?

MR. CASHIN—Tea is seven cents a pound. But what concerns me most

is this. It is only to-day I got the report of the Commission—and I suppose I am suspicious and like to figure things out as best I can even though I may make a mistake on dry goods --but I would like to ask the Hon. the Minister of Finance if he would not be agreeable to giv'ng the members of the House time to read this report. I am of the opinion that every member of the House is deeply interested in this report and if he does not know what it contains he should be given a chance to find out. I consider, personally, that I should be given time to look over it. The passing of this Tariff is a great job that we are taking on ourselves and I for one, would like to study the report. I received it for the first time to-day and when I went home I started to read it but after an hour I was very little advanced and I think it would take three or four hours to go through it fully. Therefore I do not think I am asking too much when I request that the Committee rise so as to give the members a chance to consider this report. I never saw this report till to-day and I would like to read and fully consider it before anything further is done with it.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the motion made by the honorable member for Ferryland, Mr. Cashin. I submit that this is not class legislation and the Government should not feel in a hurry to put it through. I would like to point out that there is no attempt on the part of the Opposition to hold up the House, but this is one of the most important measures that has come before the House in many years and therefore I have great pleasure in supporting the motion of Major Cashin. This report has not been perused by the members, and personally I have not seen it, and I would like a chance to go through it so as to be able to deal with it in the manner which its importance deserves and calls for. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion of the honorable member for Ferryland.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Chairman, I have no objection whatever to the rising of the Committee as I am just as much interested in this Tariff and the welfare of the people of the country as any man in the House, but I want to say right now that if the Governments in the past had not squandered the revenue derived from the people there would be no need of this Tariff to-day.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 4 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of Legislative Disabilities and the Vacation of Seats in the House of Assembly."

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Chairman, there is nothing different now from the last occasion when we distributed the Bill with the addition of Section 2 which embodied the suggested amendment by the honorable member for Fortune. That only arose in Committee the last day because instead of providing for an appointment of a member to one company we wish to insert a clause to cover the appointment to any company. I think it is better to deal with each case as it arises. I now move the reading of the Bill.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the introducer of the Bill to explain this Section 2.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Section 2 was inserted as a result of the discussion when the Bill was first introduced. In the Old Country if after nine months a member takes office he does not go back for re-election. The period is nine months there and we brought it down to six months. It is simply an addition to Chapter 4 of the Acts. It reads

(Reads act).

That is how it reads and now we merely put on this

(Reads.)

These words are taken verbatim from the English Act but we made the period here six months while they have nine months in the Old Country. The amendment applies only to those holding portfolio offices.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Chairman, might I be permitted to ask a question by way of obtaining information. The Bill before the House authorizes the appointment of a Director of the Newfoundland Power & Paper Company, Limited. I understand that Mr. S. J. Foote, K.C., was appointed on that Board by the late Government and I understand still holds the position, and I would like to know the reason why this Bill is before the House if Mr. Foote is to retain the position. I really see no necessity for the present bill.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —The Bill is to apply if any member were to be appointed.

MR. HIBBS—I presume that you mean that some member of the present Government is to receive the appointment. I met Mr. Foote a few days ago and he doesn't look like a man who is likely to die soon, and I have not heard that he has any intentions of resigning the position. I suppose if the Government is about to make any change in the position of Director on this Board, it must be on the basis of qualification and candidly I think that the Government will find it very difficult to get a more competent or better qualified person than Mr. Foote. I confess to be a bit curious to know what the object behind the Bill is. Is it to dispense with Mr. Foote's services and appoint some member now sitting on the Government side of the House?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —What we are trying to accomplish is, to enable the Director of the Board to hold his seat in the House of Assembly.

MR. HIBBS—Well, Mr. Foote is not a member of the House of Assembly and I think it is just as well for the Government to be honest about this matter and state definitely just what they intend doing. I presume that if Mr. Foote is to be asked to resign in favour of some Government nominee, then that person will of necessity require to be a lawyer.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, the object speaks for itself. The position is quite clear today and the honourable member for Fogo, whose remarks with reference to Mr. Foote's qualifications I heartily endorse, will find that, under this Bill, Mr. Foote will be afforded an opportunity of serving his country as a member of this House, if he feels so inclined so to do in the future. However, I would like to say that first no appointment has yet been made on the Board, and secondly that this question has not arisen for the first time because it will be distinctly remembered by certain honourable gentlemen that this question arose when some of us were sitting on the opposite side of the House. I do not think that the honourable member for Fogo or myself need worry about Mr. Foote's qualifications or need worry about his annual retainer for what financial difference it makes to him.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I wish to endorse the remarks made by the honourable member for Fogo. Apart from Mr. Foote's independence, which is a characteristic that should be sought for in any position with the N.P. and P. Company, he is a competent and qualified man. It requires more than the ordinary layman to qualify for the position of Director with this Company, and I trust that the Government will see that they appoint one of their best men, whether from this House or from outside this House. Personally I have changed my opinion with regard to such an appointment, and I think that it would be better if the Director was not a member of this House and clear of Party politics. When Mr. Foote was appointed it was considered necessary that a lawyer should get the position for the interpretation of that important contract in connection with the management of the Company and its relations to the Newfoundland Government, and if a lawyer was not qualified in that respect it is no use trying to get the ordinary layman to fill the job. If you have no other individual in mind, I would endorse the position taken by the honourable member for Fogo, namely, that unless there is good and sufficient reason for making a new appointment that it would savour too much of party politics to make any change. With regard to Section (2) of the Bill I would support it because it will save a considerable lot of time and expense to the country.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman, I read in this Bill a disposition on the part of the Government to make this job of Director with the N.P. and P. Company a political one, and I am opposed to that principle. I think that this thing should be taken outside of the realm of politics altogether. Now there is a well known and well recognized axiom that says: "What's everybody's business is nobody's business," and if every succeeding Government that comes in power makes a change and appoints its own man in turn on this Board, the chances are that the country will not benefit hereby.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —I think that the danger would be in the man being outside the House of Assembly. When he is a Member of this House he is responsible to this House and has to answer to the House for his conduct.

MR. HALFYARD—The point that I am trying to bring out is this that the duty of the Government is to conserve and to protect the interests of the public and the country. Now then if as the Hon. Minister suggests it is within the right of the Government to make the appointment then I consider that they should be very well advised in changing from time to time the Director of the Newfoundland Pulp and Paper Co. because as I said before if you are going to make a change every few years you will find that some time you will have a man there who is not competent to hold that job. If you have a man there who is competent and knows the job from beginning to end, and a matter of that kind cannot be learned in 15 minutes. It is a position for a man that has some experience as for instance the present Director. He is a capable lawyer. If he understands the position he can be held responsible by the country and to the country. But the Government cannot hold him responsible for what is being done in this regard.

Also there is another Directorship, the Hotel Directorship, that will be given. I consider as I said before that those things should be taken out of the realm of politics. It may be alright to have members of this House on Boards, but to my mind to look after the welfare of the country and to be answerable to the public more of

them should be taken out of politics than we have to-day.

There is another matter at the moment that I would like to speak about. I want to read a part from the Manifesto of the Prime Minister.

(Reads.)

I would like to know what the Prime Minister intends to do on that matter. I have just handled this Manifesto and there are several things that I would like to speak about at a later date.

At any rate persuant to the question in hand I thought that it was an opportune time to bring this to the attention of the Prime Minister, and I hope that he shall see his way clear to keep his promise in this regard.

CAPT. RANDELL—Mr. Chairman, with regard to the subject that is before the House I quite agree with what has been said by Mr. Ashbourne with regard to the shifting of people from positions to which they have been appointed by a previous Government and then appointing somebody else in their place. As I understand it, it appears to me that the object is to make a change with regard to the Newfoundland Pulp and Paper Co. Now I don't believe that that is good policy. In this country as far as I can see political expediency goes too far. Just when a man becomes competent to hold a position and to know something about it, and is getting an insight into the work of the business that he is supposed to attend to in his position he is shifted and somebody else is put in his job. This not only applies to what we are discussing here to-night, but also to the different departments of the Government. There are men who have been qualified and have held positions for 16, 17, or 18 years, and somebody comes along that is a supporter of the Government or possibly a defeated candidate and he is elected over the head of the man that has been serving this community for 17 or 18 years. This is not as it should be. I don't think that anyone in this House to-night can dispute that. For that reason I cannot find myself in accord with sub-Section 2 of this Bill.

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 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.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting a Tax on Certain Incomes."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I opposed this Bill and as the business of the session proceeded I have been more than justified in the stand that I took in that respect. Now I don't know whether it is too late for this Bill to be repealed, but I think that it is the opinion of this House that we cannot afford to repeal the income tax at the present time. Mr. Chairman, I quite believe that no member of this House appreciated the necessity of securing revenue more so than the Minister of Finance who has to be responsible for the financial conditions of the country. I think it is a mistake that we as legislators are going to repeal the Income Tax at the present time. I am led to think that the Government did not appreciate the financial conditions of the country when this Bill was introduced.

We passed our estimates and then we were committed to certain expenditures. The Finance Minister, I believe had no dissenting voice in the membership of the Government in

connection with the estimates. Perhaps I may be mistaken but that is my opinion. After making these commitments for the expenditure of eight or nine million dollars he has to find ways and means to meet that expenditure and has to increase the tariff accordingly. We all realize the effect of the new tariff that we are now considering, and we will find it very difficult to live in this country. It is most unfortunate that the confidence in the present Government should be shaken at the present time. We want confidence in ourselves and the community want confidence in the legislature of the country. We are dependent on the people outside this country and we should not do anything to cause any loss of confidence in the minds of those people with whom we have to treat in a financial way. There was a time in the history of this country when the confidence of the people was very weak, and the people through the force of circumstances were leaving the country. After all it might not be such a drawback as it was at first imagined because the people go away and earn money and then they bring it home, and it is like the people leaving Newfoundland and going to the Labrador for a few months and then come back again. But our people prefer to live in their own country. When our people go to foreign countries through the force of circumstances they work under conditions that are perhaps remunerative, but when they come back they are glad to remain in their own country and endeavour to earn their living at home. It is unfortunate that we should do anything that might make it impossible for them to stay here. Now to get back to the subject before the chair we are by the repeal of the income tax forfeiting three or four hundred thousand dollars annually, and I understand that by the amendment to the Bank Tax Act we are losing from fifty to eighty thousand dollars. I do not know the exact amount. If the Finance Minister was clear on the matter he could have reduced some of the duties on the necessities of life, but I think that this is one of the greatest mistakes the Government made. That is one of the reasons that I cannot support this bill. Of course I can understand that the income tax is objectionable in some respects and that it is hard to collect, but still twelve or thirteen hundred people would continue to pay, and with the present Finance Minister I believe that everything possible would be done to enforce the act. The income tax act is just as objectionable in Canada as in Newfoundland, but there are forty-five million dollars collected there which they cannot afford to lose by the repeal of the act. I am sure that under the present conditions in Newfoundland that we cannot afford to repeal the income tax without raising in the minds of the ordinary individual that there is discrimination in favour of the wealthy. It is said that between three and four hundred thousand dollars have been collected from about twelve hundred people. Out of this twelve hundred there are six hundred that pay about fifty thousand dollars. I imagine that about six hundred out of the twelve hundred paid about two hundred and fifty thousand dollars. Therefore they must be fairly wealthy. Now this repeal of the act does not fall as easy on the business man as it might at first be imagined. Because the new tariff will increase the prices of the articles that the merchants have to supply on credit, and nine out of ten of the business people of this country have to go to the banks to get the money to buy the goods that they supply on credit. If a man wants a hundred dollars worth of goods on credit he has not only to pay the hundred dollars of the first cost, but in addi-

tion to that he has to pay the seventy per cent. of duty if it is dry goods and then he has to pay the interest on the hundred and seventy dollars that the merchant got from the bank and then the man has to pay perhaps one hundred and ninety dollars for the goods that were invoiced at $100.00. The income tax is a tax that we cannot unfortunately do without at the present time. If you repeal the act, it means that extra taxation has to be put on something else to meet the expenditure. And I wish to place myself on record as being of opinion that the country is unfortunately in the position of not being able to repeal the Income Tax.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman, I would like to go back to Section one of the Bill if I may be permitted. Is it within my right to discuss it?

MR. CHAIRMAN — Not strictly speaking. We passed that the other day and left only section 2 over for further consideration.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Am I to understand that I am debarred from discussing it? (Being given permission to continue.) I would just like to ask the attention of the House for a few minutes, because to-day in reply to a question asked by Mr. Duff as to the amount of tax collectable from the Fire Insurance Companies, the following was tabled:

Amount collected by the Government from Fire Insurance Companies for 1923, was $34,337.65

The amount collected in St. John's, which went to the St. John's Municipal Council 21,026.65

The balance went into the Exchequer Account.

On that information, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the whole of the premiums collected in St. John's goes into the hands of the Municipal Council, whereas the amount from the outports goes into the public chest. I do not think that that is a fair and square deal to the outports. They have to pay a tax which goes into the public chest, while the amount paid in St. John's does not go into that but into the hands of the Municipal Council, I think that that is against the outports, and if that is so I think that this tax should not be collected in the outports. Otherwise St. John's should pay its share into the public treasury, into the finances of the Colony. I think that should appeal to the members as being very fair. The only reason that I brought this matter up was that I wanted to bring it to the attention of the Minister of Finance and Customs.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, there is one section I would like to draw the attention of the House to, and that is section 3 (a). There seems to be some misunderstanding existing outside of the House among certain interested individuals with regard to this tax on absentee landlords. I had a small delegation wait upon me to-day with reference to this tax, and they pointed out that heretofore any taxes put upon the absentee landlord recoiled upon the head of the occupier. That, of course, has been the practice, owing to the fact that in the leases that have been in existence that clause has been put in in every lease that was executed between the landlord and the leases. In the case of this tax, however, it is different. If the section will be read carefully it will be seen that the landlord resident outside the country who derives any income from this source must pay a tax on the income received. I merely draw the attention of the Committee to the fact, so that it may be understood outside that this is not in any way like former taxes that were imposed upon non-residents in this olony.

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 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.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting a Tax on Goods Imported into Newfoundland."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, why is it necessary to bring in this Bill at all. Why cannot you make it the straight tax upon the goods. Take for instance readymades which we were considering this afternoon—the duty is sixty-five per cent., and then this is another five per cent. Why not make it a straight seventy per cent? I was thinking that possibly it might be done, so that if later you might see your way clear to take off the five per cent. you will be able to do so by repealing this Act.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—That is really the object. It is a separate enactment. If at any time we wish to take off this tax, we can do so without interfering with any other Legislation.

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 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.

Second reading of Bill to amend "The Industrial and Provident Societies Act, 1919."

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this Bill I would like to explain that it is introduced in order to remedy an anomaly. The Act of 1919 provides that a person, a member of a co-operative society, is limited to the amount of interest to $200. In the English Act the figure is £200 and I have discovered on several occasions that the correction has not been made here, and I now introduce the amended Bill at the request of the Grand Falls Co-operative Society. The matter will be clear to members when they see the position. To-day, at the end of the year a man has to take the dividend and cannot reinvest it beyond $200 and it is now proposed to do what should have been done at the outset and alter the figures which were wronly inserted through an oversight. I have pleasure in moving the second reading of this Bill and may add that it will not adversely affect any company in any way.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the Hon. the Minister of Justice is making this alteration and I give it my heartiest support. I think there are 300 or 400 people in the society at Grand Falls and many at Bishop's Fals are also interested in the amendment now before the House. As the Hon. the Minister of Justice has said these people are not able to reinvest their money which has been made by their own efforts, but as this is being remedied the organization will be able to carry on business on a larger scale and I therefore give the amendment every support and I hope it will meet with the full accord of the House.

MR. GODDEN—Mr. Speaker, I would also like to speak briefly in support of the amendment. I know it is a fact that in the Old Country shareholders in Co-operative Societies are allowed to let their profits or dividends accumulate to £200 and the financial success of the society depends largely on the fact that members are able to allow their profits to

remain in the society. I therefore have much pleasure in supporting the amendment.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend "The Industrial and Provident Societies Act, 1919," was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they concur in their request to them for the return of the Bills sent up entitled "An Act Respecting the Encouragement of Shipbuilding," and 'an Act to Amend Chapter 172 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Survey of Foreign Going and Labrador Vessels,'" which Bills are returned herewith.

With unanimous consent, and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 172 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Survey of Foreign Going and Labrador Vessels" was laid aside, and, with unanimous consent, leave was granted for the introduction of the Bill entitled "Of the Inspection of Ships."

With unanimous consent, the Bill entitled "Of the Inspection of Ships" was read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

With unanimous consent and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Bill entitled "An Act to Repeal Chapter 174 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of Passenger Accommodation on board Steamers and Vessels," was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries gave notice that he would on to-morrow move that the Bill entitled "An Act for the Encouragement of Shipbuilding" be laid aside, and that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions relating to the Encouragement of Shipbuilding and Rebuilding.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Speaker, on the motion to adjourn I would like to learn from the Prime Minister if the Government has any scheme under consideration whereby the unemployed may be given assistance without longer continuing the dole system. Surely the Government cannot feel justified in continuing longer to supply dole to able-bodied people in this city while there is an abundance of work to be done in St. John's. It has been stated that the Government is paying out $10,000 per week in this way, which can only be regarded as a deliberate waste of public funds. I daresay that this figure is somewhat of an exaggeration.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE — It is.

MR. HIBBS—Well, let us suppose that the amount paid out weekly is $6,000, the fact remains that the system is entirely wrong. I was inclined at one time to criticize the Municipal Council, and I am not yet fully prepared to exonerate them, as it is largely their duty to help out the unemployed in the city. A rumour got abroad that the Government offered to finance the Council so that very necessary works could be attended to but that the Council had refused it. I now understand that the Government has not offered to co-operate with the Council. Surely if the Government is in earnest and desirous of securing some returns for the money paid out weekly to supply the needs of the poor, then they will take immediate steps to co-operate with the Municipal Council to inaugurate a scheme whereby

every able-bodied man not receiving assistance in the form of dole will be employed. As a matter of fact there is no reason why work would not be commenced on the suburban roads radiating from the city. Members of the present Government were very strong in their criticisim of former administrations for what they termed wasting money, by giving relief. The rock shed was regarded as a means of demoralizing the people, but what are they doing themselves? If giving the unemployed an opportunity to earn something to support their families by breaking rocks was a demoralizing method of handling the situation, then what may be said of supporting one thousand able-bodied men in the city without requiring them to give any returns whatever for the money expended. It only requires the application of business methods in dealing with this unemployed problem, and at least a considerable percentage of returns would be secured. Certain apologists of the present administration say that the Council was offered a loan by the Government, which was not accepted. Personally, I do not blame the Council for not adding to their liabilities and burdening the taxpayers of the city, when the Government was wasting money in the way it has been during the last six months. Why talk about lending the Municipal Council money to carry out city improvements when you are deliberately paying out large sums weekly for which you are getting no returns. Is it not possible for the Government to pass this amount over to the Council and ask them to organize those people and get them to work on the streets, for surely there is room for improvement in this much neglected city.

HON. PRIME MINISTER — Those who are getting the relief are destitute and many of them are too old to work.

MR. HIBBS—That only applies to perhaps 25 per cent. of those who are getting relief.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Once you embark on any kind of work every man expects to be employed, whether he is destitute or not, and the great difficulty at present is there is no work to embark on, except that there are forty men working on the grounds of the Normal School, who were sent there by Capt. Byrne, the Employment Agent, after he had registered their names.

MR. HIBBS—It is only a matter of proper organization. The Municipal Council should be able to secure sufficient information to discriminate between the destitute and those that are not in need. Personally, I cannot be persuaded that if a little effort was made the whole business would be put on a working basis, but it is nothing short of criminal for the Government at this season of the year to continue the paying of a dole to men who should be employed cleaning up the filth that has made this city an eyesore to even the least observant, and the most unsanitary little city in British North America.

Before taking my seat, Mr. Speaker, I would again urge upon the Government to begin work on Monday next, and not pay another cent of dole, by placing sufficient funds in the hands of the Council so that the hundreds of family men now being supported free would render some service for what they receive.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, In reply to the honourable member for Fogo, I desire to say that long before we gave out a dollar's worth of dole we had a conference with the Mayor, the City Engineer and the Government Engineer with a view to opening up some work that would be productive and useful and that would be of assistance to the Municipal Council. The only suggestion put forward between the three was the making of concrete culverts, but the

doing of this kind of work in the depths of Winter was found impracticable. That was the only suggestion they had to throw out and then there was no other course open to us but to open rocksheds or give out dole. We did not want to open rocksheds or give out dole, but, with great regret, we adopted the dole system. I am perfectly prepared to acknowledge that abuses crept in, as is known to many of us in this House, but those who were not in need and who took advantage of the dole were when detected brought before court and prosecuted. We want to stop the giving out of dole as quickly as we possibly can. Only the day before yesterday we had a deputation of the unemployed in to see us and they called our attention to some necessary work that was needed to be done in Wickford Street. We told them that if the Municipal Council were satisfied that we would loan them some money to go on with such work. I telegraphed to Mr. Bishop asking him if he was prepared to start work on the cofferdam or any other work at the dry dock, pending the agreement, and that the Government would pay him for it if for any reason an agreement was not arrived at. He telegraphed back that he would start work on the dock itself as soon as possible, so that we are hopeful that work on the dock will begin sometime next week, and we are also hoping that work on the new Hotel will begin the week after. This together with the work of laying a new track that will be undertaken shortly by the Nfld. Light and Power Company should take care of all the unemployed people of St. John's and those of the nearby outports within the next month or so. There are a few men working at the grounds around the Normal School, but, as in the case of all Government work, every man expects to be employed, including the man who has a barrel of flour in the house as well as those in need. We, as a Government, do not claim that we are getting all the results that we might have got, but we are firmly convinced that we have done better by the dole system than by the opening of rocksheds.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Speaker. With regard to this loan that the Government say they offered the Municipal Council and which they refused to accept. Now I do not blame the Council for not adding to their liabilities and for not burdening the taxpayers of this city any more than what they are at present; but why the necessity of a loan when you can afford to pay out, without getting any returns whatever, from six to ten thousand dollars every week to able-bodied men?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Those who are getting the relief are destitute and many of them are too old to work.

MR. HIBBS—That only applies to twenty-five per cent. of those who are getting relief.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Once you embark upon any kind of work, every man expects to be employed, whether he is destitute or not, and the great difficulty at the present moment is that there is no work to embark upon, except the forty men who are working on the grounds at the Normal School and who were sent up there by Captain Byrne, the Employment Officer, after he had registered their names.

MR. HIBBS—Why not make a limit and only give the work to those who are destitute and who apply for the dole? However, I am very glad to hear from the Prime Minister that the unemployed will be looked after very soon, because the matter has been an eyesore to me.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker. I would like to assure the House that there are a number of people in Trinity District in need of work as

well as in St. John's, and, as this is the time of the year when they expect work to start, I would like to know from the Prime Minister when he expects the work of re-railing the track will begin?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The first steamer load of rails is due to arrive here about the first week in May, and the work of re-railing will start immediately afterwards.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Speaker. It is said that there is some misunderstanding between the Nfld. Milling Company and the Government over the interpretation of the agreement. I would like to know what the Prime Minister has to say about this?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker. In reply to the hon. member I would say that there is no misunderstanding. Mr. Palmer understood perfectly well that the duty was off flour when we put the Bill through. He came to me the other day and I confirmed that statement that I had made before to him. He said that a suggestion had been thrown out that the duty was about to be put on flour again. He said that he was able to put up the mill understanding flour would be duty free. The position that he is in now is that he is afraid that the Canadian Mills may get together and cut the price. In other words he asks us that we should put through some legislation by which he would be able to hand in every day to the Custom House, to be confirmed by them, the export price of flour in Montreal. I do not see any real reason why the Government should not consider putting through such legislation. I may say that I have suggested to the Government that we might frame an Act to that effect. I have not seen Mr. Palmer since.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the Prime Minister if, when the work of re-railing the railroad starts, the distribution of labor is to be handled as it was last year. While the work was going on last Fall, laborers were required to get a note or what is commonly known as a pass from members of the House of Assembly before securing employment. I hope that this system will not be put into effect this year. I feel sure the Prime Minister has no knowledge of the way in which the employment situation was handled on the railroad last year. I wish to inform the House that the way in which some men were treated, who were badly in need, and applied for labor on the railroad, was absolutely disgraceful; passes were given strictly along political lines. Practically no person who did not vote for the present Government received work on the railroad. I am not making a statement that I cannot stand behind. I know practically every man from St. John's to Holyrood. I had occasion to visit the various settlements along the shore several times while the work was progressing and observed closely the manner in which this heartless discrimination was practised. There were a number of poor men with heavy families who did not happen to vote for members of the present Government, and on this account they were barred from receiving employment. I received numerous complaints and in one particularly serious case, I gave a man a note to Mr. Joyce, who very kindly gave him employment, but it was no sooner discovered that this man was working, than he was fired, for no other reason than he did not vote for Messrs. Woodford and Cahill. While a large number of family men in very poor circumstances were refused employment on this score, there were about twenty-five or thirty small boys ranging in twelve to fourteen years of age working on the job, in most cases their fathers were

too independent to work on the railroad, a number of them being "local" butchers. I believe that the Prime Minister would like to do the right thing in connection with work of this nature, but I wish to assure him that the railroaod work last year was not relief work but merely furnished as a sop or reward for political friends of Messrs. Woodford and Cahill, and I will ask you in the name of humanity, to see that this treatment is not carrie dout to persons who will seek employment when the re-railing of the road starts later on.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until Monday afternoon next, the 27th inst., at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, April 27th, 1925.

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

Notice of Question

Mr. Brown gave notice of question.

Mr. Scammell gave notice of question.

Hon. the Leader of the Opposition gave notice of question.

Mr. Ashbourne gave notice of question.

(3) MR. GODDEN asked Hon. the Prime Minister, Chairman of the Railway Commission, if tenders have been asked this year for lumber to construct Section Men's Houses and for repairs and construction of freight cars? If so, to Table the copy of notices sent out and the tenders received, also, to whom the contracts are awarded.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I beg to table the information.

(4) MR. RANDELL asked Hon. the Prime Minister what loss, if any, has been incurred by the outfitting and sending of the S. S. Sagona and S. S. Prospero to the seal fishery.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The result of the sealing voyage has not yet been determined.

(5) MR. RANDELL asked Hon. the Prime Minister if the Department lately known as the Shipping Department is abolished, if so what employees, if any, are still engaged in connection with that Department; also what position does Mr. James Foley, at one time employed by the Shipping Department, now hold with the Government.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I would like to have that question stand over until to-morrow.

(6) MR. RANDELL asked Hon. the Prime Minister, Chairman of Railway Commission, if tenders will be asked for cement and other material for rebuilding the Dock.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Yes, tenders will be asked for cement for the dock.

(7) MR. ASHBOURNE asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs if Mr. Levi Chafe has been reinstated in his department? If he has been paid salary for all time he was idle? Is his present salary same as when he was suspended or has it been increased.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chafe has been taken back in the Customs House. He has not been reinstated in his old position. He has had no increase in salary. He has been paid back money.

(8) MR. SCAMMELL asked Hon. the Prime Minister what is the policy of the Government as regards the Old Day's Pond project at Bonavista, and if it is the intention of the Government to start constructing a breakwater at Bonavista.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I beg to say that since Mr. Grey's report has been handed in the Government has not given any consideration to the Bonavista project.

(9) MR. ASHBOURNE asked Hon. the Prime Minister if there was a deficit for the Railway during the months of January, February and March, 1925, and if so, to state the amounts and give a comparative statement for the months of January, February and March 1924.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I beg to table the information.

(10) MR. HICKMAN asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay upon the Table of the House all cables and other correspondence between the High Commissioner's Office in London and the Minister of Finance and Customs and the office of Finance and Customs in reference to the $4,000,000.00 loan; also, to lay upon the Table of the House cables and correspondence between Hon. M. S. Sullivan and the Minister of Finance and Customs in reference to the loan; to state why the Bonds were Gold Bonds instead of Trustee Bonds; to state why interest on these Bonds is being paid from the 1st of July 1924, to state why the Bonds in the advertisements called for tenders in Newfoundland currency and was accepted in sterling without any further advertisement or giving notice to Financial House in London that a sterling bid would be accepted.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I beg to say that the copy of the correspondence can be had on application to the Minister of Finance and Customs. The bonds were gold bonds as has been the custom in loans in the past. Interest has not been paid on the bonds from the first of July, but only from the issue date of the bonds. The balance of the question was replied to by me on the 16th of April.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—I beg to table the reply to ` question number 5 on the order paper of April 22nd, asked by Mr. Scammell.

MR. SCAMMELL—Does the Minister say that there was no tender received for $200.00 for the building of a Post Office at Brooklyn?

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—That is my information.

MR. SCAMMELL—I addressed my question to the Minister of Public Works because I presumed his information would be reliable.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—It is reliable.

Mr. Hickman gave notice of question.

Mr. Hickman gave notice of question (2).

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—May I ask the Hon. Leader of the Opposition if he wants the correspondence and telegrams between the High Commissioner and myself besides the correspondence and telegrams between Mr. Sullivan and myself.

MR. HICKMAN—What I want is what I have already asked for several times . . . .

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—I want to have this question made clear. You want the correspondence and telegrams between me and the High Commissioner and between me and Mr. Sullivan?

MR. HICKMAN—Yes.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 4 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Legislative Disabilities and the Vacation of Seats in the House of Assembly" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting a Tax on Goods Imported into Newfoundland" was read a third

time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting a Tax on Certain Incomes was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs the House resolved itself to a Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Chairman, I notice that the duty on potatoes is fifteen cents per bushel. That is a matter to which I would like to direct the attention of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines. It is a very questionable policy to allow potatoes to come into this country at such a low rate, especially when the Minister of Agriculture and Mines is endeavouring to inaugurate some kind of agricultural policy. I would like to point out that in my opinion it is absolutely useless for the Minister to attempt any agricultural policy with a view to improving agriculture unless there is greater protection given to this industry. It is a well known fact that potatoes are being annually imported from Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia in very large quantities to the detriment of our local farmers. Last year there were fifty thousand barrels of potatoes imported into St. John's alone. What is the value of all this talk about improving agriculture while this state of affairs exists? In Conception Bay and in Harbour Main Districts particularly which is represented by Messrs. Woodford and Cahill, there are thousands of barrels of potatoes held by farmers to-day that cannot be sold because the market in St. John's is over-stocked with foreign produce. The same applies to other districts on the Peninsula of Avalon. Another fact is, that owing to a prejudice among local consumers in favour of the imported article the latter commands a greater preference than the local grown potatoes. This is a serious matter that will have to be dealt with if we are to encourage our own farmers; everything that we have done so far tends to discourage them. The same applies to fresh dead beef. I understand that beef is being imported into this country today for 13 cents per pound, but the consumer does not benefit by the low price, but has to pay twenty five to thirty cents per pound, and this condition of affairs exists while the local farmer cannot sell his beef cattle. The circumstances surrounding the farming industry in this country is very serious and calls for some immediate remedy. In my opinion the Government will be acting wisely in placing a duty of one dollar ($1.00) per barrel on potatoes imported into this country, and also placing a higher duty upon dead beef. I can understand that if this was done it might be said that we were increasing the price of the very necessary food stuff, but the people of St. John's and other consuming districts are more concerned about the duty on tea, sugar, beans, rolled oats and other commodities of that nature on which they are taxed by the Monroe Government 15 p.c. more than ever before. If you tax imported vegetables and beef you are protecting and encouraging an industry which affords a living to

thousands of our people, and with sufficient encouragement within a very short time this country will become self supporting as far as foreign vegetables and beef is concerned. I might also refer to eggs, last year there were no fewer than 120,390 dozen eggs imported at a value of over $722,891. There is absolutely no reason why the local markets should not be supplied by the people here.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—How is it that since the Poultry Association was formed the price of eggs is doubled.

MR. HIBBS—I do not think that statement is correct, the price of eggs is mostly controlled by the eggs imported. The Poultry Association is doing good work and I believe that in a few years its influence will be felt throughout the country, but at the present time the Association has little bearing upon the price of eggs. It is really pitiful to hear the Minister of Agriculture and Mines talking of a new agricultural scheme which is costing this country $25,000 more than last year, while our own people are being supplied with foreign produce grown in Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—You cannot get a schooner going to Labrador to take a barrel of local potatoes.

MR. HIBBS—That is a very sweeping statement and a very regrettable one to say the least of it. I wonder does the Prime Minister buy Prince Edward Island in preference to Newfoundland produce?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I do, because my customers demand them.

MR. HIBBS—I think, Mr. Chairman, that the whole matter is one of education, and it should be the policy of the Government to start a propaganda convincing our people that the local potato is superior to those which are imported. I agree that our farmers grow too many qualities of produce; they should learn to cultivate and grow one or two choice varieties, and this would go a long ways towards moving the prejudice against our local produce that now exist. During the last month, I have met a number of farmers who tell me that it no longer pays to raise either potatoes or cattle as they find it very difficult to compete with the foreign article. I cannot understand the Department of Agriculture allowing people to import seed potatoes duty free, surely the Minister must know that many people will take advantage of this and import potatoes for general consumption, and he must be aware that there are sufficient potatoes in this country to-day to supply the demand.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Don't you think the trouble is that they let the seed run out and the product has deteriorated.

MR. HIBBS—The trouble does not lie there; as a matter of fact a lot of new seed has been imported into the country recently and our farmers are very well supplied, but the point I wish to make is, that the grocers and others will avail of the free tariff and import potatoes ostensibly to be used as seed, but which will eventually be sold to their customers for direct consumption. We hear a lot of talk about protecting fishermen, and representing a fishing district as I do, I am as much interested in that class as any other gentleman in this House. It is right that they should be given protection as they are the largest class of producers in the country, but nevertheless the farmers per hundred deserve as much protection as the fishermen. The Prime Minister has on many occasions since the House met endeavoured to justify the protection which is being given the Im-

perial Tobacco Company and the Colonial Cordage Company, a plea was put forward on behalf of these two concerns on the ground that they were employing a number of people. As a matter of fact not more than six or eight hundred people are employed by these two concerns while the farming industry supplies a living for anywhere between five and eight thousand people throughout Newfoundland.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE —Do you not think that there is protection enough on already. I do not think farmers around St. John's West or East want any more than $1.50 a barrel protection, as the laborer has to pay that amount, and for my own part I would like to take it off. A man here in St. John's has to pay for rent, fuel and everything else, and is already paying enough for potatoes.

MR. HIBBS—What is the justification for spending $20,000 on agriculture.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—To encourage the farmers to produce more. I will tell you of one man named Moores of Clarke's Beach. He has ten acres of land, and a few years ago he gave up the Labrador fishery. To-day he is independent and has money in the Bank, and there would be more like him if they worked as hard as he did. His name is Tom Moores, and he sells $500.00 worth of strawberries alone. But he is a real farmer and gets right down to work. He sells 120 barrels of potatoes and 100 barrels of turnips every year. Since the 1st of January he sent $160.00 worth of eggs into St. John's. The farmers are getting as much protection as anyone I know of, and the people of St. John's West already have enough to pay for the produce they sell.

MR. HIBBS—Now I want to sound the note of warning again, and I hope that provision will be made for what I am talking about. It is absolutely impossible for butchers in and around the suburbs of St. John's and Conception Bay to raise cattle owing to the fact that cattle can be imported into this country so cheaply by steamer, and you are going to find that agriculture will go out of existence unless some better protection is afforded local producers.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAHS—Mr. Chairman, I think that what is responsible for a great falling off in the supplying of a large quantity of potatoes in the St. John's market is that most of those people who supply potatoes cannot compete with the imported article in addition to the fact that people who raise potatoes dump into our market all grades of potatoes, as against the imported article that are commonly called blue noses. I know that there are potatoes grown in Bonavista Bay that can compare favorably with potatoes grown anywhere, but a market cannot be found for them because the people who raise them take up their crops in the Fall of the year and bring them in here when the market is glutted. Now in our own district (Mr. Main) can be raised as good a quality of potatoes as in any other part of Newfoundland, but the trouble is that they are not all honest and they mix the bad and the good, and they pawn off all their mixture on the consumers of this town. It is like the people from the same district who pawn off tough mutton on the majority of people of this town. But this does not apply to all of them because I know of people who serve meat to myself all the year round in a satisfactory way. Still I know that there are people who live in Kelligrews and Long Pond and in that section who come to St. John's and who buy cattle and bring them back to St. John's for sale again; but if there was a rule by which we could com-

pel the people to bring in their products in first class condition they would get first class prices for them, as the ordinary customer is always anxious to pay a good price for a good article. The same applies to potatoes and eggs. I know of a man in Upper Gullies whom I would prefer giving $10 for a barrel of potatoes than I would pay half that amount to others because you can depend on him. In speaking the other day of the highroads policy the Government has in view, Mr. Ashbourne commented very strongly upon the unwisdom of spending so much money. Well, I do not know a better way to encourage our markets and encourage our agriculture than by building highways, because it will mean that we will have a great access to the railway what our grandfathers and great grandfathers failed to do. Eventually it will be found to be a good policy for the Government and for any Government that will be in power in this country by the time this policy has fully developed. That is my idea about it, and it will be the means of encouraging our farmers and others to settle down in the interior and elsewhere in this country. Now I do not believe all that Mr. Hibbs said in relation to potatoes, nor do I believe that we are going to have any more people this year plant seet potatoes than what we had last year. On Friday night last I happened to wander my way down here in the height of the storm. I thought that all the trouble was over at eleven o'clock, but on Saturday morning I noticed by the "Daily News" that the honourable member for Fogo had made a statement with reference to boys being employed on the railroad in Conception Bay. I thought that I should make some reference to that matter in explanation. I think that any young man over fifteen years of age, and whose parents are dependent upon, should be given a chance to work upon the railway. Several young men, whose ages range from 15 to 25 spoke to me to get a job for them on the railway and I in turn interceded for them with the foremen.

However, no objection will be taken for those young fellows, provided they are able to give value for their pay. That is what happened on the railway. I want to say that those men who were employed on the railway last year performed good, valuable work. You know the condition of the railway, you know that it required to be ballasted and graded, and that it needed a lot of repairs. It requires them even yet, and I hope, and will do all in my power to induce the Government to continue the repairing of the railway, because I do not think that there is any section of the railway over which more traffic passes than that part from St. John's to Bay de Verde. The result of the employment of those people was that I had not, and I don't think my colleague had one single request from any man, woman or child for poor relief this year. That is a thing I have never known before, during my thirty five years representing the district. That was the result of the employment on the railway last year.

I think it is only just to make this explanation, because while the honourable gentleman may be right and convinced that there was something radically wrong, there was no money wasted.

I think he made reference to distinction being made along the railway line. Now it is only natural to christen our own children first; but I gave no instructions, and I am sure my colleague did not either to discriminate between anybody out there. In fact, some of my opponents had better jobs than those who were supporting us. Every man was put on in his turn, and all got employment, and the

result is that the people were well off and there was not a single appeal for any kind of relief. I did not have to pay a cent out of my own pocket, and I had often been obliged to do that. I have often given out my own money when I could not get it from the Government. We are obliged to do that sometimes. That is why I am here to-day. While you always have the poor with you, it is our duty to be as liberal as we can afford to be with those we represent.

There is one remark I have to make about the highway in Conception Bay. The clergyman from Brigus wrote to me a few weeks ago and stated that owing to the number of motor cars that travel around Conception Bay whether on pleasure or on business, that they were a great incentive to those who raise eggs, strawberries and cream, and such little domestic necessities; and on one occasion he said while a woman was endeavouring to sell a gallon of strawberries to a motor party they asked her if she had any more, she said "Yes, they were out in the garden." They said "We will wait until you pick all you have in the garden." She picked twenty dollars worth and brought to them. These are facts that happen in hundreds of other places also. There are strawberries, potatoes and lettuce and other things that can be bought, especially around Conception Bay. That is why I think that even in Conception Bay that this highway policy will be a great incentive. I think it is going to be the means of encouraging all the people who have gardens to continue to raise crops because there will be a ready market right at their door for all the stock that they raise.

Now, Sir, when local butchers can get thirty five cents a pound for beef; and for good potatoes $4.00, $4.50 or $5.00 a barrel, I don't think there will be any fear.

MR. HIBBS—We can't get $2.50 to-day.

HON. MINISTER POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—That may be to-day, but we could get that price a month ago. They could get five dollars a month ago. Now perhaps those who have their cellars full would like to dispose of them right at once, but they can't do that, and we have to wait until there is a better market. At the same time I quite agree with the honorable member as regards the protection for those engaged in agriculture. I contend every inducement should be given to those people for the simple reason that money earned in this way remains in the country, and the country gets the benefit of it.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I think that the statement made by the honorable member for Fogo this afternoon is one that ought to be corrected without any delay, because it is liable to lead to an erroneous impression in the minds of the people of the country as to our agricultural possibilities. To hear the member talk it might be inferred that we are getting an enormous stock of potatoes from Prince Edward's Island to the detriment of our own products; but when I tell the honourable member that not ten per cent. of the potatoes in this country used are imported perhaps he will think that he is just a little bit misinformed. I took the trouble to look up the census that was taken in 1921 and also the customs returns for 1924. I observed that the total quantity of potatoes imported for the year 1924 was in line with what the honorable member has said, that was 47,616 barrels or approximately 140,000 bushels. That was what was imported in 1924. From the census returns of 1921 529,000 barrels were grown in the country, at a valuation of $1,912,000.00.

If the Honorable member will look up volume 3 of the Census Returns

he will find that those are the figures as tabulated under that heading.

I remember attending a meeting at Government House during the War, when the question of the food supplies was given serious consideration. I was amazed to discover that at that time with the increased production brought about by the efforts of the Patriotic Association, the production nearly reached three quarters of a million, and when you come to consider that there were only 47,000 barrels imported last year there must be potatoes coming from some other place than from Prince Edward Island. Talking of production; as the census returns show, in 1921 there were 529,000 barrels grown in the country. Take turnips. The figures are in the same ratio. We imported in 1924 6,285 barrels. In 1921 there were 68,000 barrels grown in this country which is ten times as much as imported of this vegetable. Cabbages. There is a greater anomaly still here. We imported in 1921 170,398 heads at an average weight of three pounds. The local production is 7,768,000 heads, which shows that merely five per cent. of the cabbages used in the country is imported. These are facts that statistics show. I presume they are fairly correct. Therefore, I don't think it is any great disappointment to the agriculturalists of this country when we find that the production of certain vegetables is very creditable.

But what I would like to see is no vegetables at all imported. I want to see these cut out altogether, and I believe that Newfoundland can produce sufficient, not alone for her own use, but for export as well. I remember the days of Sir Edward Morris. He got Dr. McPhail, one of the greatest authority in the world at that time on potato culling. He was a native of Prince Edward Island. He was attached to the Agricultural Department of the Canadian Government at the time, and through the influences of our government his services were obtained. He came down here and gave a report on the possibilities of potato production in this country..

One afternoon when going through the suburbs of St. John's when we had seen the fish offal and the ordinary peet which we have in this country he said to me that we had a gold mine in this country as far as the production of potatoes is concerned. He said that they had nothing like it in Prince Edward Island. We ought to be exporting he said instead of importing potatoes. He had no object in saying this except that this was his own impression that we ought be raising more potatoes. There is one feature about this matter that the Hon. Member will be glad to learn. A great deal of trouble has been caused by the transportation of potatoes from one section of the country to another. There are places like Grand Falls and other places that are starving for potatoes, and the price is almost prohibitive owing to the freight on the railway and the steamers.

Only two short weeks ago the railway commission decided to make a nominal freight rate on potatoes and vegetables of all kinds, and you can now send a barrel of potatoes from one section of Newfoundland to another and be transhipped from steamers and trains at the cost of twenty five cents a barrel. This is the strongest and the longest step that could be taken towards propagating the growing of vegetables in Newfoundland. The Hon. Member refers to districts that are particularly prolific in the production of potatoes; in fact perhaps they could feed the whole of Newfoundland in this respect, and these are the districts around Conception Bay. They would

have been able to supply the whole of the country except for the expense of transportation. But the Government or the Railway Commission have seen the absolute necessity for doing something for the encouragement of agriculture, and on the recommendation of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines they have decided to put a nominal rate on the transportation of vegetables, which I submit, Mr. Chairman, is a long step towards the development of the growing of vegetables in this country. I merely make these statements to correct a possible wrong impression. The Hon. Member has referred to the fact that our local meats have been discriminated against. But he knows as well as I know that the local butchers have to go to all parts of the country to get sufficient cattle for their requirements. They have to go up on the Cape Shore and St. Mary's Bay and other parts of the country to get their supplies. I like to see the butchers make a good living provided at the same time I do not think that there should be an additional duty put on cattle coming in here. Because if there is the consumer will have to pay for it, and even now the local butchers cannot get sufficient for the fulfilment of their own requirements. I am sure that the Hon. Member will appreciate these facts, as I know his absolute fairness of mind will not allow him to distort any argument. With regard to the putting of duties on vegetables I think that that would be a mistake. Certain parts of the country in the past have been in a difficult position with regard to getting a supply of vegetables. Take for instance the question of the importation of seed. We do not get sufficient new seed in this country. We have the seed used until it deteriorates and becomes unproductive. I think that is a fact that is born out by scientific experience. And therefore I think that the policy of having the seed come into the country duty free is a good one. I do not desire to delay the House, but I thought that I should in deference to the House given an explanation with regard to the situation of the production of potatoes in this country, and the statistics in connection with it.

CAPT. RANDELL—Mr. Chairman, after listening with considerable interest to the various ideas with regard to the production of the farmers and others I must say that I am in favor of protection when we have the raw material at hand. If you have to import the raw material into this country or into any country and the factory supports only a few people that are employed in that factory I think that is a case when the benefit is for the few. We have factories here in this country that have the protection, but they have not one iota of raw material that is produced in this country, and we are sending out iron ore and pulp wood in the raw state. There is something wrong about the situation. Of course the argument may be put forward, "If we do not have the protection then this country will become a dumping ground." But I say let them dump if it is for the benefit of the whole community. In the case of the farmers, there is no such thing as going outside the country for the raw material as far as they are concerned. Now I just want to say a few words with regard to the new tariff that is before the country and the House of Assembly. The Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs is as we all know in a difficult position with regard to this tariff. We sympathise with him, and I suppose that it has been the problem of all Ministers of Finance ever since the people have appointed governments to represent them to find the ways and the means to make the two ends

meet. Of course, we all agree that the tariff is very drastic. But still if I might use the words of the Minister of Finance and Customs if the Governments in the past had not squandered the money we would not be in need of this tariff to-day. That is the position that we find ourselves in, and we have to find the money. We have to blame ourselves because we have been borrowing the money. As I said before in this House some time ago we are the trustees of this country, and I do not know if we have the right to borrow the money if we do not see our way clear to liquidate the debt right away. There are people in this country to-day who shall I say, curse the names of the people who represented them here and went to the extent of borrowing millions and millions, and now we have to find the wherewithall to pay the interest on the money. When we borrow we are handing down legacies to future generations. In other words we are using up our assets and I do not consider that the people in the past had the right to borrow the money that they did, and I do not consider that we have the right to-day. Now comes the question of making two ends meet. I do not blame the Finance Minister very much for bringing in this new tariff. He is like 95 p.c. of the heads of the families in this country; they have to find the ways and means to make the two ends meet. That is what they are trying to do to-day. The fault is not ours. There are one or two things in the tariff that I would like to bring to the attention of the Government and to the Minister of Finance particularly and that is with regard to the duties on engines. Most of the fishermen in this country have engines already, or at least very few of them have not. That is certain. But I should like to have the Minister and the Government consider the duties on the parts of engines. Nearly every fisherman who has an engine wants parts at least in the early part of the year. Now then I think that the parts as well as the engines should come free of duty, if we are to do all we can to help the fishermen out as much as possible. Of course with regard to this tariff I may say that it came as a political bombshell when it was put before the House and the country recently. We never expected to be called upon to pay such an amount of money as this new tariff calls for. Goodness knows it is hard enough to live in this country now. We all know that it is going to be harder. I cannot sit down without bringing to the attention of the Government and reminding them of the policy that they went to the country under during the last general election. But to borrow and speculate on such a thing as this tourist policy, I cannot find myself in accord with. We are just piling up the debts from year to year, and that means of course that we are piling on the duties. There is no other way to get it.

With regard to some of our local industries. I know that there are a number of farmers growing potatoes in this country, and if they can produce a good potato as cheap as we can import it from other countries I presume that they will get the market. Emerson says "If you can make a boat, or build a ship, or do anything —produce anything better than any one else, the world will beat a path to your door." The same applies to anything that you can produce in this country. If you can produce better potatoes, you will sell them. There has been a lot said about encouraging the fishermen. Well if you can produce a good article you will sell it well. If you cannot, and the imported article is better than the local

article, then the imported article will be preferred.

I cannot say that I am in accord with the excessive duties that have been put on by this revision in the tariff, but I just want to say that, in all fairness, I find myself sympathising with the Minister of Finance on the position that he finds himself in. I cannot do otherwise, because, as the father of a family, I know what it is to try to make both ends meet, and that is the position that he finds himself in to-day. I am not an economist. I might possibly begin to be able to tell him something if I studied the question as long as the tariff Commission sat before they had revised the Tariff—then perhaps I might be able to make some suggestions, but at the present time I cannot tell him how, or why, or where he could do better. I know that some of the increased duties imposed by this tariff will bear heavily on some people, but otherwise I suppose they will be looked upon as alright for others. I just want to say that I feel that the whole country is more or less astonished by what they find themselves up against, because of the outlook for the future—I am not a pessimist—but the outlook for the future is anything but encouraging for the poor man. I hope that we do not see any people leaving our shores as we have in former years. But if a bad fishery comes along with prices as they are to-day, it is very questionable whether people will remain in this country. However I trust that things will turn out much better than we anticipate, but at the same time, I cannot help but sound a warning to the Government with regard to what is going to happen in the future.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Chairman, just another word in reply to my friend, the Colonial Secretary, with regard to potatoes. It was no surprise to me to hear that there are a half million barrels of potatoes produced in this country annually. I am not so much concerned about what is produced as to the number of barrels that are marketed; I do not think that the farmers sold more than 125,000 to 150,0000 barrels and against that there were 50,000 barrels imported into St. John's alone, so that you will find that fully one third of the potatoes marketed here came from Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia farms. I contend that any industry that is handicapped by such a class of competition should receive some form of protection. In the city of St. John's I should think there are about seventy five to eighty thousand barrels of potatoes consumed annually and two thirds of these are imported. The Hon. The Colonial Secretary thinks that he has made a favourable point on behalf of the Government when he states that a uniform rate of 25 cents per barrel freight is in future to be collected upon potatoes from any point in Newfoundland however distant, to the City. I might point out that this change of rate is of very little benefit to the farmers, as a matter of fact it will have the opposite effect as far as the suburban farmers living in that section enjoyed in respect to the St. John's market, but at the same time people who send potatoes from these sections to Grand Falls or the Humber receive a very small rebate. Usually potatoes sent to these centres go in car lots and the freight per barrel is in the neighbourhood of forty to forty five cents, so at the most it would only mean a difference of twenty cents per barrel. On the other hand by this reduction of freight the farmers residing in the Codroy Valley and other distant sections can compete in the St. John's market with the suburban farmers, as they can now send small quantities here at 25 cents per brl. We should consider that there are large

numbers of people on the Peninsula of Avalon depending upon their farms for a living and St. John's is practically their only market. It is therefore unfair to them to permit the man who lives on the western part of the island to flood a market which naturally belongs to the suburban farmer.

With respect to meats, a number of our farmers to-day find it impossible to market their beef cattle while beef in large quantities is being imported into this city. This beef, I understand, landed here cost the butcher about 13 cents per pound and is sold to the consumer at 30c.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—That simply means that the butchers are not giving their customers a square deal.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—If you can get beef in the outports, proper beef I mean, for fifteen cents or even twenty cents per pound, I will give you an order to take any you can get for that price.

MR. HIBBS—I am referring chiefly to St. John's, but I do know that beef has been offered at 18c. per pound in the outports, while the butcher purchased foreign cattle and sold the beef in St. John's at 30c. per pound.

Now that the Minister of Agriculture and Mines is in his seat I want to repeat what I said before he came in and that is, that the farming people who raise potatoes and other vegetables in this country should be protected against the importation of foreign produce. If the Minister of Finance and Customs wants to raise revenue I would suggest that he put at least a dollar per barrel on potatoes, if the same quantity is imported then he would realize fifty or sixty thousand dollars. The effect of this duty could be offset, as far as the consumer is concerned, by the duty being taken off other very necessary food commodities which we cannot raise in this country and must of necessity import. If something is not done, instead of increasing the value of our farming products you will find most people abandoning the industry entirely. The Government by the Tariff which is now before the House is protecting heavily certain industries which employ a few hundred people, while the agricultural industry on which thousands are depending for a livelihood, which is denied them, receive little or no protection or encouragement.

HON. THE MINISTER OF POSTS—Mr. Chairman, to my knowledge there was no such discrimination in railway work as the Hon. Member referred to. Every day from the time the railway work started until it was finished there were hundreds of men at my office—they came in batches of twos, threes and fives—and there was such a rush that it was impossible to discriminate. The office was full all the time, and my practice was to ask Mr. Joyce if he would take on the men, which was done each month. Of course it might happen that I would give a note to a personal friend, but there was no such thing as wholesale discrimination, and the best proof I offer of that to Harbor Main District, to the House, and to the country, is that I did not have one application this year for relief beyond a request or two from a man who wanted to go to Corner Brook. There was one woman who understood that there was to be relief work here, and that it was to extend to the outports, and she asked me for a note, and I told her the only thing I could do was to give her a note to Mr. Furneaux, the Relieving Officer at Kelligrews. She said she didn't want that kind of assistance while she or her husband could earn a dollar. That was the only case, and I say that the Government work last year was sufficient to keep the people during the winter. I trust that it will begin again as soon as possible, and that those who have

no other employment will get work on the railroad from St. John's to Bay de Verde, because as I stated before, this is the line over which most traffic travels, and the Government, if possible at all should put it in first class condition. While this sort of employment is afforded the people will be independent instead of having to cut pit props, and be engaged at other foolish works as they were in recent years. I am delighted to be able to stand here and state that the people of Harbor Main are independent, particularly those on the South Shore, from whom many appeals for assistance came before. No calls for aid were made to me, and I do not think to my colleague, or I would have known it as we work in harmony. I promise Mr. Hibbs that this year there will be no discrimination, as we want all the people to be employed. I have no bad feeling against any man because he voted against us the last time, as I know he will be with us the next time. There are hundreds coming over to the side of the Monroe Government, because they have been treated fairly, which is in keeping with the policy of the Party. You talk of the Tariff and I hope it will not last longer than this year, but if the people can get good employment at fair wages they will be willing to pay the extra few cents on tea or anything else. I say by all means give lots of employment, and pay a man for a good day's work. That is my policy, and it is also the policy of the Honorable Mr. Monroe. Yes, Sir, I say go ahead with the Highway Policy and the Dock, and give us first class roads, dock, hotel and bridges, but do not neglect the connecting roads. Spend the money and give the people employment. I hope to see all the bridges in Green Bay and Trinity in the near future built under the direction of the Government Engineer of concrete composed of good clean sand and cement. The secret of concrete structure is in the proper proportions of the material used. It is waste of money at the present time to build wooden bridges, as they will not last more than twelve years. I say put the roads and bridges in first class condition, and as the years go on borrow more money and build more roads, etc. There should be no discrimination, and I would not stand by a Government which would not look out for the people. But if there are any jobs to be given, give them to the men who worked for us and put us where we are. I do not believe in giving the plums to those who were opposed to us, as in doing that we would be playing the part of hypocrites. There should be no discrimination, but men should be given a chance to earn an honest living. I do not believe that the Honorable Mr. Monroe would stand for discrimination as that is not his policy. The Prime Minister is too honest and the intentions of his Government are too honest. It is the duty of the Opposition to criticise and that is what you are there for. Otherwise you would not be a loyal Opposition. The Leader of the Independent Party is smiling, I can see. I can quite see the force of the argument of the honourable member for Fogo, but then the fault is with the farmers themselves because they do not give us the best article they have to give.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Chairman, I agree with some things that the Honourable Minister of Posts has said particularly his reference to motor roads. Some of us have had a little to do with roads and this brings to my mind an incident that occurred in 1923. The Road Commission that I had the pleasure to be identified with, built a fairly good road to Holyrood, and I happened one day to visit a certain hostelry which is well known to the Hon. Minister. The proprietress

of the hostelry in commending us for what we had done said that business was very slow until we built this highway, but added that now she was compelled to get assistance to cater to her patrons, and continued she, "Mr. Hibbs can you tell me what Mr. Woodford was doing while occupying the position as Minister of Public Works for the past twenty five years, and holding a Seat in the House of Assembly as Senior Member for the District."

MR. GODDEN—Mr. Chairman, in my opinion agricultural products in this country are not encouraged and are not protected enough. A reason for that is that just at the time that our home crops are gathered, the Canadian crops are gathered also. I mentioned a few weeks ago that a close season was necessary in this country against the imported article and I still adhere to that. It is generally admitted that potatoes at any rate can be produced in this country in sufficient quantities to supply local requirements, the trouble is the Newfoundland farmer does not get value for what he grows; the reason for that is because the Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia farmers being unable to sell their produce at home, consign them by the shipload to this market and their agents here dispose of it at sacrifice prices, which interferes with the successful selling by our own local farmers, who find themselves up against this competition every Fall. The new Tariff gives a certain amount of protection in cabbage, but I would like to go a step further in the interest of our farmers, and put on a higher rate of duty on imported potatoes at a certain time of the year, such time could be decided on by the Hon. Minister of Agriculture. If this idea is carried out I believe it will prove a practical protection to our agriculturalists. Referring again to the new tariff, I would point out what I consider the inconsistency of it. The Hon. Minister of Finance stated that increases were so arranged as to make those best able to pay to bear the increase. But just compare sugar which is a staple article to rich and poor alike, the duty on sugar is considerably higher than on fancy chocolates or confectionery. Chocolates of the more expensive kinds are a luxury and therefore I submit should be levied on at a much higher rate than Sugar. The idea of putting the extra taxes on the shoulders of the people who can best afford to pay is quite right, and that is the idea that should be carried out. This Tariff is not based on that idea, and is, as I said before, entirely inconsistent with the promises made.

MR. SCAMMELL—We have now come to an item in the tariff around which a great deal of debate centres, namely, tobacco. At this juncture, I would like to ask the Minister of Finance if he would be good enough to raise the Committee.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—The Minister of Finance will not raise the Committee.

MR. SCAMMELL—That is very impertinent of the Finance Minister. My reason for asking this courtesy, is that the other day the Opposition party asked for the report of the Tariff Commission on which you have based this tariff, and you have tabled a report of this commission; but I must, with all due respect to the Minister, submit that this report was not the report of the Commission in globo. It was not the whole report. I submit that the Tariff Commission had to report on the schedule of duties which they thought should be amended. We have no hesitation in saying that the schedule of duties embodied in this report is not exactly what the Tariff Commission reported, and I would ask the Minister of Finance to

raise the Committee until the Opposition get this report.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—The Minister of Finance will not raise the Committee.

MR. SCAMMELL—Well, I trust that the day is not far distant when the people of this country will raise the Minister of Finance.

Mr. Chairman, I have a few general observations to make regarding the Budget, Tariff and Expenditure which is now before the Legislature, and seeing that the Finance Minister, at the outset was not sufficiently courteous to accede to my request, I think it only fair and proper that the members of this House should be acquainted with the fact that a couple of years ago, a Royal Commission was appointed to investigate this whole matter, and for the information of the members of this House, and also for those outside the House who had not the pleasure or who were not instructed in this matter, I propose to read a copy of the report of this Commission.

(Reads Report)

Now, Mr. Chairman, there can be no doubt in the minds of the honorable members as to the authority under which this Commission to which reference has just been made set to work to report to the Government of Newfoundland on the question of the status of the revenue at that date. There is a saying, or at least we have learned somewhere in the pages of history of a people who have in some way offended their dieties or their God, and who, as a punishment, were compelled to continually and forever pour water into a tub which had holes in the bottom, and through which the water is continually running. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, for the first time glancing on the present outrageous taxation proposals, as outlined in this Budget now before the House, in some way or other the people of Newfoundland have offended the present deities or gods who exist in charge in the Government circles, and for some reason or other the people of Newfoundland are to be eternally condemned to the punishment of pouring money into the Exchequer of Newfoundland that is continually flowing out at the other end.

I don't imagine, and I don't suppose for one minute that at the time the present Government went to the country, the people of Newfoundland, when they returned them to power had ever contemplated that such a perfectly outrageous tariff would be given to the country as we have here before us to-night. It is now nineteen days since the Finance Minister first introduced this Budget and brought these proposals for increased taxation to the notice of the country. To put it mildly, when these proposals became known the country was astounded, and I wish that we could have on the table of the House for the public's information the telegrams and letters which the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance received from the outlying sections of the country since these proposals were introduced.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—I have not been in the receipt of one.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I received one alright.

MR. SCAMMELL—Well even that one serves my argument. What I want to say is that the country was absolutely astounded at the present proposals in the tariffff, and they certainly never expected such a raw deal from a Government that went to the country on the pretext of reduced taxation and expenditure. And the only argument put forward in extenuation or support of the present proposals is that they were the findings of the Tariff Commission. We from this side of the House readily charge

the Government they have accepted the proposals of the Tariff Commission without giving the consideration to them which they deserved. That statement has not been refuted, and I doubt whether it is capable of successful contradiction. They went to the Members of the Tariff Commission and asked them to enquire into these matters. It was never contemplated by the Government issuing such a Commission that these proposals were to be accepted and to be made the basis for further taxation in their entirety. To my mind it is nothing short of criminality on the part of the Government that has accepted these proposals without having given them the due consideration which a matter of such importance certainly merits. The Finance Minister must have known some months ago the requirements of the Tariff. He must have known that he would find himself in the position of having to avail of the report of the Commission. Why did he not give it more thought and deliberation. The facts are that since the Budget was introduce, since it was brought into this House on the 8th day of April, he has been subjected to all kinds of criticism and reproaches, and you have found yourself in the invidious position to-day that no Finance Minister in the history of this Colony has ever found himself before. You are in a pretty position. You came down here on the 8th day of April and delivered your budget, and since then you have been forced to amend it several times and you are going to amend it again.

The Finance Minister in his Budget Speech made reference to some facts, when tabling his estimates. He gave some figures. He stated that under the estimates that he brought in he anticipated a surplus of 207 thousand dollars, and he was man enough to say that these figurese were conservative. He has based his Customs Revenue under the present tariff that is now being discussed at $8,000,000, and taking into consideration his expenditure he anticipates a surplus of 207 thousand dollars. I want to ask him, taking into consideration the conditions of things at the present time, what justification he had for providing for a surplus to that amount. But I will go further and say, if the trade of this country is carried on this year as it promises to be that he will have a surplus of $750,000 instead of $207,000, wrung out of the people in taxation for what?

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—To pay the back bills of the Government that you were in.

MR. SCAMMELL—But if we go back to 1919 we will find that there were back Bills of that time.

The Finance Minister knows that the four millions of dollars surplus that the Government which went in 1919 left or the myth in connection with it, has long ago been exploded. Now I notice that in this Budget Speech that the Minister of Finance says:—

(Reads the paragraph)

I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that we have travelled a long way, it is a long journey from the day when Sir Edward Morris gave us the free breakfast table. And the result has been that you have lowered the standard of living in this country. The Government came into power with the promise that they would make the conditions of living better for the people. They were going to bring about a standard of living for the people that would make their condition a better one than it was at the time that they went to the country. But how in the world can they come down here with this taxation burden which they are now placing on the shoulders of the people of the country and still say that they are bettering the con-

dition of the people of Newfoundland. Particular instance have already been referred to by members of this side of the House who have spoken and who are more particularly connected with business than I am; but the fact is that you have raised the duties on the necessities of life of the common man even as high as 135 p.c. The average man wants to keep a decent table. He wants to live in a decent manner and he finds that is impossible at the present time; and yet this is the manner in which the present Government is rendering the conditions of the people of this country better than they were when they came into power. I must say that this afternoon I was frankly amazed by the disclosures that were made about the duties that have been put on agricultural implements. The Minister of Agriculture and Mines brought in legislation for the encouragement of Agriculture, and yet just a few days after the Minister of Finance comes in here with a tariff that is to raise the duties on agricultural implements ten per cent. There is another thing in connection with the matter of agriculture — there should be a duty on eggs. I know that the Minister of Public Works knows as well as I do that there are scores and hundreds of dozens of eggs around Conception Bay that cannot be sold because they cannot compete with the imported article. We want to encourage home industry and we want to encourage agriculture, and why does not the Government do something to encourage those who are interested in the raising of eggs. Now the Prime Minister took office with a great flourish of trumpets, and if I read a certain part of the manifesto that he had given to the country at the time I think it would not be amiss.

(Reads from the Prime Minister's Manifesto.)

How if such is the policy of the present Government have we that tariff before us to-day. Another of the most important items in this tariff that demands particular attention is the duty that has been placed on lines and twines. Lines and twines came into this country free before the present government came into power. Lines and twines are to be taxed 10 per cent., but the Prime Minister went to the country and told the people that the fishermen had to be helped because they were the producers of the country, and that it was his duty to help them prosper, etc., etc. Lines and twines came in on the free list with the exception of the five per cent. sale tax, but now they have the ten per cent. tax on them when they are imported and in addition there is the sales tax. This is a matter that will go very hard against the fishermen of this country. The result to-day is that we have created here an absolute monopoly. It is useless for an American firm to come here to do a cordage business. It is practically useless for a firm like the Norwegian Products Corporation to come here and do business to-day. Last year and the year before a great deal of business was done by the Norwegian cordage companies. It almost looks as if this is in retaliation for the business that these outside firms did last year that this tariff barrier has been erected. I do not charge the Prime Minister altogether, but I think that it is his manifest and manifold duty to see that the duties on lines and twines should come off again. The Hon. the Minister of Justice said that he had to swallow his vomit a hundred and fifty times a day since he brought in this new budget, and I think that it would be the right thing for him to peacefully swallow it once more when the Prime Minister takes the duty off lines and twines. The Finance Minister gave no sane reasons why the duty

should be put on lines and twines. The common fisherman is frankly annoyed and frankly astonished to see what the Government has done in this matter. The Ropewalk is in a very strong position financially. We are told that it is to encourage home industry that this business, which as I said was in a splendid condition, had to be given protection and I fail to see any justifiable reason why this firm should be given a protection when it bears so heavily on our most important class of producer. Then again there is the tariff on tobacco. You have made some reductions since the first proposals were brought in here, but this tariff still shows a considerable increase in the duties on tobaccos. There is absolutely no reason why this should be done. The average fisherman has very few luxuries that are allowed by his small income, but tobacco is one of them, and these proposals which are outlined here will bear very heavily on that class of man. Of course if the Government feels that it is politically so strong that it can overrule the wishes of the people to such an extent then that is their own funeral, and it will be their funeral just as soon as the people of the country get an opportunity to inter the deceivers. This Government has also come here and reduced the taxes on the banks, and they have taken the income tax off the wealthy people who can afford to pay it. If the people will not pay the income taxes why then the Finance Minister ought to get after them, that is all. Why did you take the taxes off the banks? Why take the income tax off yourselves and the people who could afford to pay it? Then you give a subsidy to wealthy concerns like the Ropewalk and the Tobacco Factory and plank on taxes on the poor man that effect the ordinary necessities of life. That is the position we find ourselves in; and I think that is the position which this Government is going to find very hard to explain to the people of this country with any amount of success.

Mr. Godden in his able speech referred to candy. I am not myself particularly interested in candy, but Mr. Godden is a business man who knows something about it. Here we find ourselves faced with another strange situation—that the lower grades of candy which the poor man consumes, which the average tot going round the street buys with a penny or a nickel, is covered by a protective tariff, while the higher grades of candy which, as Mr. Godden says, are consumed at plays and are brought for the bon ton girls, are placed at the lowest rate of duty. There again is a situation in itself which, if you were to go to the country, you would find very hard to explain; and which further shows that you have not given the serious consideration to the budget or to the tariff which the importance of the subject merits. What condemnation you are laying yourselves open to. What an attack you are laying yourselves open to when you go before the country and tell the people that you accepted the report of the Tariff Commission holus golus. You have never stated that you considered it as a Government, you have not denied the charge that you never seriously considered the proposals outlined in that tariff.

You talk in your manifesto, sir, about a policy of retrenchment and economy, you said that the condition of public finances was very bad, you stated it was worse than it was generally known. There must, quoth you, be a drastic reduction in public expenditure. What of that piffle now? There is already an increase of four hundred and fifty thousand dollars shown in the estimates, and doubtless there is more to come. Your said, "the Customs Tariff requires rear-

rangement with a view particularly to the encouragement of the prosecution of the fishery." Again out of your own mouths you have been condemned. 'The public expenditure must be reduced," and "the Civil Service must have increased efficiency." Who is there in the Government who is going to have the hardihood to stand up here and say that the cost of the public service has been reduced, or that the efficiency of the public service has been increased. I challenge any honourable minister to stand up and say that he can justify that statement.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—It has been increased to the extent that during the past few months we have discovered no more money order robberies.

MR. SCAMMELL—The Miniser of Justice well knows that knowledge of many of these things were had before he became the incumbent of his present office.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I know that; I am merely saying that there have been no more robberies, and you cannot say that there have. And the efficiency of the public service has been increased to that extent at any rate.

MR. SCAMMELL—That may be, and no doubt there may be something in what you have said, but it is noticeable that no other minister is able to say anything on behalf of his department.

The Prime Minister says in this famous manifesto that, if given power, he will cause thorough investigations to be made, etc. Now there is one thing that I do not like about all this. The promises are all very good, but the preamble to this manifesto seems to concern itself chiefly with damning Sir William Coaker. There is nothing that happened during the regime of the Squires Government that Sir William Coaker is not blamed with; and that seems to be the object of the preamble of this manifesto. Everything that the Squires Government did wrong Sir William Coaker is blamed for, and the Prime Minister was very insistent in urging upon the people of this country that the menace of Coakerism had to go, and that he would make these wonderful transformations promised in his manifesto. We are living and learning, and we are straining our eyes to see where the benefits are coming in.

What has been the policy of this Government during this the most important session that the Government will ever hold during its term of office. There has been a very big programme of legislation, and this House has already been sitting for about two months, passing bill after bill, and the only bill that has borne any trace of benefit to the fishermen of this country during these two long months of legislation has been the bill to provide for a bounty for repairing ships. And well I may say now, "Where, oh where has that bill gone?" We put it through here, through Committee and had quite an amount of debate upon its provisions, and we considered it very carefully, passed it and sent it up to the Legislative Council, and now where is it? Clear of that bill the whole policy of the Government since it came down here this session has been a programme outlining a carnival of public expenditure.

The most astonishing part of the Government's policy is the proposal with which the Government has come down here to spend two million dollars on public highways. At the head of the Government which presents this proposal to us is the same Mr. Monroe who stated in the Board of Trade on April 4th, 1922: "In my opinion it would be advisable not to spend another cent on roads for the next five years, and we should even let the

grass grow on the railroad." That was Mr. Monroe in 1922; that was the policy of the present Prime Minister two years ago as regarding the spending of money on roads, that for the next five years he would not agree with the spending of a dollar on roads. That was 1922; this is 1925—three years later, and now we have passed in this House legislation brought in by the Government calling for the expenditure of two millions of dollars on a public highroads proposition. The man who is responsible for that proposition is the same Mr. Monroe that spoke in the Board of Trade on April 4th, 1922. Where is the consistency? Where is the consistency of the Government's policy as taken from the utterances of individual members, such utterances as that of the Prime Minister which I have just mentioned. These are the things which we in the Opposition have to bring up, and for reasons such as these it is our bounden duty to oppose such propositions.

Some years ago down North an organization was started known as the United Fishermen. I have no objection to any such organization being started. In so far as the United Fishermen have laudable objects and aims we would support them; but I was always under the impression that the United Fishermen was nothing more or less than a political catspaw. It was said some time ago, and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries seemed to entertain the idea, that the United Fishermen some day would rule Newfoundland. If the United Fishermen ever expect to rule Newfoundland they will have to change their ways and display more consistency and pertinacity in their objects and their aims than they have displayed in the past.

We were all nonplussed when the United Fishermen first came on the scene. We all expected a little cloud that would come up out of the North would assume gigantic proportions, but it seems that since the present Government took office the United Fishermen have vanished.

Here is a document addressed to His Excellency the Governor in Council. This is the petition of the United Fishermen, and I submit, Mr. Chairman, that it has a very important bearing upon the subject under discussion before the chair this afternoon, because it shows how a body of fishermen expected at that time to bring about a change in expenditure, and were so led to support the Government now in office, and I think it is pertinent to show how they have been basely deceived.

(Reads Petition of the United Fishermen addressed to His Excellency the Governor in Council.)

At that time the United Fishermen were in hopes that public expenditure would be drastically reduced. The Prime Minister at that time was a colleague of Mr. Bennett's, and that was the doctrine that they preached from every platform—that if the Bennett party were returned that they would be in a position to reduce public expenditure to the extent of fifty per cent.; and the men who preached that stuff knew that it was not possible. They must have known it if they were serious minded. They must have known it if they seriously considered the estimates and thought at all about the general position of the country. They must have known that expenditure could not possibly have been reduced to that extent, and they must have known that they were delibrately perpetrating a hoax upon the electorate. I took the estimates for that year—1922—and laid them on the table and asked any man in the audience to show where expenditure could be reduced in any of the various items, and I said that if Mr. Bennett were returned to power and

could reduce expenditure by two million dollars, I would be one of the first who would gladly go back on the floors of the House and support him. But that was what these men thought, and were lead to believe could be done. Many of these United Fishermen have discovered to-day what a hoax the whole thing was and have nothing but disgust for those who so mislead them.

Mr. Chairman, no man, no sensible man who had the welfare of the country at heart, or had the welfare of the people at heart, and who knew conditions and circumstances as they existed at that time, could deny that the objects of the United Fishermen movement as outlined in these proposals was not reasonable, and was not sane, and if they could be put into practical aplication, that they would not have been for the benefit of the country. But the situation goes on to-day—we are further than ever from that position and from the desires of the United Fishermen. Now, as I said before, I have no objection to any organization or body of men of fishermen having a say in the Government of this country, but if the United Fishermen are to even entertain the idea of having any power in governing this country they will have to exhibit greater consistency and pertinacity than during the last few years has been exhibited by them.

It is a very serious charge that the Government to-day by these taxation proposals is going to lower the standard of living instead of raising it. If the Minister of Finance found himself in the position that he had to have revenue, whatever his excuse may have been, there was always the excuse open to him of re-enacting the old tariff, and have nothing to do with reducing the taxes on banks and incomes this year.

The great objection that I have to the Budget of the Hon. Minister is that it contained too much politics and too many political references, and therefore it is only the more reasonable to understand why the debate on such a budget brought on such a political furore as this has.

I thought the Hon. the Prime Minister would be in a position to-day to make a definite statement as to just what the Government proposals are as to Bonavista Harbor project. I wonder how much politics is rankling in his breast as to this matter and would like to know just how he views it. I am not in favor of the suggested breakwater and I am still convinced that the digging of this canal to the Pond so as to make the required shelter for the fishing boats is the best plan in the interests of the people. Seventy thousand dollars have been spent on it already and forty-six thousand more would make the total only $116,000. If my memory serves me aright, the sum of $120,000 was spent in the last few years on a pier at Grand Bank and I would like to know just what is the condition of that pier to-day. It certainly is no more to spend the money on the project for Bonavista than it is to spend it for the benefit of Grand Bank. I do not at all dispute the right of the people of Grand Bank to that pier but I think that at least as much consideration should be given the matter of the Harbor for Bonavista. Now here is the report of Mr. Gray on this subject to the Hon. the Prime Minister.

(Reads report).

I wonder how many times exactly the Hon. the Prime Minister has taken backwater on this project. This will be another illustration of how a man can be made swallow his statements. What I object to is the fact that it seems Mr. Grey's report was based on the facts and figures supplied him by the Government Engineer, Mr. Hall. But if the Hon. the Prime Minister wanted an independ-

ent and competent opinion on the project there should have been no collusion between Mr. Grey and Mr. Hall. We all know that Mr. Hall had all kinds of ideas as to this matter—sometimes he approved it and sometimes he opposed it and therefore his opinion is of very little value. The same thing applies as to the Dock. Nobody in the House would entertain the first suggestion as to the repairs and the Government was forced to secure an independent opinion but this like the matter of the improvement at Bonavista, was based on the views submitted by the first engineer and therefore was of little or no value. As a matter of fact it was not an independent opinion at all, as it was largely influenced by the first one. I think if all these Dock opinions had been turned down it would have been much better for all concerned and would have been the best thing that could have happened.

(Reads report).

Can the Hon. the Prime Minister tell me just how long Mr. Grey stayed at Bonavista in connection with this project. I must say that I never met the gentleman and his credentials as an engineer may be alright. It is true that he has a lot of initials after his name and appears to be a man of repute in his line, but he was not long enough at Bonavista to say whether or not the connection with the Pond would form a safe refuge for the fishing boats or not. He did not make examination enough to say what should or should not be done. He says

(Reads report).

That is Mr. Grey's opinion.

(Reads report).

It will certainly be some consolation to the fishermen of Bonavista to know that Mr. Grey after a day and a half's examination of the project on which they had set their hearts, says that it should be abandoned.

(Reads report).

Then he goes on to say that the breakwater described could be built for $30,000. And there is another point. We have already spent $70,000 on it and if the original idea had been carried out it would not have cost anything like a quarter of a million dollars. We have spent $70,000 and now he says to spend $30,000 more.

(Reads report).

Well, Mr. Chairman, I do not profess to be an engineer or to know anything in a technical way about this project, but I have been closely associated with the fishermen of Bonavista and they say that a breakwater would not be satisfactory in any way or any advantage to them at this place. If it were it would have been embarked upon by Sir Wm. Coaker when he undertook the connection of the Pond with the sea. As a matter of fact this matter attracted the attention of the Admiralty years ago which shows that there must be reason in it.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—And they turned it down. I have the report in my office.

MR. SCAMMELL—I would be glad to see it. Perhaps the Hon. the Prime Minister speaks from knowledge but I doubt that this project is not a good one. The Admiralty had surveys made and no doubt but for various circumstances would have gone on with the project. Now we have spent days talking about taxation here and it seems to me that we are killing the goose that lays the golden egg. It is alright to talk of getting a revenue of $8,200,000 next year but we have to consider where the people are to get the money to pay this huge sum. You cannot get blood out of a turnip. What is the position to-day with regard to the fish markets? The Hon. the Prime Minister and every other member of this House knows that the outlook at the present time is anything but encouraging. What will be the price of our fish next year in the

foreign market. Who will dare hazard a guess? And who will guarantee that the earning power of the people will be as great as last year, and it will want to be as great if not greater if we are to get this revenue. There are no signs on the horizon to-day to indicate that we will have as many men engaged this year as we had last at ordinary labor. More men will be released to prosecute the fisheries and the consequence will be that it will be harder to get supplies and the earning power of the majority will be decreased. The people will not be able to make up this taxation and next year we will be in a worse muddle than we are now. There is a balance of trade against us. The imports last year were six or seven millions in excess of our exports and under these conditions how can our fisheries be improved at home or abroad.

The Committee then rose until 8 o'clock.

Mr. Chairman when the Committee rose at 6.30 I was on the point of summing up my remarks on the Tariff that is now before the House. And at the moment I had been making some reference to the dock, and I had pointed out that there was very little to be learned from Mr. Gray's visit to this country to give us an independent report, for the reason that in the two instances to which I referred the dock in one case and the Bonavista Canal in the other it was quite evident that Mr. Gray had come collusion with the report that had already existed. Since then I have been handed a copy of Mr. Gray's report and the opening paragraph bears out the contention that I have made just now. Mr. Gray starts by saying....

(Reads).

This forms a very important part of the Government proposition that the Government of Newfoundland was obliged to take into this House and to ask us to authorise them to raise a loan of $6,000,000 for various public works. They outlined to us part of the proposition in connection with the expenditure of the $6,000,000 and that is that $1,250,000 shall be spent in repairing and reconstructing the dry dock. I submit Mr. Chairman, that if we are dealing with one million dollars of public moneys at a time like this when the taxes will be raised to that amount and I suppose as the Minister of Finance informs us this tariff in a short while will be the accepted law of the land. Then I submit in view of the circumstances that this expenditure forms a very important part of our financial policy and progress. When the Dock resolutions were brought into this House the Hon. Members on this side took the position that we ought to have had an independent report on the dock and that it was a question whether it could not have been reconditioned for the next twenty or thirty years with the expenditure of what the dock resolutions proposed. The Government did not have the grace to accept the suggestions offered by this side of the House. The resolutions were thrown into another arena of discussion and this legislature made its opinion felt upon the Government to such an extent that the Government were obliged to accept the position which the opposition took. We have had an independent engineer come down here and we have had him report and the point that I want to make is this, that after all is is questionable whether after all that report was worth while when we consider that as the basis of his report Mr. Gray accepted first of all the reports of the two previous engineering firms. In regard to the construction and the present condition of the dock, Mr. Gray has nothing to say about the dock which was not identically what the Government expected and what we expected when the Government brought on this man to give an independent opinion.

(Reads again).

Apparently, and I think that this is a fact, that both Colonel Mitchell and Mr. Crandell were of the opinion that there was a danger of the dock collapsing and the opinion of Colonel Mitchell was that the Government should close the dry dock. And today it is open again. We are getting not two opinions but three opinions and just now I would not be a bit surprised before there is anything done about the dry dock, before there is any definite policy put into practise, that we shall have to get another opinion.

(Reads again).

There is a great difference between the estimate of five hundred thousand dollars and a million and a quarter. And if the dock can be put into condition for five hundred thousand dollars and be held safe for that amount then surely the Government is not going to spend a million and a quarter on it. Save the difference between the million and a quarter and five hundred thousand dollars and make a corresponding difference in the tariff and improve the conditions of living for the people. Now in connection with this one point of the Government's policy regarding the dock, it has been shown that although we were told on the opening day when the Speech from the Throne was delivered, that the Government had given the nature of the legislation that it was going to bring in during the session, and that it was ready to proceed with the programme that it had mapped out. But we find that the facts have not justified the position taken on opening day. We have been here in session for more than two months, and there are no indications whatever that the Government is ready with any programme any more than it was on the opening day of the House on February 18th. These very tariff resolutions that we are discussing here have not received that consideration from the hands of the Government which they should have received. And when they were handed down here in this House there were men in the Government ranks that were just as much astounded as were the members on this side of the House. Mr. Chairman, I am compelled to reiterate the statement that I made here this afternoon that the Opposition has felt it to be its bounden duty to oppose these resolutions, not from any political standpoint or from a position of political partisanship, but they felt that it was their bounden duty to oppose them because they tended to lower the conditions of living of the common people, and to make it harder for them to get along. You are increasing the taxation and it is very little use for you to throw back at us that when we were in power we expended millions on relief works, or to say that we wasted this, or that we did this, that or the other thing. You went to the electorate with definite promises to reduce taxation and to undo the wrongs that we were supposed to have done, and this is the result of the pledges that you made the electorate. Is it going to be an answer to the country that the Squires Administration did this or that, or that they raised this loan or that. It is not going to be an excuse that you have to borrow money and put on increased taxation because the past administration did the same thing. Such is not the answer that is going to be expected by the people of this country when you go to give an account of your stewardship. The electors will not be concerned with what transpired in past administrations, but they will be very highly concerned and very seriously concerned with what is taking place in the country at the hands of the present administration. Your duty to the country is to see that you make

the conditions of living better. It is your duty to reduce taxation as you have promised.

You have failed signally in the performance of both these duties. As I said before if we held our peace and the people held their peace and did not protest against this fiscal policy of yours, then we would be failing in our duty. The salient points of your policy are after all in the first place that you have borrowed millions of dollars. Even admitted that you met with a deficit of a million and six hundred thousand dollars. Or a million and eight hundred thousand dollars. Oh, yes, that is a distinction without a difference. Let us suppose that it is two million dollars. Say that you met with a deficit of two million dollars. It is very well known how that deficit came about. We all know the conditions that the late Government had to contend with. You know that we were in office and had to contend with problems which was much more difficult than exists at the present time.

When we were financing this country, we did it in a much better way than this Government is doing, even though they are experiencing much better conditions. It is true that we opened the rock sheds in St. John's East and West and put the men to work and did not give them the dole. And the men would like it much better to-day to be working and earning the money that they are getting and not to have to be stigmatized as paupers. If you provided this class of work, you would be spending the money wisely, because with the erection of the dock which is to be done this year this stone could be used to considerable advantage. And if this were done there would not be a thousand or more men who to-day are stigmatized as paupers. I am only handing back the criticism that has been thrown at the past administration because of the rock sheds. The people of this city who have to go down and receive the dole at the present time, would much prefer to be able to earn the money even if it were cracking rocks. Now in the programme that has been put before the House at this session, you have outlined a policy whereby you were going to have two million dollars spent on roads and you have not given any justification for that policy. This money is not to be spent for the people of Newfoundland, because they want to do business over them, but because of the supposed tourist traffic. You are not spending the money because it is for the good of the people of Newfoundland, and because they should have roads to traffic over, but you are spending the two million dolalrs for some outsiders that it is expected will come here in accordance with this tourist policy. This is the fishermen's paradise. But they are not finding it so, and I think that we will live long enough, and I trust, Sir, that you will also live long enough to see that this two millions of dollars that is to be spent on the roads and the million and a quarter dollars on the dock, is not the right thing to do; and that the position taken by the present Opposition is the right one. The Finance Minister must have a remedy. He states that he must have a million dollars more revenue; but what about the surplus revenue that we have been hearing so much about? We have seen figures comparing one month in the present year showing much more revenue that the corresponding month in previous years, and we find it very difficult to believe that these are facts when we hear the statement of the Minister of Finance that he must have a million dollars more revenue. You would have been bold, Sir; you would have

been courageous and you would have been applauded by the people of the country if you had embarked on the policy with which you went to the electors, and if you had made a serious effort to reduce taxation. But in view of the facts and present conditions, I fail to see how the people of the country can give credence to the words that have been uttered by the Government. We have not heard anything from anybody on the other side of the House about the Gander project. We passed legislation last session giving the rights and the charter, but we have not heard anything more about the matter. If it does not materialize the Government is going to be faced with a serious labor problem. Your revenue which was collected was dependent on the earning power of the people, and as I pointed out this afternoon, if the earning power of the people is up you get a good revenue, but if it is down you do not get a good revenue. You are taking every occasion to reduce the earning power of the people. You have penalized the District of St. Barbe with your lobster regulations, and we are not allowed to kill a caribou, by a crowd of men who call themselves the Game and Inland Fisheries Board. You are making it more difficult for the average fisherman to make a decent living on every occasion that offers. The situation is a serious one and I do not think that the hon. members on the other side of the House have given the situation sufficient thought. I understand that the fiscal policy of the Finance Minister is the fiscal policy of the Government. But I think that the hon. members on the other side of the House have not given the situation sufficient attention or as much as it has merited. There is a great deal in this budget which demands careful attention. There are a great many resolutions in the budget which a man may find it difficult to understand, and I presume that as these go through the Minister of Finance and Customs will be in a position to give us an explanation as to just wshat these resolutions mean.

I thought that this Government said that the powers of the Governor-in-Council should be very largely circumscribed, but it seems to me that under the various resolutions appended to this tariff that we are giving the Governor-in-Council a great deal of power, and it might be pertinent to ask the Minister of Finance and Customs if there is any alteration in these various resolutions which are different from the old tariff. Take for instance Page 67, where there is a resolution in these words:

> In addition to the duties hereinbefore provided to be levied, raised, collected and paid on all goods, wares and merchandise imported into this Colony there shall be raised, levied, collected and paid on the goods, wares and merchandise hereinafter in this section mentioned imported into this Colony from Countries the fishermen of which have the privilege of taking codfish upon all parts of the Coast of Newfoundland and its Dependencies, an din which countries duties are, or hereafter shall be levied upon fish or the produce of the Fisheries, exported from the Colony or its Dependencies to such countries, the following rates: viz: Pork, the barrel .. .. ..75¾ etc.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—That was in the 1905 Tariff.

MR. SCAMMELL—Is the wording verbatim?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—The wording is practically verbatim.

MR. SCAMMELL—If you will tell me that the wording is the same that will be sufficient, and we need not go back, but it seems to me that that section is worded rather clumsily, and

from 1905 to now is a long time, and we ought to be able to be in a better position to cook up resolutions in a somewhat better fashion.

What about this resolution:

In case of any country now imposing, or which may hereafter impose, an import duty on herrings exported from this country and imported into such country in vessels belonging to this Colyony, when such herring may be imported into such country in vessels belonging to the same free of duty, the Governor-in-Council may by proclamation impose an export duty equal to the amount of duty so imposed by such country aforesaid on herring exported from this Colony in vessels belonging to such country where such import duty is imposed.

Is there an export duty on herring at present?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Not that I know of.

MR. SCAMMELL—The Finance Minister knows that our fish going to America is taxed, and while I am not urging that herring should be taxed, I think that if America is not very soon going to do something for us in a reciprocal way, that the attention of the Finance Minister might be very well drawn to that resolution.

However, as I stated before, as we go through we shall give careful attention to these resolutions, and we shall seek to obtain from the Minister of Finance the fullest possible explanations. The position of affairs to-day to say the least, is not very encouraging. The "hope deferred maketh the heart sick," and the hope of reduced taxation and reduced expenditure which was raised by the promises of the Government has been shattered for all time as a result of what has come to light during this session.

We are, I am sure, all anxious to see the best possible done under the circumstances, but our bounden duty is to oppose these resolutions now before the House. It would have been better, as I have said before this afternoon, for the Finance Minister to have re-enacted the old tariff, and to have left the Income Tax proposals severely alone, and not to have lessened the tax on banks, and to have had nothing at all to do with subsidising our well off industries, and to have given more time and consideration to the Report of the Tariff Commission and the resolutions which are now before the House, and which I am bound to oppose.

MR. DUFF—Mr. Chairman, I feel sure that the remarks made by my friend, the hon. member for St. Barbe, have been listened to with great attention by the Finance Minister, and he must be struck with the arguments that he has brought before this House against increasing the duties. There is no question at all in the minds of the people of this country that it is going to be impossible to live in Newfoundland with an increased tariff, The position in the outports to-day will be the worst that it has been for many years.

I was very pleased to hear the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs say that his district is very well off financially, and that he had no people looking for Government relief. Unfortunately, I am not in that position, and I represent a district, the people of which are as thrifty and as economical as the people of any other district in the Colony. But the labor market is such that our people are on the verge of starvation, and it appears that the only relief that the Government is prepared to give them is the dole, and a great many of them are too independent to take that, unless they are absolutely on

the verge of starvation.

I would like to read a few extracts from the Manifesto of Sir Robert Bond, in 1908, and I think it will show that history is repeating itself, and Tory promises and performances regarding reduction and retrenchment are the same as they were in 1897, and they like the Tory Party mentioned had no intention of carrying out these promises.

(Reads from Manifesto).

I might also for the information of the House give the bounties for building ships given at that time.

For ships of fifteen tons and up, $4.00 per ton.

For ships twenty tons, $5.00 per ton.

And for ships 40 tons, $8.00 per ton.

There is some difference to the present bounty, is there not?

The Manifesto says again:

(Reads from Manifesto).

Mr. Chairman, I think it is a great pity that the present Government should not carry out their promises, and then we would not have to throw this up to them, and say that it is the same thing that happened long ago, and say that the Tories of those days are the same Tories of to-day, and that their promises are fulfilled in the same way.

We have been speaking of protection of the fisheries. I would like to get at the idea of the Government when they took the duty off hooks and placed the duty on lines and twines. I know that the Prime Minister told us that the Norwegian lines are subsidised. That may or may not be, but I am not here to prove that. You took the duty off hooks, and the difference in value of hooks compared to lines is 37c. against $6.00, and there is very great difference against the fisherman here.

Now the Prime Minister told us that Public expenditure must be drastically reduced, and that he would enforce a wise policy of expenditure. It is necessary to-day, Mr. Chairman, for this country, if people are going to be allowed to live in it, it is necessary to reduce taxation instead of increasing it, so why not cary out your policy and reduce expenditure. We have all over this country two telegraphs offices in little towns, and surely that is not necessary in a sparsely settled country like ours.

You have increased the Pensions list by thirty-seven very heavy pensions. You have increased the pay of Government officials and so it goes on. It was said some years ago by the present Prime Minister that this country should revert to a Crown Colony; and I perfectly agree with him, because at this stage it is evident that there is not any man on that side of the House that has any desire of helping the country in the way in which it should be helped by decreased expenditure.

Now you are going on with a great big expenditure of two million dollars on roads, one a half million dollars on the dock, and you are rerailing the railroad from Clarenville to St. John's and last, but by no means least, the big hotel. Where that hotel is going to end I do not know. Whether it will be turned into a poorhouse, or a skating rink, or a bowling alley, I cannot say but certainly I do not think it will pay. However, I suppose wiser men have decided upon the policy and I hope their desires will be realized.

In speaking the other day on this matter, I called the attention of the Finance Minister, that there was a two cents a gallon fee for inspection of cod liver oil, and he knows as well as I do that this country to-day cannot compete with Norway, and it is necessary that we should compete with this valuable produce of ours. I would ask that this matter would be given consideration by the Government, and that the two cents tax would be removed so that our people can

compete with Norway in the American market.

I do not suppose that the House would be inclined to consider a British preferential tariff, but that is being considered all over the world today wherever the British flag is flying, and we know that in the States they have the Fordney Tariff in operation and their products are protected as against ours and their goods are coming in here on the same terms as British goods. I am glad, Mr. Chairman, that we have in this country a Legislative Council though I understand they have no such body in some of the provinces of Canada. Apparently the men in that Chamber are listened to in connection with some matters and it is a good thing to have men to stand up for what is right. In many cases the opinions of those on this side of the House are over-rode but thank goodness we have the Legislative Council to take up our debates. I noticed that a few days ago the Council were discussing the Old Age Pensions Bill and it was stated that there were men on the list who were not 70 years of age though the law says they should be 75. I know of men who should not be on that list—men from Carbonear —but I was not a party to placing them on it. I call the attention of the House to this, and I think the least the House might do in selecting these pensioners is to consult me. We have men of 75 in Carbonear who are in poverty and yet the Hon. the Minister of Finance or someone else places on the list men who are possessed of means. Everyone knows that the law is clear and an affidavit has to be given as to the pensioner's age. There is one other matter that I have brought up before and I would like to ask why this man was thrown on the street simply because some disgruntled opponent of mine desired it. I believe that the Hon. the Minister of Finance was the one responsible.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—I do not wish to use a harsh word but I must say that the honorable member is absolutely wrong in his statement. If he knew how interested I am in the people of Carbonear he would not say what he did.

MR. DUFF—I apologize if you did not do it but I think I ought to have been consulted in the matter and I call on the members of the Government and Opposition to stand up in defense of this man. He is a competent man and had three sons to the War and now he is thrown on the street and if he can raise enough money he will have to leave the country. I am sure the Hon. the Prime Minister is not a party to this, nor the Hon. the Colonial Secretary who had sons of his own to the War. I hope my remarks as to this dismissal and the matter of pensions will have some effect. The House may not adopt my suggestion but you have to listen to it and I want you to be fair and straight in the matter.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, Mr. Scammell this afternoon asked the Hon. the Minister of Finance if he would raise the Committee and the latter did not feel like doing it. I understood on Friday that the Committee was raised in order to have the Report of the Tariff Commission printed so that every member of the Opposition and Government could peruse it and see if it coincided with this as brought down by the Hon. the Minister of Finance in his budget. We have placed on our desks the Report of the Tariff Commission, but it is not half the Report as the principal things are left out. I am not now referring to the evidence taken before the Commission.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—What is there outside the evidence?

MR. HICKMAN—The list of the duties in vogue which is the only thing of value to us.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FI-

NANCE—This is the same as printed in the resolutions. It is only the tariff as recommended by the Commission. I do not know of any changes except those already made.

MR. HICKMAN—That was the main thing needed as it is the only part we could check up. We have a printed list here, but the House wants to know if the tariff now going through is the recommendation of the Commission. When the Hon. the Minister of Finance laid his Budget on the table he said it was the recommendation of the Commission appointed by the previous Government, and last year when he laid the Estimates on the table he told us they were the Estimates of the Warren Government and he did not want to take the responsibility for them. Now he says this is the report of the tariff Commission appointed by the Squires Government to recommand a tariff. I presume that the Hon. the Minister of Finance wants to go ahead with Ways and Means and get through the session, but unless this is printed and circulated to the House it will be necessary for it to be read to the members, because outside of duties listed there is a great deal of matter left out—important matter—relating to the duties on goods coming in from countries which place a tax on our fish. This was a good opportunity for the Government to have an equitable tariff, and if they had gone into it and made the proper adjustments there is no doubt we would have such. It is hard to expect a proper tariff to come from a commission. A good many of those on the Commission were business men and it is only reasonable to suppose that they would not do anything against their own interests. So as I said before, if this tariff had been gone over by the Government an equitable one would have been arrived at. But to place it on the table of the House and ask us to adopt it without looking it over is not to be expected. When the House opened the Hon. the Prime Minister said there would be no delays, legislation was ready and everything would go right through and the session would be a short one. But now we have been open going on three months and the most important thing to be tabled—the tariff—has not been considered at all and we are asked to accept it "in globo" from the Commission. Certain changes have been made in the tariff and, as was remarked by the honourable member for Fortune a few days ago, the Government is not consistent in what they are doing. During the session of last summer they placed the duty on pork, beef, molasses and flour because it had been taken off by the previous Government by Minute of Council, which it was claimed was illegal. And as an excuse for the illegality of their actions they now say we will put it back again on the free list. But now they come into the House with a tariff from the Commission and decide to make some changes in it.

Well, if it is illegal to take the duties off certain commodities without bringing the matter before the Legislature, well certainly it is illegal to make any reduction in the tariff by the Executive Council. There is a great deal in this report that the country wants to know and it will be my duty to-night to read certain portions of it. Now I do not want to unnecessarily delay the time of the House, but I think that there is a lot in this report that the House should be made familiar with. Probably some of this is embodied in the Budget Speech of the Finance Minister.

(Reads from report.)

Every importer of salt pork in this country knows that it comes from the United States and from countries to where our fish is exported and which is not on the free list, as many peo-

ple suppose. I understand that, under the retaliatory measure this Government adopted, the extra duty on herring exported from this country in American bottoms is $1.25 on a barrel of herring. I suppose that this duty will not apply to such a place as Porto Rico, which is such a great buyer of our fish products. I hope and trust that this extra duty will not be put into force in the direction mentioned, because it will only act as a hardship on our people. However, I would like to see the United States taking our products duty free, because if such a tax goes into effect we may have to pay, perhaps, five dollars per hundred pounds, or five cents per pound, on tobacco.

If each member of the Government had a copy of this it would be very easy to check up when the tariff is being read. Now as I said before, when the Finance Minister comes in here and brings down his budget, he brings down the estimates for the coming year. He lays this budget on the table of the House, then he has to make changes in the tariff. He has not even the support of the members of his own side. Now I don't think that any Minister of Finance should have to make amendments for anything of that nature. Of course if he has not the confidence of his own side of the House why then, there is a reason. Now as I said before this is the greatest opportunity that the Government had to bring down an equable tariff instead of throwing the tariff upon the table without even the members of the Government themselves knowing what is in it, because the Hon. Minister of Justice who is one of the executive tells me that he knows nothing about it. So if the other members of the Government are the same how can we expect to have a proper tariff laid on the table.

This tariff, as I stated before, is bearing so heavily upon the class of people who have small incomes that it is going to lower the standard of living. Now we will not talk about the fishermen this time, we will talk about the ordinary man, the labourer or the clerk or a man in that walk of life who is earning a moderate salary. This tariff bears very heavily upon him. Unless his salary is increased which is not likely on account of the burden put upon his employers this is going to lower the standard of living. It may seem very small to have a cent a pound put upon such commodities as beans and things of that nature or on butter, but when there are two or three cents a pound placed as duty upon everything that man consumes, he soon will have to cut into his income and if he had difficulty in the past to make both ends meet he will have greater difficulty in the future, and he will have to do without a great many things that he was accustomed to. Now although the Government pretends that they are taking the duty off the poor man's commodities the fisherman's articles such as beef and pork, they are not taking it off the poor man's meats, because after all the poor man eats spare ribs and things of that kind and the duty is on that as before. It is three dollars a barrel more. Ham butt pork and fat back pork and things of that kind that the Minister of Finance was telling about on the opening day that costs money and is consumed by better class therefore the duty is not taken off the ordinary man's living.

Now, when I was speaking before about tariff, I called the attention of the Government and the Prime Minister to the duty on flour. He assured me when the contract was made last year with regard to the proposition of putting up a flour mill the Government gave no guarantee as to protection by a duty on flour . I understand since that there is some dispute over that contract and it is

doubtful whether the Government is not liable for breach of that contract. Now I do not know whether the gentleman who is here in the interests of the building of that flour mill has the means to erect a flour mill at all but I do know that if he has the money he should be encouraged. And this Government should make a point to discover if the fact that flour is on the free list will prevent that man from coming in here with his thousands of dollars and erecting this mill. Now the erection of this mill will mean, I suppose, the expenditure of half a million dollars among the people of St. John's in labour for cartage and labour in construction and I think that we can not very well afford to do without that if there is any possibility of getting that industry in St. John's. Therefore I think that the Government should well take care of what they are doing before this tariff goes through and find out whether there is an possibility of that flour mill being erected or whether the taking off the duty is going to prevent this man from coming in here with his money. I understand that the Prime Minister made the statement a few days ago that lines and twines made in Norway are subsided by the Norwegian Government. He told me that he had some evidence to back it up but I have been since speaking to a Norwegian and he told me that the only protection that the manufacturer of lines and twines has in Norway is that they pay a duty of one cent a pound on the imported lines. And when lines are exported to foreign countries the Government gives a rebate on the manufactured article. If that is correct that is not a subsidy. It is no competition for us to be subsidized by a foreign government. That is only what any country would do. Give a rebate of the duty on those commodities that are manufactured in return for the labor given in the country, when the manufactured article is exported from the country. Newfoundland would do the same thing for any other country. The duty put upon lines and twines is not a fair duty because of the increased cost of catching fish, and as I said before we cannot afford in this country to increase the cost of catching fish. The duty on lines and twines is 10 p.c. and 5 p.c. which is 15 p.c. In addition to that lines can be assessed at their domestic value under the Dumping Act. Therefore if lines and twines costing $7.00 a dozen in the country of manufacture, and the local manufacturer's price is ten dollars, an additional duty can be inflicted by the Minister of Finance if he thinks that he should do so. It does not mean very much to a man who has a boat and goes out with a hand line and catches fish. But it means a tremendous lot to the man who is fitting out banking schoners, like the industrious people on the West Coast who fit out for the banks in the spring of the year with trawls. And in an outport of that kind it means a difference of two or three hundred dollars in the banker's outfit, and I am sure that there is a great difficulty in making these vessels pay, and that with the additional cost there wil be much more difficulty than in the past. The bankers will be done away with altogether and eventually you will find that beam trawlers are coming into existence, and there wil be many fishermen who cannot afford to buy those kind of ships; there will not be one-tenth employed fishing then as now. And just as soon as you have these trawlers on all the banks where the fish frequent the trap fishery will go right out of existence. Now the last time I spoke I mentioned about some addition to the duties, and the Prime Minister said that they were not correct. But they were. I have

had it figured out by a man who is in the hardware business, and the additional duty on these materials are as follows:

Fencing wire, 20 p.c.; Sheet Lead, 40 p.c.; Paint Brushes, 10 p.c.; Splitting Knives, 57 p.c.; Sheet Iron, 40 p.c.; Hammers and Hatchets, 15 p.c. These are the adidtional duties that are put on these articles under the new tariff, and everyone of these articles are used by men who prosecute the fisheries. At the present time as every man who is in any way connected with the fishery knows, that the traps are getting worn out.

I say that this is not the time to tax the necessaries such as lines and twines, which are so necessary in the prosecution of the main industry of the country. Now there is the tobacco business. And I am prepared to say what I said here before and that is that the duty on tobacco should not be increased. The increase on the tobacco is giving to the Tobacco Factory a protection of thirteen and one half cents a pound. That is on the better grades of tobacco and the other is cheaper and the duty is less, but this means an increase of about five cents a lb., and this means a lot to the fisherman who has to pay for an article that is necessary for the fishery. The Prime Minister made a statement here before and he failed to prove it. He did not give any figures to prove it. Can you state now that the duty has not been increased on Tobacco?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The local factory has not increased protection. There is an excise duty on tobacco which is equal to the increased duty on tobacco.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPOSITION—I was not referring to the local factory. I said that there was a protection and I say it now. We will leave the protectjon out of the question altogether and I will make the statement that there is a duty of thirteen cents a pound on tobacco. And then there is the excise duty on tobaccos. You have said that there is not an increased protection for the tobacco, but that is a thing that you will have to prove. I say that the fisherman has to pay an increase of five cents a pound on tobacco.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—If you increase the import duty and the excise duty the same amount there is no more protection.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—I think that you are making a monopoly out of the tobacco business. I believe that there should be a protection for every industry. That is where the Minister of Finance makes a mistake.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I would like to ask Mr. Hickman why he put up the price of tobacco fifteen cents a pound?

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—And I would like to ask the Prime Minister if he is a director and a shareholder of the Imperial Tobacco Company?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Yes.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Anyhow we will leave that matter of the excise duty alone. The fisherman has to pay more for his tobacco.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Don't charge him too much.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—If you will reduce the price of tobacco we will not charge so much. Now the Minister of Finance and Customs asked if I thought that an industry should be protected. I certainly do think that an industry should be protected. I certainly do think that an industry should be protected. I think that every industry should be protected to this extent that all the money that has been invested should be proected so that it will be

able to make a fair profit. But I do not think that an industry should be protected outside of that. I would not give it more protection than is necessary for its success. I do not think that the industry should be protected at the expense of the consumer so that he will not have to pay too much for his supplies. I think that every industry should be investigated, and I think that the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance should make an honest endeavour in this direction and see that every industry should be made to give employment to every man that can possible be given employment, but the protection should not be more than is necessary for them to make a fair profit, but more than that should not be allowed. But I do not think that this Government or any other Government has taken this question up with regard to the matters to which I have just referred. I would not see an industry in this country lose a single employee because it is so necessary to keep the people working, and any industry that may be fading out of existence on account of insufficient protection, I would be one of the first to support giving it protection; but I would not give any industry more protection than was necessary, no matter whether I was connected with it or not. Now the Government has taken the recommendations of the Tariff Commission, but they cannot tell us very much about the tariff with the exception that there are certain things that are to come into the country with increased duty, and that there will be a much larger revenue collected than was the case before. But there are some things that if they came into the country with less duty would really give a greater revenue to the colony. Take for instance the motor industry. No doubt the Government would feel diffident about reducing the duty on motor cars because somebody would say that they were taking the duties off the rich man's articles. But the Government should not look at it in this way. They should look at in a fair way, and in the best interests of the country.

But men who can afford to have a motor car—of course those that can well afford it will have it whether the duty is 65 p.c. or 25 p.c.; but every motor car or truck that is brought into the country needs a driver. A great many motor cars have drivers, and a great many people drive their own cars, but every motor car has to have new tires—probably next year, and has to have spare parts, and has to give labour for repairs to it. It would probably be a much greater source of revenue to the country when the thing is properly figured out. I figure out if the duty on motor cars were thirty per cent. there would be an additional $150,000 in revenue, because a car coming into the country is like an insurance policy—the insurance agent gets his commission on his premium every year, and as the thing progresses you will find new avenues of revenue. Your revenue will be very much more increased if you allow this commodity to come into the country at a lower rate of duty.

HON. PRIME MINISTER — We thought that ourselves, but thought that if we took any duty off them, we would be accused of taking the duty off the rich man's luxuries.

MR. HICKMAN—That is where you make the mistake. You cannot expect a Government to carry on successfully if they have nothing in their minds but politics. If a Government is elected with a substantial majority, they ought to cut out politics altogether for four years at least, and try to do the best possible they can to run things in a business like way, and not be following politics all throughout the session. You can never expect to have any more im-

provements in things when there is nothing else in a politician's mind but politics all the year round, morning, noon and night. If the Government is looking for more income—revenue income, that now is a commodity also which helps the farmers and the people living in the country to have some means of conveyance, it helps everybody in commercial life to have something that they can use to extend their business, and there are many people to-day that are not in a position to have a car or a truck, who would be able to have one if the rate of duty were reduced about three or four hundred dollars.

Now the Minister of Finance, of course, needs revenue. He has increased the estimates, and he has made a loan, upon which the interest has to be paid, and therefore he has to have additional revenue. But whether this revenue should be raised in the way it is, is a question that is very debateable, and we doubt very much that it should be put so much on the backs of those who are least able to bear it.

The Auditor General's report was placed on the table of the House some time ago, and I have it before me. The Government last year, in the last session had a great deal to say about executive authority, and about paying out money on executive authority, and they denounced the actions of the past Government who had done things on executive authority, and who had authorised things without bringing them before the Legislature. When they got in of course they were not going to do anything—authorise any payment until the matter could come before the Legislature. Now, I find in looking over the Auditor General's Report that there is a tremendous lot of money spent by order in Council. Referring to the Auditor General's report on the Post and Telegraphs Department he says: "Appointments for which Salaries have been paid under Order in Council." That means to say that these people named in the list which I am now going to read have been appointed since the House met last August.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—No, I would like to put you right about that. Some of those officials that are being paid under order in Council we knew nothing about. I think you will find crosses after those that were appointed by us.

MR. HICKMAN—Yes, it is there. There are over thirty names in the list on the Posts and Telegraphs Department that had their salaries paid under order in Council. The Minister of Finance and Customs tells us that these men were employed before, but I know that many were not employed before, because there are two at the head of the list—one a private secretary to the Minister with a salary of $1,500.00, and one following him who was recently in a dry goods store, Mr. Samuel Ryall.

That is why we are here tonight, why this tariff is before us to-night, so that we can put a duty on every commodity that men use, to pay the salaries of these people, a great many of whom have been appointed since this Government has gone into office. Now there is another list for the Posts and Telegraphs Department, these men whom I have previously pointed out. Part of these have the X opposite them, which shows that they were not in these positions before the Government went there. The Auditor General says about these, that these are officials whose salaries were paid without order in Council. They were simply brought up there and paid salaries from $960 to $420 a year.

Then there are the additional salaries of the officials of the Government. I would not criticize too many of these. I know there are a great many worthy officials in the Govern-

ment who have been there for a long time, and perhaps they have not been getting as good salaries as they might have been getting in some other walk of life, but at the same time I am not prepared to say that all those other salary increases are made to people who deserve them.

Then we go through the different things until we come along to the Department of Agriculture and Mines, and we find that since the House met last session, the Minister has created an inspector of beetles. I do not know what other kinds of insects he is supposed to inspect, but the fact remains that there is a vote of eighteen hundred dollars from the department of Agriculture and Mines for an Inspector of Beetles. I think he ought to be employed by Capt. Winsor.

Now the total for overdrafts is $139,000.00. I want to point out to the House that the Government which we have to-day is just as inconsistent as any Government we have had in the past, and if there is anyone who expects anything extraordinary from the present Government, he is expecting far too much.

The Governmnet is about to spend a considerable amount of money on rerailing the railroad from here to Clarenville, and I would suggest to them that if they are taking anything into consideration except the fact that they are going to lay down rails on the road, that now is the time, if the Government is going to rerail the road from here to Clarenville, to put down a standard guage rail, outside of the track that is already there, so that as we go along from time to time rerailing the road, we will eventually have a standard guage rail right throughout. What we have now is a narrow guage over which very little traffic can go, and if we had a standard guage road we could haul so much more freight over it, and we could make the passage across country in a much shorter time; and I trust that the time is not far distant when this will be done, and when the railroad will be electrified from here to Port aux Basques, and that is the only time that the railroad is going to pay, and we have in this country abundance of water power which gives us our electricity, and it is a very easy matter to have the road from here to Port aux Basques electrified. Then there will be no trouble to make the Newfoundland railroad pay, and we will have no trouble to sell it to a big corporation for a great deal of money. An electrified railway can go over substantial grades, as fast as over the level ;they can go over the hill almost as fast as they can on the level, like our street cars going over theatre hill, because they are safer with the grip on the line. I have been on electric railroads over the world, and I have noticed the substantial grades over which they have been able to go. It would be justifiable to spend money on things of that kind, so when we are rerailing the railroad we should look forward to the time when we are going to have an electric railroad, which I trust will be in the not very far distant future.

The Government, of course has had to spend a considerable amount of money during the past winter on what they call the dole.

They are getting no returns for it and a great many who have been compelled to take the dole have done so greatly against their will. A great many have been forced by the want of employment to take it though they did not want to take something for nothing. The Government claims that it is better to give the dole than employment, but I say they are wrong, as if the man who has been used to making a living by his hands and supporting his family is compelled to take the dole, his spirit is broken and he is not the same man as before. The Gov-

ernment should not have pursued this policy but should have given work instead. There are many forms of work to be done. In the controversy here a few days ago the statement was made that the Municipal Council and the Government could not come together as to the matter of giving employment. The Hon. the Prime Minister said that the Government was willing to give the Council money as a loan on interest and therefore the Council would not come to terms on it. If the Government is paying out $10,000 in a dole why not give it to the Council to spend? I have here a report of the speech by Mr. F. W. Angel on the city of St. John's, and, as all know, Mr. Angel is a practical man. He outlined the condition of the city and he says that on the advice of the Secretary of the Council there are 1,031 houses which have no sewerage, and then goes on to give the conditions as to uninhabitable houses. Many may not have gone into the sections where these conditions exist, but we all know that many people are living in quarters that are not fit for habitation. If the Government has $10,000 a week to give away for nothing, there is no reason why they should not spend it on St. John's in a way that would get returns. By this the people would be more independent, and even if we did not get full value in the matter of work, we would be able to clean up part of the city. Even if the money were spent on a workingman's house policy it would be better than giving it out in form of dole.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—The previous workingman's house policy cost us $60,000 and the workingman has not got a house yet. We have to pay that amount to the bank as a result of the last policy.

MR. HICKMAN—I think the least you might have done is spend some of the money on houses and in putting in sewerage and in making a general clean-up instead of spending it without any returns.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—We have no control over the city.

MR. HICKMAN—But if you hand the money over to the Council they would be glad to spend it and get returns. I have read that the Government were ready to advance the money to the Council, and while they were not prepared to take it as a loan on which they would have to pay interest, at the same time they would be prepared to use it in putting houses in proper condition, connecting sewerage, etc.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — If the Government made me a present of the money I would find some way to use it too. The dole is helping only those who are destitute.

MR. HICKMAN—But you are getting no returns.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — Everyone else would want to work as well as those who are destitute.

MR. HICKMAN—You have lists in the employment office and it would not be much trouble to arrange about the work.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —How would you draw the line between those who are out of work and those who have accepted the dole.

MR. HICKMAN—You should spend it in some other way supposing you only go to quarter of the value, as then you would be getting some returns.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER— That's about what you got out of the rock sheds.

MR. HICKMAN—Perhaps we did not get full value from them, but that has nothing to do with the present situation. Now I want to go on record as supporting the honourable member for Carbonear in his appeal for the reinstatement of the man who was a Government official and who gave three sons to the war. When this Government came into power he was dismissed to make room for another man. He is getting up in years and cannot find employment and he is thrown on the

streets in the sense that he is out of a position because the Government thought he voted against them and for Mr. Duff.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—When the Squires Government was returned in 1919 almost all the officials were turned out.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—If Mr. Duff would let us know just what he wants we may be able to give it to him, but there are so many sections in Carbonear we do not know what he wants.

MR. HICKMAN — Some consideration should be given this man who had three sons to the war.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY —Mr. Chairman, this man was put in office in place of a man who was turned out in 1919. I fail to understand the attitude of the honourable member for Carbonear in connection with this matter. On Friday, I think it was, after the session here he met the Hon. the Prime Minister and myself here at this desk on this matter and we gave him a message to take to Carbonear, but we got no answer since—at least I did not, but I do not know if the Hon. the Prime Minister did. We assured him that the matter would be looked after. Why then does he take an attitude so different this afternoon. We had a gentleman's understanding with him—if that be possible—in the matter.

MR. HICKMAN—The fact remains that this chap should not be dismissed because of his contribution to the war, and I think that the Government should have taken this into consideration. Before I finish there is just one other subject that I would like to refer to and that is the report of Colonel Ross on the Post Office. Mr. Ross was brought down here by the Government to inspect and report on the Post Office, which, the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs said, was only fit to grow potatoes in. The Minister also said that the employees were such that he could not trust either one of them to go on a message, that only by accident he discovered two officials reading his private correspondence and that he had to go outside and get Mr. O'Neill to attend to his private work. I might tell him now that Colonel Ross does not throw any bouquets at him in his report by any means. I think that Colonel Ross's report should have been printed and circulated amongst the members of the House, because he outlines here exactly what he found in the Post Office, but he does not say anything about what the Minister referred to here. What he referred to particularly was:

(Quotes from Report.)

Colonel Ross went away a short time ago and he says that the Minister has not carried out any of his recommendations. However, I know that the Minister has never been in that position before and which made it more difficult for him to fall into line than if he had been familiar with the workings of the department.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS — Mr. Chairman, the Ross report corroborates the statements that I have made over and over again in this House. When Colonel Ross came here we had the institution cleaned up. Before he came I remarked that the condition of some of the departments there were so dirty and filthy that one could grow potatoes in them. That is what accounted for that statement for growing potatoes getting abroad at first. With regard to the time clock, I might say that if Colonel Ross had seen the conditions of the institution when Sir John Crosbie and the Auditor General and I went through it he would have possibly an altogether different impression than the one he has. I agreed with Colonel Ross as to the time clock and I kept tab on the officials, and I want to inform Mr. Hickman that it was only on the first of April that this new system was inaugurated and is

still in operation, and it is hoped to have it operated in the future successfully. There is no official now who can leave on his own account as before. He has got to give a full explanation and a doctor's certificate when absent from work. Colonel Ross did not expect that all his recommendations were going to be carried out immediately. It will take time to bring about the necessary reforms in the department. Being new in the department I have to grope my way along, which is a very slow process, I admit; but to-day the department has a crowd of men that the Government has reason to be proud of, and in my opinion has one of the best working staffs in the Civil Service. Of course they are not all perfect, there is a black sheep in every flock. But I still maintain and reiterate that after I was a few days in the department I discovered two officials—two gentlemen some may call them—who were reading my private correspondence and the dismissal of these two officials were recommended by Colonel Ross. I got my stenographer to reply to that letter. And the letter that I was dictating I did not want it to be known, and the two men were looking over the stenographer's shoulder and reading it I still term them political spies.

MR. HALFYARD—I suppose your eyes were alright.

HON. THE MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—My eyes are alright. My ears might be defective but not my eyes. Now these two officials went down to the Registration Office and made an affidavit to the effect that they did not read that letter. And I want to state right here now, sir, that I have no faith whatever in that affidavit and I contend that that affidavit cannot be relied upon. What did Colonel Ross say when he was told of that matter? Well, he said if there is an official in your department in whom you have no confidence dismiss him immediately. And that is what I should have done. I would like to know if the hon. gentleman the leader of the Opposition would be satisfied with an official in his office that would resort to such a mean trick. If you caught him reading your private correspondence what would you do with him? Could I trust myself in the hands of those men to-day? Not at all. Why during the bye-election in Bonavista Bay, when Mr. Monroe was fighting his bye-election down there, I could not trust that man to do anything in that department, I had to send one of them on a wild goose chase, so to speak—up to Placentia Bay and down the North Shore, anywhere to get him out of the office. No, sir, that affidavit was not worth the paper it was written on. After catching Mr. Bradbury in the act, if there was another man in my position he would have been dismissed immediately. If the Minister of Finance or any other Minister was there, or you yourself, sir, you would not have tolerated such for a moment. Now as to the statement that I have made I am prepared to back it up and to reiterate that it is nothing but the truth. And while I am in control of the Department of Posts and Telegraphs I will not allow any man to play these low tricks. We will not be long in straightening it up. Every man is now working faithfully and well. There are no complaints. Mr. Milley is a good man. The Deputy Minister is a good man. In fact they are all good men. They realize that I am determined to see that the work of the department is carried out properly and we hear no complaints. The only thing I regret is that there are some officials who are not paid enough for their services. There are some men who have been a long time in the department and I have no doubt that the Prime Minister and the Government will take into consideration their length of services and the small salaries that they have been receiving and will see that justice is done to these

men. I don't know that I have any more to say but I am prepared to answer any questions.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to hear the Hon. Minister of Posts and Telegraphs in such a glowing report of the Postal Department and I feel sure now that if what he is telling us is true, under his management what he intends to be done will be carried out and he will have no further trouble with the Post Office. I am glad to hear that the Minister will be able to make good use of all the officials that he has got there. I only said that when we got the report on the street that he would be good enough to tell us whether it was true or not: That there were so many officials up there that the Government were offering some of them a month's salary if they would resign and look for another job. We have already heard it here about the Post Office being overstaffed and underpaid. And I am only asking now if the Minister would let us know if it is true or not that the Government had taken on so many clerks in the Post Office that when Mr. Ross came down he offered them six months' salary in advance if they would get something else.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—The Government has no intention of doing anything of the kind. Colonel Ross made that recommendation because he was under the impression that there were men in the Post Office who were not properly employed. It has been overstaffed for years past. I think that I heard the statement a short time ago that the officials had been reduced from time to time. There are less officials in the department now than there have been for the last three or four years. There are fewer by thirty. That is the answer. Colonel Ross found such conditions when he took charge and he made the recommendation to the Government but the Government has come to no decision in the matter. They would not think of doing it. We do not intend to put any more officials in the department, but when the opportunity occurs we do intend to shift them to the other departments, and so we will reduce the staff and accordingly the expenditure. Now I do not think that there is anything unreasonable about that. But it would not be fair to take officials and dump them out on the street especially if they are men with families, and the Government would not do it even if I recommended it. I think that it was the late Postmaster General who made the statement in the Upper House that the Department of Posts and Telegraphs was overstaffed and underworked, and Colonel Ross made his report along these lines. We have no intention of putting any man on the street, but when the opportunity occurs from time to time we will make the staff smaller by transferring them to the other departments. Now I have a number of applications from persons of al denominations and descriptions and political tendencies and they have been asking for positions in the Post Office, and my answer is that Colonel Ross has already recommended the dismissal of twenty-three of the present employees of the office. But the Government have not considered the matter at all. We want to decrease the expenditure but we want to do no man any injury.

I could not find it in my heart to dismiss a man unless he had been neglecting his work, but if I find that a man has not been carrying out my instructions I will have to find some means to handle the situation. I am beginning to learn something about the department, Of course, Mr. Chairman, it will take some time to get clear on all the intricacies of the department, but I am determined to know them all. There are a great number of rules and regulations that one has to grapple with and all the different departments to become fa-

miliar with. There is the telegraph department, the money order department, the registration department and the telephone department, and I do not know how many others that come up and have to be grappled with. It is not like the Public Works Department. That is as simple as A.B.C. But of course there is an able man there now, and there is no cause for complaint. And there is the Minister of Agriculture and Mines. He is a fine, able man. And the Minister of Justice, you all respect him. And with regard to the Prime Minister, I have noticed that you are giving him all sorts of praise and you are telling the public that he is an honest man in the commercial and the political life of the country. As a leader of a party I do not know of anyone in whom I could have as much confidence. And all that we want to ensure the honest expenditure of the public moneys and to have the taxation reduced is that you should come over here, because we want to tell each and every one of you that we are all honest men. I will wager anything that you want to. Yes, sir, we have a government that is holding the confidence of the people and the only thing I find fault with is the Controller's Department. And the only thing wrong with that is the price that they are charging for liquor. Of course the liquor is fairly good. I have no fault to find with that. But if they would only reduce the price so that we would be able to get a little when we required it. No, sir, Mr. Monroe without a doubt has the confidence of the people. He is a good man, and you are a good man yourself, sir. It is a good thing to have you there and that good able staff that you have there with you. I want to give you every credit for that. Now I remember Mr. Duff, my friend from Carbonear, said that the hotel that we had built would be turned into a poor house. I had some plans for a poor house when I was in the Department of Public Works. They are there now, I suppose, if they have not been stolen. However, the hotel would be a very cheap poor house. But I feel that nobody expects that this will not be successful. I feel that the tourist policy is going to be successful and that the hotel will have a full period of prosperity and that it will be filled continually. During the winter months they will find some means of getting people to come in there and spend their money. As regards the roads policy, I think that without a doubt that has been the best policy for years. The trouble with us is that we were afraid to take the bull by the horns and borrow a few million dollars to do the work that had to be done. As I stated in reply to Mr. Halfyard in his criticism on the tariff, I think that the little extra that has been placed on one or two or a half dozen articles will not amount to very much, and if the people are given the means to earn the money they will not mind paying the little extra which the increased tariff calls for. But this is only for a trial. It is only for twelve months, and then if it is found that it is not up to what was hoped of it we can change it if we want to. I should like to see a commission appointed to go into the matter thoroughly, and I think that the leader of the Opposition should be a member of the commission. I think that would be a good way to make any improvements that might be necessary. But I think that there will be plenty money in circulation and that the people will be able to afford to pay the little extra duty. As I stated before, we were afraid to take the bull by the horns and borrow a few millions.

Now the Government has decided to encourage the other industries. The fishery should not be the only mainstay in the present time. You, yourself, Mr. Leader of the Opposition, said that there was too much fish caught, and when the Govern-

ment has encouraged these other industries I think that the conditions in Newfoundland will show considerable improvement. Now I was listening to that speech that was delivered by Mr. Scammell and I thought that he was going to continue for at least two or three hours more, but he dropped off very shortly and I was very much disappointed. I expected Mr. Scammell to tear to pieces every member on this side of the House. He was criticising everybody; that is the best indication you could get, and still I noticed that when Mr. Scammell, and yourself too Mr. Leader of the Opposition, had finished, there was not a single applause. That is the best indication.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, it was my intention earlier in the session to speak on the subject of the Post Office, but I do not intend to do so now at any great length because the edge has been taken off it.

From a remark made by the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs the ordinary listener might conclude that there had been great improvement in the management of the Post Office, and I hope there is, but from the little I have heard in connection with the management of the Post Office, it would hardly lead me to believe that there had been any improvement. But what the outside public is most interested in at the present time, is whether the Hon. Minister of Posts and Telegraphs has tried to reduce expenditure in his department, and to have the work of his department carried on efficiently, and if he has taken steps to dispense with all unnecessary employees. He has told us to-night that it is not his intention to reduce the staff although he has at other times told us that it is his opinion that the department is overstaffed. I know of one or two things to which I would like to draw his attention. In some cases you have two officials where the work could be just as efficiently done by one.

For instance, in the stores you have three men—the general stores. You have Mr. Bambrick, Mr. Manuel . . .

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS—And Mr. Richards.

MR. HALFYARD—And Mr. Richards. Now, a man and a boy can do that work and do it efficiently and well, and I cannot see why you should have three men there drawing large salaries—or large as Government salaries go. You have two clerks on the Placentia train, where one formerly did the work. Why should you have two clerks on the Placentia train. You have three clerks on the morning train leaving Carbonear, and one man does the work on the train that leaves here for Carbonear. One man does the work going out of St. John's, and one would naturally conclude that there are just as many letters to be handled going out of St. John's, as there would coming from Carbonear. This is the kind of thing that the public will criticize, and will wonder what the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs is doing to reduce expenditure. I just mention these two or three items.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that the Minister was not correct in saying that past Governments had filled the Post Office with unnecessary officials. I am only speaking for myself now, when I was Minister of Posts and Telegraphs. I hold no brief for any one else. I assure you that the plans outlined by the Minister here to-night were adopted by me. If a vacancy occurred we did not fill it unless it was absolutely necessary to have some one there. There were less officials when I left there than there were when I took charge.

Now the object of the Minister, no doubt, is to do what he thinks right, and if his attitude towards Messrs. March and Bradbury is correct, it is a

matter which I will leave between the Minister and the officials, but possibly there is a misunderstanding, as I had the greatest confidence in these men when I was there, and I still think they are treated unjustly.

No doubt the Minister has read the letter that has been published in the public press from Mr. Leawood from Corner Brook. Now, we were told that all the irregularities and shortages and mismanagement in connection with postal matters at Deer Lake and Corner Brook could be attributed to the carelessness and laxity of the late administration. I do not think that is correct, and I come to that conclusion on some remarks in the letter from Mr. Leawood. He speaks of the business that he did there. It amounts altogether to $407,000|00. He says he was held responsible for all that. He says that there were inspectors there on three occasions. The first visit was in October 1923. That was during the Warren regime. Mr. Aylward went out then. He was appointed in September 1923. I was not at the executive meeting when he was appointed, but when I came back I found that Mr. Aylward had been appointed as inspector. Mr. Aylward went out to Corner Brook in October 1923.

The next visit was in January 1924, when the Deputy Minister, Mr. Le-Messurier went out, and the third was in August 1924. Your Government took charge in June 1924, and in August 1924 Mr. Milley, the Superintendent of the Money Order Department went out. On no occasions were accounts audited until October 1924, when they were audited by Mr. Crummey.

If there is any blame to be laid to any administration it could not be previous to October 1923; but certainly from October 1923 to November 1924 the situation was not getting any better, but was getting worse, and with all these officials from the General Post Office going out there, the charge of negligence, if there is any, should be laid at the door of the offiicials who worked under the present Minister of Posts and Telegraphs from June 1924 to January 1925. In justice to Mr. Leawood I think these matters should be mentioned. Mr. Boland was at Deer Lake, and he was short in his accounts. He was promoted, but Mr. Leawood was summarily dismissed. Mr. Brushett was at Deer Lake previous to Mr. Boland, and he was short a few hundred dollars, and he also was dismissed. If you are going to treat all alike and give consideration to the conditions and circumstances under which they were working, why did you not show to Mr. Leawood the same leniency? I do not say that it was right to keep on these men in their positions, but it was the opinion of those who went out there and saw the conditions under which Mr. Leawood had to work that he was very little to blame. He had collected $407,000, and he had repeatedly asked for assistance and help, and the department had sent an Inspector, the Deputy Minister and the Superintendent of the Money Order Department, and still there was nothing done until Sir John Crosbie and his colleagues went out there.

(Reads Letter)

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that if in the opinion of the Minister or the Government it was right to re-instate Boland or give him another office, why was not Leawood treated in the same way? I would be shirking my duty to a former constituent of mine if I did not bring his case to the attention of the House and also point out that he repeatedly brought the need of assistance to the attention of the Government, but his request was ignored till Sir John Crosbie himself went out there. That is all I have to say, Mr. Chairman,

except that Colonel Ross thinks twenty-three men can be done without. I do not know if these include the travelling postal officials, where three or four men are now doing the work that was formerly done by one man.

HON. THE MINISTER OF POSTS —Mr. Chairman, owing to the lateness of the hour I do not wish to prolong the debate, but I would like to say a few words by way of explanation. I think it was in March 1924 that Mr. Leawood applied to the Department for assistance. I will get the exact date for the honorable member for Trinity to-morrow. However, some time during the winter he sent in the request, but none was sent, and he continued to ask for help. You have heard what the Hon. the Minister of Justice has said in his behalf, and I think we are all in sympathy with Mr. Leawood, but we had to do what we did under the circumstances. Mr. LeMessurier went out there, but he made no report, which I think will be verified by Mr. Milley. As a matter of fact, Mr. LeMessurier could not make head nor tail of the situation. Now I am not excusing anybody but I am giving the honourable member the facts as I know them. Nothing was done till the Hon. the Minister of Finance went out there in connection with his own department and took a look in at Corner Brook and Deer Lake. Then Mr. Crummey went out and several developments followed. As regards Mr. Boland, though he was short a small amount, I made his appointment personally and the Government was in no way responsible for it. He was not appointed, but we were short of men and I put him in the office temporarily. He is a smart young fellow.

MR. HALFYARD—We appointed a Postmaster and why was he not sent out.

HON. THE MINISTER OF POSTS —Why did not you or the Warren Government send him out then. As I understand it, the appointment was made in the dying hours of your Government and was as much as to say "Here is a bone and if you can get away with it, carry it off." I do not think it fair or square to throw that bone at that man under the circumstances, and I do not think he expected to get much pickings off it.

MR. HALFYARD—If you did not approve of him why didn't you send somebody else.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS—I was not aware of what was going on at the time, and the officials—Mr. Milley and Mr. LeMessurier—were doing their best and I daresay Mr. Hawco also, so I do not blame anyone. If you want the facts and figures I am prepared to get them and bring them here for your information.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, as I was interrupted in my remarks, and gave way to the Honorable the Minister of Posts to make his explanations as to his Department, I will now continue. He has taken the opportunity to refer to various matters and to eulogize the Government. He tells us that everybody has the utmost confidence in the Government, that the Honorable the Prime Minister is the greatest man there ever was, and that those associatd with him are practically super-men, but the other day the Honorable Member for Fortune said the voice was the voice of Jacob, but the hands were the hands of Esau, and therefore I would like to point out to the Honourable Minister that everybody has not the same opinion of the Government that he has. He says everyone is delighted with the idea of spending two million dollars on the roads, and that it is a proper thing to do to take the bull by the horns, etc. But this is taking a gamble on borrowed money. If we had two million dollars to spare and

felt like building roads it would be alright to do so, but when we got to borrow the money this expenditure is wrong, especially when the Honorable the Minister of Finance has to bring in an increased tariff in order to pay the interest on the money which we have borrowed. If a man has money and wants to gamble or go into a venture, it is alright, and if he loses he is only so much out. But if he borrows some money and loses he still has to pay the interest on it, and eventually the principle and is, therefore, much worse off. Previous Governments were blamed for borrowing, but the greatest surprise we ever had was when the present Government last Session brought in a Bill to borrow six millions, making with the Humber amount a burden of nearly eighty million dollars of debt. If we could get any returns it would be alright, or if we could get the class of tourists such as the Honorable the Colonial Secretary spoke of—the rich men of the United States to pay our bills, or such as Mr. Morine referred to, their money would offset this expenditure. But if the Government have it in mind to cater to rich Americans or Canadians they must provide the proper class of hotel service. If we were to get the rich men to come we must give him rich surroundings, and he will be ready to pay a price. A few days ago I had a conference with the representative of the Munson Line who is here. He told me that his concern had built an hotel in Nassau at a cost of six millions of dollars and that his Line carried as passengers to Nassau as many as 500 people in one day to this hotel. This hotel was filled up with wealthy Americans who paid $16 a day for their room, but I think that such a venture is too speculative for this country to embark upon because of our lack of modern facilities. With regard to our tourist policy and everything in conjunction with it, I think that two million dollars is altogether too much money to spend on the building of highways. The roads here at present can well take care of the influx of tourists that we are going to get for the next couple of years, at least. We are not going to get tourists here to any great extent, unless we advertise extensively, and if the tourist policy here is going to be a success at all, it certainly is not going to be a success before 1927. Then why should we gamble with borrowed money on this road scheme? We should cut our garment according to our cloth, and start on a small scale and make our roads we have better than they are at the present time. The Minister of Posts and Telegraphs said he had great faith in the tourist and dry dock policy. With regard to the dock policy we think it is not the right policy because we think that any man can hire another to spend a million dollars for him. It has been stated recently by competent men that the dry dock can be made safe by spending anywhere from twenty five to fifty thousand dollars on it. Until such time as we can get founderies and all machinery necessary in conjunction with the dock, I think we should leave the dock as it is, because if you embark on that dock policy it will mean that the country will have to pay interest of about sixty thousand dollars annually and at the present time it is not earning anything like that amount in profit per year. The Government first brought down here an Engineer named Crandell and then W. I. Bishop and Company's Engineer. Crandell's report was passed over for Bishop's man to see and then they sent for a man named Gray, a Canadian Government Engineer, who saw the reports of the other two. I contend that the Government should not have passed

these documents over to Gray to peruse or give him any information whatever. Then Gray went to work and submitted his report. Now that is not the way to get an independent report on the dock. Gray or anyone else should have been in the position to make his own report, without seeing the report of anyone else.

There is one subject that has not been touched upon at all and which I would like to deal with, and that is the source from which the Government obtains a great deal of revenue —the Liquor Control Department. The Auditor General states here in his report that from July 1st, 1924, to February 4th, 1925, the liquor sales amounted to $541,649.83 with gross profit of $148,934. Now why I make particular reference to this is that it is all very well for the Government of this country to say that we shall have liquor properly dispensed and perhaps the system that the Government has in vogue is a very good system, but I do not think that the people of this country can afford to buy over a half million dollars' worth of liquor in seven mouths and much of the money used in the purchase of that liquor has deprived many little children of food and clothing. In my place of business in the West End of the city I have watched people flocking to the Bond Store to purchase liquor. I am not disputing the right of any man to buy liquor, if he can afford it, but I do say that it is altogether too much for our people to spend over a half million dollars in the short space of seven months, and I rather thing that it would be much better if that amount of money was spent on groceries and boots and clothing, etc., because the country would get the revenue and the families of most of these people who drink excessively would also derive much benefit. It may be argued that the Government would not get as much profit on that as they do on liquor, but I certainly think it a poor way to get revenue—at the expense of people who buy, but who cannot afford to buy, liquor.

It is a difficult problem to deal with, I know; to satisfy everybody in reference to that. Now I made a few remarks in reference to the post office department, and different departments of the Government in general. There was a discussion to-night and it has not been denied that the department of Postal Telegraphs was over-manned and underworked. Colonel Ross, who was brought here from Canada as Inspector of the different department of Posts and Telegraphs requested that twenty three officials be dismissed. No doubt, if the inspection was made of the other departments there would be a similar report to be received. My contention is that the Government should put every government employee under examination. A man should pass civil service examination as they do in other countries before he is permitted to take a government position, and then you would have men qualified for the positions they take instead of having a man dumped into the department at the wish and desire of some member of this House to whom he gave his support during the election.

In an election campaign you can always find men who are always ready to work for a particular candidate, and you can figure out that that man is looking for some government job, then he is given a job in some department that he is entirely unfit for. You should have a system of civil service examination. That is one of the things that this Government in their desire to see that everything is done right, in their desire to improve the present or past political machinery should take particular notice of, and institute a system

whereby all applicants for any department should pass the necessary examination before being accepted. Now the hour is getting late and I have nothing else to say in reference to this tariff at the present time. I have talked particularly on the tariff more than on the Budget, and the Estimates of Expenditure that the Minister has just placed on the table of the House.

MR. CASHIN—I was listening to Mr. Hickman and he made some remarks that I thought reflected on the personnel of the Railway Commission. He mentioned Mr. Gray, and hinted that I was chasing him around. I want to say that I have never chased Mr. Gray around, and I have no intention of chasing him around. That is away from the point, and I just wanted to make myself clear on the matter. I want to say that I am absolutely in favour of the repairing of the dock and of putting it into first class shape; and I consider that it is only right, and if we spend half a million dollars on it we will be getting our half million back; but that is not referring to the Tariff that is before us to-night. To-day I want to acknowledge receipt of the report of the Tariff Commission which was tabled. I have just received a copy, and as I had not any time to read it through, and as there are several items on which I consider that I should have a little more information, I hope the Finance Minister would not mind raising the Committee, seeing that it is now after twelve o'clock, and give me an opportunity to read this through. I can assure him that I will have it finished before daylight, and then he can go ahead in the afternoon.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—We have to get through this Tariff as soon as possible, and as there is a lot still to be read I don't think, Major Cashin, that I will be able to accede to your request.

MR. CASHIN—I quite agree with the Minister of Finance as regards the necessity of getting it over as soon as possible; but there are a couple of items with which I do not agree. I just want to wait until to-morrow to make sure whether I am right or wrong. But you can't prove to me that I am wrong, and I cannot, personally, prove to you that I am right.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—If there are any items you want to look up we will let it stand over until to-morrow.

MR. CASHIN—I want that section on tobacco to stand over until to-morrow.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—I have no objection to that.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the idea put forward by Mr. Cashin is a good one. But I want to say a few words on this, and then I will be finished. It seems that some members of the Government have changed their opinions as to what the financial policy of the Government should be, and we would infer this from the remarks that were made by the members of the present government when they sat on this side of the House. Apparently it was the concensus of opinion of the then Opposition that it was the wrong thing to increase taxation, and there seems to have been a change of opinion because some of the men who were in the Opposition then are members of the Executive Government now. Here is what the Colonial Secretary said when he was sitting where I sit now

(Reads)

Mr. Chairman, I am glad that the Hon. the Colonial Secretary has come into the House because I would like him to express an opinion on the tariff that is now being submitted to this House. And I would like to

know what has caused him to change his mind, during the last year or two.

(Reads

We were accused of not being a business Government. The Hon. Colonial Secretary was then in Opposition in the House and he deplored the fact that we were not a business Government.

(Reads)

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—That is the reason why the tariff was introduced.

MR. HALFYARD—Does the Hon. Member contradict the opinion that was expressed by him when he was on this side of the House. Are you prepared to say that your statement from this side was wrong?

(Reads)

I think that the Hon. Member was voicing the sentiments of the people of the country at the time. If the Government has made up its mind to put the tariff through it is only a waste of time for us to stay here in the small hours of the morning. It is unfortunate and regrettable. There is a lot of truth in what the Honourable member said at that time. We know that we must have revenue to meet expenditure. The trouble is that expenditure has been increased without consideration as to how and where we could find ways and means to meet that expenditure; and that is why we are in such an awkward position at the present time.

It is a set back to the industries of this country—this tariff will be a set back to the general well being of the people of this country, because it will create a lack of confidence, and if there is anything we want to-day it is confidence. Ours had been badly shaken, and it was being restored to some extent, but this is another slap in the face, figuratively speaking, that the country is getting; and I was really hoping that the Government would reconsider this tariff.

It is no difference what people would say or think—the best interests of the country would be served by this house remaining open for another fortnight or a month if necessary, if confidence could be restored. But it is not being restored, it is abandoned. It should not make any difference to the Prime Minister personally as a politician whether the nine or ten men happen to be sitting on this side of the House or not, but what should make the difference is the general well being and welfare of the country as a whole. We live on sentiment, and we act on sentiment as well as on more material substances, and when this is broadcasted throughout the country, it will create disappointment and lack of confidence, and the result will be contrary to the expectations of those who sent us here.

However, if the Government as a Government has determined to put this through as it is, we can only submit to it, and let them put up with the result.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, I think it is getting late and I have asked the Minister of Finance and Customs before to rise the Committee. Personally I am willing to do anything in reason, but I do not think that it is fair to ask members to stay here until three o'clock in the morning. We come down here at three o'clock in the afternoon, and now we are expected to put this through at this early hour of the morning. I am a man who has to go to work at half past eight every morning . . . .

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—So am I.

MR. CASHIN—I have to hook it home at two or three o'clock in the morning and get to work at half past eight. Surely, Mr. Chairman, the Hon. the Minister of Finance does not want anyone to vote for this tar-

iff without having a chance to consider it. You, Mr. Finance Minister, tabled the Report of the Tariff Commission a week ago, but the Leader of the Opposition had it in his possession and I doubt if any member of the House has read it yet. If the Minister wants it I am ready to stay here all night too. I stood for three years in the trenches in France for Newfoundland and I am ready to stay here all night, but I do not think it fair when I asked to have this tariff held over to be turned down by the Minister of Finance in the same Government. Give us a chance to consider this. You have had a year on it, but we only saw the report yesterday for the first time, and then you expect us to come in here and know as much as you about it. Nobody knows anything about it and nobody can explain it, not even yourself. You, yourself, cannot explain these duties. All I want is a square deal; that is what I am here for, but I did not get it. And there are a lot of people outside this House who want to know about this tariff, but there is no body here able to explain it. If I had a chance to read it I would be prepared to put it through to-morrow, and I appeal to the Hon. the Prime Minister as a square deal man to rise the Committee so that I may get a chance to read it and be able to cast my vote intelligently on it. I represent a large number of fishermen here—it was they who sent me here and it is they will turn me out if anybody does. I do not think I am asking anything unreasonable. I have been here all night and have to walk three or four miles to my home, and I do not think it fair to put this through to-night. Nobody can explain this tariff and some of the honorable members are not even interested enough to listen to it, but go outside.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I do not know what vote Mr. Cashin has been discussing, but it appears to me that the honorable member on our side is more or less against the Government, and if that be the case the best thing he can do is go over to the other side. I think that the members ought to stand by their party, and if not they ought to go to the other side of the house. That's the feeling I have on the matter. I have the conviction that if Mr. Cashin wants to leav the Government ranks he ought to cross the floors and go over to the other side. That is the only thing I want to say. Mr. Cashin has shown himself opposed to the Government for some reason or other. We have had party meetings, after which Mr. Cashin went out and spoke against the Government—practically denied us more or less—and as I said just now, if he has not confidence in us the only thing he can do is leave the party.

MR. CASHIN—I take my dismissal like a man, but I would like to draw attention to the fact that I did not seek from the Prime Minister the honour of coming out under his banner. He sought me—he wrote me a personal letter asking me to contest Ferryland District with my colleague, Mr. Moore, who is not here just at the present time; and I replied to him and told him I would, and I wished him the best of luck in Bonavista, and he won. I too went out and won my district. Why did I win it? Not because of Mr. Monroe's manifesto. I did not use his manifesto as part of my campaign, but I went out and told them that if I was given the honour to represent Ferryland District in this House, I was going to stand for the fishermen of this country, and I gave them a promise that if I was returned, and if the financial condition of the country warranted it, that Mr. Monroe was prepared to grant a bounty on fish commensurate with the fin-

ancial condition of the country. I told them that we hoped to reduce expenditure and taxation.

Now what has happened since last year? Last year the Tariff Commission reported to the Government, and this report is tabled here for the first time to-day. Last spring it was given to the Government and this Spring it is given to us. This Spring the same Government comes in here and abolishes taxes—the income tax for themselves personally, knowing that this tariff meant increased taxation. They took the taxation off the rich man, and they shoved it onto the poor man —the fisherman of this country—and they did it intentionally. And I say further that they intentionally increased the preferences in favour of some of the local companies. I can show this by figures—and I have not been proved wrong yet. The Minister of Finance can have my figures and he cannot prove me wrong.

I claim to-day that the Imperial Tobacco Company has been given under this new tariff a preference of an extra two cents per pound over the imported article, and I can prove it with figures, and I ask honourable members of this House now to take them down. The figures are correct—no doubt the Prime Minister will say they are wrong. He has in his possession now figures sent down from the Imperial Tobacco Company, not made out by himself. I will give you a sum now in making out customs entries on tobacco. He has driven me to do it. He wanted to drive me out of this party six months ago, and I challenge the Prime Minister to deny that.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—I do deny it.

MR. CASHIN—I will prove it to you. Members of the Opposition do not know it, the public does not know it, though I have told some of my friends about it. I am independent. I may not have any money—but I am independent as any man in this House. They started to bring in a redistribution bill here not long ago, and what happened? They thought to put in a clause in that Bill to cut out St. John's East. Why? Because it was mooted round this city that my father would possibly be either an independent candidate or a candidate for the Government, and they were afraid. They had combed this city with a fine comb to get a man to stand for them in the East End, and they can't get one. Mr. Monroe told me myself that he did not want my father. Is not that sufficient to tell me that he did not want me. Am I not blood of his blood and flesh of his flesh. But you were prepared to take my name last Spring and go to the country, and we got ridiculed all over the country. Your party was prepared to take his name. Then when I came back I asked the Minister of Finance and Customs a favour in connection with a man who was dismissed by the Squires administration. I wanted to have him replaced, and the Minister of Finance refused me, and I had to make him do it, and if there is anyone in Newfoundland to-night, who is to be thanked for the few taxes that have been taken off since this tariff came in, it is me they have to thank and no one else. And I am going to prove it now with figures. I have heard it stated that figures are best. I would like Honourable members to take down these figures, and if I am wrong, I am prepared as a man to take back anything wrong which I may say.

You have to work on some price to show what the real increase is. In 1924 one pound of tobacco cost thirty cents, and invoice cost forty cents. That is seventy cents. Then take ten per cent. of the invoice cost, which is four cents, and that makes it 74 cents, then get the five per cent. sales tax on freight and duty. That comes to

3½ cents a lb. The total is 77½ cents a pound. I am subject to contradiction. Now let us take the excise duty for the same year, when tobacco cost thirty cents a pound, the excise duty was thirty four cents, and ten per cent. of that is 3½ cents, that all comes to 67 4-10 cents to be exact, and then there was the sales tax of 2½ cents a pound, bringing the total to 69 cents a pound for tobacco. Now the Tobacco Company claimed that they paid at the rate of two cents a pound for the wrapping that they imported in connection with the tobacco. That is 71 cents a lb., and that leaves a preference in favour of the Imperial Tobacco Company of 5½ cents a pound.

Now under this new 1925 Tariff the tobacco still costs thirty cents a pound. There is a duty on it of forty-eight cents a pound, and I might tell you that they had it up to fifty cents a pound before I made them bring it down to forty eight.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—That is not true either.

MR. CASHIN—You have to add on that 48 cents, and that brings up the price of the pound to 78 cents, and the 15 p.c. makes it four and a half cents more. That is 82½ cents a pound, or an increase of five cents a pound over last year. Now look at the excise duty. It cost thirty cents a pound to-day, and the excise duty has been raised to forty cents a pound. That means that tobacco is raised from 77½ cents to 82½ cents per pound and these are the only figures that the Prime Minister has got to give us, figures that were put in his hands by Mr. Hartnett, Manager of the Imperial Tobacco Company, and I defy contradiction to that. There is also a clause in this tariff intended to drive the small man out of business. Take Mr. Faour, who employs eight men. He started in about six months ago. He spent his private money to try and build up a business for himself and now the Government are trying to pass a law to drive him out in order to give greater protection and to give a monopoly to the Imperial Tobacco Company. He is only a small business man, but he has invested his all in his tobacco business and then the Government endeavours to put him out of busiess and tries to poke this class legislation down our throats, provided we are prepared to allow it, but I for one am not. Besides the Imperial Tobacco Company had to pay a Profit Tax last year; but this year they have not, and this gives them another $20,000 a year protection in addition to the $120,000 they had last year, and be it remembered that sixty per cent. of the capital stock of this Company is owned in the United States and the rest of it is owned by Mr. W. S. Monroe, the Prime Minister of this House, who is the President of the Company. Now I want to tell the House to-night that the Finance Minister and the members of the Government know what my reasons are for opposing this tariff, because I told them that I represented the fishermen of this country and I intend to represent them as loyally as I know how, and no Party Whip will persuade me otherwise. I claim here to-night that, if the honourable member for Fortune Bay represents the man on the street and the Opposition are the Opposition, I want to represent Newfoundland for Newfoundlanders. Take the Colonial Cordage Company, of which the Prime Minister is a shareholder. This Company, under this tariff, got protection to the extent of having the imposition of a duty of ten per cent. on imported lines and twines and which will yield the Company something like $2500 a year. Well I state here publicly that the lines and twines that are brought into this country from the United States are much better

than those manufactured at the Ropewalk. Personally, I am in favor of giving due protection to any local industry, but not to the extent that the Imperial Tobacco Company the Colonial Cordage Company are getting. I regret very much that Mr. Monroe happens to be a substantial creditor and shareholder of both these Companies because he might think that I am making a personal attack on him, but at the same time I have a public duty to perform and I intend to do my duty to people who sent me here. There were only two of us here when we were needed, Mr. Ashbourne and myself, to protest against this tariff vigorously. And what do we get for it? We are told that we are out knocking the Government and I was promptly expelled from the Government ranks because I gave a free expression of my own opinion on this tariff. I did not have to get out; I was turned out by the Prime Minister; but when I get back to Ferryland again in a political contest I predict to-night that my majority will be greater than ever it was. There are no big galleries to talk to to-night owing to the lateness of the hour, I suppose, although there once was a time in my recollection when we used to attack at dawn, but I would like to point out that, if the Finance Minister is going to stay until three o'clock, I am prepared to remain all night because there are too many members who have axes to grind, and too many industries to be given big protection for me to allow this tariff to go through as it is. What have we done for the fishing industry of this country? Absolutely nothing. Take the article that appeared in the "Daily News" this morning that was written to deceive the public. The article is headed "Discussing the Tariff."

(Reads Article)

There are clauses in the tariff, Mr. Chairman, that the Finance Minister knows nothing whatever about and he knows it. Still we are asked to rush this tariff through this House. Now if that is not trying to slave drive I would like to know what is? But I serve notice on the Government here and now that I am no slave The Finance Minister knows that he is going to make money out of this new tariff if it becomes law and if he denies it I can prove my statement. Every Magistrate that the Government wrote to regarding this new tariff only laughed at them because these Magistrates new that it was going to be class legislation and was going to be a further burden on the fishermen and working classes of people generally throughout the country, and they knew that this tariff was going to allow the Imperial Tobacco Company more protection on tobacco, a Company that has been sucking the life's blood out of the people of this country. I got in bad with this party a year ago because I had my own opinion, and I have come to think that a man in politics has to be prepared to swallow crows all day long. Last year in this party I was opposed to the spending of two million dollars on roads, and I am still opposed to it. I did not vote for it, but I was prepared to sink my differences. Two million dollars to be thrown away on roads from somewhere to nowhere. A plan fathered by Mr. Morine who was a Minister in the Upper House, a gentleman who, by the way, when I went to the country with this party, I understood had no connection whatever with it, I did not know anything until he was slapped into the Executive Government, and now he is controlling the Government of to-day. This man fostered the Redistribution Bill, he fostered the Liquor Bill. He has not sent in his own bill yet, and we never know when he does send it

in what it is going to be. We will pay it and try to look pleasant.

(Reads)

Have we done anything to make it cheaper? Nothing. There is much the same idea about the similar duty on lines and twines, because it affects the fishermen of this country. The fishermen of this country are the mainstay of this country, and there is no gentleman in this House can tell me they are not. Twenty five years ago they were catching one and a half and two million quintals. To-day they are catching one and a quarter. That is because on account of the taxation; there is no money in the business. But I want to come back in this argument and to say that the Lunenburgers are fishing on the Banks, are catching our fish, taking our bait, have they not made a success of it? Last year they had over 67 vessels prosecuting the fishery on the Grand Banks and the catch was 170,000 quintals at an average of $9.03 per quintal, and at the same time we had ten vessels and we did not give any encouragement to the fishermen whatever. The Government voted twenty thousand dollars to go towards the fishermen of this country and the Government thought they were doing something wonderful, and now they are preparing to spend two million dollars on the roads, and my opinion is as good as any of theirs, it will never bring anything to this country. They are prepared to slap away two million dollars because Mr. Morine says so. They have raised that money on the credit of this Colony, and to pay the interest on it they have to put extra taxation on the fishermen of this country, and they are prepared to do it, and then they expect me because I have an opinion, but my opinion is just as good as yours they expect me to stifle it.

Then this article goes on to say.

(Reads)

When did the duty come off molasses? That was written for the sole purpose of deceiving the public. The duty is on molasses yet. Now I have not a paper to back me in this House, but I have the district that sent me here to look after their rights, and I am going to tell them, and I am going to see that they know what has happened since I came back. Furthermore, I am going to wire every harbour in my district and let them know why I left the Monroe Party; because I considered that they were putting through this House class legislation to help themseleves; that they are protecting industries in this country which are owned outside the country, such as the Imperial Tobacco Company and the Ropewalk, and I am going to let them know also that the Prime Minister is the principal shareholder in both.

(Reads)

Now, Mr. Chairman, I ask you in all sincerity, is it fair for any man on that Commission to come in here and ask the representatives of the people in this country, to ask the members of this House who represent the fishermen and labouring class in this country. Is he supposed to come in here with this report and ask us to take the tariff which has not been read even by the Minister of Finance, and to vote for it because Mr. Morine says so? Is that a square deal to ask me to vote for it? You may ask the other members to do so, but I am not going to do it. It is not fair to the other members of the party, and you know it; but probably the other members of the party do not see eye to eye with me on the tariff. Take the Tariff Commission itself. Dr. Mosdell; Mr. LeMessurier, what happened to him? Why, six or eight months ago he was suspended from the Customs. A report was supposed to have been made in the Customs Department. Mr. LeMessurier was

supposed to have done something frightful, and the next thing we hear is that he is on the Tariff Commission, and the Tariff report is adopted. What has happened since? Mr. LeMessurier could not have done anything wrong. It was merely that certain items had to be taken out of bond and this was not done. Mr. LeMessurier was fired out of the examining room and was off for ten months. There was an investigation held. I never saw the report, but in it there was nothing against Mr. LeMessurier. They had to take him back and give him 10 months salary and an increase of $500 a year. And this is what they call cleaning up, keeping clean and a square deal to all. Now is that right or is it not? It is right.

(Reads)

Has that evidence been tabled for the information of the Members of this House? I know that it has not. The Commission took no evidence whatever that was acted upon. Because if they did the recommendations that came in here from the outports and the magistrates, the Government took no notice of whatever. But they did not act according to it. They took no notice of it. No more than if they had not heard of it. Mr. Hickman had the information here the other day. They all recommended a decrease of taxation. They recommended a decrease on the articles that are essential for the fishermen of this country and these were taken no notice of by the commission. They were absolutely ignored. And then we are told that we are giving the fishermen of the country a square deal. There is not one of your actions that will prove to the country or to any fair minded sensible man that any of your actions have been a square deal to the fishermen of the country, and the labouring man of the country. I do not only represent Ferryland district. When we come here to represent a district we represent the people as a whole, and when we come here we represent the general opinion of the country. And it would not be right for a member of this House to express an opinion that was belonged to Ferryland alone, unless it was for the benefit of the whole country as a whole.. That is our duty and we have not lived up to it. The position that I take to-day is this. that I consider that it is a betrayal of your promises. The betrayal of the trust that was reposed in us last June. And as far as I am personally concerned I am leaving this Government or I am being turned out of the Government, and I wish to thank the Prime Minister sincerely because I know that he did not want me. He was trying to get rid of me for the past two months and I can prove that he was. (Reads)

To-day, Mr. Chairman, although the tax has come down recently on tea the tax is still considerable. And the tax on sugar is also considerable. And according to the Minister of Justice the other night we should be now collecting duty on flour and five cents a lb. on tobacco coming in from the United States. But there are independent members in this House and they are not going to swallow everything that is put up to them in this thing. Here it is again on page 39.

(Reads)

Now as I stated here in this House the other night the American Government has a duty of $1.25 per quintal on the fish coming from Newfoundland into the States, and according to the tariff there should be a duty on flour coming into Newfoundland from the States of seventy five cents a barrel, and there should be a duty on pork of 75 cents and there should be a duty of seventy five cents a hundred lbs on butter.

(Reads)

According to the tariff there should

be a duty collected on the pork that is coming into the country from the United States, but that is not being done. The Minister of Justice told us that the other night. He also state dthat the Executive Government was taking the right to take off that du ywhen it thinks that that is necessary. (Reads)

That means, as I said, that the duty is on to-night, and if we pass the tariff as it stands the duty is on flour and pork that is coming into this country from the United States, but the Executive Government has or is going to take the rikht to take this duty off when it sees fit. That is as I got it from the Minister of Justice the other night. And then there is an increase on readymades of twenty two per cent. I made a mistake the other night in figuring up the increase on ready-mades and some of the Members of the Government thought that it was a wonderful thing that they should see that there was more than I said it was at that time. But I find now that the increase on the price of readymade clothes. Surely Heavens we do not want the people of this country going around naked. Surely goodness we are all of us human, and in passing this tariff we are going to have the people of the outports naked. And we do not give the consumer the advantage that may take place. And then the Government is paying out ten thousand dollars a week on doles in St. John's. And they are getting nothing for it. Personally I think that there could be something got for this money if the Government had gone about the matter in the right way. But there was no attempt made to get anything for the money. And now the Government has to buy broken rock to finish the dock. Of course I must admit that the work of breaking stones is mean work, but I think that there are many men in St. John's who would rather be doing that than living on the dole. But to-day the Government is paying out the money and they are getting nothing for it. No returns whatever. And there is the Board of Works Department. There is a Board that has been appointed and they have not had a meeting for six months pretty near. There was no meeting and they are supposed to have one every month. Is that right, Mr. Minister?

THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—No that is not right. There has not been a meeting for three months.

MR. CASHIN—And you should have one every month. And why have you got that crowd of fellows appointed down there? And then we are supposed to be doing things right. We made some attempts to do the right thing and then failed. We started in alright and then fell down on the job, and then to top the whole thing off this tariff is brought in and puts up the price of everything about ten or fifteen per cent. And then they made us swallow that. Some of the members swallowed it and I had half swallowed it until I found that there was a protection of two and a half cents a pound for the Imperial Tobacco Company.

We have been talking about the fisheries. I would like to know what have we done for the fisheries. I am going to read this article to the House from the Financial Post, one of the leading financial papers in Canada. There are two articles which I understand are in connection with the fisheries of this country. You will see then what we have done in connection with the fisheries of Newfoundland. This article is headed "Our Atlantic Coast Fisheries produce millions of money yearly." That fish was taken out from the Grand Banks of Newfoundland. It was taken right from our door, and we are told in this House that the Bank fishery of

Newfoundland cannot pay. Why not? Did not Capt. Hollett and Capt. Lake here beside me, as well as many other people, make it pay?

I am going to read this article.

(Reads article)

(After words "industry growing in importance".)

Is our industry growing in importance? There is no member of the Government who can stand up here tonight and tell the House that they have done even a small thing for the fisheries of this country. They have turned down the fisheries of this country today, and they are going to have a tourist policy instead. Imagine a tourist coming to Newfoundland yesterday, in all the snow. Further than that,we are told that a Commission is to be appointed to build the roads in connection with this tourist traffic. The members of this Government do not know who the members of that Commission are. They have no idea, but they are prepared to let the Executive Government go ahead and appoint whoever they like. There were various rumours about commissioners who were to be appointed, but there was some trouble about them and the idea had to be abandoned, and now we have another proposition about the people to be appointed.

Mr. Morine in the Upper House—perhaps I should not name the person—but a gentleman in the Upper House outlined the policy of the Government some time ago, and he had to swallow all that he had said. He was going to build a road from here to Trepassey, and he was going to start at Fermeuse. Evidently he must be contemplating going into the aeroplane business too, if he is going to get from there to Trepassey first. Today we have no Commission, and we are going to close this House to-morrow or next day, and go out of it and let the Executive Government appoint anyone they like to spend two million dollars of the people's money, and we do not know whether we are going to have reliable people spend it or not.

Wait till you have to go to the country again. Some of you will be like you were some time ago when you had to run from the place in women's clothes to get clear of the people. If there is anything which I am saying is wrong I am prepared to take it back. I know now that the women have the vote, and I suppose they won't have to put them on now. But to continue the article:

(Reads article.)

After the words "built up."

What are we doing with regard to the trade or the fishery to-day. We had a meeting of the Fishery Board the other day and there were only two members of the Government turned up. There were Capt. Winsor, Mr. Hepburn and myself. Two members of the Government. Of the rest, none showed up. They did not have interest enough in the fishery of the country. They looked upon it as a joke.

Reads. (After the word "progress".)

Mr. Chairman, I would advise that members of the Government eat more fish, because they say in fish there are more brains, and if they eat a little more fish they might have a little more brains to deal with this tariff. You can see here how the Canadians are boosting their fisheries. There has not been as much written about the Newfoundland fishery for the last forty years as contained in this article. We are doing nothing whatever, and we have not started to do anything for the fisheries of this country. There is not one man in the Executive Government to-day who knows anything about the fishery of this country. They may be alright on highroads but they know nothing about the fisheries.

(After the word "subject".)

Has there ever been anyone to tell the fishermen of this country anything about beds on the Grand Banks, or anywhere else for that matter? Has

the Government ever made any attempt to advance the standard of the fisheries—this Government or any other Government? I am not particularly blaming this Government, and I am not trying to defend any other Government. They did nothing, and it is our duty to do it. We have betrayed the trust imposed in us by the people of this country a year ago. The fisheries of this country are the mainstay of the country. You can put up pulp mills if you like at the bottom of every bay in Newfoundland; they will operate successfully probably for a few years, but the fishery will ever remain the mainstay of the country. There may be some people in this House live long enough, or I may live long enough myself, to know that I am saying the truth.

And yet people think that we can get up and defend that tariff. I do not like to be hypocrite enough to get up and attempt to defend that tariff to-day. I would be an absolute hypocrite if I as much started to defend the tariff, and I would deserve to be publicly horsewhipped, after what I told the people last year.

Reads. (After words "small fish".)

There are people in this party to-day, I believe, who do not know that fish eat caplin, and I say that in all sincerity. There may be two or three of us, perhaps, who know it. I would like to ask some honourable members on this side of the House when do the caplin come in.

Reads. (After words "major portion of the catch".)

Why do the Lunenburg fishermen make a success of the fishery while the Newfoundland people do not, or have not attempted to. The West Coast men do, but you take when you leave Placentia Bay to-day and come north there is not a vessel going out to the Grand Banks. But twenty-five years ago at Bay Bulls there were twenty-seven Williams' commanding twenty-seven vessels, and making money. And what happened? It is gone, but I do not think it is forgotten. I believe still that where there is life there is hope. I believe that the banking fishery can be brought back to what it was twenty-five years ago. And we are told that there is no market for it. Where is the Nova Scotia market? Cannot we make our fish just as well as the Nova Scotians? To-day we ship our fish to Oporto, but the man from Nova Scotia takes down his little package of fish or herring and he trades with the West Indies. Heretofore we were told that if we had any West India fish it would be just as well to throw it away. Last year the price of fish went up. Where is it to-day, and what has happened it? What of these wiseacres on Water Street—what we call the nabobs of Water Street, the people who come in here to-night to put on more protection for the nabobs of Water Street in that tariff that we are asked to swallow. What have they done for the industries of this country? They are ruining them in some instances by packing fish over there and letting it pile up. Three years ago I happened to get stung in the fish business. I consigned a large cargo of fish to Alicante, and I got an advance of fifty shillings a quintal upon it. Then I went round trying to get some more, and I made some outright sales at seventy to seventy-two shillings a quintal for the same fish. But the brokers on the other side did not attempt to get rid of the good fish and left it there for eighteen months, and the result was that I had to pay back the money that I got in the first instance. Surely we could do something in connection with a matter of that importance, but we have not atttempted to.

And you would not get a man to pen a line in one of our daily newspapers to say that that fellow was telling an untruth, because the best codfish in the world is caught and cured in

Newfoundland, and the fish that is cured in Lunenburg is heavy salted bank fish and is known as Madeira and not merchantable at all. Now it does not occur to members of the Government to-night how the fishermen of this country have to toil in order to pay the increase imposed on them by this new tariff, which is nothing more or less than class legislation put on to protect monopolists in Newfoundland, and the fishermen and workmen generally in Newfoundland have got to pay the piper. Still every member of the Government to-night are prepared to lie down and refuse to raise their voices against it. If such a tariff as this was introduced here forty years ago the people would raise in their might against it and turn us all out of this House. Imagine this fellow in this article here trying to tell how the schooners catch fish on the Grand Banks, although it would be well if some of us here to-night could picture those poor fishermen setting their tubs of trawls and not be here cutting the stomachs out of them with increased taxation. You have increased taxation by this new tariff to the extent of $600,000. Half of this amount used to be paid by the well-to-do classes as an income and business profits tax, but it was taken off those who could afford to pay and put on the poor people. Why if the fishermen of this country to-night knew the whole story of this infamous tariff they would be shocked, and any member of this House who is prepared to swallow it is a traitor and should be publicly courtmartialled and politically shot. I agree with the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs that this is pretty hard language, but it is the truth and he knows it is. I agree that he has been up against it because he was never in the Post Office before and when he went there he knew more about the workings of that department than the Post Office knew about him. Take the appointments that were made in that department. The new Deputy Minister, for instance, is a very estimable young man and a gentleman I have nothing against, but ordinarily he did not know his way up to the Post Office. There were capable men who had spent their lifetimes in the service, but they were refused promotion and the new Deputy Minister was taken from outside without a day's experience. The same applies to other departments in which appointments were made by this Government. Now take the railroad. I happen to be a member of that foolish Railway Commission. I say foolish because we have done nothing since we started. At the last General Election the Minister of Finance preached from every platform that he would see that almost every salary in connection with the railway would be cut down. Now what did the Finance Minister do since?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE — Nothing more than you did.

MR. CASHIN—You know what I did and the Prime Minister knows what I did.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I do not know it; you never made any proposition in regard to the railway that I know of.

MR. CASHIN—I did make a proposition with reference to the reduction of some of the big salaries up there and your answer was that if you reduce the salaries of any officials that they might leave the service entirely, as if they could not be done without, although there were better men going around this country out of work. The Prime Minister himself stated in this House that neither Mr. Harvey nor Mr. Joyce were competent enough to make a report on the drk dock, but when I suggested here some time ago Commander Howley, a competent engineer, he was turned down. Commander Howley, who is known as the man of a hundred wounds, did more for this country than any of us, and still all he was offered was a job

around the Golf Links or a position around this House. Why, if I was in his place I would have leaped down in one of your throats. Now your tariff to-night is for the fishermen of this country to go naked, because you have knocked off the duty of the wealthy and stuck it on the fishermen and laboring classes.

Because he has slapped on 20 per cent. extra on his clothes. And if he cannot afford to buy them they can say resort to the days of Adam and Eve. when the fig leaf was the supreme adornment of dress. Imagine having to tell the fishermen of this country that they can wear the fig leaf if they like. They have no regard for fishermen of this country.

Now I was one of the first men that Mr. Monroe asked to join his party and I went out in all sincerity, and I am going to take my medicine like a man. I took it before when some people were too cowardly to take it. Those who are now heaving me out. If I am wrong I am man enough to take it back. But I have learnt to take my medicine. Why they did not even ask me about anything in my own district. The member for Placentia is running my district—Mr. Sullivan. They bought a court house and I knew nothing about it until it was built. Cashin is a young fellow who has no brains. Has nothing. Oh, I know what they thought. Cashin is no fool. He is not afraid and he is going to stick out for the crowd that sent his father to this House for thirty years.

(Reads)

Are we doing anything to seek new markets or to expand the old ones. We are doing everything to kill the old ones and to steer clear of the new ones. Motor boats. The Shore fishery of Newfoundland employs motor boats and the Government is going to put an extra tax on motor boats of ten per cent. Is not that correct, Mr. Chairman.

The reason given by the Government to-day for putting the duty on lines and twines is because they took the duty off hooks. The protection on hooks was somewhere in the vicinity of ten thousand. And the importation of lines and twines was approximately 25,000 dollars. We have put on $2500 and taken off a thousand.

And no other industry in Newfoundland gave employment to a greater number of people than the fisheries of this country. Will the great Humber Industry be the success that they hope it will be. Personally I think that the Government have the idea that it will not. In 8 or 10 years they will be willing enough to pay off the bonds on this guarantee at the present.

Banks. That reminds me of the other things that the Government has done. Taken the duty off the Banks. They are down here for the good of their health. They are not making money and so we take the taxes off them. And who are they going to put it on. They are not going to put it on themselves. They are going to put it on the fishermen and the workmen of this country, to the tune of $600,000 or $700,000 a year.

Are our sailors famous. This Newfoundland sent more sailors to the war than any other dominion of the Britis Empire. And we are told in our history that it is owing to the fishermen of Newfoundland that the British Navy to-day is what it is. And if you don't believe it I will bring in the book to you to-morrow and prove it to you.

Now how are we going to find out the truth about this tariff. I say that it is disastrous to the fisheries of this country. The Government say no and the Opposition say yes. And who are we going to get a correct answer from. Go to the people of Newfoundland to-morrow if necessary and ask them if the tax that you are putting on to-

night is disastrous or not to the fishing industry of this country, and any sane man will answer yes. The extra taxation of lines and twines, tobacco, tea and sugar and other articles of all kinds because they are not going to wear clothes any more. They have got to go naked. That is what the Government are doing for the fishermen.

And where are they going? You will find them fishing out of Gloucester or out of the wharf of Boston. And we drive them up there to make money for other people. And we are not making any attempt to keep them. If that is not right then I will take it back but there is no member in this House who can prove to me that I am wrong.

(Reads)

I think before this Government goes out of power there will have to be a close season on more than Lobsters. There will have to be a close season on quite a lot of things.

(Reads)

And what are we doing to-night to encourage this industry in Newfoundland? And I ask the Prime Minister if we are doing one thing. I ask him in all squareness and fairness if we are doing one thing, or is he doing one thing since he came into power to develop this industry, and his answer must only be in the negative. No. He has not done one thing.

(Reads)

I wonder how many pounds of fish are eaten in Newfoundland. It says that fish is a good food for the brains and I would advise the Government to get five or six quintals in to-morrow afternoon and see if they can get some brains for the consideration of this tariff. This tariff commission sat for two years and they got thirteen thousand dollars for their work and then they handed it over to the present Government, the first time they came into power. What did they do. They never looked at it until the other day. They had no Executive meeting on it I think. They took off the income Tax and the business profit tax before they looked at it. Now I ask any man if that is good government. I claim that it is slave driving again. Surely heavens we have not got back to the olden times again and there are a good many women and children of the fishermen and the labourmen class that think the same thing. You put a tax on tea and sugar and you cannot go down Water Street for the past week without getting the smell of this new tariff everywhere. You need the best perfume and that is Cote's best French perfume, to get clear of the smell of this new tariff. Now in two or three months there will be the Lunenburg fishermen up on the Southern Shore looking for bait. I do not know how many Newfoundland vessels will be up on the Banks this summer but I know how many Nova Scotians will be on the Banks this summer, and I know how many Nova Scotians will be at Burin for caplin to take to the Grand Banks for the spring fishery. I know something about them. But how many Newfoundland vessels will be out there. Have we encouraged them in any way? We have done nothing for this main industry of the Country. We have passed a vote for two millions on roads. And then we are supposed to shut up and say nothing about it. Members of the House come in here and they evince no interest in this tariff. They have begun to look upon it as a joke and then they are supposed to be doing the right thing by the people. Is not that wrong? Is it the right thing to do by the people of this country? There is not one in this House who has a proper interest in this tariff. My God, it is frightful. And what satisfaction will the people of this country get for this perpetration to-night.

(Reads)

This Government and the Govern-

ments in the past have been making slaves of the fishermen of this country. Mr. Coaker was the first man who made any attempt to do anything for the fishermen of the country. I was opposed to him for various reasons but I think that he was the first to make any endeavour to raise the fishermen of this country and I think that it is only right that I should say this for him. I am leaving this party and I am going over to the middle of the House and I am going to represent Newfoundland as a Newfoundlander. This is no joke, Mr. Chairman. But Mr. Woodford, I do not want to be personal to you, but I think that as far as Mr. Coaker and you are concerned, I do not think that there is any comparison between you. I want to move the adjournment of this House as this thing has gone too far.

Mr. Chairman, if this kind of procedure is in order; if this is the kind of show that the fishermen, the people of this country, and the members of this House are going to get at the hands of a Minister of the Crown, I am certainly not going to stand here and say nothing. I am not trying to preach any doctrine to the members of this House, but I certainly do not think that this is good enough. I am here in the interests of the people of this country, and all that I can get is a couple of oaths from the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs. That is contrary to every rule of this House.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS — Coaker—Coaker—I hope Mr. Chairman, that we will never hear the name of Coaker mentioned again in connection with any party. Coaker—the man who is responsible for all the trouble.

MR. K. M. BROWN—Coaker is alright. If you were not an old man to-night you would be afraid to mention the name of Coaker in that way.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, I think we should move the adjournment of the House. I think that some members have been imbibing too freely of the drop that cheers, and when they get two or three hours sleep, they may be able to come up here to-morrow and discuss the tariff more intelligently than they are doing at present.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—I do not wish to interrupt the Hon. Gentleman. . . . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN—Sit down please, Mr. Minister, Mr. Cashin has the floor.

MR. CASHIN—I agree with the Prime Minister, and I do not think that under these conditions we should be asked to consider this tariff any further to-night. I am doing the best for my cause and I think I deserve better treatment than to be cursed in this House.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—Did I use any curse words?

MR. CHAIRMAN—Sit down.

MR. CASHIN—I would ask the Prime Minister then to allow the Committee to rise, and sit again tomorrow?

HON. PRIME MINISTER—If you would finish your address we could then rise the Committee.

MR. CASHIN—Very well, then, we will be here until eight or nine o'-clock in the morning.

MR. HICKMAN—I beg to support the motion of the hon. member for Ferryland, that this House should now adjourn.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—I raise no objection to it. If the Hon. Leader of the Opposition suggests that the Committee rise, I have no objection.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

And it being past Midnight.

TUESDAY, April 28th, 1925.

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

On motion this Report was received

and adopted, and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on to-day.

MR. WARREN—At this late hour I will not raise a question that I intended to, but I would like to give notice, and I would like to have it published in the paper to-morrow that I intend to raise a question of privilege.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, April 28th, 1925.

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

(Presenting Petitions)

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from the inhabitants of Burgognes Cove and vicinity in South Sound in the district of Trinity. The petitioners ask the Government to grant a sum of money to repair the road from Burgoyne's Cove to Shoal Harbor to the several places in Smith Sound; and they set forth that the road is in a very bad state of disrepair. The petition is signed by a number of people in the different localities around Smith Sound; and I beg to ask that this petition be received and referred to the department to which it relates.

I also beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Heart's Desire, who are owners of cod traps. There are nine men who have signed this petition, who represent themselves as being owners and users of cod traps at this place. They represent that the system of procuring trap berths is not all that they would desire, although they live in Heart's Desire; and they ask now that the Government, or the Fishery Board, would be good enough to change the system. The system as it is at present is that a gun is fired at an appointed time, and these people row for the berth, and the first boat reaching the berth secures the berth for the season. It costs them about five dollars an oar, or twenty dollars a boat, and they say it is too expensive. They ask now that the system of drawing for trapberths be adopted. They think that system at present obtains in the electoral district of St. John's East, and I think it obtains also in many other electoral districts, and I do not think it would be much trouble to formulate a system that would give to the people of Heart's Desire the same satisfaction as obtains in these other districts.

I would refer this to the Department of Marine and Fisheries for immediate consideration. Thomas St. George, the leading man of that community, writes me a personal note and asks me to have the matter taken up at once, as they would like to have the berths drawn by the first of May. If it cannot be done this year, the first week in May might do. He asks that they should have the drawing of trap berths between the last of March and the first of May. It is an important matter for the people interested, and I would ask that it be given the immediate attention of the Government.

I also beg to present a petition from the inhabitants of Melrose, Port Union and Catalina, in the electoral district of Trinity,on the subject of a motor truck being provided by the Government to ply between Melrose or Catalina and Bonavista, during the months of August, September and October. The petitioners point out that during these months, especially during the months of September and October they depend largely upon the bait supply, especially the squid bait supply, from the waters of Bonavista,

and they are now subject to great inconvenience and loss of time, and sometimes hardship in having to use the ordinary two wheeled vehicles. Perhaps some of them have a small pony attached to their carts, some others use dogs; and I would now ask on their behalf that the Government would give their consideration to the prayer of this petition for a motor truck, in order to give these people a supply of bait; or to facilitate them in procuring the supply of bait; and although the petition may be somewhat unusual, we should do anything we can to provide our fishermen with better means of prosecuting the fishery, and so enhancing the wealth and revenue of this country. I trust that the Government will give this petition their serious consideration which it deserves.

I beg to present this petition and ask that it be referred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

CAPT. RANDELL—I beg to support the petitions presented by my colleague.

MR. GODDEN—I also beg to supopr these petitions.

On motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Bill "An Act for the Encouragement of Shipbuilding" was laid aside, and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole, to consider certain Resolutions relating to the Encouragement of Shipbuilding and Rebuilding.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

MINISTER OF MARINE—Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to take up the time of the House with these Resolutions, but it will be remembered that a while ago the Bill was brought in in connection with the repairing of ships. It was sent to the Upper House and discussed, and since then in going through the Shipbuilding Bill I found that in the last few years a lot of alterations had been made in it, but no new bill replaced it, and, therefore, these Resolutions are brought in.

As to the Building of New Ships I notice that some parts of the Bill were upside down. Reference was made to vessels of from twenty to forty tons to have Lloyd's tested chains, and also vessels from forty to sixty tons. Now if these needed it vessels over a hundred tons needed it more. Therefore, it is embodied in this as you will notice by the printed bill that it will all be in the one Bill now. A lot of dissatisfaction has been expressed over the condition of the small boats carried on coastal boats. We have had quite a few accidents in late years and last year there was an outcry as to these boats, and I may say now for the information of the House and the Country that as far as these boats on passenger boats are concerned, they have been overhauled this year and are in first class condition. And I also say that the people who made complaints last year as to the boats on the Prospero were justified in doing so. With this Bill carried out, passengers will be able in future to feel sure that in case of accident there will be good and tight boats to take them and the crew safely to land. You will find this on Page 5. I found since we sent the first Bill to the Upper House there was no provision for a man putting old gear on a schooner which he was building. There may not be many cases of this but there are a few men from Trinity Bay who had first thought of using new gear, but when the hulls were completed found they had to use the old. Provision is now made for this, and for them to get the Bounty.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman, I regret very much that the Government has not seen its way clear to increase those bounties that are named here for the encouragement of shipbuilding. To-

day, as we all know, the cost of building material has not gone down anything worth while. In fact labour and material cost practically as high as they did for several years past, and I consider that the bounties named here could be increased somewhat larger than they are in order to encourage more shipbuilding, which is very essential in this country at the present time. With regard to subsection (f) of section (4), it seems to me that one-half of the bounty which it is proposed to give is not sufficient at all. It does not seem reasonable to my mind that a man who has a schooner which is twenty years old, say, and who cuts her down and rebuilds her, should get as much as a man who starts and builds a new vessel, and I would like to ask the Minister how he came to the conclusion that one-half of the bounty of thirty dollars per ton, viz.: fifteen dollars, is sufficent for the man who starts and builds a new schooner whereas a man who rebuilds an old one gets twenty dollars.

MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, the idea is to give every inducement to every man who builds a new schooner from the keel and equips her with new gear, because people are inclined to put old gear on new hulls, and we want to give as less encouragement as possible to this sort of thing. If these two men from Trinity Bay had known that this law was going to be introduced they would have used the old gear. Therefore the Board has come to the conclusion that the less encouragement they give to the building of new hulls and the putting of old gear on them the better.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I think that the point raised by Mr. Ashbourne is well made and well taken, and should receive some consideration. I think that the man who makes up his mind to build a new ship should get the same encouragement only as the man who attempts to rebuild and in conformity with Schedule A. I think the point is worthy of consideration. Why could not the same regulations apply to ships that are going to be rebuilt as well as to the newly built ships? I do not think that any man would run the risk of putting old gear on a new vessel. Surely a man does not want to lose the hull for the sake of the insurance.

MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Well, apparently you do not know much about the country.

MR. HALFYYARD — I think that would be bad business altogether, because I think that any man who goes to such trouble with his vessel would naturally get the best gear possible for her. I would suggest that we leave that clause over for further consideration, because this is the first time we have seen this new Bill and we do not know exactly what it contains. Section 6 reads "No bounty shall be paid in respect of ships built and equipped according to Schedule A. hereto unless such ships have been surveyed," etc. What about ships built and equipped according to Schedule B.? Will not they require any survey to be made on them?

MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Yes, they are all surveyed ,as will be seen in Section 7.

MR. HALFYARD—(Reads.) This does not provide any survey. It will take five years to build and equip those vessels according to Schedule C.

(Reads.)

I gather from that that ships built under Schedules B. and C. may not be surveyed in their frames but after their completion.

Mr. Chairman, I contend that that is worthy of consideration. I don't know what interpretation is put on Section 7. If you say that you must send a surveyor to survey acccording to Sections C. and D., I would like you to explain that to me.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, if the Minister wants to re-

move all doubt on that matter you could make Section 6 read according to Sections A. B. . if you like.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman, in regard to the point before the House for discussion I contend that it is more important to have a good hull than it is to have new gear. And I don't see any reason in the world why a man should not get a bounty for building a new hull and putting in second-hand gear.

(Reads.)

Now evidently all schooners that are going to be rebuilt are compelled to have new chains on them. There is nothing there about chains.

MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Yes, the word "chains" ought to be in there also.

MR. HALFYAYRD—Mr. Chairman, when this Bill first came before the House this matter came up for discussion concerning the section that is about to be read with regard to vessels that might possibly be repaired in the water. They possibly may not have known about this Bill and they might have had their vessels repaired in the water in all good faith. Are they to get no bounty? I feel that would be a great hardship upon those people. The Minister at that time was good enough to tell me that he would take the matter into consideration. I would like to ask the Minister now if he has heard of any such case.

MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I have heard of only two. These two were repaired in the water.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, in reference to this Bill, some time ago, as the Minister knows, a Bill was passed in this House called an Act respecting the Encouragement of Shipbuilding. I have this Bill before me now. The Bill passed through the different stages of the House and it was sent to the Upper House. It was destroyed in the Upper House and they reprinted a new Bill which we have before us now, and they send it down here for the Lower House to ratify it. Now I want to speak in reference to Sections 12 and 13 of this Bill. When this Bill first came up before the House we impressed upon the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the necessity of guaranteeing a bounty upon ships that were under repairs and were not pulled out of the water. There was a clause in this Bill that any who started to build a vessel last fall and had not pulled it out of the water would not qualify for the bounty. We impressed upon the Minister and upon the Government the necessity of taking that into consideration. They would not take our advice. They simply defied us in every way and they passed this Bill in such a way that no vessel that had not been hauled out of the water for repairs should get a bounty. Now the Upper House is introducing a Bill.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE — That statement is not correct. These resolutions have not passed the Upper House.

MR. HICKMAN—You would never have brought in a new Bill only for the Upper House. This is the Upper House Bill.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—You voted for this Bill. You didn't ask for a division, which means that you were in favour of it.

MR. HICKMAN—I did not ask for a division because you have got more on that side than we have on this side. The Minister of Justice is only trying to draw another red herring across the trail as he is always doing. Here we have spent two or three days passing a Bill through its different stages and now find that this Bill is destroyed and we are asked to consider another Bill. Here is it:—

(Reads)

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has to say on what vessel a bounty shall be paid. I claim that the Government and the Minister of Marine

and Fisheries and whoever brings in these Bills and see that they are passed in this House should see that they stand and not have them sent to the Upper House and then at the desire of somebody up there they are changed and sent down here again and they occupy a great deal of the time of this House during this session. Is it not correct that you passed a Bill for this same thing here before. Yes. Is it not correct that it occupied the time of this House for two or three days? Yes. Is it correct that it has been passed over? Yes it is. Is it correct that this is a new Bill? Yes.

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—You said that this Bill was discussed in the Upper House and that these Resolutions originated there but that is not correct.

HON THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—I said that it was discussed in the Upper House. I know what I am thinking about. I am making the statement that it was discussed in the Upper House. I know that somebody discovered that it was contrary to the Act that was passed before and then the Consolidated Statutes were looked up and then we have this new Bill down here again. Yes I know the man who discovered everything. I know the man who discovered that it was legal for goods to be imported into this colony and have the duties taken off them by the Governor- in-Council.

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—You made the statement that these Resolutions were discussed in the Upper House and that is an untruth. As I said before there are some things that you cannot understand. You are too dense to understand.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—That is very good coming from the Minister.

I would not be so dense as to do what he has done. I would not be so dense as to bring in a bill and find out then that there was an old law about it, and then find that the one that I had brought in was wrong and have to bring in a new bill. But the point that was made by Mr. Halfyard, the Member for Trinity, and Mr. Ashbourne is a good one, and that is when the vessels are rebuilt and the gear and other things that are belonging to another vessel, and if they are alright for use then the bounty should be paid. The fact that the equipment was not new should not make any difference. But as far as this Bill goes it is the first opportunity that we have had of looking over the bill, and when a member has only four or five minutes to look it over it is not sufficient time for him to get acquainted with it and be able to discuss it intelligently.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, it is a pity that we cannot make the discussion on this bill more interesting. As the Hon. Leader of the Opposition just pointed out this bill went before the Upper House and it was turned down because there were certain gentlemen up there that made certain recommendations, and the result is that we have these new resolutions before us now. And I suppose that we must give the Upper House the credit for these resolutions as they are now. And it seems that this is going on right through the session with a lot of the new legislation that has been prepared in this House. Something has happened to seven-eighths of the bills that have been sent from this House, and I really do not know whether the Law officers of the Government or the Minister of Marine and Fisheries or the other ministers of the departments who show a lack of interest and attention which they should give the legislature, but it is certainly apparent to anyone who has any knowledge of the proceedure of legislation that the Upper House is formulating the Legislation

fo.' this House, that we have had to adopt this session. I think that we will have to change the name of this House and call this House the Upper House because we are becoming decadent and almost defunct. We are acting in a very perfunctory manner. We seem to be depending on the Upper House to examine and amend the legislation. It is unfortunate to be a member of this House from the viewpoint of the legislation that has been turned out lately. It is humiliating. Now my point in looking at this section thirteen is to see whether my friend Harry Miller is going to get the bonus on the ship that he rebuilt in 1924. I hope that the minister had him in mind when he changed the date on this bill and if under the new bill Harry Miller will not get the bonus I hope that the Minister will change it again. I hope that the Minister will make it so that he will get the bonus. However, I trust that this bill will produce the results that are expected of it. I hope that it will encourage shipbuilding and that the rules and the regulations will be followed out, but I certainly think that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is assuming a great deal under this section 13.

(Reads)

It may be some day that I may have the portfolio of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I may not be as well qualified to fill the position as the present incumbent of the office as to say whether a ship should receive the bonus or not. You may be a good navigator or a good seal killer and you may be everything that is desirable, but it does not follow that you should be able to say whether the ships should get the bounty or not. I do not look at this in a personal manner, but I think that it would be the right thing to get Lloyd's surveyor to look at the vessels and see if they should get the bounty. The surveyor would be a man who is very experienced in the business of examining ships, and I would suggest that it would come with good grace from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if he would amend these two lines.

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES — The Lloyd surveyor never saw a wooden vessel except she was afloat.

MR. HALFYARD—It certainly seems that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had confidence in himself or he certainly would not nominate himself for the position that this bill gives him.

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—I claim that I know as much about a vessel as any man in Newfoundland.

MR. HALFYARD—Yes, but I think that you should take the opinion of the surveyor. It may be alright for you as it is, but it may happen that somebody will write in and ask the Minister to see if he can do anything to get the bounty for him, and I think that the Minister should be in a position to say that he has nothing whatever to do with it. I think that it would be a better position for yourself. Some fellow will write in and say that he was one of those who voted for you or that he was the fellow that got thirty others to vote for you, and he will say that he is the one that brought so much revenue into this colony, and then he will say that it is not right and that he should get the bounty. And then it would be the best thing that you should be in a position to say that you have nothing whatever to do with it. I am considering the position of the Minister himself.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, I just want to say a few words at this juncture, arising out of the comments made by honourable members. I think that reference has been made to the fact that we

should retain what is styled the dignity of this House, and honourable members seem to have been very anxious to retain that dignity; but in spite of that they do not really appreciate what the dignity of the House means.

The facts are well known to all of us, that some little while ago a bill was introduced into this House dealing with a bounty for repairs to ships. The matter first came before the House in the form of resolutions, which were debated and passed, and a Bill was brought in accordingly, dealing entirely with repairs to ships. The Bill was brought in by way of amendment to the Encouragement of Shipbuilding Act.

In another Chamber certain suggestions were made respecting the general question of shipbuilding itself, in addition to repairing. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition may have been reading some rumours in the papers as regards what took place in that other chamber. Whatever was done by gentlemen in another chamber with regard to Legislation of this kind we have nothing to do with. This is a Bill with regard to the spending of certain moneys; and according to the rules of the House it must originate in the Commons by way of resolutions. That is the procedure which has been taken, and honourable members must notice that this has been done in the proper way. We have decided upon the repeal of the Encouragement of Shipbuilding Act; and we are incorporating a new Act under the title of these Resolutions, if they are passed through this House. The Act for the Encouragement of Shipbuilding and Rebuilding. It is the first time that the question of rebuilding has been brought up. To make such new provisions the Government gave consideration to the different suggestions that came along in connection with the Bill. That is all. We are only trying to do the thing in the right way, so that instead of accepting dictation as we have been accused of this afternoon, the actual fact is that this House, and this House only, can bring in resolutions involving the expenditure of money. Honourable members will remember that the other two Bills were laid aside for the purpose of bringing in these resolutions. If these resolutions are agreed to, there will be a Bill brought in, passed, and will be sent to the Upper House, and they will have to go through it afresh. These matters begin afresh here and that is why it is done in this manner —so that there may be no infringement of the privileges of this House.

CAPT. RANDELL—Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the fact that in this Schedule A there are no specifications of how the ship should be built. As far as I can see, in accordance with that schedule, a ship can be built with any size keel, deck beams, etc., that the builder might like to put into it. There is no such thing as any specification given for any of those particular parts of the ship. There are requirements given for the thickness of plank, ceiling and deck. We all know that it is essential that the principal parts of a ship should be good, and there should be specifications of them in the Schedule. Here we have no such thing as a specification. In other words, the builder can put anything he likes into a ship, as far as those principal parts are concerned.

I trust that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will consider something in the nature of principal specificaitons for a ship built under these resolutions, that is in Schedule A of these resolutions.

While I am on my feet I would like to say a few words in regard to vessels that have been built in this coun-

try. We all know that during the war time there was great need for shipping, and shipbuilding was being conducted almost all the world over. We started in to build wooden ships in this country. I might say that perhaps the builders that built some of those ships had never experienced the building of ships of the same size previously. They had been used to building smaller vessels, and the result of that was that part of the ships were built with good material, while some of the parts were not fit for ships of half the size. I have one or two in my mind that I looked over or surveyed. I had spent many years going to sea in wooden ships and I had some idea of what should be the size and quality of the principal parts. I remember one ship that had as fine a deck frame for its size as you could find in any vessel, while its ceiling was something like two and a half inches, which was suitable for a ship of seventy five or eighty tons, though the ship I am speaking of was about three hundred tons.

I think, considering this, that there should be some specifications put into this Schedule A. I also notice in Schedule A that only the measurement is given for the plank, ceiling and decking, and there are some particulars with regard to the fastening.

While I am on my feet I would like to make reference to a remark made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries with regard to the passenger steamers that have been going round the coast here. I want to say a word for the masters of those ships, that are carrying passengers and freight around our coast. There has been a lot of criticism with regard to some of them when they got into trouble for not handling their boats properly, or for not having them in good order, or not in a position where they could easily be got at. I want to impress upon this House that if ever there is such a thing as a Bill for the surveying of shipping comes before this House, it should be given consideration as we are now giving these resolutions. I say that the Masters of those coasting vessels going around this Coast are nothing more than pilots. He is not master of the ship. If he comes to St. John's and says that he wants to put his boats out in order to have boat drill or something like that, he is told to mind his own business. That has been done right here in St. John's. And fearing that he might be told to go and look for a job the next day, he remembers that he should mind his own business, and that is to do what he is told. I do not see why any blame should be put on the masters of those ships. The most of them that I know are good competent men.

While I am on my feet I would like to say a word with regard to some of our foreign going vessels. I do not know whether it has ever occurred to the commercial men of St. John's, but I would like to remind the Minister of Shipping, that for the last thirty five or forty years there has not been a foreign going vessel condemned in St. John's. Now ships wear out. They wear out like anything else, and they are sent to sea out of this port when they are not fit to go, and in my opinion, and I know it is the opinion of a good many shipping people in this country, that it would be better that there should be more rigid and strict surveys with regard to foreign going shipping before they clear from this port. There is food for thought in the fact that there has never been a ship condemned in this port for the last thirty years not a foreign going vessel.

MINISTER OF MARINE—I do not suppose there ever was a ship detained in this port till this year. I held up the "Fiona" and had the car-

go taken out and sent her over to Harbor Grace for repairs.

CAPTAIN RANDELL—With these few remarks of mine I think I have given the Minister of Marine some food for reflection, and I think we should go into this schedule A very carefully. He knows as well as I do that it is just as important for a ship to have the proper timbers as to have the planks, decking or ceiling.

MR. HICKMAN—Does the Minister think this necessary?

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—I do think it necessary, and I quite agree with Captain Randlel.

MR. HICKMAN—How is the Inspector to Act if the timber is not of the right size.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—He can condemn it, as he is the Inspector.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, in putting this Bill through why not make this matter of the demensions of the stem, sternpost and keel a point of law. Captain Randell is a practical man, and he says he has seen a vessel built here which met all the requirements as to planking, etc., but whose keel was not large enough for a ship of her size. No doubt she got the Bounty under the Old Act, and I think the Minister of Marine even if it does come from the Opposition should adopt a suggestion that is good. As he is a practical man like Captain Randell, I think they could ascertain in five minutes what should be the proper dimensions for the stem, sternpost and keel. But I fear the trouble is that the Minister does not want to adopt anything that comes from this side of the House, even though it is in the interest of the trade. As I said before if these two practical men would get together this matter could be easily adjusted, and in future there would be no dispute over the size of the stem etc. I say he should give Captain Randell's suggestion consideration, and I do not think any Member on the Government side would object to it being embodied in the Bill.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—I consider Captain Randell's opinion just as good as mine, but I do not think it is necessary to include his suggestion in the Bill. The statement of Mr. Hickman as to the Government accepting no suggestions from the Opposition shows his memory is bad, as we have just adopted several about chains.

MR. HICKMAN—If you do not adopt this it shows you will take nothing from the Opposition.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—We have made alterations, and almost torn up the Bill for you, and yet you are not satisfied. All this talk is only for delay.

CAPTAIN RANDELL—Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to obstruct the House,but I tendered my remarks with the idea of assisting. There is nothing in Schedule A as to framing, and not only that but as to deck beams and other most important parts of a ship. I have seen vessels here that were not fit to go to sea, but yet they were allowed to sail, and some of them were lost. One was the Pauline Martin. Some of them had two and a half inches of ceiling and only eleven inches in the top of the timbers and champs combined. And I could name other vessels beside the one mentioned. There was another which was alright except as to her iron work, and that was not suitable for a vessel of her size, but as far as I know she got the bounty. That is why I make these remarks. If details as to decking are stipulated, why not stipulate the dimensions of the other important parts.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, may I be allowed to suggest to the different Speakers, that as we have to go into

Committee on this Bill, their ideas need not be interfered with, and the Minister of Marine can take time to consider this. I think the fairest way in which to take the suggestions made is to consider them before we go into Committee. We are only dealing with the Schedule now, and I think they might go on, and pronounce on the suggestions of the Honorable Members later.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—But if we include the suggestion, there may be no bounty on vessels built this winter.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, it doesn't necessarily follow that no vessel built this winter will get the bounty, because most of such will be conforming with the regulations just as if Captain Randell's suggestions were embodied in the Act. I think we ought to be thankful to Captain Randell, and I must say I am surprized to find that there are no specified dimensions for the important parts mentioned included in the Act. I did not look through it very closely, but it seems very strange that some previous Government did not make amendments if there are the ambiguities, which there appears to be. I think Captain Randell's suggestions are of a constructive nature, and ought to be given great consideration.

MR. HICKMAN—I offered my suggestion, because I think the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and Captain Randell could settle the matter in five minutes, and then there would be no further discussion later on. Perhaps in the Committee stage they would not agree on the sizes of the parts if no agreement was reached now.

MINISTER OF JUSTICE—It is peculiar that in all our years of shipbuilding this thing should have been going on. I would like to give the Minister of Marine an opportunity to think over the suggestion made by Captain Randell.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman, I would like to call attention to the last paragraph of page 5. Are all vessels this winter being handled according to this Section? The Minister is fully conversant with shipbuilding matters, and I would like to ask him if any schooners are built of all spruce.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—I never saw one of all spruce. Of course they may be built like that.

MR. ASHBOURNE—I would like to ask how many are being built this winter?

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Thirty-four.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I am just reminded by accident of an editorial appearing in to-day's "Evening Telegram" and it confirms the remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition where this Bill originated and was born, nurtured and where it grew to manhood. Now it must be admitted that these Resolutions originated in the Upper House. Some remarks that were made in one of the daily newspapers were caused as a result of a discussion and a heated argument that took place over these Resolutions. Evidently they were discussed in the Upper House and the members there know all about them. Now they may not be the better or the worse for that, but at any rate, it conforms to what the Leader of the Opposition said with regard to them.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed the said Resolutions with some amendment and recommended the introduction of a Bill to give effect to the same.

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and the Bill en-

titled "An Act Respecting the Encouragement of Shipbuilding and Rebuilding" was read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Notice of Question

(1) MR. BROWN asked Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs what rate of pay did Mr. Louis House, late Paymaster and T. O. at Gambo, receive, how many assistants had he and what were their names and salaries in each case, and also to state how many officials are at present employed in the same office, and what are their names and salaries in each case.

HON. MINISTERS OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—Mr. Speaker, I beg to table the information.

(2) MR. SCAMMELL asked Hon. the Colonial Secretary to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing what bills for advertising or printing have been paid by his Department since July 1st last (1924) and to show to what newspapers, periodicals, magazines or publishers such amounts were paid in each case and to show the amounts paid.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, I may say that this information will take a couple of days to prepare and I hope to have the answer to table on Friday next.

(3) MR. SCAMMELL asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the table of the House a statement showing what bills for advertising or printing have been paid by his Department since July 1st last (1924), and to show to what newspapers, periodicals, magazines or publishers such amounts were paid in each case and to show the amounts paid.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, In reply to the question I may say that there has been no money spent in my Department for advertising or periodicals.

(4) MR. SCAMMELL asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing what bills for advertising or printing have been paid by his Department since July 1st last (1924) and to show to what newspapers, periodicals, magazines or publishers such amounts were paid in each case and to show the amounts paid.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—I have much pleasure in tabling the reply.

(5) MR. SCAMMELL asked Hon. the Minister of Education to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing what bills for advertising or printing have been paid by his Department since July 1st last (1924) and to show to what newspapers, periodicals, magazines or publishers such amounts were paid in ecah case, and to show the amounts paid.

HON. MINISTER OF EDUCATION—I beg to table it.

Question No. 6 deferred.

Question No. 7 deferred.

(8) MR. SCAMMELL asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing what bills for advertising or printing have been paid by his Department since July 1st last (1924), and to show to what newspapers, periodicals, magazines or publishers such amounts were paid in each case and to show the amounts paid.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—I beg to table the information.

(9) MR. SCAMMELL asked Hon. the Colonial Secretary to lay upon the Table of the House a copy of all public messages sent to the Outports from eighteenth February, 1925, to date. Also, to state who compiles the messages and if they are submitted to anyone before being sent out.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—In reply to the Honourable Member I

beg to say that these messagts were compiled by J. S. Currie. They are not submitted to anyone before being sent out. I beg to table the copies of these messages sent to the outports from the 18th of February to date.

(10) MR. HICKMAN asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay upon the Table of the House a copy of Minutes of Council authorizing the change of duties on different articles that have been changed since the Budget was delivered and the new Tariff was laid upon the Table of the House.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—There was no Minute-of-Council authorizing the changing of duties. Council discussed it, it was generally conceded that the suggestion that Minutes be framed to be brought before the House for discussion.

No. 11 dfeerred.

No. 12 deferred.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—I beg to lay on the Table of the House the answers to question No. 1 on the Order Paper of August 27th, and to say that the answers are not certified by the Auditor General or my Deputy. I consider that when I give answers to a question these answers are sufficient.

MR. WARREN—In accordance with a notice that I gave early this morning I rise to a point of privilege. I think that I ought to take this matter up here in this House, which is a public forum and which has been described in the communication which I shall read later as the High Court of Parliament. There are some people in this community who have suddenly got imbued with the idea that they ought to protect the public, and they do it by sitting in front of a cosy fire and casting reflections and making insinuations against those who are trying to do their duty. I refer now, sir, to what I consider a reflection upon me and accordingly a reflection upon this House. I refer to a letter in last night's Telegram. The gentleman signs himself J. A. W. W. McNeilly. There has been for some time past certain amount of criticism by Mr. McNeilly, who was very anxious to see that the rules of the House were adhered to with regard to private Bills. He was replied to on a couple of occasions by my partner in my law practice, Mr. H. A. Winter. I did not follow the correspondence very carefully, but having been worsted in the argument with Mr. Winter, Mr. McNeilly sees fit to draw me into the discussion, and insinuates that because Warren and Winter are solicitors for the Newfoundland Power and Paper Co. that I was likely to be influenced by that fact in dealing with the Bill before the House. First of all I better read portions of the letter. The first part does not apply to me. (Reads)

That, Sir, I consider is a gross insinuation upon any one attitude that I may assume with reference to that Bill. Let me say in the first place that the firm of Warren and Winter are not solicitors for the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company at all. Mr. Conroy is the solicitor for that Company. But as he was out of the country at the time Warren and Winter agreed to undertake it in his absence, and as such the notice was signed. Mr. McNeilly made insinuations against Members of the House who are shareholders in any company which is asking for privileges from the Government, and I do not think that it would be wrong to ask that this gentleman to be brought to the Bar of this House and let him name them. He does not name them, but he makes the broad suggestion to that effect and then he names me personally as being a solicitor for the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company, and "better" than a shareholder for their Purposes. He insinuates that my integrity is not all

that it might be. He says that my absention from voting is not enough, but that my vote may be required to protect the public, which Mr. McNeilly is trying to do. We have a new Oliver Cromwell in the midst of us, and this new Oliver Cromwell says that Warren has no right to be in this House and to take any part in the discussion if his firm is the solicitor for a Company applying for concessions, and he does not know what these concessions are. I consider it an aspersion on my independence, and, as I said, I am going to quote the rules of the House on it.

According to the rules laid down, it is absolutely against the prerogative of this House and against the law for any man to try and intimidate the Members of this House. But if he thinks that by writing such letters and trying to intimidate me as to the course of action that I propose to take he has made a very big mistake. While he may be very learned and anxious to protect the public, yet at the same time he is very ignorant of the rules of this House. By the rules of this House. Rule 276 and 277. (Reads Rule).

If Mr. McNeilly is ignorant of the rules of this House, take it from me that I am not. And I would no more think of taking part in any discussion or voting upon a prviate Bill than I would of flying or of writing such a letter as Mr. McNeilly has written. In accordance with the rules of this House I cannot take part in any discussion of a Bill of that sort. And these rules are wide and wise. To tell the truth, I have never seen the details of that Bill, and I don't know what is in it. But if I have to make a casting vote on that Bill, which I of course will never have to do. (It will never be necessary). But if I had to do it to protect the public I think that my past history and my past career will be sufficient for the public to judge that I have tried to do my duty. I don't require the insinuations of an arm chair critic like Mr. McNeilly to tell me what I ought to do and at the same time get cheap advertisement for himself. Now Mr. Speaker, I was going to make a motion that this House should deal with this matter. I do not want to indulge in any newspaper controversy with the gentleman who wrote that letter, but I can safely concede that what has been written is going broadcast throughout this country. But I don't want to take advantage of my privilege and engage in any acrimonious discussion with Mr. McNeilly upon the matter. If I had not been a member of Parliament or a member of this House I would have taken that course, but it is because Mr. McNeilly has cast this reflection upon the integrity of a member of this House that I have called the matter to your attention, and I want to say this, that if it happens again I will make a motion that Mr. McNeilly will have to answer.

Question of Privilege

MR. SPEAKER said: Of the utmost importance to this House is the safeguarding of its prerogatives and the rights and privileges of its members. It protects them not alone in their persons and liberties, but against reflections upon their honor or accusations of partiality in the discharge of their Legislative duties. And such interference with them is resented as an indignity to the House itself, to be not only discountenanced, but effectively stopped.

Dealing with the question raised by the Hon. Member for Fortune, I may say that because his law firm acted temporarily as legal advisers to the Newfoundland Power and Paper Co., Ltd., Mr. Warren deliberately refrained from presenting the petition brought forward on behalf of that Company, and took absolutely no part

in its discussion or consideration. He is not a member of the Select Committee to whom the Petition was referred for enquiry and report; nor is he engaged in the promotion, management or passage of the proposed legislation through this Assembly.

As was to be expected from one of his professional standing, who has occupied with such distinction the highest positions in the gift of this House and the Government of this Colony, Mr. Warren has acted throughout, in connection with this matter, with the utmost propriety; in complete agreement with the Rules; and in accordance with the best traditions of this Chamber.

I extend to the Hon. Member an assurance that this House views with grave displeasure and emphatically repudiates any suggestions that tend to disparage him, or in any way reflect upon his integrity or reputation.

Amendments to Pure Bred Animals 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 Records of Pure Bred Animals" with some amendments, in which they request the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—The Minister of Agriculture and Mines has asked me to move that the amendments be read the first time.

I would like to take the opportunity of explaining shortly the effect of these amendments. In Section three they have inserted the word "or" and now it reads like this:—

(Reads)

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the said Amendments were read a first time.

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, with unanimous consent the said Amendments were read a second time, and passed, and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting that body that the House of Assembly had agreed to the said Amendments without amendment.

Amendments to Hotel Facilities, Limited Bill.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they have passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act for the Confirmation of an Agreement between the Government and the Newfoundland Hotel Facilities, Limited" with some amendments, in which they request the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain that these amendments do not amount to very much. The second clause is:—

(Reads)

Clause five is the same thing:—

(Reads)

That is changed to the hotel in St. John's instead of the hotels that they might have elsewhere.

Clause six reads:—

(Reads)

That is the only change with the exception of clause one. But the purpose of putting that in is that the agreement has been signed and cannot be altered because it forms a part of the bill, and the only alteration is the one that I have mentioned. It is the change of the section which puts in the hotel instead of the hotels that they may afterwards acquire.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the said amendments were read a first time.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, with unanimous consent, the said amendments were read a second time, and passed, and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting that body that the House of Assembly had

agreed to the said Amendments without amendment.

Amendments to Old Age Pensions 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 Chapter 74 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Old Age Pensions'" with some amendments, in which they request the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER—In this connection it is my duty to call the attention of the House to the fact that this is a money bill and that the amendments that have been suggested by the Legislative Council are an infringement on the privileges of this House.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I have just seen the amendments for the first time and I cannot see the reasons for them as yet, and I would like to have the matter stand over until to-morrow.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Speaker, you have just told the House that this amendment is an infringement on the rights of this House, and I think that we should take steps to reject it altogether.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the said amendments were read a first time and it was ordered that the second reading thereof be deferred until to-morrow.

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. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, I would take this opportunity of congratulating Major Cashin, the Hon. Member for Ferryland, on the stand which he took yesterday with reference to this tariff that is now before the House. He has taken the stand of a man, a stand which could only be taken by a soldier, such as he is, and I think he is worthy of congratulations of all those who were within the sound of his voice last night, when he gave us his reasons for leaving, and the sound arguments which he advanced in reference to the tariff, on which he differed from the Government.

Major Cashin's arguments were that he represented the fishermen, and that the taxes imposed by the Tariff now on the table worked a very great hardship on the fishermen. It put on the labouring man and the fisherman, and on people in other walks of life, particularly those who have to live on a small or medium salary, a very great burden. In the stand which he has taken, I must say that he is backed by me. I have stated before on the floors of this House of Assembly that no further taxes should be put upon the fishermen of this country, and no further taxes should be put upon the people who produce the great wealth of this country, and it is going to be difficult if not impossible, for these people to exist with the additional taxes that are put upon the commodities which are used by people in every walk of life.

The increased tariff, as I have already said, is going to reduce the standard of living. The man who was drawing a salary of one thousand dollars or under last year has found it very difficult to make two ends meet, and now the additional duties of from fifteen to twenty per cent. on the articles that he consumes most will make it more difficult for him to make the two ends meet, and he will have to do without a great many of the necessities, not to talk of the luxuries of life.

While it is not our intention, and we have no desire to reduce the ranks of the Government, still we must congratulate a man of the standing of Major Cashin who will take this position on an issue of this kind, which effects everybody. We must congratulate him upon the stand he has taken.

He has left the ranks of the Government, and it is a well known fact that at all times to the victors belong the spoils; and those who sit on that side of the House have the privilege of dividing the spoils of the Government, whatever they may be, in the way of patronage; and Major Cashin has, on principle, forfeited every privilege he had, and every connection that he had with the Government and Government departments; and he has left the ranks of the Government purely upon the stand that he was sent here on behalf of the fishermen of the country. He has told us that, while he is not wealthy, he has got enough to make him independent of any political party, and to enable him to take a stand of this kind; and I am sure that the whole country will congratulate a man as fearless as Major Cashin, and a man who has taken a stand of this kind on an issue which concerns the country.

From this side of the House we tender him our sincerest congratulations.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. Hickman for the very flattering remarks in connection with my dismissal from the Government last night. I did not leave—I was dismissed. In other words I was excommunicated from the ranks of the Government because I did not see eye to eye with the Minister of Finance and the Prime Minister in connection with the tariff which is on the table of the House to-day.

I did not seek any unusual terms from the Government last night. I merely asked the Minister of Finance if he would give me time to read the report of the Tariff Commission, and after I had had that time I said that I was prepared to come in here and cast an intelligent vote one way or the other in connection with the Tariff that is now before the Chair. In justice to the people who sent me here I owed them that.

To-day we have this tariff on the table of the House which is placing from 12 to 15 per cent. extra taxation on the labourer and fisherman of this country. Then on the other hand we as a Government came in here early this session and abolished the Income Tax, and the Business Profits Tax. We abolished the Income Tax for the wealthy man who could well afford to pay it, and we abolished the Business Profits Tax for the wealthy business man, who if he made money in his business, was bound under the law as it was at the time, to pay the business Profits Tax. We abolished that tax—and what did we do in return to get the necessary revenue for the country. These tariff resolutions replaced that Income Tax and the Business Profits Tax, and put the taxes instead on the poor men—the working men and the fishermen of this country.

I was one of that party who last year during all the political turmoil which took place in Newfoundland happened to be a member of the House. I was one of the party who went to the country in 1923 under Mr. Bennett, the present Colonial Secretary as my leader, and at that time we pledged ourselves to the people that if we were returned to power under Mr. Bennett we would give a bounty on fish to the fishermen. Unfortunately for Newfoundland and for the fishermen of this country that party was not returned to power, but we came back to this House as a party.

The Prime Minister of to-day was a

Member of the Party who gave the same promises to the fishermen of Bonavista Bay and to the fishermen as a whole. We came back and you all know what happened, what brought about the election last year. I was about to quit politics, as I was a young man, had no great means, and did not think I could afford to be in political life. But the present Minister of Justice used certain influences to bring me into the field, and the Prime Minister sent me a letter asking me to contest Ferryland District for them. I did not ask him to take me as a Candidate, and if he did not ask me I would not have placed myself at his feet, as he considered himself the saviour of his adopted country. I fought the election in Ferryland, which is entirely a fishing district, and we pledged ourselves if returned to reduce taxation, though I did not use his Manifesto in the campaign in the District. I will read it now for the information of all in the House, and would ask if he has carried out one solitary promise which he made in that Manifesto.

(Reads Manifesto)

We have heard a lot of talk here about Jacob and Esau. Well, I think that that Manifesto is the hand of Esau. I claim that that Manifesto was not written personally by Mr. Monroe, but that it was written by Esau and placed in Mr. Monroe's hands merely to sign. Esau is the man who wrote it, and I was one of those who pledged myself to it and told the fishermen of this country that this Government was going to reduce taxation and reduce expenditure and give them a better show to earn a living. Now I have read to the House Mr. Monroe's promises and I challenge him here to-night wherein he has carried out one, with the exception of the repealing of the Prohibition Act. Esau said in the Manifesto that the principle of Responsible Government and representative Government was Government of the people, for the people and by the people. Now what are the Government doing to-night to carry out that? Still they ask me to swallow that tariff without complaint, a tariff which they have had in their hands nearly twelve months ago, though they have only gone into it once since, and they knew that when they took off the income and profits tax act on the wealthy that they would put it on the poorer classes of the country, particularly on the fishermen. They asked me to go and tell the fishermen of Ferryland district that this Government was going to reduce taxation, if returned to power, and in doing my duty to my constituents I claim that if I voted for this tariff as it stands now that I would be betraying the confidence placed in me last year by the fishermen of Ferryland District, and I claim further that any member of the Government to-night who votes for the tariff that is on the table are traitors to the people who sent them here, and I say now, as I said last night, that they should be publicly court-martialled and politically shot, and the time is not far distant when this Government as a whole will be politically shot. The Prime Minister told me last night that as I had been opposed to the Government for some time that if I did not like their way of doing things to get out of the Party, and I got out. I was not wanted in the Party because I was not prepared to let the Prime Minister or the Minister of Finance poke this tariff down my throat. Neither one of them this evening can explain this tariff, and I challenge them to do so now. I have no paper to tell what I am saying, but I am going to tell those people of Newfoundland who are in hearing of my voice now that nine or ten years ago I fought for this country, and I was willing to lay

down my life for this country, and I am perfectly willing to remain here until I drop dead on the floors of this House before I will allow this tariff go through. I claim that this tariff should have been gone into more thoroughly by the Executive Government before it was brought down here, and there is no one member of the Executive to-night who understands or can explain it or they cannot tell how it compares with the old tariff of last year, with the exception of the Amendments they have made recently to the manufacture of butter and tobacco. If that clause that was put in there respecting tobacco passes this House it will give a greater monopoly than ever to the Imperial Tobacco Company and will drive the smaller man out of business entirely. And that small man's name is Faour, who has invested his money, but because he had been threading on the corns of the Imperial Tobacco Factory, of which Mr. Monroe is a large shareholder the present Government goes to work to put him out of business. Now the Imperial Tobacco Company got a preferential tariff last year of $20,000 on tobacco and have been getting all along $120,000 per year protection on cigarettes, and are the workmen and fishermen of this country, who are paying dearly for this big protection for this Tobacco Company, prepared to take this tariff lying down. I am doing my best, but no one cannot do everything alone. Forty years ago no Government would dare introduce such a tariff as this, because if they did they would be driven out of this House. Now I make the statement here now that the Prime Minister wanted to get me out of the Government three months ago and I challenge contradiction to that statement. Why? Because he found that I was not prepared to be pitchforked around nor do I intend to be pitchforked around by any Government. Friends of mine in the Government to-night know that when they vote for this tariff they are doing wrong and they know it, but they are afraid to get up and say that, and they are afraid to tell the fishermen of this country who elected them that the Government have taken the duty off the wealthy people of Water Street and off the wealthy members of the Government and tacked it on to the working classes of Newfoundland. There are just as independent men in the Government as I am, but they are afraid to assert their independence and they are traitors to this country and to the people who sent them here, and they should be fired out of this House within the next forty eight hours, and if I had my way, which, ufortunately I have not, I would drive them out this afternoon. Now I defy the Prime Minister or the Finance Minister to get up here this evening and say if what I am saying is not correct, and if I have accused the Prime Minister wrongly I am prepared to act the man and take it all back. I again ask the Prime Minister if it is not correct that he tried to drive me out of his Party between two and three months ago? Now I will sit down until I get his answer.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—No, it is not correct.

MR. CASHIN—It is correct, Sir, and you know it is correct. Well now here is the place to prove it and to end it. I have no papers to tell it in, but I intend to tell the story to what few Newfoundlanders are here this evening.

The House rose until 8 o'clock.

Mr. Chairman, before we retired to supper I was about to ask the Prime Minister if it was not correct that he, approximately five or six weeks ago, put the gun to my head and tried to drive me out of the party and he replied that he did not, and I told the

House that I was prepared to prove that he did, and I can prove that he did, and if I cannot do it I am prepared to take it back. Five or six weeks ago they brought in the new redistribution bill. Before this came into the House it was discussed at a party meeting of the whole party, of which I was a member at that time. The bill which was brought before the House eventually was different from the bill that was prepared then, and which came before the party, in as much as they had the clause in addition in the first bill, and I will read it to the House. I have the clause here now as I took very good care to keep a copy of it. So here it is.

(Reads)

Now Section 4, Chap. 4, of the Consolidated Statutes(Third Series) is entitled of the Disabilities and the Vacation of Seats of the House of Assembly. It reads like this:

(Reads)

Which means in plain English that if that clause had to go through any district for which the member had died or taken a job would not be entitled to have another member. It would not be entitled to representation in this House of Assembly. Particularly it related to the District of St. John's East, which is still one man shy in this House of Assembly and they wanted to close it up, and they did it because it was rumoured that my father whose name happens to be Cashin was going to contest the district as an independent or as a representative of the Government or of the Opposition, because he could go wherever he wanted to, and so they were afraid, and they did not want to open the district so that he might be kept out. Mr. Monroe told me that he did not want Sir Michael Cashin, and surely goodness if he did not want Sir Michael Cashin he did not want his son. And that goes to prove, Mr. Chairman, that he did not want me and that he tried to drive me out of the party, and I made them take that clause out of the bill, and he had to take it out. Mr. Monroe told me that he thought that was a cowardly clause, and he told the Executive Government that it was a cowardly clause, but he was prepared to have it go through this House if he could get away with it. But they did not get away with it because the people of this country would not stand for it, and you know it. This country is not represented in the House of Assembly properly. Under the new bill the District of St. John's East calls for four representatives, and there are only two here to-night. I do not want to harp on St. John's East, but I just want to prove to Mr. Monroe that he did try to drive me out, and any ordinary commonsense men within the hearing of my voice knows that I am right in what I have just said. Now what was causing Mr. Monroe to have that clause in that bill? The Members of the Executive Government know something about it. But they will not get up here and say why they were trying to close up the district, and to take from the people of St. John's East or the people of any other district the right of proper representation in this House, and in other words if all the members of this Government were to die, which is not impossible, then this country would be without a Government. And then to think, Mr. Chairman, that you asked me to come in here and vote for this tariff that is now before the House. The Prime Minister has excommunicated me from his party, but I want to tell the Prime Minister that he could not excommunicate me from his party because I was active in the capacity of a detective for the fishermen of this country, and I am prepared tonight to resign my seat in Ferryland district if necessary, and then I challenge any member of the

Government to face me up there on the tariff in that district of Ferryland, and if you think that I am not sincere then I can place my resignation in the hands of the Governor tomorrow morning. If a Government candidate were to go down there he would not save his nomination fee. And I say that whatever member in this House who votes for this tariff ought never look a fisherman in the face again. We have betrayed the trust that was reposed in us last June.

(Reads)

He refers in that manifesto to what the late Government has done. Now, what action of the Government has commended itself to the people. Is there a member of the Government in the House who can stand up and state one thing that the Government has done since it came into power. I was a member of that Government for eight or nine months. There have been no improvements in the Government departments. What has been done with the railway? I was a member of the railway commission. I suppose that I have been dismissed now. They have done nothing after all that was told the people in the manifesto of last June. I challenge the Prime Minister or the Minister of Finance to tell the people of the country what has been done by the present Government. You have not attempted to do anything. What have we got under this tariff that has been brought down? As I said last night, we are giving a protection to the Ropewalk and to the Imperial Tobacco Company. You take the duty off the hooks and put it on lines and twines. The Ropewalk does not manufacture hooks, but they tax the people of the country an extra 10 p.c. on the lines and twines. I say that that money is filched out of the pockets of the fishermen of Newfoundland. The present Government's policy is dictated to them by the Ropewalk and the Imperial Tobacco Company. I say dictated to them. And I defy contradiction from any member of the Government. I made the statement here last night that by this tariff that we were giving a protection of twelve and a half per cent. a lb. on tobacco over last year. I will prove to this House that the figures that I quoted were correct. I would like the Hon. gentlemen in this House to take this down and figure it out and if it is wrong then I am prepared to take it back. Last year under the old tariff the cost of the lb. of tobacco was thirty cents. It does not matter whether we take thirty cents or thirty dollars to work on. Let us take thirty cents. The cost of the article is thirty cents. The duty last year was forty cents and that makes a total of seventy cents. Ten per cent. on the forty and that is four cents, and that makes a total of seventy four cents. Five per cent. sales tax makes it seventy seven and a half cents. And now let us take the excise duty of last year. The same lb. of tobacco costs thirty cents. The excise duty is thirty four cents; and that is a total of sixty cents. Two and a half per cent. thirty four makes three and a half cents and the total is sixty seven seven cents. Two and a half per cent. sales tax is one and a half cents, and that makes a total of sixty nine cents; the duty on the paper and wrappings, etc., that have to go with it comes to two cents a lb., and that makes a total of seventy one cents. And that leaves to the Imperial Tobacco Company in six and one half cents.

What is the difference under the new tariff? To-day the same pound of tobacco costs thirty cents when imported, and then you have to pay forty-eight cents duty on it, which makes it seventy-eight cents. You have to pay the five per cent. sales tax, and ten per cent. ad valorem duty of 4½ cents, and that makes a

total cost for that pound of tobacco of eighty-two and a half cents. In other words the imported pound of tobacco costs 82½ cents, and that means an increase of five cents over the price per pound last year, as a result of the new tariff. Now take the excise duty. The same pound of tobacco costs thirty cents, and on that you have to pay the excise duty of forty cents a pound. They passed a Bill here a few days ago whereby you have to pay five per cent. sales tax, that means one and a half cents, and then you have to add on the same two cents a pound for the wrapping, and that brings the total cost to 73½ cents a pound. Last year it was 71, so that there is an increase in the excise pound of tobacco of 2½ cents a pound. This year the imported tobacco costs 82½ cents a pound and the excise duty comes to 73½ cents a pound. There is a difference of 2½ cents a pound on tobacco more in favour of the Imperial Tobacco Co. this year over and above last year, and that involves two and a half cents a pound on 700,000 pounds of tobacco every year. That is to say there is a present of $15,000 made to the Imperial Tobacco Co. which is taken out of the pockets of the fishermen and the labourers. I know that the gentlemen opposite will say that they have put on a tax of one thousand dollars which the Tobacco Company will have to pay. But what else have they done? They have taken off the Business Profits Tax, and that means a saving of far more than a thousand dollars to the Imperial Tobacco Co. And more than fifty per cent. of the stock of that company is held in the United States, and most of the rest of it is held by Mr. Monroe, the Prime Minister, who is bringing in a preference of two and a half cents more on tobacco to-night in favour of that Company. And we are asked to vote for that—for that filching from the working classes and the fishermen of this country. And I am supposed to swallow it, and I am told that if I do not like it I can get out.

Mr. Chairman, I ask you in all fairness is that the square deal that Mr. Monroe promised the fishermen in that rag there—that rag? Is that the square deal that you promised?—taking the Income Tax and the Business Profits Tax off himself and shoving the extra taxation on the labourers, and the fishermen of this country; and he expected me to vote for it. Never, sir. I would rather leave politics to-morrow than be a party to voting for such a tariff that is now before the House; and I trust that there are some men in this House who are independent enough to vote against it with me. I have not any extra money, but I have independence, and they have not got enough money between them all to buy me.

Lines and twines last year were duty free. This year there is ten per cent. on them. What is the total amount of lines and twines manufactured in Newfoundland? The Custome returns should show us that. The total importations last year were $25,000 worth. But on that you have to pay ten per cent. That is $2,500 taken out of the people of this country and given to the Colonial Cordage Company. One would imagine it was a defunct company, a defunct outfit begging for protection from this House, and if rumours are correct they have watered their stock two or three times over. Yet I am supposed to sink any differences and be told that I was not told to get out of the party. If I have not proved to the people of this country to-night, although I have no organ to tell my story to the country, that I was told to get out of that party, then I will eat my hat.

There is one other clause there that I would like to ask the Minister of

Justice about if he were here. If he were here I would ask him to explain it. I mean the clause in that Redistribution Bill—can he explain that? He was the member for St. John's East, and he is in the Executive Government, and he was a party to putting in that clause. He must have been, because he is the senior member for that district, and they could not put it in without his permission. Mr. Sullivan went across to England and made a statement in the great metropolis of London that Cashin should not be allowed into the House of Assembly. I have that in writing.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—That is not true.

MR. CASHIN—I am telling you that it is true. You did not say that three years ago when you were prepared to go out with Cashin in Placentia District for him. I regret that Mr. Sullivan should have taken it upon himself to make that statement.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—I did not make that statement. Mr. Sullivan is not in the habit of telling lies, and I am telling you that I never made that statement.

MR. CASHIN—I must have been misinformed.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—You certainly have been, and if the rest of your information is on a par with that you have certainly been suffering from misinformation.

MR. CASHIN—You cannot disprove any of them.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—I have disproved that one.

MR. CASHIN—You have not been able to disprove any other statement of figures that I have made.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—I am going to do so now in a few minutes.

MR. CASHIN—I will sit down and let you do so now.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—You finish your remarks and then I will reply to you. This is not a debating society. If I have anything to say I will say it when you have your talk over.

MR. CASHIN—This is a debating society. This is the place where the representatives of the country meet and debtae all matters relating to the welfare of the country, and the Prime Minister knows it. He knows that he refused to give me even a party meeting on the tariff until some people got up a round robin and sent it to him. I was blamed for that round robin, but I did not start it. And tonight there are some people who signed that round robin that are going to vote for that tariff. Is that true or is it not?

I tell you, Mr. Chairman, that it is a betrayal of every promise that you made to the fishermen of this country when you were seeking election. You promised to reduce taxation and you promised to reduce expenditure. You have increased expenditure and you have increased taxation by about five hundred thousand dollars. And worse than that, you have taken it off yourself and you have put it on the poor fishermen of this country.

The public has not read the report of that Tariff Cofmission yet. It has not been published in the paper at all. With reference to that Tariff Comffission, the following were the gentlemen selected to report: Mr. H. J. Brownrigg, then Minister of Finance and Customs; Mr. H. W. LeMessurier, Mr. C. P. Ayre, Mr. John V. O'Dea, Mr. Harris, Mr. F. W. Angel, Mr. J. J. McKay, Mr. Mortimer Greene and Hon. Dr. Mosdell. These are the gentlemen who made up this Commission, who made up the tariff that was adopted holus bolus by the Government, who did not read the tariff at all. There was a question asked here the other day by Mr. Godden, I think it was, asking for a comparison between the present tariff and the old tariff, and it has not been tabled yet.

And I predict here to-night without fear of successful contradiction that you have taken the taxation off yourselves and have put it on the fishermen.

What have you done for the fisheries? Nothing, although you promised them in this manifesto as follows:

(Quotes.)

And what have you done—what have you done as a Government to further this industry? You have not done one single thing. You have not attempted to do a single thing. I have no axe to grind in this matter, because I say that no Government for the past twenty-five years has done anything for the fisheries of this country. Last night I made a statement which I will repeat to-night, that in my opinion, though I was opposed to him, and very bitterly opposed to him, Sir William Coaker was the only man who attempted to do anything for the fisheries. We all know that he failed, but at least he made the attempt, which is more than anyone else has done.

You came in here and borrowed two million dollars last year to spend on roads—to squander two million dollars on roads; an absolute gamble, to try and encourage tourists who probably will never come here, and to-night or to-morrow this House is going to close and no one, even in the Government party, knows who is going to spend that two million dollars with the exception of a few men in the Executive; and the people who are supposed to be about to spend this $2,000,000 are not responsible to the people of this country. They can put it where they like and where it suits their political ideas. Mr. Morine the other day in the Upper House, as I mentioned here last night, outlined a policy of road building, and he said that he was going to build a road to Trepassey and start at Fermeuse; but he made no provision for how he was going to get to Fermeuse.

I was opposed in the party to that borrowing of two million dollars last year. Sure I was. Why? Because I considered, as I still consider, that we should try and do something for the fisheries. What have we done for them? Take the West Coast disaster that happened a few months ago. What did you do then? You told the representative for the West Coast that you could do nothing—to go and beg from the public—that the Government could do nothing for them. These were men who were out working hard and did not want charity from you ordinarily. But when the day of disaster came to them they appealed to you and you refused to listen to them.

It is no wonder that all our young men are leaving the country to-day. And where are they going? To Nova Scotia and Gloucester, and they are going to the Banks in vessels going out of Gloucester, hauling trawls on the Banks. They have been driven out of here, and I say driven in all sincerity. They got no encouragement here, but they could go up there and they were encouraged to catch fish.

By this tariff you have told the fishermen of this country to go naked and to go out to the Banks with their oilskins next to their skins and a pair of rubber boots on. And that is what was done, they put 22 to 25 per cent. on the clothing worn by the laboring man and the fisherman and then asked them to vote for it. If I agreed to that I say I would be a traitor to the people who sent me here and should be driven naked through the streets and horsewhipped. Why? Because I would be betraying the confidence of the people to whom I went last year and deceived on the policy which you said to go forth and

preach. That policy was a false one and meant only to deceive. And to-night old Newfoundland is governed by foreigners. They are in this House and in the Upper House—Englishmen, Irishmen, Nova Scotians and everything else. Where is the blood of our forefathers, as it asks here in this manifesto. Where, indeed; if we had it in us we would drive these foreigners through the end of the House. Mr. Monroe says in manifesto in reference to the public finances:

(Quotes.)

This I say is hypocritical and meant only to decieve the electorate. Esau again—and yet I had to go out and preach this and do as I was told and tell the people "Mr. Monroe is going to reduce taxation and expenditure and encourage the fisheries." Now he asks me to vote for this increased taxation on the workingman and fisherman. I told the people of Ferryland last year that he was going to help them and assist the fisheries according to his Manifesto. If that was not meant to hoodwink and decieve them then my name is not Cashin. Now I have no grievance with my friends on the Government side and I left that party of my own accord—though the Prime Minister says he drove me out, but if I had stayed there I would have had to eat crow; and they will have to put a close season on crow like they did on the lobsters before I would accept that tariff. If I had stayed with the Government I would have had to swallow it holus bolus. When the Government held a meeting a few nights ago on the matter of this tariff I told the Prime Minister that I was against it and now they have put on the extra duties. I was the only gentleman—if I am a gentleman—who said that I was opposed to certain rates and they took them off. They took the taxes off tea, tobacco and one or two other things, that is they reduced them a little but they left them on lines and twines because the Ropewalk said so. I have nothing personal against the Prime Minister but as I said before, why did they take off these duties. They took them off because I told them I was opposed to them and if there is anyone responsible for that reduction, on motor engine parts, tea and tobacco, I think I am that one, at least in a large degree. They refused to take the duty off clothing but they put it on and practically said to the people "go naked." They must think we are reverting to the days of Adam and Eve when the only clothing in evidence was the fig leaf and that the people could go around dressed up like the Figi Islanders. It is alright for the Prime Minister to laugh but I say that the people in the outports are up against it, as to the matter of clothing and the representatives of those people in this House know it. Now what are you doing but putting on this duty to freeze the people next winter and to drive the young blood out of the country. Go down to the Rosalind or Silvia and you can see this every time these boats sail. And then again there are 4000 of our people in Sydney almost starving and what has the Government done to help them. I will recall to your minds that at the time of the fire—I was very young then, but I know about it—the people of Halifax sent help to us most generously, but we are doing nothing for those who want help in Sydney. And the most of them are Newfoundlanders too. I am asked to support a Government that would do a thing like that, and I say that the man who would give such support would be a traitor to the people who sent him here. The Manifesto says "the trappings of the Government are too costly and there are too many unearned salaries." But what did this Government do—they increased their own salaries and the heads of the Departments were hard-

ly in office when they raised their pay from $3300 or $3400 to $4000. And then they say the trappings of the Government are too costly and there are too many unearned salaries. Again the Manifesto says:

(quotes)

Now what has the Government done as to the increase of quality and quantity of the work to be done. Colonel Ross was brought down here and he recommends that twenty odd men be thrown out of their jobs. But if the stories heard on the street are true he had an axe to grind. I do not know Colonel Ross and don't want to know him and he may retort the same to me, but I will read his report to the people of the country before this House closes or this tariff goes through as otherwise it would never be made known but hidden away in the pigeon holes of some public building down town.

(Quotes)

Now what happened here this winter? What did the members of St. John's East or West do for the laboring people this winter. The Government gave them a dole and then increased taxation so that instead of getting ten dollars next week they will be getting only nine next week. There are men here to-night who were promised everything, but the only thing they got was a dole of ten dollars a week. If this money had been spent for the labor of breaking rocks for the dock, work on which is to start next week, the Government would at least have got back ten cents in the dollar. Now they are getting nothing.

(Quotes)

This was if Mr. Hickman's party was returned. But who is dictating the policy of the Government now? There is nothing for the fishermen but they will give their answer in due course. I put it to the Government to-night to put the question to the people as to whether they are willing to have the taxes off the rich and put on the poor. But no, you will not give them a chance to answer this—you only filch the money from the working classes by putting on the taxes. This sort of thing is getting back to the days of merchant government and open voting when the merchant had a man in every booth to see how a man voted and to take his name. This is what we are coming to as by passing the tariff we are giving monopolies to a few of the rick. Some members I presume are going to vote for this and say they are doing right. But they know they will be doing wrong. I know, because I was there with them though as they say, they threw me out. They know it is wrong to pass this tariff and the only answer they can give is that they need the revenue. Why have they not reduced taxation? Why have they not reduced expenditure and their salaries instead of putting the taxes on the poor. Every member here to-night should be paying the business and profits tax but to-night they are free. Let us take an example as figures talk plainest. If a man has an income of twenty thousand dollars, under the old tariff he would have to pay $2000 into the Government but now he is free and under this tariff the Government are making up that money out of the fishermen and the poor laborers of the country.

The Government tells as an excuse that it was impossible to collect the Income Tax. That was their own fault. If I had charge of carrying out that Act I would collect it from all who could afford to pay alright; and I can tell you here to-night, Mr. Chairman, that, if Inspector O'Reilly was given a free hand, he would collect it. And the Income Tax reminds me of the way that Sir Edgar Bowring was treated. He should pay an income

tax as well as I did, I suppose. But there was no reason for the Government dragging him through the courts in the way they did. Sir Edgar Bowring is the greatest philanthropist ever born in Newfoundland. He represented Newfoundland as High Commissioner in London for four or five years without any compensation whatever and still the finance Minister saw fit to haul him through the public courts of this country. Now I do not think this good enough in consideration of what Mr. Bowring has done for this country. I think there are a number of other people that some of us know here who should be dragged before the courts for not paying their Income Tax and for not paying their Customs Bonds. It would make very interesting reading to see the names of the people who owe for Customs Bonds and what steps the Government have taken to collect them. The fishermen and workingmen generally pays for these uncollected bonds and then they ask any self-respecting member to stand for that. Please God there is a day of reckoning coming when the people of Newfoundland will arise in their might and assert their independence, and I might say in passing that there is very little independence in the ranks of the present Government to-day. The people cannot be fooled all the time by this Government or any other Government of this country or of any other country, and, if the present Government thinks that I am wrong, I am prepared to take my chances and go back to my constituents and tell them what the Government of Newfoundland wants to do with them, under this tariff, and their answer, I can assure you Mr. Chairman, will be a vote such as was never rolled up for any member before. Now before I went to Ferryland district as a representative of this Government, the Government sent for me and they asked me to contest the district for them; but I can tell you, sir, that there are members in that Government to-night that were not wanted in it when we went to the country and who are not wanted in it now. They know it and I know it to. It might seem strange to say; but I have been in politics for over thirty years in this country and I know what I am talking about. There are members of this Government who were not blue-blooded enough for some people, I thank you, but the way it was that the Government were prepared to take anybody when they wanted representatives. I was not blue-blooded enough either, but when I went to Ferryland district I told the people from every platform that I preached the Gospel of Monroe on that, if he did anything that in my opinion that was wrong, or did anything that would unduly tax or take away the rights of the fishermen in my district that I would leave them and I think I have carried out my promise and, to use a common expression, with regard to Mr. Monroe, "I have left him where I found him at the foot of the mountain brow." And that is where the Government is leaving the workingmen of this city in relation to the dry dock. When I notified the Government last night that I was leaving their Party there was quite a scene and some of the famous Moving Picture Companies, I am sure, would be satisfied to pay two million dollars, sufficient to give this Governmen enough to spend on tourist roads, if they had a chance of getting a picture of what was portrayed last night. I asked the Finance Minister last night to rise the Committee and give me an opportunity of studying the Report of the Tariff Commission and he refused, although the previous day he granted my request and he said he would supply me with a copy of that Report. But why did he refuse me last night? Because that was the end of a plot that was hatched to drive

me out. That plot was conceived in iniquity and is going to die in iniquity. It was the essence of small-mindedness and it was brought about because I happen to be a Cashin and a man with some independence. Now I want to ask the Executive Government why certain clauses were taken out of the tariff within the past twenty four hours? If they do not answer me I have only got to stay here until they do answer me. Some Ministers of the Crown may laugh, but I will issue a challenge to-night and ask them to open St. John's East and West and see what the people of these districts think of the new tariff. The people of St. John's have been promised everything but have been given nothing. The members of St. John's East and West were elected last year by large majorities because the tide was with the Monroe Party and the country wanted a change, but that Manifesto that was written by Esau deceived the fishermen and the ordinary taxpayers of this country. I am sorry thatI cannot stay here for a life-time to hold up this tariff, but I am going to do everything in my power to prevent it from going through in its present state, and I trust that His Majesty's Opposition will see fit to do likewise and let us make a united effort in demanding that the Government take that extra duty off the working classes of St. John's and the outports. Call a public meeting, if necessary, and march to Government House and force the Government to take that tariff off and make them put that Income Tax back on themselves and their wealthy friends of the country.

This is what they call Government of the people for the people by the people. This Government is against the people. This Government is absolutely opposed to the people of this country. They want to revert to the days of the Southern States, to the days of slavery, when the old planter used to horsewhip the niggers through the streets.

I would like to take some of the honorable gentlemen to my district although they are paying out no dole up there, and let them see some of the families up there. I want to tell them that I know every man, woman and child in my district, what no other man in this House can say. I have visited every family in my district, personally. There are some two or three hundred up there, and they will be voting for me for the next thirty years because I hope to be up there for the next thirty years. I have to go there now, although recently I considered going out of politics altogether, but the Minister of Justice got after my people last year and asked them to influence me to come out for the party. I caved in, for what? to be treated this way, to be, as it were, fired out by the same Minister of Justice. Now I have to stay there while I have life in me to fight for the cause that I advocated for Mr. Monroe last year. I have to stay here now, but Mr. Monroe knows perfectly well to-night that what I say here is correct. He knows that he has taken the Income Tax and the business profits tax off himself, and he has stuck it on the fishermen of Bonavista Bay, his own district. And he is taking it off me and sticking it on the fishermen of Ferryland and the same way with every other member, and I consider that it is unfair. I call that traitorous. I said last night that every man who was a traitor during the war was shot. And I say it again and I say that this Government should be shot politically, and shot at dawn. Now, Mr. Monroe is a traitor to his adopted country He is not a Newfoundlander. He said that he was disgusted listening to me. He was disgusted with me last Spring when he wrote to me to ask me to join his party. I did not ask him for a place in his party.

Mr. Chairman. I submit that the present Government has been traitorous to Newfoundland.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I have not betrayed my country and I don't intend to do it.

MR. CHAIRMAN—The member's remarks are very unparliamentary. I think that the Prime Minister deserves the respect of every member of the House especially as Prime Minister. And if the member wishes to proceed he will have to keep within bounds.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, I am within bounds absolutely. I have made a statement here that the Prime Minister has betrayed the people that sent him here. I make it again and as long as I have the strength to stand up here. I was referring to the railway, and I was going to tell some stories about the railway, that may be interesting concerning the railway and the dock. I voted for the million that was to be spent on that dock. I would still vote for it even though I am now on this side of the House. The Hon. the Prime Minister made a statement in the House the other day that the officials up there were incompetent. He said that Mr. Harvey and Mr. Joyce were not competent to do the work although for managing it one man is getting $7,000 and the other 4 or 5 thousand dollars. That may be so. But as I said before there is a man in this country to-day. The man of a hundred wounds, that we heard so much about during the war. That man is Commander Howley. What did we do for him when he came back here. We sent him in on the Golf Course, to sweep it. Or they offered him a job in this House as Sergeant-at-Arms. They insulted him. A man who made a report on the Dock which practically confirmed the report of Colonel Mitchell.

This is the Government that says they are going to clean up and keep clean and a square deal to all. We come in here and the Prime Minister himself because he is a shareholder in the Imperial Tobacco Co., puts on an extra 2½ cents a pound on tobacco then he goes down and says that he is doing the work of the Educational Department for nothing. No wonder he is doing it for nothing if he can get paid for it indirectly. He made reference to an item in this Budget in connection with the fisheries of this country.

(Reads)

Is the price of fish firm to-day. It is not. It is anything but firm. And we are making it more expensive to catch fish by putting on a taxation of an average of 10 per cent. on the fishermen.

(Reads)

I say that that is being duplicated right here to-night because bad as were the late crowd and some of them are here now and although I was opposed to them in many things still they did something for the fisheries of this country, and reduced taxation, and you are slapping it on again.

The Commission spent two years on it. And then the members of this House are supposed to come in here and vote for it in two minutes, without even being given a copy of the tariff. They are not even given a copy of the tariff report. And we have the duty on pork yet which was not known until the Minister of Justice told us here in this House the other night. (Reads).

What an admission on the part of the Minister of Finance that he did not have the time to go into the matter thoroughly. It is an absolute admission that he brought this thing here and slapped it on the table of this House and said, here you can vote for this or not. If you do not like it you can lump it. Now that the Minister of Justice is in the House, I would like to ask him one

thing. As we were going to supper, I was asking the Prime Minister if he was trying to drive me out of the Party about six weeks ago. And he said that he did not try to do so. But I proved to the satisfaction of everyone here, that he did, and now I want to ask you, if you know anything about the clause that was put in the Redistribution Bill, so that it might keep the District of St. John's East closed, during the present General Assembly?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—If the hon. member will just sit down for a minute, I will be glad to answer. So far as the idea as to the District of St. John's East is concerned, I am sure that the hon. member will not be offended if I say that he seems to be taking things more or less to himself. It has nothing to do with St. John's East. But the position is this: the Redistribution Bill was passed in this House so that the Districts that were formerly three men districts were changed to three one man districts. So far as the particular district is concerned let us take one thing. Bell Island is now one district. The Districts has two representatives in the city and one along the shore. This has been the practice for years. Take my own case, for instance. I represented the District alone for three years because Judge Kent was on the Bench and the late Mr. Dwyer was dead. Take the position with regard to Fortune Bay. That District was not represented for three years because of the death of Mr. Emerson. Let us take the instance of St. John's East or take any other district. Take Twillingate, for example. If that District were open for election, it might happen that a man that was entirely unsuitable to the other two men and to the District might be returned to the House. Suppose that we opened the District that the hon. member refers to, and in which he seems to have a personal interest, it is the best evidence that the Government can show that the section was removed when it seemed that there was a suggestion of unfairness just in this particular case. It cannot refer to that because that it is now eliminated. He has shown a personal and a perfectly natural interest in this matter, and I know that he is fair enough to view this matter from the right point. The Government's attitude has shown that it was entirely disinterested. I do not think that there is any doubt as to the theory that the Government had in introducing this measure. Now there is just one point that I would like the hon. members of this House to understand. Perhaps that as this debate matures, what I say will be confirmed, and that is that one of the greatest mistakes that can be made in this world is for any one man to think that he cannot be done without.

He suggested that the Government wanted to drive him out of the Party. I did not know anything about that. I never heard the idea from the Prime Minister, or from any member of the party. As far as I am concerned the hon. member is old and wise enough to know his own mind, but it is not for the reason in any shape or form that the section that he refers is in the Bill. The idea was to have the anomoly removed, where the Government of the day might be asked to open a district.

Take the District of St. John's East. Bell Island is out of it and will have its own member. The whole atmosphere is changed. If the hon. gentleman thinks that the Bill had any other motive, other than the one that I have given, then I want to assure him that as far as I am concerned that he not right. That is the best answer that I can give.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Monroe gave me a different answer. And there was no shananagan about it. He told me that he did not want Cashin in the Party. He never said it in this House, but he said it in his own office, when I called on him about this clause. He told me that he did not want Sir Michael Cashin, and if he does not want Sir Michael Cashin in the Party, then goodness knows that he does not want me. I think that is sufficient proof of the statement that I made that the Prime Minister wanted to drive me out of the party. He told me in a straightforward manner and I liked him for it. Now in reference to the District of St. John's East. We are told that it does not come into effect until the dissolution of this House. And if any of the members of the Government were to cash in their cheques what position would the Government find itself in. It is not impossible. They have no idea when it will happen. You might have an earthquake, and it might as well happen and swallow the whole country now that the Government is putting on this ten per cent. on everything the people want. Now referring to the Tariff Commission's report. This Commission was appointed by the Government, and they were to go into this matter ,and were told to secure information from every source and take notice of it. They wrote to every magistrate in the country and they got replies asking that everything possible be done to reduce the taxation on the fishermen of the country. But no notice was taken of the pleas that they made. And then the Government comes in here and takes off the bank tax and the business profits tax and the income tax. But the people of this country are not going to stand for it. There is some independence left in the country. But the Government is traitorous to the best interests of the country. And yet they have the gall to ask me to go up to Ferryland District and tell the people that elected me to the House of Assembly that I had tried to reduce expenditure. We see that Hindenburg has been elected to the Presidency of Germany. Hindenburg—a Field Marshal, who commanded the German Army during the War. Perhaps there are some good Germans being called upon to stand by. There are Germans to-night, I suppose that are as loyal to their country as I am supposed to be, and do you think that if they put on a tariff like that they would be allowed to go on with it. But if Hindenburg to-night, who is President of Germany, does not carry out his promises, although he was a Field Marshal, commanding the German Army during the War, were to do anything like this, the German people would rise in their might, and drive him out. I do not know but it would be as well for Newfoundland if they did something in that direction. It is time that somethink like that was done, and the sooner it is done the better for all concerned. Forty years ago in this country the Government would no more bring in that tariff than they would fly, because the old timers with the blood of their forefathers, as they call it, would not stand for anything like it. Seeing that tariff on the Table of the House to-night shows that the people who are responsible for laying it there, have not the blood of any forefathers in them.

They all admit that it is too bad that they have to put on this tariff. They are all prepared to admit that it is too bad, and maybe they think so, but if so, why did they take off the duty on themselves—their income tax and their Business Profits Tax, and why did they put such an enormous protection on the Colonial Cordage Company, and the Imperial To-

bacco Company, and the Clothing Company, and the Candy stores and everything else that they are interested in.

(Reads from paper.)

As I said before, this tariff has certainly received all the criticism that is coming to it both in this House and outside; and as I said this morning at three o'clock this tariff stinks in the noses of the people to-day, and it would take an enormous amount of the best perfume in the world to remove the smell of that tariff from the people. It affects the outport man particularly, because to-day those on Water Street knowing what was coming, have their goods in, and this tariff coming into effect, does not injure them very much. I wonder are they raising the price? I say here to-night that there is more profiteering going on on Water Street to-night than there ever was during the War, with their extra four or five cents a pound on tobacco, and their extra cents on tea. These extra prices are now on goods that were imported into this country six months ago; and we are up here standing for it. There is more profiteering on Water Street than during the War—and we are standing for it.

(Reads.)

But you must remember that you dismissed Mr. LeMessurier, and said that he was not coming back again. But you took him back again. Why did you do that? As I said before, the scavengers will soon be cleaning up Newfoundland.

(Reads.)

Has it received the endorsation of the trade? That is not the question —has it received the endorsation of the fishermen and workmen of this country? That is the question to put to-night. I say that it has not received the endorsation of the fishermen and working men of this country, but it has received their denunciation, and you will know it when you try to face them and attempt to explain to them why you took the taxation off yourselves and put it on them. I had a fisherman in to see me the other day, one of the fishermen amongst whom I was born and brought up, and he told me that if I voted for that tariff, never to show my nose in Ferryland District again. That man was the man who nominated me the last two elections, and I said to him, all right, Skipper Dick, you leave it to me.

(Reads).

To-night we have no men in this House who have any intimate knowledge of the Tariff. Not one, and yet we are supposed to vote on it. They have some knowledge of how to protect themselves. I would like to hear one of them tell why they took the Income Tax off themselves and shoved it on to the fishermen of Newfoundland.

(Reads.)

They are grouped alright. Twines are grouped—tobacco is grouped with 2 and one half cents preference for the Imperial Tobacco Company. With the price five cents over what it was last year. The fishermen and workmen have to pay that extra price for their tobacco. I claim that there will be trouble come out of that tariff yet, and it will do more to encourage smuggling than anything that was ever brought into this House. It is encouraging the people to break the law, and I would not blame them for doing it. You are driving them to it. Drink. Even drink has gone up, and judging from what we saw last night in this House it would seem as if the price had been reduced and the strength had been increased.

(Reads.)

Clerical Work—as if that was of wonderful interest to the people of the country—as if they cared how

you passed the entries at the Custom House. There are very few members in this House could make up a duty entry any more than myself. I had to learn it. And there are members in this House that are proud to say that they know nothing about it. They do not care. It does not effect them. They have taken the taxes off themselves.

(Reads.)

There is no fault to be found with the compilation of the Tariff, I will admit. That is all right. But the reply from the Board of Trade—you have not tabled that. I do not know if they made any reply. I suppose they don't care very much about it. The consumer is the man who eventually has to pay every time. If I want to go down on Water Street today and buy beef and pork, I have to pay for it; and if there is any duty on these articles I will have to pay that duty as well. The same applies to lines and twines and tobacco. The extra duty is put on them, and the consumer has to pay it in order to make a present of fifteen thousand dollars to the Imperial Tobacco Company and fifteen hundred dollars to the Colonial Cordage Company.

(Reads.)

Were the fishermen or the labouring men of this country asked to go before that Commission and give evidence—the men who have to pay the piper? No, they were turned down and betrayed, and they are going to be turned down and betrayed. We are going back to the days of open voting when the merchant had his man at the booth, waiting to see how the men were going to vote. They had to put an end to that, because the people would not stand for it any more. Personally I do not care who sees me voting.

(Reads.)

The reporters—what effect do they have on the fishermen and the laborers of this country. What does it matter about all the people that went down there and gave evidence—there were no increases made in deference to them. They did not care what happened. They knew that the increase was going to come and they got their goods in. I claim that there were a good many people in this country that knew what that tariff was before it was tabled in this House. But there is no investigation into that to-night. But the dole men who are getting ten dollars a week may as well know to-night that their ten dollars is only worth nine now. And they would not even let them break rocks. There would have been a return of at least ten cents in the dolalr from that.

(Reads.)

Granted that they did not confine themselves to those people. They confined themselves to the magistrates in the outports of this country, and what did they do with their suggestions. They did not burn them —that was all they did not do. They ignored these people. What about Magistrate Freebairn's suggestions. and those of the man that is at present in charge of the Rum Shop here. It is these reports of the magistrates —of Mr. Freebairn from Ferryland, and from the magistrates in the outports, and from other sensible men that they ignored. They took evidence from outside—yes they did. They got their evidence and took no notice of them. But they took notice of the Imperial Tobacco Company and of the Colonial Cordage Company, and other big concerns on Water Street.

That is what happened, and moreover they did not intend to take any notice of them. But they took notice of the recommendations of the Imperial Tobacco Co. and every big firm on Water Street. And then they had sub-committees. They had all kinds of tails to this thing, and after paying

$14,000 for the Commission what did they do but tack on $600,000 to the taxes of the people. Now here we have it:

(Quotes.)

In order to gain the views of the people, etc. Isn't that a joke. Again, there was a general response; there was, but they took no notice of it but burnt it or threw it in the waste-paper basket. And when the members wanted a copy they had to hunt through the vaults of the Custom House for it.

(Quotes.)

That is the point, it was the duty of the Commission to report and recommend. Give credit where credit is due. They sent their report to the Government and it was up to them to see that the interests of the people were protected, but in introducing the tariff the Finance Minister said:

(Quotes paper).

And the Commission tells us here, according to their report, that all they could do was recommend certain things and make correction in certain anomalies that had crept in under the old tariff. It was the duty of the Government to check over their recommendations, but still there are members of the Executive and of the party who never saw the report till I asked for a copy to be handed round, and they formed a round robin which they accused me of drawing up.

(Quotes.)

And the Commission took their recommendations and turned down the recommendations from the magistrates, which came from the workers and fishermen who are the mainstay of the country. They were turned down and the merchants taken in. They said "no, go naked, you are only a dog or a slave." That's what the Government did, they drove the men who fought for Newfoundland in the trenches out of the country. You accused the late Government of doing this, but what can we say of this one, of which I was a member for the last eight or nine months. This says:

(Quotes.')

The Commission evidently did not give the merchants the extra protection but the Government did; they are responsible for putting two cents on tobacco and 10 per cent. on lines and twines. And I was supposed to vote for that to become a member of the Government again, but that was absolutely impossible, I could never vote for that. Now we come to ready-mades.

(Quotes).

Such as the Tobacco Factory and Ropewalk, which to-night are getting in goods duty free.

(Quotes.'

The lower cost of readymades, where is it? To-day the old man who goes home after his work has to pay 22 to 25 per cent. on a suit, or $25.00 for a suit that cost him $20.00 before. Is that the policy of the Government —to drive people naked? Mr. Warren told me of a man whom he had seen in Fortune Bay handline fishing in a dory with nothing on but a pair of long rubbers and oil clothes. Where will he be now under this traiff? The clothes must be worn out because they would be chafed through by rowing, and he must have to go around just as he came to the world. Who did it but the Government, and they expect to be respected by the like of that.

(Quotes)

What is responsible for the present condition of the tariff, and the 22 p.c. on readymades—are the people or the fishermen responsible? When we went out to preach the gospel of St. Walter did we tell the people about the increase on tobacco, clothes and the all round expenditure. We were hardly back when the Government wanted to raise a loan of seven and a half millions, but we beat it down to six. They took authority to raise six,

and what happened? They are going to spend two million dollars on roads, and take men from the fisheries and put at that work, and the House is going to close in a day or two, but nobody knows yet who is going to have the spending of all that money. Some say that it is Mr. Morine, and some say Mr. Ellis, but nobody knows, although we are going to close the House. This is absolutely a raw deal, a regular unmanufactured deal. And what will happen when the roads are being built. I claim, with only common horse sense—that you cannot build motor roads for two million dollars, and you cannot repair them let alone cut new ones through the woods, and the Government will realize it before long. In a short time you will come back here and say "Cashin was right" but it will be too late then. Some of these roads will be washed away, and it will cost two millions for repairs alone. You cannot build roads for five thousand dollars a mile, and I say that it will cost ten thousand. Where are these roads going to get you to. If you go to Trepassey the Government proposes to start at Renews. I suppose you will have to fly from here and pitch at Jimmy Neils at Riverhead. That is the road policy, and I was supposed to vote for this tariff and did so when we raised two million dollars last year, because financial conditions were in a bad mess. If they were bad then, how are they now? They are worse, because expenditure has increased by a half million, and extra duties have been put on to the amount of six hundred thousand dollars, and what have we got to counteract it? We are told about the Hotel for tourist's policy, and we had to guarantee the cost of that or the best part of it. It is going to start to-morrow or the next day, but nobody knows exactly when. When the Prime Minister sent me to preach the gospel of a square deal, he told me nothing of this tourist or road policy, or of the increased taxation. The Government is prepared to come here to-day and go back on every promise they made except as to Prohibition, and I will gamble that they are not making as much to-day as they did before, because the law is carried out and is too strict. If a man sends in the money from an outport for two bottles they will send him out one, and the balance of his money the next day. If that is what you call business I do not know what business is.

Mr. Monroe's Manifesto says that steps will be taken to encourage the fisheries. Now what are we doing here to-night to encourage the fisheries? Are we or are we not dealing a deadly blow to the fisheries of this country by the imposition of this new tariff, I ask? And are we endeavouring to keep the industries of this country going by passing this tariff as it stands to-night. As I have already said, every member who votes for that tariff is a traitor and is betraying the people who sent him here, and it is about time that the people of Newfoundland realised the situation and made the Government get down to rock bottom and tell them that they are fed up with their promises. These promises were only hove out to catch votes, or, in other words, to cod the electorate. Last night I made reference to the Board of Works Department. The Board is supposed to meet once a month, but they have not had a meeting for the past four months now. Why? Is that carrying out the promises contained in the Prime Minister's Manifesto. I am not a member of that Board, but the members there get something like $25 a month for lashing out money to keep them quiet, and that is the way that jobs are dished out in all the other Departments of the Government. Now let us get back to what legislation the Government has put

through this year. This afternoon a Bill was discussed in connection with shipbuilding. A similar Bill was brought in here some time ago and was fired back here because it was improperly made up. Take the Re-distribution Bill and I am sorry to have to come to it. Now that does not give the people of the country a square show, although it does not affect me in my district politically, in fact it makes things easier for me because the Government can send who they like to Ferryland and I will clean him up; and I challenge the Minister of Finance, who introduced this tariff, that if he thinks the people of St. John's West have any confidence in that tariff, let him resign his seat up there and I will resign mine in Ferryland and I will face him in St. John's West constituency, and then we will see what the people have to say about the new tariff. Now that is a square show; there is no bluff about it. What the people have to say well and good. I am satisfied. They are the judge, but I don't think that the Minister of Finance is so foolish as to accept that challenge because he knows very well what the result would be and he knows where he is well off. Now what is in this tariff to encourage or protect the sealfishery? Nothing. This year the Government went into the business and sent the "Prospero" and "Sagona" to the ice. The returns have not yet come to hand as to how they got on, but I will predict that we will lose on the venture twenty thousand dollars. I opposed the idea of sending the "Glencoe" to the ice because I thought she was not suitable. Tonight the "Neptune" is at the icefields and for the past fifty odd years she has killed over a million seals, whilst on the other side of St. John's harbour to-night is the "Ranger," and fifty two years ago when she came to this country first she made two trips in charge of my grandfather. Now what am I doing to-night to help the sealfishery and what is the Government doing in that direction? It is said that the main herd of seals cannot be got to now because we have not got suitable steamers for icebreaking purposes. But if the seals are to be had, and we think they are, like they used to be, why does not the Government give the matter consideration? In 1884 over six hundred thousand seals were brought in to this country, which I think is the record. To-day if we get one hundred and twenty five thousand seals that will be the outside of it. Forty years ago there were ten or eleven thousand men engaged in the sealfishery; to-day we have twelve or thirteen hundred employed in that direction and one has got to go down on his knees to get a berth to the ice. In fact berths are confined to a certain section of the country, and it is placarded around this country that no Southern man need apply for any berths because he is looked upon as being no good; but I want to say to-night that the fishermen of the West Coast are hauling fish out of the water this evening on the Grand Banks and upon whom this Government are putting on extra taxation. Now what did we do for the dependents of the bank fishermen who were lost on the West Coast the past winter? Nothing. A few thousand dollars was taken up by public subscription and the Government donated a few second hand dories. And is that giving a square show to the fishermen of the country, and is it square in the light of what the Government is trying to pass here tonight in an endeavour to not alone starve but to freeze out the fishermen entirely? But never while I have breath to draw will they be frozen out by the members of this House. I am no orator; but I have a certain amount of self-respect and independ-

ence, and I am not prepared to be whipped into line at the beck and call of any Party Leader. I have to vote against this tariff because it is my duty to do so and right will conquer always, and the Government and the Prime Minister will find that out, too, at the next General Election, if we ever will have one again and unless we are not driven to Crown Colony. I understand also that there was a movement on foot two years less we are not driven to a Crown Colony. The Leader of the Government in the Upper House delivered a lecture at that time, and at which I was present. He said during the course of his remarks that this country could be run for four million dollars a year. Now this same gentleman is in the Executive Government to-day and is he or his Government making any attempt to try and run this country for four million dollars? Why it will only about pay the interest with regard to this tariff, and I do not think that any further comment is necessary, but I am going to stand out as long as I can against it in justice to and in defence of the people who sent me here.

There is a tax of 10 p.c. on lines and twines imported into this country, and there was a similar duty on fish hooks. A duty of 15 p.c. But they removed the duty off the fish hooks. Now the fishermen of this country imported 10,000 dollars worth of fish hooks last year. That was approximately $1500 taken off the fish hooks. Now last year there were $25,000 worth of lines and twines imported and at 10 p.c. that would mean a duty of $2500.

Now as I said I gave a lecture last night on the fisheries of this country and compared them with the fisheries of Canada. It was taken from the Financial Times, and I promised tonight to give another lecture on the Lunenburg fishing fleet. I might say that there is not a poor man in Lunenburg to-day. Their vessels come down to the Southern Shore and get squid and they take the very fish from our doors, and they bring it to their home and sell it, and make a good profit off it and still there are people who tell us that the Bank fishery does not pay. Now they had 67 vessels on the Banks last year and we had only ten. And then this Government comes in here and puts an extra duty on lines and twines to make it harder still for the fishermen to make a profit out of the fisheries.

Now what have we done for the fisheries in comparison to what has been done by other countries. We had the Fishery Regulations a few years ago. I claim, Mr. Chairman, that there were certain aspects of the fishery regulations that were good while there were other aspects which killed them and were wrong. It was wrong to try and fix the price. I should not be told that I cannot sell an article at what ever price I like. These Regulations were brought in here by Sir William Coaker.

(Reads)

It is a lot that you care about the fishery of this country. You talk about the fishermen of this country. And at the same time you come in here and make class legislation for a few that are driving the young fishermen out of the country. A few years ago a man made ten or twenty per cent. out of the bank fishery, but tonight as the tariff stands he can't catch fish and sell it and get enough for it to make a fairly decent profit. And why? Because of what he will have to pay for supplies to catch the fish. Last year it cost him $300 or $400 to fit out for the fisheries ,and this year he will have to catch at least another fifteen quintals to make up for what he lost last year.

And where is the labouring man going to get off at with the extra

taxation that is being put on tonight? Now this has to come to an end sooner or later. I may not live to see it, and you may not live to see it. Sir John Simon said the other day that the dole is a dope. This Government is going to dope the people of Newfoundland, and the sooner they realize it the better. Would you expect me or any independent Member of this House to come in here and slap this tariff on the table of this House which is going to dope the people of Newfoundland. That was not the policy that you went to the country on last Spring. To go on with the fisheries of Nova Scotia.

(Reads)

Have we not got a harbour that provides safe anchorage for the fishermen of this country on the Southern Shore, where the fishermen could get ready and prepare for the Grand Bank fishery. I told you that twenty or twenty five years ago there were 25 bankers in Bay Bulls. There are a few of them alive out there yet. And I have got to go and tell them that when I came up here last Spring I told you a lie. I was deceiving you. And I ask you to-night, what shall I do. And I believe then the answer would have been "Cashin, go down and leave that crowd." I have received wires from all over the country telling me to clear out. And I have done as I was told, but as I said before, I was watching things while I was in the Government, and I have proved here to-night that they were trying to drive me out. I knew that I was supposed to vote for this taxation and they as much as told me that if I did not like that to get out. They are taking the income tax off themselves and slapping it on the fishermen and the labourers of this country. And I said no. I would not vote for it, and I still say no, and I appeal to the people of this country and the working man of St. John's, for I know perfectly well that the people of Newfoundland generally are opposed to this tariff. They are absolutely opposed to this tariff. And this country has not been wronged by a Newfoundlander but by a foreigner. By people with no interest whatever in Newfoundland. Only what can be got out of it. That has been the history of this country.

(Reads)

How long has the evolution of the Newfoundland fleet been going on? When was the first vessel on the banks of Newfoundland? Some time in the sixteenth century the first vessel came to the banks from Portugal. The French paid a bounty to the British Government to fish on the Banks of Newfoundland. That was two or three hundred years ago. And where are we to-day? They bringing in this tariff and then they want me to support it.

(Reads)

The Lunenbergers can come down here and they can catch the fish off the Newfoundland coast, and they then take it home and have it cured, and then they go into our markets and compete with the Newfoundland product. And they should not be able to do this but for this fact that it costs too much to catch the Newfoundland fish. The duty on lines and twines and the other things that the fishermen need is made so high that the cost of catching the fish is too high.

(Reads)

Now for the present I conclude these few remarks, but I say now, Mr. Chairman, that before this tariff goes through the House that I intend to make further remarks, but in conclusion I want to make one last appeal to the Prime Minister and the Government of the country that they raise the committee and give this tariff more consideration than they have done, before they make it the law of

the country as they are doing, without giving the matter the proper attention. In the statement of the Finance Minister when he was introducing this tariff he admitted that he did not have time to look it over. I ask the Government in all fairness before they make this tariff the law of the country to go slow. Take it out and consider it for a year, and then bring it again into the House at the next session. Now if there is anything that comes before this House that is for the benefit of the people of Newfoundland during the sitting of this House I intend to vote for it, but any measure that is like that tariff that is for the ruination of the fishermen of the country I think that I am in duty bound to oppose it. And therefore I ask the Government to take back the tariff and then go down in the Custom House tomorrow morning and put the old tariff back again. Put the income tax back again instead of trying to derive the revenue from the people who cannot afford to pay it. Leave off the business profits tax if you want to put back the income tax. And then enforce the law. See that the income tax is collected. And then bring back the new tariff next session, next spring or next winter, and lay it on the table of the House like men. Say here "Gentlemen there is the tariff which we have gone into thoroughly, and we think that the consideration that we have given it is in the best interest of this country." And then we can debate man to man, and discuss it in every phase and form, and then you can ask the people of this country what they will think of you then. They will say that you have done the right thing. But leave the tariff as it is to-night and you will have the condemnation of every fisherman and every labouring man in the country, and therefore I will ask the Government to reconsider the decision that they have made. Take it out and if you have made a mistake you can amend it. The best man in the world can make a mistake and you are not men if you do not admit it when you have made a mistake. And therefore, Mr. Chairman, I say this for the fishermen and the labouring men of this country whose interests I am here to protect.

MR. LAKE—Mr. Chairman, Major Cashin has questioned the independence of the members on this side of the House. Now I want to tell Major Cashin that I have as much independence as he has. Now he has sent a great many remarks across the House as to what we have done or as to what we have not done or should do and have not done. I want to tell him that I have as much independence as any other man. He talks about the fishermen, but what has he done for them? What does he know about the fishermen? I come from the fishing class. I have grown up a fisherman and I have been educated on the Grand Banks of Newfoundland, and I want to tell those that are within the sound of my voice that I am here in the interest of the fishermen, and that I am going to stand up for the fishermen. Major Cashin talks about leaving the party. He did not leave the party, he was told that he was not wanted. Then he calls the Prime Minister a traitor to his adopted country. I think Major Cashin has proved himself a traitor to his party. He has admitted that he was a detective in the party. Is not that what you would call a traitor? And then Major Cashin did not have the gall to leave the party until this tariff presented the opportunity for him to get up here. He just took the tariff as an excuse. Nobody is glad to see this tariff come into effect, myself included, but if you take the duty off some article you have to make the revenue

up some other way. And I want to tell Major Cashin that the fishermen of Burin are not worrying themselves over the new tariff because they have confidence in the Prime Minister, and they know that the district has the best representation that can be had, and the same thing applies to the whole country. The Prime Minister and the Finance Minister do not want to take the revenue and put it into their pockets. They want to pay the bills and the legacies of seventeen hundred thousand dollars that were left them from the late governments. How else can we get the necessary revenue? Now Major Cashin was giving a lecture on the bank fishing. What does he know about it? I do not know where he got his information. I went to the Bank fishing when I was thirteen years of age, and I know the Bank fishing because I am a bank fisherman, and the fishermen know that I am down here to protect the interest of the Bank fishermen; and I do not want Major Cashin to tell me that I have lost any of my independecnce. And I want to tell him that none of the other members of the Government have lost it either. I believe that the Government is doing the best it can with this tariff for the interests of the fishermen. That may be some surprise to you. I am not speaking to the electors of St. John's, but I am speaking to the general public of this country. Mr. Cashin talks about the Banking fleet. Why does he not invest some of his money in Banking vessels and send some men down there to educate them to be Bank fishermen. Our vesseis have already been back this spring. Some of them have been back for the second baiting. We do not want the dole on the West Coast. The people of the West Coast are too independent to take the dole. They had to take the dole under a late administration when these infamous fish regulations were put into effect. But they do not want the dole, and to-day they do not have to take the dole. Now Major Cashin was talking about the fact that the bank fishermen had to leave this country and go to Lunenburg to make a living. But I want to tell Major Cashin that Capt. John Connell had to leave Lunenburg and come home to Newfoundland, and now he is fishing out of Grand Bank, he could not make a living when he was fishing out of Lunenburg. One year he caught 6800 quintals out of Lunenburg, and I think that was the highest catch that was ever made out of Newfoundland or Lunenburg. I have a share of five hundred dollars in that same vessel in which he was fishing, and out of that 6800 quintals all the money that was cleared as a profit was about twenty eight hundred dollars. Is that what you would call getting a living in Lunenburg? Captain J. Thornhill is fishing out of Grand Bank and he has come back with 750 quintals out of the first herring bait. Major Cashin tells the House that he made the Minister of Finance take the duty off the rubber boots. When the Finance Minister found that the Tariff Commission had increased the duty on the rubber boots and knowing that the late Government has already decreased the duty he immediately reduced the duty from fifty five per cent. to forty four per cent. Still Major Cashin comes in here and tries to talk about his doing everything in connection with removing the duties. He did not get them removed. I was responsible for as much of that as ever he was. And Major Cashin gets up here and talks about independence as though he were the only person in this party who had any independence left. Major Cashin last night and to-night kept on talking about what he did in the war. I do not wish to take any thing

away from Major Cashin, but he was not the only person that ever did anything. He may be surprised to hear that I was wrecked three times in as many months, and that I did just as much for my country as ever he did, when I was in the merchant marine. That may be a surprise to Major Cashin, because I do not go around telling everybody about it as he does.

Mr. Hickman complimented Major Cashin on leaving our party. He did not leave our party—he was sent off—he would not get out himself. Why not? Because he admits himself that he stayed in the ranks to act as a private detective to try and gather information that he would be able to use against us later on, when he had left us.

As far as I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, I have faith enough and confidence enough in the Prime Minister of this country to be sure that if he is given a chance, and I contend that he has not yet been given a chance to do anything for this country, he will ,do something for this country in the course of time.

We have no reason to cross the floors of this House. As far as I am concerned it will be some good big thing that will make me leave this side of the House and go over to the Opposition, or in the middle of the House, for this reason. When the people of Burin district sent me into this House they said—stand by the Government. We do not want you to leave the party and make a fool of yourself, unless on some grave issue. We do not want any more unnecessary general elections. The country cannot afford them. It may be alright for a man like Major Cashin to talk about going to Ferryland. Personally I do not want any more elections. I would rather go back home. I wish the Government would close this House, and let us get back to our business and start producing revenue, so that we will not have to have people taking doles at ten dollars a week.

It makes me laugh when I hear Major Cashin talk about the Bank fishery. What does he know about the Bank fishery?

MR. CASHIN—As much perhaps as you know about the Humber.

MR. LAKE—It might be a good move to have some one at the Humber.

MR. CASHIN—Yes, and you have the job promised you. I know, because you said so.

MR. LAKE—You never heard me say that I had a job at the Humber.

MR. CASHIN—You showed me a telegram in which you were promised it by the Prime Minister.

MR. LAKE—I never showed you any telegram. I deny that statement I did not show Major Cashin any telegram I had. I can go on the Grand Banks and work for my living if necessary. While Major Cashin was talking I did not interrupt him at all, and he can show me the same courtesy now. Major Cashin was talking about the Grand Banks of Newfoundland, and that is a matter that I am very much interested in. I have vessels to-day fishing on the Grand Banks, and I hope they are doing well, but Major Cashin is not in any way interested in the Grand Banks. If he is as much interested in them as he would lead people to believe, why does he not invest some of his money in schooners to go there I would like to ask Major Cashin what they have done for the Bankers in Ferryland District. They tried to prevent them from taking bait there, and so prevent them from prosecuting the bank fishery; and a few days ago I had to get up on the floors of the House of Assembly and denounce them for that. Is that what Major Cashin calls encouraging the fisheries.

He tells us that he was born in

politics, and has been there for thirty years, and in almost the same breath he told us that he was only a child in politics. I suppose what he meant was that his relations have been in politics for the last thirty years.

I do not intend to take up the time of the House, Mr. Chairman, but I just want to state the fact that I have not yet lost my independence, and I do not want Major Cashin to tell me that I have. He had a chance to get out of this party, but he did not get out until last night when he found this loophole of this 2½ cents on tobacco.

HON. PRIME MINISTER — Mr. Chairman, whilst our good friend Major Cashin has spoken for six or seven hours, I do not think that it will take me very much more than quarter of an hour to reply to him; because he has said nothing in those six hours that any ordinary man could not have said in half an hour. He has simply repeated the same things over and over again.

Now I am sorry that any member of my party, who gave me his allegiance eighteen months ago should see fit to get up in this House as Major Cashin did last night and criticize every action of the Government as being wrong—not one single thing right since the party came in. According to Major Cashin, everything has been as bad as it possibly could be. There has not been one member on the Opposition benches who has criticized the policy of the Government as severely as Mr. Cashin has done in the few hours that he has been speaking.

If Major Cashin were opposed so strongly to the policy of the present Government, surely he should have told us about it before this. As Mr. Lake has pointed out this evening, Major Cashin in his own confession says that he stopped in the party to detect what was going on in the party. He stands self-confessed as a traitor to his own party, as Mr. Lake very aptly puts it. Major Cashin has told us that he was kicked out of the party, and he has also told us that he left the party of his own accord, and that he could not be kicked out of the party; and that he has too much independence to be kicked out of any party if he wanted to stop in it.

Major Cashin has also told us that the reason why we tried to get him out of the party was very clearly depicted in that clause which was in the Redistribution Bill. The Attorney General has explained that clause very fully too-night, and there is no necessity for me to cover the same ground again. That clause was put into that Bill because it was thought that with the Redistribution Bill it was not necessary to have any bye election, but after we came to consider it, and after two or three members of the party had criticized the fact that it might be construed as a cowardly clause, we decided to take it out, and more particularly when Major Cashin spoke about it. I do not say because he spoke about it, but because we realized that in Legislation such as this, suggestions made by any member of the Party should be considered. Major Cashin takes all the credit to himself. He says that he made us take it out. Why should we take it out if we were very anxious to have it in. We have not done anything that we did not want to do, on the advice of any one member of the party.

No, Mr. Chairman, it was not because of that clause in the Redistribution Bill that Major Cashin left us; and Major Cashin has told us tonight that it was not the Tariff alone that drove him out of the party, and I am quite prepared to believe that it was not. I am going to tell the House something that may possibly throw

some light on the reason why Major Cashin left the party.

It was not very long ago—only a few months—when a gentleman who called himself Tobin blew into my office; and this Tobin said to me—"We want St. John's East opened up, and we want Sir Michael Cashin to stand for your party in St. John's East." I said to this gentleman—"Are you here as a delegation from Sir Michael Cashin?" and he said he was not. I asked him then whom he was a delegate from, and he replied "From Mr. Higgins' Committee in St. John's East." I said "If Mr. Higgins' Committee wishes to make any representations to me, surely they can do it through Mr. Higgins"; and then he planked down some petitions on a table, and said "here are our petitions upon which we have come here." I picked them up and gave them back to Mr. Tobin, and said "you can go back to the people who sent you here, and say that I considered it a piece of impertinence for any person to come down here and tell me whom I shall have stand for my party.

Immediately after that I asked Mr. Cashin to come to my office. Mr. Cashin came down to see me right away, and I told him what had happened. He told me that Mr. Tobin had no authority to come to me as far as he knew. I told him that we might as well understand one another. I asked him "does your father want to come back into our party as a simple rank and file member of the party" and he said he did. I said, "Well it seems to me very extraordinary that a man who has been Prime Minister of this country, and has held the highest positions in the gift of the country, and who has retired from politics, should be asking to come back as an ordinary rank and file member of our party;" and I said further, "I do not think it is in the interests of the party to ask him to do so, and I do not propose to ask him to do so, because I have to consider party interests before anything else." Sir Michael Cashin has been a friend of mine—I hope he still is. I have nothing against him—and I never had. Still, I have to say that I still think it is not in the party interests to have him back, and I do not think that Sir Michael Cashin or Major Cashin finds fault with that statement as being absolutely correct.

When I told that to Major Cashin his one remark was, "Now we understand one another, and I know where I stand—blood is thicker than water." I admire the honourable gentleman for standing for his family interests before his party one. I admire him extremely, and I have no grouch with Major Cashin; and he must recognize my position too, because when I told him that I did not think it was in the party interests, he said that he understood where we were.

And from that day to this Major Cashin has been trying to find some way of getting out of this party. In the meantime I am rather very much inclined to believe that he has gone around in the party trying to urge other members of the party to be disloyal. I am not prepared to prove that, but I have very strong suspicions that this is so. He has not, in my opinion been loyal to the party, and I very much prefer to see him sit over on that side of the House tonight, than to have him sitting over here and pretending to be on our side.

Major Cashin has very particularly emphasized the fact that the present tariff has put an extra two cents protection on local tobacco. I am going to keep repeating myself every night in this House, as Major Cashin has done, but I think I clearly stated in this House that when I discovered that there was something in this tariff that gave an extra protection to

the tobacco factory, I immediately went down to the Custom House, at nine o'clock on the first morning I discovered it, and took the matter up with the Finance Minister, and went into it thoroughly, and saw that the Imperial Tobacco Company would not get any more protection than it had before. I am prepared now to put up thirty dollars, if Major Cashin is prepared to do the same, and if I am the winner I will give the money to any orphanage the honorable member chooses to mention. I will submit the case to the decision of Read, Son and Watson or any other auditors and they will find that the Imperial Tobacco Company is not better off under this tariff; I say that they are worse under the new tariff. I am not going to use figures as the honourable member did tonight, as nobody can follow them. I say that the Tobacco Company is a benefit to the city and the country. They are making nothing on the low grades of tobacco, and if they like they could manufacture these in Virginia and bring them in here, and the only thing we would get would be the duty—all the labor would be lost. The Company has a factory practically idle in Virginia and could manufacture the low grades there at almost half the cost of local manufacture It costs 20 p.c. more to manufacture tobacco here. I say the Company has been making little or no profit on the low grade tobacco, and under this tariff they will make considerably less. Mr. Cashin and his family were interested in a factory which was started by themselves, and if there were such profits to be made why did they close it up? The Imperial Tobacco Company did not close them up, but they asked us to help them close. We did not want that factory to close because competition is beneficial, and they can start all the factories they like. He says the putting on a tax on a factory which must employ ten hands is giving a monopoly, but he forgets that one company is paying $1,000 against the other's $200.00. The tax is put on factories because an excise officer has to be employed there. He costs the country about $1,200.00, and it is not too much to ask the factory to contribute $200.00 towards that amount. That's why the tax is put on. The Honourable Member for Ferryland referred to the Colonial Cordage Company as other members also did, and said in effect that he did not care a fig if we took a thousand dollars off hooks and put $2,500.00 on lines and twines, but to-night he gets up and talks and raves about the duties on lines and twines. He is playing to the gallery and nothing more. I have already announced that there is to be no duty on lines and twines this year unless there was an increase in the price of the raw materials abroad. There is a differencee in the prices of the local and foreign cordage, and the Company here would probably be chagrined enough to put up the prices of their products if the extra duty were put on. What they wanted was not to lose the labor to foreign countries. That's all I will say in this connection, as it is rather a personal affair, and it is unpleasant for me to be continually refuting charges that we are putting money in our own pockets. I say again that there are no two more beneficial Companies than the Imperial Tobacco and the Colonial Cordage, but because we are making a little money we are laughed at and cried down. If for example the fishermen of the West Coast want cordage on credit, and want their notes carried, as Mr. Lake will tell you, the Colonial Cordage Company will accommodate them, otherwise the firms would have to carry large stocks in St. John's. These two concerns are of benefit to the country, and I defend the tariff in

connection with them, as I defend the tariff in all other respects. I said that we would take off the duty as soon as we could reduce expenditure, and I promised to try and reduce it. I am sorry we have not been able to make as much reduction as I would like or hope, but we have not been wasting money as previous administrations did. There may be an odd man who may be getting a little extra salary, but this sort of thing will be remedied, and we have not wasted such sums as $70,000 on ponds and other foolish schemes. I am satisfied to go before the country in four years and be judged by the people, but not in eight months, particularly in view of the fact that we have had two sessions of the legislature during that time and could not be expected to do much to advance the interest of the country when we had to sit and listen to long and useless speeches. I will not detain the House as it is late in the evening, but I will say I am inclined to think that the country will come to the conclusion that the interest of the fishermen alone was not all that induced the Honorable Member of Ferryland to cross the floors of this House.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on to-morrow.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until tomorrow afternoon at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, April 29th, 1925.

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

BR. BROWN—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Wild Bight, Southern Arm, in the District of Twillingate. The petition concerns a telephone line from Wild Bight to Little Bay. In introducing the petition, I wish to give it my heartiest support, knowing that the poles have been cut for some time and are lying on the spot, tho' despite recommendations which have been done, I would like to suggest to the Government, or ask the Honorable the Minister of Posts to give the matter attention at the earliest possible moment. In asking this favor I again give the petition my heartiest support, and hope that it will be referred to the Department to which it relates, and that it will be attended to as early as possible.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Speaker, I wish to support the petition presented by my colleague, and I hope the Honorable Minister of Posts will give the matter immediate attention, and see that something is done in regard to it.

HON. THE MINISTER OF POSTS —Mr. Speaker, as to this petition, I would like to point out that something has already been done. The wire is already on the ground, and I think we will be able to accommodate the Honorable Gentleman at an early date.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present petitions signed by about two thousand of the Electors of St. John's East asking that the District be opened immediately for a bye-election. The petitioners draw attention to the fact that the District now has not full representation since Mr. Vinnicombe has been appointed to the Board of Liquor Control, and that important Legis-

lation is now passing through the House, such as the Tariff, Tourist Policy, Road Building, Redistribution of Districts, Amalgamation of Schools, Dry Dock, etc. St. John's East is half of the City of St. John's, and comprises a lot of the business community of the City and of Newfoundland. I wish to have this petition given the Honorable the Colonial Secretary, so that he may place it before the next meeting of the Executive Government. I give it my heartiest support, because I realize that the present representatives of St. John's East are very much taken up in their duties, one of them being the Honorable the Minister of Justice, and I think the District is due full representation, and I hope the petition will receive the immediate attention of the Government.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, I beg to support the prayer of the petition as it is of such great importance, and I believe it should get the immediate attention of the Government. It has been intimated that in the past Districts have been left without full representation, but I do not think the Government should act on this precedent, or be governed by the shortcomings of past administrations. It is altogether unnecessary for this District to be without full representation, as it is not like an isolated district, and the lists of voters can be taken and the election proclaimed in a few days. An election in St. John's East could be held as easily as that of a Road Board. For these reasons, I feel that the Government now having the sentiments of the electors of St. John's East expressed in this manner, should give the petition every consideration, and I trust that we will soon hear the District is to be opened or see the proclamation issued for the holding of the election.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Speaker, I have great pleasure in according my support of this petition. As Mr. Halfyard has pointed out, Districts in the past have gone without full representation, but this precedent ought not to be followed by the present Government, and they should give the petition every consideration. If we were approaching the dying hours of the administration, there might be some excuse for not attending to the petition, but the Government are only at the beginning of their term, and that it is all the more reason why they should fill this seat and reason why they should not countenance the precedent mentioned by Mr. Halfyard.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Speaker: I rise to support the prayer of the petition presented by the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. DUFF—Mr. Speaker: I wish to support the prayer of the petition also. I think it is a very essential and a very necessary petition and I do not think that the request of the petitioners should be refused.

Mr. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker: I feel that it is my duty to support the prayer of the petition. St. John's East at present has two representatives, one the highest commoner in the land and the other Minister of Justice. Mr. Vinicombe has vacated his seat and accepted a position in the Department of Liquor Control. I feel that it is due to the people of St. John's East to have full representation in this House and I give the petition my hearty support.

MR. CAHILL—Mr. Speaker: I ask leave to present a petition from the residents of Harbor Main in the district of Harbor Main, asking for a sum of money to repair a road known as the Ridge Road. This road, I may say, leads to farm land which is under cultivation, and which is operated by about sixty families. The road at present is in an impassable state and badly in need of repair and I give the petition my hearty support.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—Mr. Speaker: In supporting the prayer of the petition I might say that I know the road well and it is only a small grant that the people are looking for. There has been no money spent on this road for quite a number of years and the petitioners are all farmers and very industrious people and they ask for this small grant to enable them to carry on their farming operations in that locality. I trust that some small allocation will be made to help them out.

Mr. Scammell, Mr. Brown, Mr. Ashbourne, Mr. Hickman and Mr. Cashin gave notice of question.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker: I beg to move that the House do send back this Bill which they have sent down, entitled "Of Old Age Pensions," to the Legislative Council requesting them to pass it without amendment.

MR. DUFF asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay upon the Table of the House copies of all invoices for salt codfish supplied Government steamers since first of January 1925; state quality of fish supplied and whether Shore or Labrador.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I beg to table the information.

MR. ASHBOURNE asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay upon the Table of the House tenders received for accommodation of Coastal Boats while dock premises in course of repairs and what tender has been accepted.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I beg to table the information.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker: The other day Captain Randell asked a question as to what officials were employed in connection with the Shipping Department or whether that Department was wound up. The only employee engaged and receiving a salary in connection with that Department is Mr. Foley, who is at the present time engaged in collecting some outstanding accounts and trying to adjust certain insurance matters.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Speaker: I have much pleasure in laying on the Table of the House the correspondence asked for by the Leader of the Opposition between the High Commissioner and myself and also the correspondence between Colonel Sullivan and myself in connection with the four million dollar loan. After the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues have read and studied the correspondence, I should like to know from them if they have found anything irregular in it, particularly in view of the charges that were made here the other day?

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker: I want to state that when I asked the question a few days ago I made no charge against the Finance Minister or any other member of the Government. I asked the Prime Minister three times since this House opened to lay upon the table the correspondence which have taken place between the Government and the High Commissioner's office in London as to the raising of the four million dollar loan. I have before me the reply of the Prime Minister. I also asked the Finance Minister on February 26th to table all correspondence, if any, between himself or the Government with Hon. M. S. Sullivan when in England with reference to the loan. I have the reply that there was no correspondence. On April 7th I asked a question and I received this reply:

(Reads)

On April the 16th there is the following question again:—

(Reads question)

The Loan was raised through the Bank of Montreal. That was in reply to question asked by me as to whether the loan was raised through the

Bank of Montreal or through the Dominion Securities Company.

(Reads the Question)

On April 18 I asked the Prime Minister as to whether the loan was raised through the Bank of Montreal or through the Dominion Securities Company and I have here a copy of the Budget Speech of the Minister of Finance and on page 17 it reads as follows:

(Reads page 17)

Now I do not know what is in this correspondence that the Minister of Finance has laid upon my desk because I have not yet had the opportunity to go through it but I will take the opportunity just as soon as I can. But the fact remains that there was correspondence and here it is and what I have said to the House are facts. I have read the question on the Order Paper and I have read the answers of the Prime Minister which he gave me three times that there was no correspondence in connection with the four million dollar loan. Now all these things do not agree. There is something wrong somewhere. There is a nigger in the wood pile somewhere.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE —Well where is it?

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—You know more about where the nigger is than I do. Now I asked the Prime Minister for the correspondence in connection with this loan and he said that there was no correspondence and yet this is laid on the Table of the House to prove that there was correspondence and this proves that it was withheld from the House of Assembly.

And if the Prime Minister gave to the House the answer that he gave to me and if he got the information from somebody else then he has been deceived. And I would like to know what stand the Prime Minister is going to take in the matter. I asked for the correspondence between the High Commissioners Office and the Newfoundland Government. Who is the Newfoundland Government? The Prime Minister has admitted that he allowed a member of his Government to raise a loan of four millions of dollars for the Government of this country and he can have just what correspondence that he likes and then give him whatever information that he likes and then the Prime Minister swallows it.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —The Hon. Leader of the Opposition should not have a suspicious mind.

THE HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—The Hon. Leader of the Opposition has got a suspicious mind. He has the facts here.

MR. SPEAKER—I wish to draw the attention of the House and particularly of the gallery that order is to be preserved and that it is going to be preserved.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Speaker, what I say is that I have this evidence here in writing. I have the questions that I asked the Prime Minister here printed on the Order Paper and the answer that I got from the Prime Minister is written in type. And these are facts that nobody can disprove. I am not making a charge against anybody but my contention is that this House is entitled to the correspondence pertaining to the Government of this country and it should have been put on the table of this House immediately that it was asked for. I will first peruse the correspondence and see what it is about.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Yes peruse it before you talk about it.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—I am talking about the fact that there is correspondence. If the Hon. Gentlemen on the other side of the House have anything to say they will have the opportunity to do

so when I have finished. I asked the Prime Minister a few days ago if the interest on the four million dollar loan was to be paid from the 1st of July, and then he replied that it would not be from the first of July 1924. Now I suppose that he has made some arrangements whereby this interest will be paid from the issue date of the bonds. But that is not what is said in the advertisement. In the English papers there is the advertisement that asked for tenders for four million dollars in Newfoundland funds. And the interest to be paid from July 1924. The tenders were to be made in Newfoundland funds. Some of the large financial houses in England did not make a tender but they would have made a tender if the Government had notified them that they were prepared to accept a tender for the loan in sterling. The loan was advertised for in dollars and cents. There was no other advertisement in the papers. There was no notice of this given to the Financial Houses in England and the Government took it upon themselves without any further advertisement to accept the bid in sterling, and this was done by the Dominion Securities Company. Now anybody who read the papers, especially the London Times, would see the reference they made to the Newfoundland loan and they made extensive references. I have been told that a great deal of the loan is still in the hands of the underwriters. The member for Fortune Bay said that 62% was still in the hands of the underwriters. At that time I did not know about it.

But now I know after having read these extracts from the London Times that because the loan is questioned the London underwriters are not prepared to handle same.

Extrat from London Times, dated February 11.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Mr. Speaker, in reply to the honourable Leader of the Opposition I would like to first point out in connection with this loan that one of the demands of the Opposition was that these loans should be advertised and tenders called for. I am not prepared to say whether this was the best thing to do or whether it would have been better to have accepted the loan privately. Perhaps in honesty to one's self the best thing would have been to have called for tenders as we did. In reference to the correspondence laid on the table of the House there would have been no object in keeping this correspondence from the Prime Minister—none whatever, and I don't think that the honourable the Prime Minister would imagine that I had any intention of hiding it from him; but when he asked me if there was any correspondence, I took it for granted that he was all the time talking about correspondence taking place since tenders were being called, and I said there was not. Since the 20th of August I have been sending cables to the High Commissioner and to Colonel Sullivan trying to boost that loan, and that was all that was possible for the Minister of Finance to do, and when, I think in February, I took the advice of the High Commissioner, which will be found in the correspondence, I believed I was doing it in the best interests of the country and to safeguard the country's rights. The Prime Minister knows that this loan was placed in the hands of agents who were to take care to advertise the loan in Canada, the United States and England. It is quite true that the loan was not called for in sterling, but the Finance Minister and the Prime Minister were not prepared to gamble with exchange on behalf of the people of the country, and though called for in Newfoundland currency it was accepted in sterling when the tenders were opened at the Bank of Montreal in the

presence of the Prime Miniser, Mr. Gardner, Mr. Bruce and myself. The Leader of the Opposition could have been there if he wanted to. When these tenders were opened, we were negotiating in connection with the purchase of rails in England. It was therefore figured out as to whether we should accept the sterling tender, of which there was only one from the Dominion Securities Limited; and in the interests of the Colony and of Britain we decided to accept that tender and buy the rails in England, as we would ge 3¾ per cent. for five years from the British Government if we bought the rails and raised the loan in England. We did so, feelnig confident that what we were doing was in the best interests of the Colony. Why did I send cables since August 20th—why was I sending cables to the High Commissioner? Because I was trying to find out the financial conditions and the best time to issue the loan on behalf of the Colony. Why did I wait until February 10th or 12th to borrow that money? For only one reason—to save the interest on behalf of the Colony. And it is insinuated here that I was paying the interest from July 1st, 1924. No such thing could possibly happen.

MR. HICKMAN—Pardon me, I would like to explain that I got the information from the Prime Minister and the correspondence that he gave me, amongst which there was a copy of an advertisement that appeared in the papers, and in that advertisement it said that the interest was to have been paid from July 1st, 1924.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS — That statement shows that the honourable gentleman does not know anything about finance at all. The honourable member should certainly know that the Loan Act called for that loan to be raised from the 1st July, and that the first coupon on the bond would be due on December 31st, 1924, but the Government does not issue that coupon. It takes it off before the bond is sold. We ought to be put into a Lunatic Asylum if we started to pay interest on money that we never had. The second coupon on the bond will be due July 1st next, but I have arranged that bonds not already subscribed for shall only have interest paid on them as from January 1st; and the Bank of Montreal has the money now to pay interest for only a month and twenty days. I have had only one object in carrying out that correspondence that I have tabled, and that was to try and boost the loan and try to do the best I could for Newfoundland.

Another insinuation has been broadcasted by a crowd of hypocrites. It has been whispered about the lobbies of this House and outside that I had a message from the High Commissioner's Office in London offering a tender for the loan at 99, and that I declined it. Not only that, but the Prime Minister and the Colonial Secretary have been told the same story. Some gentleman told them that the report was about town. It is not true. Why should I care what rumor says about me? There is only one thing stands before me. It is my conscience and the knowledge that I am doing my best. Long ago I would have sunk into oblivion if lying tongues could have done it; but I am here to-day and the lying tongues are gone. I have done the best for my country when I have had charge of her financial affairs, and I defy the honourable Leader of the Opposition or any member of this House to prove otherwise. I did not care whether he was a rich man or a poor man, even if he was Sir Edgar Bowring, when he owed a dollar to the Custom House I collected it. And why did I do it? For only one reason. I had taken an oath to His Excellency the Governor to be loyal to the country and to fill

my office in the best interests of this Colony, and I have done so, and I defy contradiction from any man in this House or outside. I will have to be like my honourable friend Mr. Warren and use the privilege of the House to defend myself from lying tongues. They have been lying about me for a long time, and they have kept on lying, but they have not been able to keep this chap down. He is still up and on top, and will be when my traducers are dead. As far as the loan is concerned, I say it was raised honestly, absolutely honestly, and every dollar that is coming from that loan is going to the country; and Crosbie will not ask the Colony for five thousand dollars to sign those bonds as other Finance Ministers have done but he will sign them because he thinks it is part of his duty to do so, without getting paid a penny extra. Now I have replied to the honourable member and the lying tongues on the street, and to the man who hides behind the doors and round the corner, saying he did this and he did that, and he robbed the other thing. The only thing I can say to that sort of man is that he does these things himself and he thinks that other people must do them too. I have taken the trouble to send a cable to the High Commissioner in London to ask him if he ever sent a telegram to me, or to anyone else here, saying that anyone over in London had ever offered through him to take up the Newfoundland loan at 99, and here is his reply for my friends here, and for the liars that have been talking around this town and in the lobbies of this House. I ask my friend the Colonial Secretary now, sir, to produce the original of this reply to the House. Here is the answer, and if you want further proof the Hon. Colonial Secretary can show you the original. He sent me this copy this morning and I will read it to the House:—

London, April 28, 1925.

"Your telegram 27th April. Statement cable was sent by me offering ninety-nine for loan is incorrect. No tender for loan made through this office."

(Sgd.) HIGH COMMISSIONER.

What further answer do you want than that? Yes, I corresponded with Mr. Sullivan. I sent him messages and I sent them to Mr. Jennings. I sent them, if you like, to the High Commissioner's Office, but as I have already stated, I did it only in the interests of the country and of the Department of Finance, which I represented. I shall have an opportunity before this House closes perhaps to throw light on a situation that Newfoundland does not understand. I will soon throw the searchlight on these things, and some who think that they can hide away in the shade will find the light shining very brightly on them to their discomfort. I admit that I am only human, and I have made my mistakes. I know I have made them—I make them every day; but it is only by mistakes that we can learn. If there is a man who is so perfect that he cannot make mistakes he has no business here, he should be gone beyond. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I have had to take the stand I have taken this afternoon, but I want to say to my friends who believe in me, and who would not hesitate to stake their existence on me to-day, that lying statements made by my enemies are just like water on a duck's back—it drops off.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker, with your permission I would like to say that the Hon. Minister is off the point altogether. I made no charge against the Minister, I made no charge against anybody. All I did was to ask for the correspondence between the High Commissioner's Office and the Government, and if that had been laid on the table of the House when it was asked for it would have saved a lot of trou-

ble. There are certain matters in connection with the loan which I will discuss later on, but I want to point out to the Minister of Finance that it is not necessary for him to attribute to me every bit of gossip that he hears, and I have not made any insinuation against him or against any member of the Government. I simply asked for information. Now the information is forthcoming; if that had been done in the beginning all this trouble might have been avoided.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that if in future he will address questions relating to the finances of this country to me as Finance Minister, I shall be glad to answer it as I have answered all other questions; and if he confines himself to that he will get the answers so promptly that he will be surprised himself. What he has been doing is to address questions of this nature to the Prime Minister.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the amendment made by the Legislative Council in and upon the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 74 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Old Age Pensions'" was read a second time and disagreed with, and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting that body that the House of Assembly is unable to accept the said amendment for the reason that it infringes the privilege of the House of Assembly, and that they consider it unnecessary on their part to offer any further reason, hoping that the reason given will be deemed sufficient.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into a Committe of the Whole on Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

House went into Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, now that I am afforded the opportunity by the House going in Committee stage, I would like to say a few words about the loan. The Honourable Minister of Finance tells us that the Government is not paying interest on the loan on July 1st, 1924, but while the Government directly may not be paying for the coupons attached to the bonds, the underwriters are responsible for the interest, and, therefore, in estimating the net amount coming to Newfoundland, it is necessary to calculate as from 1924. If the bonds were dated July, 1925, the net amount would be better for us. The Honourable Minister of Finance knows well that when the advertisement was inserted in the papers for a loan, tenders were asked for on condition that the interest would be payable on June 1st, 1924, and somebody was responsible, and the underwriters must take the interest from that date.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—The interim bond was paid and there was no interest from July 1st to January 1st. For a month and twenty days from the time of borrowing, it has already been returned into the Bank. We owe no money on that interest until the 1st of June, the amount is approximately $100,000. The brokers pay us the accrued interest from June 1st.

MR. HICKMAN—Those whose tenders are accepted must pay from the 1st of June, 1924.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—We pay no interest for one month and twenty days from the time of borrowing. You have to do it according to the borrowing law made in this House.

MR. HICKMAN—The coupon was taken off.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Yes, and destroyed by the Government.

MR. HICKMAN—I am taking this from the advertisement.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—I do not wish to interrupt, but I must say you are altogether wrong. This has been done according to the borrowing law. I must say for the private guidance of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that this loan was taken on the basis of 4.77, so that we made about six thousand dollars for the Colony.

MR. HICKMAN—I understand that our loan is selling to-day at over par, and this I am glad to hear as it shows that the financial condition of the Colony is good. The Railway Loan is selling at 102, and it is very satisfactory to the members on this side of the House to find that our financial conditions are such that our loans are selling at a good deal over par.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a few remarks in connection with the criticism directed to me by Mr. Lake last night. I don't intend to delay the House to any great extent on the matter. I just rise in fairness to myself and to the House. Last night when Mr. Lake got up here he threw an insinuation across the House that I did not have guts enough to get out of the party. He threw across the insinuation that he was just as independent as I was. Possibly that may be true or it may not be. Now Mr. Chairman Mr. Lake is a personal friend of mine. And I would not try to hurt his feelings. I have made no personal remarks and I think that he knows that. As a matter of fact I picked him up and drove him home last night. I just want to explain to the House my position in connection with this tariff. He said that I was no fisherman. Well I am the son of a fisherman. Just the same as himself. Now the Government has brought in a Bill to give Mr. Lake a job. And he stands up here and he calls himself more independent than I am.

Reads Bill entitled "Of the Disability of Members of the House of Assembly," Section 2, Chapter 4, Third Series. Now I don't mean to say that there is any serious charge against Mr. Lake himself. He is just as much entitled to a job as anybody else. I know this man is about to accept the office as Director for the Government in the Newfoundland Pulp and Paper Company at a salary of $3,400.00 a year, if the Government passes on this Bill to the Upper House. Mr. Lake showed me a telegram which he had received from the Prime Minister offering him the job some months ago, and then he gets up here and makes a bold attack on me. Now if Mr. Lake had not been given that job he would be over on this side of the House with me. That is his place as representative of the fishermen of the West Coast. In other words he does not want to be called a traitor to the fishermen of the West Coast as he leaves them and goes to the placid waters of the Humber. He is able to row a dory better in the placid waters of the Humber than on the Grand Banks of Newfoundland. I have nothing against him for that; but when he calls me a traitor I am going to resent it. I am no traitor to Newfoundland.

MR. LAKE—You said you were in the party as a detective.

MR. CASHIN—I was a detective for the people of Newfoundland, and I am proud of it. There was a man who was a sergeant in the East African Army, his name was General Ironsides. He was a detective for the British forces, and he held the rank of sergeant in the German army dur-

ing the war. He was there to get information to help the British people, and he carried out his job and got clear. I am sent by the people of Ferryland district, and I joined the Monroe party in all sincerity and carried out my mission as best I could; but when the Monroe Party or any other party started in to take the bread and butter from the fishermen of Ferryland district I got out. They did not start in to take it until this year; but I saw it coming or as you say "hove" me out. So much for you Mr. Lake you are a friend of mine and I do not want to insult you. There is a Bill being brought before this House to give you a job, Sir. It would make a cat laugh to hear you talk about the fisheries.

Last night the Prime Minister got up here and made excuses for the Tobacco Company and the Colonial Cordage Company. This man has given a protection to these two companies, and in order to do that he has taxed the people of this country, and then he calls me a traitor and a hypocrite. It is the Minister of Finance and the Prime Minister who are hypocrites, and this morning's paper comes out, and it says here what they have to say about Major Cashin the man called an observer, a fabricator, whatever an observer is. I would first read the editorial.

(Reads)

The paper tells what took place in the early hours of Tuesday morning; but it does not tell the whole truth. In this way it is really deceiving the people of this country. Why did they not tell the scene that took place in this House. No, of course they would not. This is a Government paper, and I expect nothing from it, and I want nothing from it. This is the most inconsistent paper in Newfoundland, and I am going to tell why it is so right now.

Last year a Bill was introduced into this Assembly, and I supported it strongly. It was a Bill for the repeal of the Prohibition Act, and that paper and the people who controlled it criticised it in every shape and form. They opposed it as best they could, and still tried to make a great hit with the Government and swallowed it against their conscience, and voted against their own consciences, and I regret, Mr. Chairman, that you may be in any way connected with this.

It is said that I have been acting the part of detective and the people of Newfoundland appreciate it tonight. I venture to bet, and I challenge any member of the Government tonight to face me in St. John's West or Ferryland District on this Tarif and if they mean what they say they will take it up. The Prime Minister wants to bet thirty dollars. If I had thirty dollars I would give it to charity or possibly to buy a suit of clothes for some fisherman, whom they are trying to drive naked out of the country.

MR. BROWNE—It will cost the people something to have an election.

MR. CASHIN—It will cost the people nothing for me. It did not cost one cent for me to come into this House. I am going to pay my own way, and when I cannot do that I am going to get out, that is why I am able to take up my position here independent of any man in the House, and it would be better for this country if there was a law to that effect.

I admit that I was in the confidence of the party. I was admitted but that confidence was not sincere because that party has deceived the people of this country. St. John's is the answer. Ferryland is the answer. Any district in Newfoundland will answer the same thing to-day. It is reasonable to think so.

What is the present Government do-

ing for the people? They are bringing in this tariff and they are putting it on the people of this country to the tune of an extra 10 or 15 per cent., and they are taking it off their own incomes. They take it off their own incomes and filch it on the shoulders of the people of this country. That is what they are doing. The Prime Minister never explained his income tax and the business profits tax last night. He said that I spoke for six hours and that I said nothing but he spoke for fifteen minutes but he did not speak about his own business profits tax and his own income tax that is being taken off the rich man and put on the poor man. If I stayed here sixty hours more I would not be able to drum that into their heads. I made no secret of this thing. I came out into the open and that is what is wrong with this Government. They do too much behind closed doors. I came out in the open and I am assaulted by this political paper. I say now that the public is behind me in this opposition to the present tariff. They are behind me even though I say it myself. I have not received penance for what I have done yet. But I know that when I go back to the district of Ferryland that I will get absolution. Congenial. I wonder if the tariff is congenial to the poor people of this country. I wonder if it is congenial to some of the members of the Government. But there is no Monroe party or any other party that is going to drive me out of this House. I have a voice in this House and I intend to use it. As I said there is nobody in this House that is going to put me out. The Labourers and the Fishermen of this country can do it if they want to but they are the only ones that can do it. Now there is another statement that the Prime Minister made last night. He made the statement that I was trying to get members of the Government to leave the Government ranks. I deny that. I deny that and I challenge any member of the Government to stand up here to-night in the House of Assembly and say that I tried to induce him to leave the party. I will even ask my old colleague, Mr. Moore to back me up in that.

MR. MOORE—I will say what I have to say if you will sit down. Mr. Chairman, I am glad that the honourable member has brought this matter to a head this evening. There have been a lot of whispering and a lot of surmises both inside and outside of this House with regard to my relation to this party. As far as the honourable member himself is concerned he never asked me to leave the party. I did not know what the Leader of the Government was referring to last night when he said that Major Cashin was using his influence to take members from the party. I knew that for the last three or four weeks that Major Cashin had grievances with the party but he always told me to use my own opinion. I will say that for him. With regard to my support of the Monroe Party, I went to the country as a supporter of the Monroe Party and I was returned as a supporter of the Monroe Party. But there seems to be doubt among some members of this party and amongst some people outside this House with regard to my loyalty to my leader. If my connection with Sir Michael Cashin, which has lasted for fifty years and over, were going to interfere with my allegiance to my party I would give up the party rather than lose the friendship of a man who has stood by me for more than fifty years. Mr. Monroe, the Leader of the Government, has many men in his party who are loyal to him but he has none who are more loyal to him than I am.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank my colleague for relieving me of that charge of trying to induce any member of the Government to

leave his party. I challenge any member of the Government to say that I tried to get him to leave the party. The statement of the Prime Minister is not correct and if he is a man he will take it back—he will take back the charge that I tried to induce any member to leave the party.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I said that I had suspicions.

MR. CASHIN—I think that suspicion has not been borne out.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I am quite prepared to take it back.

MR. CASHIN—Well, that point is cleared. I hope that the Daily News will publish that to-morrow. I want no favours from the Daily News or anyone else but I want a square deal. If I had to be a member of that Executive that tariff would never have gone through. I challenge any member to say that I was looking for an Executive seat. When I went to the country for the Monroe Government I was promised nothing, but there were promises made ,all kinds of them, but I was made no promises and I asked for none. I ask Mr. Monroe now if I asked him for an Executive seat before I went to the country? He knows that I did not. All that happened is that Mr. Monroe wrote me and I wrote Mr. Monroe, and then I went down to his house and then I went to the district of Ferryland and won it, and he counted that district as two men on the head of the list of members that would support him in this House. He was sure of them. If the man who wrote this thing was a man he would have signed his name to it. If that paper will publish what I will send them to-morrow morning they will find that this man, whoever he is, is lying. Now this tariff, says the News, is speculative. It is speculative to the tune of seven hundred thousand dollars additional taxation on the taxpayers of this country. That is the speculation. It is no speculation but a sure thing.

Have the two cents on the tobacco been considered? Have readymades been considered? Have lines and twines been considered? They took the taxation off themselves and they put it back on the people who could not afford to pay it. Sir John Crosbie has brought in this tariff that puts seven hundred thousand dollars on the taxpayers of this country and he has taken off the business tax and the income tax which brought in three or four hundred thousand dollars a year and now the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Justice have to pay no income tax. You put it on your salaries and take it off the poor man. I do not call that a square deal.

They ought to be ashamed to move into this House to-day under such trying conditions. Class Legislation! A Government should be governed by the masses and not by the classes. The people of this country are an independent people and it is the duty of the Government to endeavour to keep them independent; and to make the young men who are in the country stay in the country. But this class of legislation is going to drive them out if they can get the passage money to get out on the Rosalind or the Sylvia or on one of the other boats that go to Halifax and New York. Go down to these boats and you will find the young men of Newfoundland beating it out of the country. And you are not trying to keep them in it—you are driving them out.

(Reads)

Every man meets with criticism I admit. Why should not the Minister of Finance any more than I. He is in a position of trust in the Government, handling the finances of the country. The Finance Minister has admitted in introducing the tariff into this House that he had not had suf-

ficient time to go into it. What I say is that if he did not have sufficient time to consider it carefully he should not have brought it in here; and he knows that himself in his own heart and soul, just as well as I do. He brings in the tariff just as it has been handed over to him by Mr. LeMessurier and Dr. Mosdell, and tells you to vote for it or get out. That is why I am over here tonight, and why I am going to do everything I can by criticism if possible, if not by some other way, to induce the Government to take off some of the duties placed on by this tariff, to try and help out the labourers and fishermen of the country. And I feel that in doing this I am doing the duty that the people of Ferryland District sent me here to do. I am here to represent the fishermen, and not only the fishermen, but I am here to represent the country, and I feel that the people outside the House are not being told the truth. The papers are attempting to deceive the country. We have heard a considerable amount of debate lately in this House on articles appearing in newspapers. We ail know what these articles are like. They are merely attacks on politicians. They do not tell the truth. But it would be well if there were a building large enough in Newfoundland to put in the two hundred and sixty thousand people in Newfoundland and tell them the truth about what the Government has done; and place the Government in that arena, and let the people judge them. If that could be done, I feel sure that the Government as it exists to-day would exist no longer, because I feel that the people would realize that the promises had been broken, and their trust betrayed. We are betraying the people of this country if we vote for this tariff as it is on the table tonight.

(Reads)

In other words the person who wrote this article means to tell me that I have not the interests of the country at heart. I want to tell the writer of that article that I probably have more interest in this country than he has, and I probably will do more for this country than he has done, or possibly ever will do. I wish he were listening to me, and I hope he is. (Reads)

Economy in public expenditure. We hear of economy in public expenditure, and yet the public expenditure this year is practically half a million dollars more than it was last year. The Minister of Finance and Customs no doubt will tell me that there are things included in the estimates this year, that were paid in other years, although they did not appear in the Estimates. That may be so, but the Minister knows, and I told him before in private conversation, that what we should do was to cut out all those additional expenditures altogether, which have been coming in here in additional supply, and then we should be doing our duty, and then this awful man Cashin would still back up the Government to the finish.

(Reads)

Reasonable reduction in taxation. Let us suppose for argument's sake that there is a surplus of one million dollars at the end of the year. Even that would not justify this tariff being passed by this House, because that extra one million dollars would have been wrung from the poorer classes of Newfoundland. It was all very well during the war to pile up extra surpluses. Talking about that I would like to ask if any endeavour has ever been made by any Government to try and induce the Home Government to pay us something on account of the War. I personally do not believe they have, and I believe I am right when I state that Canada has received several millions of

dollars, and Newfoundland has not received a cent, because they have not put their claim before the Home Government. We did our duty during those years of the War, and spent our millions of dollars, and it is only right that the Germans should be made repay to us some small thing at least for our losses during that period. It is the duty of the Government, whether it was the Squires, or the Warren or the Monroe Government, to try and induce the Home Government to give us our share of what they received from the Germans.

(Reads)

"Mr. Cashin's insistence that it should be done without looking into the circumstances of cause and effect is not a financially sound proposition." What is not a financially sound proposition "Mr. Cashin's insistence is not financially sound"—what insistence? What did Mr. Cashin insist—that we should keep on the Income Tax and the Business Profits Tax, and not stick the extra taxation caused by this tariff on the fishermen and the labourers of this country. That, according to this writer, is not a financially sound proposition. Are they not better able to bear the taxation than the fishermen and labourers of this country? Of course they are.

(Reads)

If I was honest . . . . I am just as honest, and more honest than the gentleman who wrote that article; because he knows very well that by that article he is attempting to deceive the people of this country, and he has not pluck enough to put his name to it. He is a coward and probably a traitor.

(Reads)

Certainly I have been sorely disappointed, and I can prove to you why I am. Do you want me to read the Prime Minister's manifesto again to show why I am sorely deceived. I was made a fool of by the Prime Minister and his manifesto. An article written by Esau to deceive the public of this country.

(Reads)

Is not that wonderful? Well rid of one who has criticised their actions. They are well rid of me, and I am very well rid of them; and I would not stay in a party that would take the taxes off themselves and put them on the poor man. If they would pay those taxes, there would be no need to-night to put the duty on these articles. Let them put the Income Tax back on themselves.

Mr. Chairman, I will have some further remarks to make later on, but I want to thank my colleague, Mr. Moore, for having cleared me of the insinuations of the Prime Minister last night. I do not think that the Prime Minister's other remarks amounted to so very much that there is any necessity for me to go into detail on them. It is enough to say that he went into the small things, and forgot the principal things. But as I said, I will have some more remarks to make later.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman, first of all I think that anyone who has listened to the debate during the last forty-eight hours, and who have seen the stand taken by Major Cashin on the question of this Tariff can come to no other conclusion than that he has taken up a position which is highly commendable in the eyes of the electorate of the country. Going to the country as he did with the Government, and laying their policy of retrenchment before the people, he finds in the short space of nine months that the Government instead of carrying out their policy is going in the very opposite direction. There was no other course for him to pursue but the one which he took, in honesty to his constituents who form a large section of those who are af-

fected by the tariff. And when I heard Mr. Moore saying that he was loyal to Mr. Monroe I did not think his statement at all commendable. I think that his loyalty should first be to the people whom he represents, and he should see that they are not excessively taxed as they are to be under this tariff. Does Mr. Moore think he was loyal to the people of Ferryland when he told them he was going in for retrenchment and reduction of taxation. He should have said he would stand with those who are trying to make it easier for the people. His duty is due to the people first and then to the Prime Minister. I have no fault to find with the leader of the Government personally, as I have no doubt but he is a first class and straightforward business man, but he is not carrying out his policy as laid before the people. I am standing by the people and I say that there is no other position for a man to take than that of Mr. Cashin who wants to be true to his constituents and is trying to do what he promised them in the election of 1924. But instead of reducing taxation we find that the Government is helping those who are well off and neglecting the poor. They are putting the burdens on those whose incomes are less than they were last year.

We are now dealing with the man who has to buy a suit of ready-mades or the woman who has to buy a little article for her boy or girl, and I say that that man has now to pay $4 more than he had to pay before for his suit. Is his income increased to that extent? I ask any member on the Government side, has the workingman's income increased by 25 p.c. Not one of them can say to the contrary, and as a matter of fact we find that this winter there were from ten to fifteen thousand people out of employment, and they have to face the Spring with empty pockets. Even those who are working have no increase in wages and they have to face the situation of every article which they wear being taxed 5 p.c. or more. There are a large number of people in this city and throughout the Island who met with straitened circumstances during the last 12 months, and instead of helping them to better their condition the Government reduced their dollar to the value of 80 cents, which is the effect of this tariff going into force. Is that fair and acting justly to the people whom you promised to reduce taxation and lighten their burdens before you came into power. No wonder there is such a revulsion of feeling to-day against the Government. The Government in dealing with this tariff pleads want of time—want of time to plan a reduction of taxation. They had a plan for this before they came into power and instead of following it out, they have increased taxation. In his speech as to the making up of the salaries of the civil servants the Hon. the Minister of Finance said the amount was to be taken out of the contingency and supply account. But the vote to-day is the same as it was last year, and though his statement may possibly be correct, this fact shows there was no thought given to finding out Ways and Means of carrying out the plans as to the civil servants and of fulfilling the promises made to them. If you are going to raise these salaries fifty or sixty thousand dollars there should be a reduction in Contingencies of that amount, but you only say you are making an attempt to do something, leave the vote as before and then plead the want of time to make reduction. But that is not what is done in other countries. In Great Britain the Labor Party was not in power six months when they took steps to reduce the cost of the necessaries of life and cut down the

income tax on those who were finding it hard to make a living. They did not take off the tax altogether, but they lightened the burden. But in this country the effect of the tariff is that the taxes are reduced for the wealthy and increased on those who are least able to bear them. Now take such an article as confectionery. Who is it buys the cheap quality in this line. It is sold in every hamlet throughout the Island, and it is bought by the children of the poor. And how are they treated under this tariff—the duty is increased 6½ p.c. ad. valorem and there is a specific tax of 5c. per pound. It works out that it costs 14 cents per pound now instead of 8 cents last year, but the wealthy who buy the fancy chocolates imported from New York and Boston and which cost 20 cents a pound, have to pay only 9 cents duty instead of 8½ cents last year. Is that doing your duty to the poor and to those who can afford to pay the high figure? That is the kind of tariff we are faced with to-day, and no serious attempt has been made to deal fairly with all. That is why I say this tariff is easier on the rich and harder on the poor. Now a great deal has been said about the Income Tax, but the reason that we have to bear $600,000 extra taxation is because that tax has been removed. Who used to pay it—not the poor people, but those who had incomes of from $3,000 to forty or fifty thousand dollars a year. These latter were in the position to pay and no man who has any thought for those in a less fortunate position than himself should have removed that tax. We should be thinking of one another to-day and trying to help the man who is laboring under taxation. Are we in the position that we are to have no regard for the people of the country who get from $700 to $800 per year? And are they not entitled to give their children a decent education And the tax that these people are being called upon to pay for those who get from five to sixty thousand dollars annually is, in my opinion, a disgrace to every member of this House who supports that proposition. We may go around the country and talk to the working class of people about how concerned we are about their welfare, but I can tell you, Sir, that the discrimination shown in this tariff between the various classes in this community show that we are only considering our own partciular interest. Why should the poorer classes of this country be asked to shoulder the taxes that those who earn from five thousand to sixty thousand dollars should pay? If the wealthy man pays a couple of hundred dollars a year tax, it does not affect the life of his family, and if he pays into the Treasury of this country an income or profit tax he helps out the working classes to whom he owes very considerable; and any man who owns and runs a business in this country owes the producers and those who work for him a share of the money he is making. Now I have no grudge against any man who accumulates a fortune for himself in a right and proper way, but when he grinds it out of the poor man and then goes around and says the reason that a reasonable rate of wages cannot be paid to-day on account of the present taxes, then where does the consistency of his statement come in? And why not lighten taxation so that everyone will get a chance of getting things cheaper than they are at the present time. Now the duties on readymades, under this new tariff, is seventy per cent., and in consequence of this, I do not see how the Minister of Finance can go back to his constituents in a few years' time and say that he has done his duty to them. Judging by the amounts collected at the Cus tom House monthly, as published in

the papers, the Minister of Finance has been doing his duty and I do not see why he cannot still enforce the income tax so that the rich will have to pay for the extra taxation as well as the poor. The putting of an extra duty on readymades amounts to a considerable item in this country. According to the Customs returns of 1923 the sum of $430,000 worth of readymades and with the extra duty put on would make them worth $800,-000. Well, look what that means to the man who has got to go down and buy the suit and dress for his boy and girl. The poorer classes have got to pay something like $50,000 more than they did last year under the old tariff. Then again take tweeds and cloths which are worn by the working class of people in this country. The tariff on these commodities do not affect the rich people at all because they take trips every year to Canada, England and the United States and they buy their readymades and bring them in as personal effects. Now I would like for the Finance Minister to tell me an item in the tariff affecting the well-to-do to the extent of seventy per cent. duty outside of champagne, and even at that the workingman has to pay the same price $4.50 if himself or any member of his family requires a bottle of brandy. and the working people of the country will ask: Where does the Minister of Finance stand by us? Where does he reduce taxation? Where does he reduce the price of overalls? and when he comes around and says that overalls are going to be forty or fifty per cent. or even seventy five per cent. over last year, they say that he has failed in his duty, and did not keep his promises. This not only applies to the workingmen who wear overalls, but it applies to him in regard to the tools that he uses.

And now we come to tweeds and cloths, and I want to say here that this is another item that has been raised from forty to fifty per cent. Every bit of tweed or cloth in the country costs more to-day because of the tariff, and the only people to-day who buy tweeds are the labouring classes, and perhaps a few of the middle class. They go down to-day and they want to buy some tweed or cloth to make a pair of pants for their boy or a dress for their little girl to try make her trim and as pretty as they can. You ought to encourage that more and more by reducing taxation. Instead of that you are making it more difficult still for our people to have their children dressed well. We complain about the unsightly conditions that we see in St. John's and some of the outport constituencies, and we sometimes feel ashamed of the conditions that we see there. Well, if that is not the greatest hypocrisy that has ever been got off in this country I do not know what hypocrisy is. If there is any sincerity in those statements, if you want to see people looking better and better dressed, this Government has to do more than it is doing at present. You are certainly not helping it by increasing taxation. All people like to have their children well dressed when they are going to school. How many children are complaining that their dresses are not as pretty as other children's, and they do not want to go to school on that account.

It is all very well to smile at that sort of thing; but it does not alter the facts that you are making it still more difficult for these people to meet the demands of their families and have they not just as much right as anybody else to have their children dressed well.

I say, Mr. Chairman, that the Tariff is not creditable to the present Government, and that is putting it

very mildly. Now, I made a statement the other day in regard to tobacco. Tobacco is used by everybody in this country with the exception of a very few people. It is regarded as a necessity by hundreds of people to-day. The man who is out in his boat catching fish requires it, and the man who has to concentrate very much. There is no question about the use of tobacco to-day, and the great majority of men would rather do without their breakfast than without their smoke. I am not going to discuss the figures of the statement of the Prime Minister with regard to the undertaking that he got from the Imperial Tobacco Company; but I do say that any one here to-day who uses tobacco who goes to any tobacco store and asks the price of tobacco will find that it is gone up two, three and four cents. Well I say that is very unfair to the people to whom they promised to reduce the price nine months ago.

Now take such articles as sewing machines, these have been increased from twenty five to thirty per cent. Who uses them in this country? If you go into any home you will find a sewing machine there. It is used by the people who want to make up a little article that they want for their boys and girls. And instead of helping them out you are going to tax them on machinery and other things 15 per cent. more. In other words those things that cost thirty dollars is going to cost six dollars more than last year. And the people who use sewing machines are the labourers and the working man, and perhaps a few of the middle class. I can't see how they are increasing the earning power of the people when they are increasing the taxes. Instead of increasing their earning power, they are reducing. The dollar of last year with this tariff is only worth 80 cents in effect.

MR. K. M. BROWN—Mr. Chairman, I rise first to congratulate Major Cashin on the noble stand that he has taken in this House last night; on the noble stand he took in crossing the floors of this House, because he was against the tariff that is now before the House. Major Cashin in my opinion is acting on his independence, when he left the Government owing to the tariff that we are now asked to pass and put through this House and vote on. He is an independent man, who went to the country with the Monroe party in May last and preached the doctrine of a square deal to all, and when he came to a point where he saw that the country was not getting a square deal, and that the Government was introducing a tariff in this House that he knew would be detrimental to the working classes and fishermen of this country, he asserted his independence, and said that he would not be a party, or a member of a party who would put through that tariff.

Not only the Opposition, but the country to-day congratulates Major Cashin on the action that he has taken. Mr. Cashin, although young in politics like myself, this is his second time to be elected to this House of Assembly, has seen that by this tariff the people of this country, and the fishermen and labouring classes particularly, are not getting a square deal. I quite agree with him. There was nothing else open for him to do. He had either to cross the House, or swallow this thing holus bolus, which he refused to do.

Major Cashin, in my opinion, can go back to-day to the District of Ferryland and tell his constituents why he did cross the House, and when he has explained fully to them why, they will send him back again with a greater majority than he ever was sent back with. The name Cashin is not mud in this country yet. I

must admit that only about nine or ten months ago I sat in Opposition to Major Cashin, and we had our little spats across the floors of this House, and I admit that in a friendly way we differed in our views. He is the son of a man who has been Prime Minister of this country, and the name of Cashin has gone down in the history of this country as being the name of a man who has done his part in this country, and his son to-day is trying to do the same, and I extend to him my very hearty congratulations.

I would like to ask here to-night Mr. Chairman, where is the square deal—where is the reduction in taxation that we were promised just ten months ago, and the answer to that question is right here in this tariff that is before the House tonight. The reduction in taxation that was promised is not forthcoming, but instead we have an increase of anywhere from seven hundred thousand to a million dollars in taxation. The Government that I was associated with some time ago, and which has been so much criticized never taxed the people of this country, the fishermen in particular, as much as this Government that we have to-day. But the names of the leaders of that Government were drawn through the country, and termed to be the hypocrites of Newfoundland. But what have we got to-day? The name of Sir William Coaker has come up in this House on a good many occasions during this session, and we have heard of all the wrongs that he did. But what about the good things he did as well as the bad things. He is blamed for the fish regulations that were in force in this country two or three years ago. He has got all the blame of it; but where are the men who appended their names to those papers as well as Sir William Coaker. Where are the men who backed him on Water Street—the merchants who backed him in bringing in these regulations. When they saw that they were not going to be a success and were not going to be for the benefit of Newfoundland they backed out of it, and blamed Coaker, but the name of Coaker will live in this country when many of these people are gone out of it. Coaker! He has been looked down upon, but he is the first man in this country that ever made any attempt to uplift the fishermen and working classes of this country. They can talk about him to-day, and they can ridicule him, but I would like to know what man down on Water Street to-day has more brains than Sir William Coaker. He is not there, although Sir William Coaker is turned down to-day, and in some places despised. Who is the man who first educated the fishermen and brought them up to learn and know what things were happening in this country, and in the foreign markets. Take the position of our fishermen with regard to the foreign markets twenty years ago. I speak this because I am the son of a fisherman, and I am a fisherman myself, and I have been through the mill, not only on this coast, but on the Pacific coast and on the Banks of Alaska. Not only that, but I have been on the bridge of a steamer and have mastered her, and that is why I speak to-day in defence of the man who has come out in this country and has tried to uplift the working man, and the fisherman of the country. What were the fishermen told many years ago. The fishermen who went down to Labrador and brought back big voyages of fish. They were told when they came back to St. John's that because the fish was plenty and the voyage was good, they were told that the fish markets were poor. There was black fever, or there was small pox, or some other disease in the markets. They were told that there was everything wrong

with the fish markets, and the result was that they only got a couple of dollars a quintal for their fish, and perhaps in some cases they only got $1.50. But you have never heard of black fever, or small pox since Coaker came along. He seems to have killed out all these diseases in the foreign markets, and he is the best doctor that this country has ever seen.

There was a man who was my great, great grandfather who sat in the first parliament of this country under Responsible Government. He may have been like me or not—I do not know. What he did, I do not know, but if he did not do as much for this country as the present representatives of some districts to-day, I say it is very little credit to him.

He was a merchant too, and he had several foreign going vessels, and sealing vessels at that time, and when he died he left something like sixty to eighty thousand pounds, dry money, for those who came after him. But how did he get it. He sweated it out of the labouring men of this country, and out of the fishermen. In that day when a man got fifty dollars, even if he brought back five thousand dollars worth, that was all he got. That is the way it was in those days, and I have got books up in Bonavista Bay, showing that they sold flour for fifty dollars a barrel, and pork for a hundred dollars a barrel.

These are the sort of things that should be told to the people of this country. These were the class of men that the fishermen had to deal with in those days. They used to make the fishermen believe that the merchants were going in the hole every year, while in fact they were fleecing the fishermen right and left. If the representatives for Bonavista District is not going to do anything better than bring in this tariff to-night, that the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance and Customs have brought in, I do not think they are much better than the people of those days. If this is all they can do for the fishermen, all I have to say is God help the fishermen. If I have said anything wrong, Mr. Chairman, I will take it back.

MR. CHAIRMAN—It is a good prayer.

MR. BROWN—Yes, it is a good prayer. We are all asking God to help us and to help the country, because it seems that the country is in a very bad condition to-day.

It is just three or four years ago since the late Government was in power, and when men came to the bar of this House and asked for assistance. What was the thing like then? I know that the state of things to-day is worse in St. John's than it was then, but there is no one coming to the bar of the House, and I would not like to see them come here. Where is the square deal that the Prime Minister promised them in this manifesto that I have here before me?. Where is the square deal? It is all right for members of this House to get up and say that they are trying to give a square deal to all, but where can you give a square deal to the country when you are spending two million dollars on tourist roads which will bring in very little or no money to this country; and at the same time you put on extra taxation on the poor people. Is that the way that a square deal is to be given?

I did not intend, Mr. Chairman, to speak any more on this, but it made my blood boil, so that I could not help getting up. I am a labourer, and I speak too-night as the champion of labour. I have fought for labour in the past, and I am prepared to keep on fighting for labor in this House until I am carried off the floors of this Assembly. But I will say this, that before I am carried off the floors, there will be someone go to Heaven.

In Mr. Monroe's manifesto he said:

(Reads)

Well God help us, if Coaker could not run the affairs of this country better than they are doing it now.

(Reads)

Undoubtedly he would surround himself with men created by him. Coaker brought up the men of this country, and tried to give them a square deal, but when the times became bad in this country. Coaker tried to do something for the people of the country, he was hissed down, and vilified by some people. He was pounced upon, and the blame for everything was put on him. The time is coming, Mr. Chairman, when the working classes of this country will realize that they have not been getting a square deal, but they will soon come into their own. I do not mean to read all this manifesto of the Prime Minister, but there is one place in the manifesto where he says:

"The men whom Coaker had with him, were tools—tools of Coaker."

But I want to tell you now, Mr. Prime Minister, that I was on Coaker's ticket in Twillingate, and I am not a tool of Coaker, and I would not be a tool for you. I speak of this, Mr. Prime Minister, because I am a native of this country; I was born here and so were my forefathers, except perhaps the old fellow I referred to, and I don't know how he blew in, whether he was shanghaied on the other side somewhere and thrown aboard a vessel or whether he was not. Anyhow all the Browns in Bonavista are his offspring. I speak, Sir, as a Newfoundlander. I had to leave the country to get a living and I went to the Pacific Coast, and I have fished in a dory on the Banks. I had to go through my degrees, and though I do not blow as much about it as some People do of their performances in this House, I rose up to be a master, and I can navigate a vessel around the world. But to-day I am back here again and fighting for the workingmen and I will go the limit in doing so, and I don't care who knows it. When you speak of the codfishery you are only touching the surface. We all know it is the most important, but there are other fisheries you have not touched at all. Where do you leave the halibut fishery, which is as good or perhaps better than the cod. This is a fish which takes the first place on the menu in the largest hotels in the world. It is being caught to-day in Port aux Basques and they cannot sell it at 2½ cents a pound. You have to pay 30 cents a pound for it along the railway. The people cannot get a market for it and what is the Government doing about it. I know about halibut because I was shipmates with the biggest cargo, the record cargo, that was ever brought in. That was in 1911. But the Government is not doing anything to help this which is the best fishery we got and where are we going to get off. We are only going from bad to worse. I asked here today, what are the people going to do when this tariff is passed—what are the labourers and the fishermen going to live on; but there was no answer. You have all heard Major Cashin tell the story of the man fishing in Fortune Bay with nothing on but a pair of rubber boots and a suit of oilclothes. If his oil clothes have now worn out he will have to go naked in the future, as he will be able to buy no more under this tariff. It will be a great sight to see men fishing on the Banks with no clothes on and still the Government is trying to make us swallow the idea that they are giving a square deal to all. Forget it. The workingmen could not subsist on 25 cents an hour before, and what are they going to do now. Starve is the only thing I can see. Now I am going to

speak about the Humber business. The Hon. the Prime Minister says in his Manifesto:

(Quotes Manifesto)

But are they well paid and housed. I say "No."

(Quotes Manifesto)

What was the prime object with the Prime Minister, last year when the strike was on at Corner Brook? Did the Prime Minister go out there and fight for the men? I worked with these men for eight years, long enough for them to know me. I had to work for my living like themselves. Now as to this trouble on the Humber. Wasn't there trouble there the other day? But the Press said nothing about it. As far as I know the story, the French Canadians there the other day interfered with some of our men and their wives on the streets, and then the Newfoundlanders broke loose and broke some of them up. And one of the police officers was broken up too. That is the square deal the Newfoundlanders are getting on the Humber. I am speaking in the interest of the laborers who earn their living by the sweat of their brow, and I want to endorse the words uttered by Mr. Cashin last night. He had the courage of his convictions and he acted in the right. Now getting back again to the days of our forefathers. The people then did not know if they were living or dead or if they were coming or going. At that time they had to risk their lives at the seal fishery and had to pay three dollars for their berths. That has been wiped out, but would it be if men had not come forward to fight the merchants? I have been fighting for the workingmen for seven years and I have been called a Bolshevik and a Red by some on the other side because they believed what they were told. I led the strike of 1500 men at Grand Falls in 1921. The unions were called together, I was elected chairman and called on to lead the strike, and I did so to the satisfaction of all, and I doubt if there was ever another strike led so well. I did my duty by the workingmen and I am not ashamed to say it because it was in behalf of the laborers, and to-night I oppose the tariff for the very same reason. I oppose this tariff because it means destitution throughout the country and that many a woman and child who need a skirt or boots will never get them if this goes through. It was stated the other night that this was going through—and I do not doubt but it will—but what is going to happen? Is this carrying out the promises that the Hon. the Prime Minister made last year? Is this carrying out the promise of reduced taxation, a square deal to all and a bonus on fish? We all know that the passing of this tariff is to the detriment of the country at large, but not of the well-to-do, as the taxes are taken off them though they are put on the fisherman's supplies, and he will have to pay 10 p.c. more on his clothing and everything else. And yet we are asked to put this tariff through. No wonder there is confusion in the Government ranks and Mr. Cashin left them and crossed the floors. I would do the same thing if I were with a party which brought in a tariff to lower the standards of living of the common people. The Minister of Finance made reference in his speech this afternoon to hypocrites. Who they are I do not know and he is not here now to explain, but I hope he does not mean the Opposition, and in particular I hope that he does not mean me. He spoke of a cablegram that came from Sir William Coaker. Well, I want to tell him that I did not see it. In talking about hypocrites he spoke about Sir William Coaker in a most unfriendly manner in regard to making money out of a loan. But, be that as it may, I want to say to-night

that I am entirely opposed to the tariff now before the House, because if I supported it my constituents would turn me down, and I do not think that the members of the Government think it is a right tariff either, although they may be prepared to vote for it. Now what is the reason for such increased taxation? The wages of the workingman, which averages 25 cents an hour, has not increased, and if a man cannot support himself and his family on 25 cents an hour on the old tariff, how in the name of common sense can he support them under the new tariff. It is well known that practically everybody throughout the country is up in arms against this new tariff, and I have letters in my possession now from supporters of the Monroe Party saying that when they voted against me last Spring they thought that they were voting for a square deal to all. Now I fail to see to-night where that square deal has come in

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman, we have been witnessing within the past few days a certain excitement contingent with the discussion of the new tariff in this House, and from the number of auditors we see here to-night, I think it will be generally agreed that the people seem to be taking a greater interest in the proceedings of the House of Assembly they they have heretofore. Last year when the question of tourist roads was first spoken of, and right up to the opening of the House this year it was currently reported that Major Cashin was against the idea of tourist roads, and when the Budget Speech was laid upon the table of this House his sentiments were against it on the grounds that it increased taxation rather than decreased it. Now Major Cashin has taken his stand. He has left the Government ranks, and in doing so he has asserted his independence, and he has given his reasons for leaving the Government, and I think that he is to be congratulated on having the courage of his convictions. In this tariff, as I have said before in discussing it, we see a considerable increase and honorable members here and the public generally are well aware that there is a considerable increase in it, and I would like for any member of the Government to-night to point me out one article in that tariff on which there is not an increase. It is a general increase which has been sprung upon the people of the country at a time when the people are looking to be relieved somewhat from taxation. Economy had been preached from every platform by the Government and economy was expected in the management of our public affairs, but instead of economy we got increased expenditure. Now the sum and substance to a large extent of the increase in this tariff lies in the Estimates which have been before this House. How is it that the Monroe Government did not live up to the promises they made to the electorate, and did not cut down expenses instead of increasing them? People are beginning to wonder what is going to happen to the country because we cannot go on as we are going. We had hoped, everybody had hoped that a new era of prosperity had come in and that there would be some evidence of reduction in taxation and some evidence of economy practised, but on the other hand we find that that policy has not been adhered to; and if we are going to spend two million dollars on tourist roads we are going to increase our interest charges to the extent of another hundred thousand dollars. The idea of building new roads is not a move in the right direction because it will compete with our own railway. There was a deficit of between thirty five and forty thousand dollars more on

the railway for January and February of this year more than there was for the same two months last year, and I contend that the spending of two million dollars on roads to compete against our own railway is only increasing expenditure and increasing our National Debt. The Finance Minister said this afternoon that he realizes that this was an imperfect tariff in certain regards and that within a year or two it would be changed further. I do not see any reason why the Government should have accepted this tariff as it is and sprung it on the country without giving more consideration to it than they have given it. In fact the Government did not give that consideration to the tariff that its importance merited, and it is an evidence of their inability to rule the country. If there is any inclination on the part of the Government to reduce taxation and change the tariff, now is the time to do it because the people who returned the Monroe Party to power expected it. Why add on 25 or 30 p.c. on articles this year and next year reduce it 5 or 10 p.c. I think it is better to err on the right side and it is better to put on a low rate of extra duty this year and next year, if necessary, increase it, rather than increase it now and decrease it next year. You will find that your present policy of adding taxation will be against the best interests of the trade as well as against the wishes of the people of the country generally. What evidence have we to-day of the policy of economy and retrenchment that was preached by the Monroe Party last year. First of all, take the Pensions list, which has been increased by several thousands of dollars.

I find here that there are certain sums, pensions, varying in amount from $80, $300, $325, $500, $1,090, $1,344 up to $2400. Now, Mr. Chairman, in regard to this pension question I hold decided views on the matter. And when it comes to the time that a man has to be pensioned I consider that the majority of men who have been drawing large salaries can afford to live on much less salary. They ought to have saved it out of their large salaries. At any rate why should men living in the outports for instance, why should they have such large discrepancies between them? It costs no more for one man than for another man when he comes to the age of sixty to live. It may cost one man a hundred dollars more but not to a greater extent between them. Then why is there such a difference? Why do you give one man $80 and another man $2400? Is there any justice in that? I see that Capt. Bonia, the liquor controller, is pensioned at $2400. I don't see any pension there for Capt. John Field of the Prospero. Would it not be better to give him half? There are the stenographers that I spoke about when the estimates were under consideration. And I have written letters to three Ministers of the Crown, and I have never received an acknowledgement that they ever received them. Perhaps they were so busy they had not the time to even write me and say "I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter." I have not even had that courtesy extended to me. I have written them asking them to consider certain matters and they have not advised me as to what they were doing in that regard. Where have I been consulted? Where have I been asked if there is anything as far as Twillingate District is concerned that needs attention. I am in this House as independent as any man that comes in here. I beg to say that Mr. Chairman, and when it comes if it ever comes that I cannot speak my own opinion, when I shall be subservient to anybody in this House I shall resign and get out of politics altogether. When the

day comes, if it ever comes, that I can't be square to the people who sent me here I shall not stay here to represent them, if I can't have the courage of my convictions.

There was one matter on which the Prime Minister wrote to me about Twillingate District. I had asked him a little while ago whether or not he could give me any assurance of sufficient money to complete a Shoal Tickle and to deepen a canal, which is an absolute necessity to the fishermen. A tickle thru which the boats have to pass to go and get their squid, and through which the boats have to pass to go and get the herring. This tickle is being filled up by silt. The Prime Minister answered that he did not know where the money was to come from. I asked him was that his answer and he said yes. He spoke about the District having received money from a former Government such and such. Now, Mr. Chairman, I think that since that canal is a necessity and so vital to the fishermen of Twillingate District it is of far greater necessity than the spending of money to build tourist hotels and bring tourists down here. I don't consider it a square deal, and I would tell the Prime Minister so if he were here now. Mr. Chairman, I fail to see what this Government has done since it was returned to power. They repealed the Prohibition Act. I am sure that that will not have a good effect on the country and will not be to their credit.

We are told that the income tax is to be abolished. I paid my income tax. I paid it on a thousand dollars because I am an unmarried man. I am prepared to pay it again. But I submit in all justice that these who have not paid and should have paid, should be got after. Why should one business firm pay it and another be let off scot free? We have not seen within the last couple of years any desire on the part of the Government to curtail expenses or to cut down the taxes drastically. Is it because they want to curry favour? Is it because they feel that they will not be returned to power again if they cut them down? Or what is it? The country as a whole wants the taxes cut down. I don't know what we are coming to. The best thing that could happen is for a Crown Colony or a Royal Commsision to come out here and run us. I have no axe to grind in politics. I am here to try and do the right thing and to stand up for the fishermen of the country; and I want to voice my sentiments in regard to the fishermen and the labour man both in St. John's and in the outports in regard to this tariff. We know the reception that it has met with and I can assure the Hon. Members that the reception that it has met with in St. John's was nothing compared to the reception it received in the outports. In fact if any Member of the Government goes back to his district I would advise him to be well boosted up with arguments if he wants to convince the outport man that he was justified in bringing in such a tariff and inflicting it on the country, at a time, Sir, as I said before when we had hoped that everything would be reduced, at a time when the northern fisheries are about to start. Just at the time when the fishermen are buying supplies for this fishery. I would like to know how much goods passed through the Customs this month. I hope that the Minister of Finance will be able to tell me what gooods passed through in the month of April before this tariff came into effect. And then we will see what came in under the old and compare that with what came in under the new. You are increasing taxation just to provide more revenue. I know that the country has to pay its bills, and I know that it is an

honourable thing for the country to do—to pay its bills. But I do not think that at a time like this that the Government is justified in providing for a surplus of $200,000. I don't consider that fair to the workmen or to the people of this country.

With regard to readymades. We made up here the other night the additional cost for a man who imports a $20 suit of clothes. The additioonal cost is $2.50 more than last year. Do you get that? Do the Hon. members opposite realise it? And still the Minister of Customs tells us this afternoon that the Clothing Cos. have been down to him and are asking him whether or not they could get more protection. The Minister stands up and shows a suit that he had on and tells us that it was made by the Newfoundland Clothing Co. for $35. And still they ask for more protection.

At the present time the Northern Fishery is about to start and what are the prospects this year? The Hon. Members may get up here and say we are singing the annual swan song about the fisheries, but I consider that the vast majority of the people of this country have very little hopes for the fishery this year. It is the labourers and the working people of this country that we are here to represent, and if we do not put up their side of the argument—the men on the street cannot come in here and make his voice heard—we are not doing our duty.

And that is not all that we have to do. The prospects for the fishery for this year are not good. We are told that we cannot look for the same price for fish as was paid last year. We find that there is an increase of five per cent. on the duty of rubber boots including the sales tax. It was in the report of the Board of Trade 1922 or 1923, I do not know which, that a Government of Merchants could cut between one and two millions off the expenditure of this country. I submit that they have been very lax indeed. They have deceived the people of this country that they would make a reduction of taxation but they have increased it. Have any of the hon. members made their voices felt about it? Have they used their influence to have the reduction made in taxation? We will see when this tariff is put into effect. This tariff commission was appointed to consider this tariff and they were to enquire into it. They sought evidence. They asked it from certain people of the country and they also asked it of the magistrates of the outports and other important men as to their opinions as regards the tariff. And here we are told what it is.
(Reads from the Commissions report)

The super-tax and the sales-tax and the sur-tax are all included in this tariff and in addition now we have the five per cent. sales-tax on top of it.
(Reads from the Commissions report)

The Governor-in-Council had the report and they read it over or at least I suppose that they did and now we have it here. It is submitted to the Legislature of this country. But if the commission asked for the ideas of the outports they did not listen to them. The reduction of taxation is quite pertinent, quite important. The outports have been able to earn enough for the past few years to feed themselves but I have no hesitation that they will not be able under this new tariff to cloth themselves and their families.

I say that unhestiatingly because I am conversant with the fishermen. I live in the outports and I am glad to live there, and anything that I can do for the fishermen of this country I mean to do. I am going to make my living in this country and I intend to stay here. I can go out of this country and make a living in Canada or the United States but I want to stay here and I will unless the Government

makes the policy of Newfoundland such that it will make it impossible for a man to live here. Unless the Government takes the pruning knife or the axe and takes action immediately I fear that it will be too late for Newfoundland.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman: Whilst we are on the clothing part of this tariff I think that since I stood out so much for the reduction I think that I should move an amendment. And the amendment that I am going to move is that the duty of clothing be reduced from 65 per cent. to 52 per cent. That would bring the price of clothing back to what it was before. I move the amendment in all sincerity. I claim that under the present tariff clothing is practically impossible for the fishermen and the labourer of the Colony. I am not asking the Government to do anything that they should not do. They should do it not only for the benefit of themselves, but for the benefit of the country as a whole. The people reposed confidence in this Government a year ago and I consider that the Government would be doing the right thing by making this reduction from 65 per cent. to 52 per cent. It may be said that that is not sufficient protection for the clothing companies but that would only make clothes cheaper for the fishermen and the labourer. Since I went to supper this evening I read the paper with a little closer scrutiny than I did this afternoon and in looking through it one would think that I was the only rebel from the Government ranks. Now that is incorrect. That paper knows that is incorrect. Now I am going to tell a story about the Government of this country here to-night as this Government stands to-day. I would ask the people who are here to-night to refrain from applause. I do not want any applause but they can keep on listening to it. But I want to show that I am not the only rebel in the Government ranks. Before I start I want to thank Mr. Brown and Mr. Ashbourne for the kind remarks they made in connection with my leaving the Government. I would like the Minister of Finance brought in here before I go on with my story. Send out for him Mr. Chairman. I will say nothing behind a man's back that I would not say before his face. I will prove to this country that I was not the only rebel in the ranks of the Government. And then I will ask the Government to reduce the duty on clothing. Now they said in this paper that I made an extraordinary confession in this House. I would like to have the Minister of Finance here Mr. Chairman. If he does not come in I will have to tell the story without him. I have to clear myself of the charge that I am not the only rebel. I want no applause. Now we were told here this afternoon that there was a bounty on crows heads. If I go down to the Minister of Agriculture or somebody else I can get twenty five cents for it. However Mr. Chairman I will have to go on with the story because I cannot wait any longer. Sir John Crosbie is come here now. Now this paper has called me the only rebel in the ranks of the Government. Now I listened to the speech of Sir John Crosbie this afternoon and all his patriotic expressions. I agree with him that he should love his country and everyone else should. I am not one of these hypocrites that he referred to this afternoon, nor one of the men who hang around the lobby of the House of Assembly.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—I would like to put the hon. member right. I did not refer to him. I referred to some outsiders.

MR. CASHIN—Now Sir John what I was going to say is this, that I was not the only rebel in the ranks of the Government. There are queer things that have taken place in the Govern-

ment. Most peculiar things that have never been published. There have been matters about the difference of opinion about the various members of the Crown that have never been published. Last fall the Minister of Justice and the Prime Minister and the Colonial Secretary and Sir Patrick McGrath took a trip to Canada to fix the Labrador boundary. Sir John Crosbie while they were gone turned Mr. Morine out of the Executive of this country. The reason for this is not for me to bring before this House. But that will prove that I am not the only rebel in the party. What happened? When the Prime Minister and the Colonial Secretary and the Minister of Justice returned from the curling trip to Canada where they defeated the various Canadian teams, and for which, I understand, some of them got from ten to twelve hundred dollars to go up there for a month. What happened? Mr. Morine, like the cute man that he is, the clever politician that he is, when Sir John fired him out, he said nothing but waited for the return of Mr. Monroe, the man that put him there, and when he came back Sir John Crosbie had made it public all over the city that he was never going to sit with Mr. Morine and what happened? What has happened? I would like to know what has happened. Why is it that they sit there to-day—both of them. I do not know whether they embrace each other every morning when they meet, but I do know that they met in the Council Chamber and had breakfast practically, and then I am told that I am the only rebel in the party—that there was no other friction other than that which was caused by Cashin. Is not that right, Mr. Chairman. Did you not tell in this paper, this Daily News paper that there was no other friction in the party only Cashin. Is that correct. I leave it to the public, and to any intelligent men within my hearing today. What else is this but an hpyocritical attack. A hypocritical paper has attacked me this morning because I had convictions. That was more than they had, because they swallowed the Prohibition Bill last year holus bolus, although their consciences told them they ought to be against it; but because I would not swallow that tariff I was a rebel, and the only one in the party.

I regret, Mr. Chairman, that I have to say this to clear myself, but when I kicked in the party, if I kicked, I kicked on that tariff, and I kicked good and hard, and the result was that I was told that I had to swallow it or get out. But what happened when Sir John Crosbie and Mr. Morine rebelled —were they told that they could sink their differences or get out.

Now this paper here, we all know fostered the prohibition cause in Newfoundland. I am no Prohibitionist I admit, but I voted for that Bill last year on principle. But for goodness sake can't we be consistent. I have tried to be consistent on the tariff. I was against it, and when a person is against any thing it is his duty to vote against it. When all the people connected with that paper who have assailed me to-day, were against the Prohibition Repeal Act, and yet they swallowed it. They try to put milk in it to camouflage it, and then they come out and assail Cashin because he has the courage of his convictions. I ask the Chairman if I am not correct.

When I went to the country under Mr. Monroe, I knew nothing about Mr. Morine, and cared less. I did not go with him. And to-night when I want to move an amendment, the solicitor of the House is out of the country, and I can't get a man to draft it for me.

MR. HIGGINS—I have said that as far as that is concerned I am only too glad to help you.

MR. CASHIN—I know that, but when this House is open, and a man gets paid for a job which necessitates his being here, it is his job to be here. I have nothing against the man. Mr. Hunt is a great personal friend of mine, but if a man gets paid for a job, it is up to him to carry it out. We talk about reduction in taxation—and here these papers are assailing me for nothing.

As I said here this afternoon the duty of a good journalist is to give the people the facts, and if they want to be good decent journalists it is up to them to give out the facts properly and truly. But that which I have before me now is guttersnipe journalism —a personal attack on a young politician who is starting in life in this country. And the hypocrite who wrote that takes milk with his whisky, and then tells us that he is doing the right thing.

Sir John Crosbie and Mr. Morine locked horns together. They were just as much rebels in the party as I was, and they were absolutely opposed to one another, and I know that they are yet. They were going to break the Government—they were going to throw it out. I was accused by the Prime Minister, and I am glad that he has done me the justice to take it back, of trying to induce men to leave that party; and I was told to get out. What did he tell these other gentlemen—did he tell them that they could get out of the party if they did not want to stay in. Is that fair. Is not that a personal attack. Is it right? I claim that it is anything but right, and could be only produced by a foul diseased mind; just as another article written by a man or a woman, I don't know which, who has not got pluck enough to put his or her name to the article.

In moving this amendment on clothes to-night I am telling you in all sincerity, and I am taking advantage of this opportunity to tell this House and the country, although that paper will not tell the country, that I don't care for what they put in that paper I tell them to go ahead. Sir John Crosbie referred to something this afternoon as being like water off a duck's back—it is the same with me and these articles. I will be up here to-morrow afternoon, and if there is anything wrong in that paper, I will tell them something that they won't like. They have their price—seats in the Upper House. How are you. This Government is run on those lines—seats in the Upper House—jobs on the Humber. And they tell me that I am a traitor. They are full of traitors and rebels. You can take it from me—I have been there. And yet they assail me, and say that I was the only rebel. They say that I was staying there as a detective—and they think I was wrong. I was a detective and I am proud to say that I was, because it was in the interests of my party that I was detecting. And I proved my case here this afternoon, and I am going to prove it again now. Mr. Monroe said that I talked this over three or four times. My argument is that I would need to tell it three or four hundred times trying to pound it into the heads of the Government, and still I would have difficulty in doing it. I told them before that they ought to bring up some fish here and cook it, because it is a brain food, and they might well use it as that.

They are coming in here with this tariff and trying to race it through. I have read the report of the Tariff Commission, and I can assure this House that I am going to read it to the House before it closes.. I am going to read the report of the Post Office Department too to this House, because we will never get it in this paper—they won't publish it. It is going to be boring and tiresome, but I am going to read it supposing I drop. And I am

going to defend myself as being a detective. They say that I was dishonourable in being a detective, but I am going to show you that it was not in any way dishonourable, and I am going to illustrate my argument by an incident that happened in the late war. There was a man called General Ironsides, who went into the German ranks, and became a sergeant there. He knew the language very well. He spent a year and a half as a sergeant in the ranks. Now I will ask this House, and the Chairman, if General Ironsides was a detective for the British Government and the British Crown in the German ranks would he have been a traitor if he had to stay in the German ranks and fight against the Germans. No. He stayed there until he found out what he had to find out, and then he came back to the people who sent him, and gave them the information that they wanted. I tell the people of this country that I am in a similar position, Mr. Chairman. The people of Ferryland sent me into the ranks of the Government to act as a detective for them, and see that their interests were safeguarded.

I want to congratulate Mr. Brown on the excellent address he made to-night in connection with the fishermen and the labouring classes of this country, and in putting that amendment to-night, I am doing it in the interests of every labouring man and fishermen in this country; and it is the duty, I say of every member who represents a district where there are labourers and fishermen to vote for that amendment. I do not suppose that they will, but I hope they will. If they do not they are traitors to the country just so far as they vote for the tariff. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to spend much time here just at present. There is a lot of work to be done before this goes through. I have said that I am going to read Colonel Ross's report before the House closes, and we may as well have some of the rumours about that report trashed out now, and here if they are true. I would like to find out if these rumours are correct. This gentleman who was brought down here from Canada, it is generally reported on the street, is a relative of Mr. Morine's. I do not know whether that is so or not. That is what the man in the street is talking about. That Colonel Ross lived at the Cochrane with Mr. Morine, who, they say, wrote his report for him. Then we came into the House and heard that Colonel Ross had gone out of Newfoundland to write his report. I wonder did he charge up the time after he went away.

He recommended the dismissal of twenty or twenty five officials from the department of Posts and Telegraphs, as a means for the Government to reduce expenditure in this country, and since he has gone the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs has not seen fit to do that. If that is so, I think that Colonel Ross's coming to Newfoundland was entirely unnecessary, and he should not have been brought here. If they believe in him, they should have acted on his report, and if they did not believe in him, they should not have brought him down here. However, I have nothing to say against the gentleman. He was well paid for his job.

Now sir, talking again about this paper that says I was a rebel. I think that if I am a rebel,I may be pardoned for saying that it might be better for Newfoundland if there were a lot of rebels here. It might be the best thing to happen to Newfoundland if it had a rebellion. If they brought down this taxation, do you not think it would be better for Newfoundland. They might come in here and make you put the tax back on yourselves, and take it off the poor man. You would not be able to do what you have done—taken the tax off yourselves, and

shoved it on to the poor man. It is the poor man who has to pay every time. As I said this afternoon, if you were put in the middle of all the children and women gathered together, you would never get out alive and the crows would feast on your carcasses. In British Columbia they have a law forbidding the shooting of crows and I have a mind to bring in a bill here to protect them as they must be nearly extinct by now and if all are killed there will be nothing left to pick up the dirt around the country. In British Columbia and elsewhere the crows are used as scavengers. I think Mr. Brown would bear me out if he were here at the moment. I say take off the 65 and put on the 52 and you won't regret it. I have great pleasure, Mr. Chairman, in moving the amendment.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, in supporting the amendment moved by Mr. Cashin that the duty on ready-made clothing be reduced I wish to take the opportunity to say a few words on the tariff. I would be derelict to my duty as the representative of the District of Trinity if I did not voice my sentiments on this matter. I am convinced I am voicing the sentiments of the great majority of the people who honored me by their votes, in protesting against the increase of taxation in this tariff and especially in connection with this vote. I have talked on different questions since the session opened—talked at great length as the papers might say—but that is the only way we on this side can protest against these resolutions with which we do not agree. I do not agree with this increase in taxation, and I think it would not be necessary if the proper thought and consideration had been given the fiscal policy of the country. As I stated before, sufficient thought and consideration were not given to the matter of our financial condition when the Estimates were introduced and we were debating the expenditure for the fiscal year. That's where we made the big mistake, and we find after committing ourselves to the expenditure that we cannot meet it under the old tariff. With the other members that have spoken during the last twenty-four hours I congratulate Mr. Cashin on the stand he has taken, as it shows he has the courage of his conviction. He does not want any member of the Opposition to praise or eulogize him, as it was his own business, and he acted on his own initiative, and it is clear to all that the Opposition could not hold out any inducement to him to take the independent stand he did. And so all the greater are congratulations due him, as he was an important Member of the Government and forfeited all the patronage which might reasonagly be expected to come to him during the term of the Government, which in the ordinary course of events will not terminate until 1928. Therefore, he had three or four years to look forward to as an influential member of the party. He must be regarded as an influential member as he has shown his fitness to represent any district by his ability as a speaker during the last 48 hours and when he was in Opposition in 1923, and has given evidence as a logical and reasonable debater. Therefore we can honestly and sincerely congratulate him when we believe that he acted on principle. His stand is against his financial interest from a political point of view or any other way you wish to take it. He was a member of the Railway Commission and interested in the transportation system of the country, and naturally being in the Government there are ways and means by which he might benefit, but he has forfeited all this and thrown his prospects to the four winds of heaven. If he were a needy member of this House to whom inducements could be held out in the

way of financial, social or political benefit, it might be said he did not act on high principle but crossed the House to further his personal interest. It has been said that since the Executive Government was formed and he was not made a member of it, he has had a grievance. I do not know if this be true or false, but from the best of my knowledge and belief, we did not consult any member of the Government, either Mr. Cashin or anybody else, as to the position he was going to take in connection with this tariff, excepting so far as we spoke from our places on this side of the House. Personally, it never entered my thought to speak to a Member as to what stand he would take. Why should I? But getting back to Mr. Cashin, and the reason for his leaving the Government, members on that side have said it was a personal one. I do not know as to the truth of that, but why should he not be in the Executive. It is a surprise to all who have been following the trend of politics in this country to find that he is not a member of that body. His father is a man of great influence in politics, and his name was used in certain districts to return this Government to power. His prestige, money, name and his son were put at the service of the Monroe party, and it would only be natural when the father was dropping out after thirty years of politics that the son should be considered by any party coming into power, whether Coaker, Squires, Warren, Monroe or anybody else. Mr. Cashin is equal in ability and experience to a great many in the Executive, and if he had a feeling that he was not treated properly he was right, though I do not know if such a thought influenced him in leaving the Government, but it has been said in the papers and hinted at in this Assembly. Be that as it may, perhaps it is much better that Mr. Cashin should be untrammelled in this respect, because when a man is a member of the Executive he may submit to a great many things that he would not stand for if he were only in the rank and file He now has greater freedom of action, and perhaps after all it is better that he was not in the Executive. On the other hand it may be regretted that he was not in it, as possibly he could have used his influence, and the tariff would not be tabled in the form it is now, but made to bear less heavily on those who can least support it.

What better reason can be given to influence a member of any Party to change his allegiance than the tariff that is now before the House and particularly in consideration of the promises and the policy that were instilled into the minds of the people who sent the Government back to power. Personally, I do not know exactly what I would do if I were a member of the Monroe Government. I never make a pronouncement unless I am fairly sure of carrying it out; but if ever there was anything that would cause me to change my allegiance to any Leader, it would be this tariff. It was suggested this afternoon by a member of the Government that a member of any Government should be loyal to his Leader, irrespective of what was done. That statement may be correct in part; but not in words, because the stand we took as a Government in connection with certain matters put us where we are to-day, but we acted on principle and we thought that we were doing what was right. I am a good Party man and I will support a man so long as he is Leader, unless something happens to make me act differently, and I would not blame any other man for doing the same thing. If there was any question that arose in political life which would cause me to change my allegiance to any Leader or to any Party, I do not know of any more serious or of greater importance than the tariff we are discussing at the present time, and I am

not surprised to find that the rank and file members of the present Government, according to reports, signed a round robin asking the Executive Government to meet them with a view to considering the tariff and asking if some changes could not be made in it, but evidently reasons were given which have influenced the majority of the Government to support the Prime Minister and his Government in the tariff we are now asked to accept. But I would still appeal to the members of the Government to re-consider that tariff because it is a hardship on all classes whether rich or poor. It may not bear heavily on the business man, whom we are told, is always prone to take advantage of a change in tariff and mark up his goods. It is like the law of supply and demand and if there is a shortage in any particular line of goods the business man puts up the price accordingly. It is the consumers of this country who will have to pay through the nose on account of this tariff. They will not alone have to pay the increased percentage on the tariff but the profit on that increased tariff and on the goods that will be sold for the next three or four months the consumer will have to pay from twenty to twenty-five per cent. more than he would if the tariff had not been increased. This tariff is the greatest disappointment and the saddest piece of business that one can think of. With regard to the fish situation, conditions are not as good as they were twelve months ago, and this tariff is not going to assist in any way to create a confidence that will lighten the burden of the fishermen and give the fisherman more supplies to prosecute the fishery next Summer; but right the opposite. Therefore, what better excuse or reason could a member of this House, a representative of the fishermen, have for leaving a Party, and it is the bounden duty of every member of this House to protect the interests of the constituents who sent him here, and, for that matter, to protect the interests of the people of the whole country. It is our duty to do all we can to have this Tariff modified. You said that you were going to reduce taxation, then carry out your policy. Carry out your manifesto, and then you will merit the confidence of those who sent you here. That is the only way in which we can voice the sentiments of the electorate that sent us here in protesting as strongly and as loudly as we can against the adoption of this tariff.

I am absolutely convinced that this tariff will bring anything but what is desired by the people of this country at the present time. The business people have no confidence in it, the working man has no confidence in it, and the fisherman has no confidence in it, and if he has no confidence in it he will not prosecute the fisheries. And it is not what you get for a quintal of fish that counts altogether, it is what it costs you to catch that quintal of fish that counts. The costs for supplies will be more this year than last year, and unfortunately I am inclined to believe that we will not get the same price this year.

Now Mr. Chairman, you realize that we have a duty to perform to those who sent us here, and we must not let this tariff go through without showing to the country that some of us at least have the courage of our convictions and that we are determined to talk to it and against it. If pleading with the members of the Government would have any effect I would plead with them. I would appeal to their conscience and to their common sense to consider the action that they are going to take when they vote on the amendment proposed by Mr. Cashin. Do you want the people to go to the Grand Banks half clad? Do you want the people in the extern outports to be living

under conditions that to a great many people who have not witnessed such conditions are unknown. Children half clad and poorly fed.And it would make your heart sick if you were to see the conditions under which many people in our own country live, suffer and die. And if the pictures of actual conditions were portrayed on canvas and represented as the conditions of those who are living in China or Japan, why you would have missionaries appealing to the Members of this House to send help and relieve the condition of those people.

Of course there are some people who are always down and out, but if some of us had no better chance than the fellow who is down in the depths of poverty it is questionable whether we would be better off or not. It is largely a matter of circumstances and environment. But the Legislature is responsible to a certain extent for the conditions of the people of this country because they have not the wherewithal to supply themselves with the actual necessaries of life and the procuring proper clothing for their children to protect them from the rigours of the climate during the winter months. A young lad was brought to the Morgue for post mortem examination this winter, and what the doctor found was physical defects and frost bites. A fine body crippled. Why, there are boys of nine and ten years of age out in the woods when they should be at school. They are half clad and half fed, and this Government who went to the country with the cry of reduced taxation and expenditure, they are eight months in office and instead of reducing taxation they are going to saddle the country with a half a million dollars of increased expenditure. And that is done in spite of the pronounced policy of the Prime Minister, and the army of officials that worked for him and his party throughout the country, and preached the doctrine of economy and reduced taxation, I don't know what they think of the proposition now to increase expenditure by half a million dollars and pile on an extra taxation of about a million dollars. Is it honest because we have no appeal from the unemployed of the city; it is honest because we have no man from Trinity District who is in destitute circumstances coming here to St. John's that we should tax them out of existence? And then the Government takes great credit to itself because they have not spent as much money on relief in the outports as was spent a few years ago. The Prime Minister said last night that he would defend his policy in every respect. Well, I can't see how any member of the Government from the Prime Minister down can defend his policy in any respect. I cannot for the life of me see how a policy of increased expenditure can be defended.

When you speak of the policy of increased expenditure you mean increased taxation, because the two go hand in hand. If you increase expenditure for the improvement of public utilities and for the other expenditure that the Colony wants without making the burden of taxation any heavier there might be some excuse, but that cannot be done. You cannot increase expenditure without increasing taxation and that is what you are up against at the present time. And that is the reason that we are so interested in that matter of increased taxation. It is not my idea that the reduced tariff would bring about a better condition of affairs in the country. That was talked at us, and preached to us and the whole country by the very men who are the Executive members of the Government to-day, and the very same men are putting the increased tariff into effect. We did reduce taxation even if we did have a deficit. The Finance Minister, in his Budget

Speech of last year, was honest enough to admit that. The Government has to meet its bills. And there is need in this country for millions of dollars for public improvement, but the trouble is that we cannot afford it. We cannot afford better roads in this country. But the road policy of the Government is providing for the expenditure of two million dollars on roads, but it's nonsense for the Government to do this, because the people of the country have not the necessaries of life. They cannot prosecute the fisheries because of the cost of lines and twines, and their traps and gear have deteriorated during the last three years or so and they cannot afford to repair them. How can they afford to purchase supplies? The merchants will certainly hesitate to issue unlimited supplies. The increased taxation will prevent them from giving out the supplies that they would otherwise have given. But I must bring my remarks to a close. Unless I look at the clock I do not know that I am talking. But I could go on for hours on this subject from one point to another because it is dealing with the question before the chair. It is the financial policy of the Government that we have to consider and the burdens of the people of this country will depend on what is done in this matter that we are now discussing. Now the Prime Minister said that there was no waste of public moneys. Very well, we will let that go. We got value for all the money we spent. Have we got the value for the money that has been given out in dole for the last few months? That is not money at all. That is only groceries. Only something to eat and drink. Certainly the definition of money has changed. I do not know what money means when the Prime Minister says that we got value for the money that has been spent. An average of ten thousand dollars have been spent each week in this city for the past few months and we did not get one cent monetary return for that expenditure. This is what the Minister of Finance said in his Budget last year about able-bodied relief:

(Reads.)

That is not able-bodied relief at all. Are all those people who are getting relief sick. They cannot break rocks or build roads or put up retaining walls or do anything like that. There are a hundred and one items that they could do in connection with the improvement of the city. The Minister of Finance last year gave the reason for the deficit and here it is:

(Reads.)

We were not so bad after all. Then the people could prosecute the fishery. That gave them encouragement to do so. Something was done for the revival of trade. It brought millions of dollars into the country and with that there was the industry that has been developed on the West Coast for which the outgoing Government was responsible and for which the present Government took no credit at all. That was the best policy, although there was a deficit. There is one thing that the people cannot understand, and that is that the Prime Minister has estimated a surplus and yet there is this increase of taxation. Now the Minister of Finance said that the salaries that were paid to the civil servants would be included in the estimates and this is the reason that he gives for this:

(Reads).

The Civil Servants per centage Reduction Act was repealed last year. Some of them were receiving perquisites and bonuses but now they are to receive straight salaries. That was in June, 1924. Now I have here the Auditor General's Report under

Section 33B of the Audit Act. It is this:

(Reads).

Even the good intentions of the Minister of Finance could not be put into effect. We will wait until they bring in the Supplementary Supply, and then we will see what the Government is going to do in the matter of New Appointments. Some of the Civil Servants have had increased salaries, and there have been some new apopintments with increased salaries. Here is the number of increases in the Posts and Telegraphs Department. Eighteen of them . . . . . salaries paid for appointments made without even order in Council. Then you come to nearly every department, where the salaries were increased, and big bonuses given. The Auditor General says this:

(Reads).

Well, without taking any more time on this matter it is sufficient to say that Supplemental Supply will be very large this year. Not all of that was contracted by the present Government. Some of those officials had been receiving salaries previously, but I am talking about the principle of the thing. Quite a lot of them were apopinted by the present Government.

(Reads).

That is one of the faults of the Administration of Government. It is the quarrelsome official that gets increases, and the quiet official who just sits down and does his work is not noticed. But the fellow who is wrangling, and quarrelsome is listened to and given something to keep him quiet.

(Reads).

And see the result of carrying out the spirit as well as the letter. There were good intentions. To use a common expression—the road to hell is paved with good intentions. But we want more than good intentions—the country wants something practical, and not visionary. They want something good from this Government. This Government assumed control of affairs of this country under different circumstances than previous Governments, and the people expect something different from them. This Government went to the country with a catch-cry that sounded very well to the people—"clean up, keep clean and a square deal to all." The Government was returned, and has forgotten all about that cry, and the people are beginning to see that they have no intention of carrying out their promises. I can see the handwriting on the wall, now, and you are now being held up to the gaze of an outraged electorate, over this tariff, and when you go back to the country, whoever opposes you, I don't care who it is, will beat you. The promises you made have been forgotten—they have been forgotten over night, and in the absence of a new crowd, we will be elected and you will be defeated. Why? Because the people expected something more than the ordinary from Mr. Monroe, as Prime Minister. He was not an ordinary man, and he was not looked upon the same as another man. He was looked upon as a man with a clean business reputation, and who was sound and practical in his ideas. The people expected sound business Government. Now you cannot put your pronouncements into effect. If you were going to do what you told the people you would do, you would not submit to any dictation—you would leave the Government altogether if necessary, and let somebody else run it. You have got right to that stage now, and it cannot be successfully contradicted that the Monroe Government has lost the respect of the country, and the confidence which was reposed in you some months ago, because you have not

carried out your promises. The country are your judges. You will say that you have not had time in eight short months to carry out your promises, and you ask the country not to judge you on eight months' work. That is just the time in which the country is going to judge you. We were accused here last night of wasting time. I do not think that I am wasting time. We have not wasted time during this session of the Legislature. We have not obstructed legislation. Bills have gone through this House which we never saw until the second reading was over; and we would have had more legislation put through if it had been prepared in time. In the early stages of the session you were unable to adjourn the House for two or three days in order to give us time to consider the Address in Reply, because you said it was wasting time. You were so taken up with that idea that you did not have time to consider the Report of the Tariff Commission, and you took the report from that Commission and placed it on the Table of the House and said there it is—take it or leave it.

If I had enough with me, or if I had the physical endurance, you would not close this House by the last of May, because it is the bounden duty of every member of the Opposition, to try and prevent the Government from passing this tariff.

The Finance Minister, last year, in his Budget Speech—which I think he delivered here some time in July or August, said that he could not then put the report of the Tariff Commission on the table, and would have to let the tariff stand over. There was some excuse for the Finance Minister last year not doing anything with the tariff; and it would be much better if he had not done anything with it this year. In his Budget Speech last year, he said:

(Reads).

Seven or eight months ago the Finance Minister regretted that he did not have an opoprtunity to consider the report of the Tariff Commission. Those seven or eight months have passed. He might have been busy cleaning up the Post Office, so that there would be no crop of potatoes up there next year, and he might have been doing his duty in going to Corner Brook to look after the Customs work up there, but the most important thing for himself as Finance Minister, was the report of that Tariff Commission. Now he realizes it when it is too late. He must realize it. And he knows in his own heart and soul that he made a mistake when he repealed the Income Tax Act. He knows that. Seven-eighths of the people in this House threw their hats in the air when they heard that there was going to be a repeal of the Income Tax Act. I am no financier, but I have certainly been long enough in the Government in connection with public affairs in this country to know when I opposed the repeal of the Income Tax Act that we could not afford to repeal it. I would have supported it if it could be repealed without increasing the tariff, but I was absolutely certain that it could not be done.

It was said people were stretching their consciences in making out their income tax returns. One reason was that they would be guilty of a sin in making false returns. We are regarded as a law-abiding people, still it is openly admitted that we use every means to avoid paying our legitimate bills to the Government, whether we are wealthy or not. That sort of thing is what is putting the country in the condition it is to-night, because we make ourselves think we are honest, while in the true sense we are not.

That applies to rich and poor, and to all classes, high and low,good and bad, and it is no use for us to try and save our conscience when somebody offers the suggestion that we are trying to break the law. We are all more or less guilty. Anyone trying to carry out the law is looked upon as an imbecile and told that he is too simple minded for this age of materialism. That's the thanks a politician gets for trying to obey the laws. Do you think a politician can get credit for acting on principle and observing the law? If men who have been occupying positions of emolument and were in the Government for a few years were retired from public life without means, the people would not believe them if they said they were poor, and would reply that they should have feathered their nest. That's tbe encouragement a politician gets. When I had to go to the Walker Inquiry and give the reason for an amount of $30.00 being entered in my name, I was pilloried, but if the sum had been $30,000 I would have been called a clever fellow. If any amount should have been entered to the account of pit props it was the amount placed against my name. I went to Port Union with the Honorable Dr. Campbeell purely and simply because the Executive sent me there on a vital question of the day, which was causing the Government many anxious nights, whether you believe it or not. What did the Opposition say then? Talk of taking the name of God in vain in this House, they said for God's sake why don't you do something for the people. At that time the people had to have work, and we went down there as we could not do the business by letter or telegraph to arrange for employment for the people during the winter, and our trip was just as important as the Government members made to Ottawa or Montreal recently. We are not morally honest to ourselves, the country or our constituencies if we vote for this tariff as it is, because it means a set-back to the business and fishery interests of the country. The Honourable the Minister of Finance went on to say:

(Quotes.)

"I observe their cheerful endurance." Now there is a limit to everything, even cheerfulness, and there is nothing to cheer but everything to discourage in this tariff. The people who were cheerful and buoyed up with the hope that this Government intended to lighten the burdens they were carrying will now be saddened and disappointed. How they can exist under the conditions which this tariff will create I do not know. They have only one way of expressing their dissatisfaction with the Government and that is through the ballot boxes. The Government of to-day may feel confident that they are safely entrenched in office, and the people if they manage to live till then will forget it all when the next election comes round. I do not know if that is in the mind of the Government or not, but places of emolument and pay and a living are not all that count. People have said to me on the attitude which I took when I could have acted differently to my financial benefit "we admire you for it, a living is not all." But I appreciate the fact that members must live like anybody else, and a position of emolument appeals to them, and there is every reason for a man weighing the situation from every angle before differing from his leader, and I know it is a trying time for the Government. I give them credit as a politician for having the hope of doing the best for the country, and not for putting on taxation because the people would not rebel against it. That would be cowardly, and I do not atttribute such conduct to them.

Unthinkingly a person may do it, but that is not good enough. Certainly we are differently constituted from that. Any man who has a beast of burden likes to treat it right and no

man will force his horse up a hill with a load that he cannot bear. It would neither be selfishly wise nor humane. Well how are we treating the people of this country with regard to this load of taxation? Is it the intention of the Government to crush the life out of the workingman of this country?—and the unfortunate part of it is that if you cannot live in this country it is very hard to live in any other country. Now take the people who are receiving the dole. They are stigmatized and condemned as lazy. The opinion of some people is to let them starve and let them die. Well under this tariff they will die. Now I think that I have made myself clear. I have not gone into the different items of the tariff because I will leave that to the business men on this side of the House, who are better able to deal with it because they have more practical experience and they can compare the old tariff with the new one, and according to the information we have received the new tariff will mean increased taxation to the extent of $1,000,000.00.

Now in connection with the correspondence that passed between the Finance Minister and the High Commissioner in London over the recent loan, the Finance Minister spoke very loudly this afternoon, so loudly that he was heard in the Upper House, and he felt very much aggrieved over certain rumors that he had heard. The statement made by Mr. Hickman is borne out in letter in substance and in fact and I cannot see why there should be such a noise made in complaining to this House that certain statements were not correct. When any head of a department is asked a question he should be prepared to give the right and proper information, and when the Prime Minister said in answer to a question from this side of the House that there was no correspondence respecting the loan, he must have been misinformed, and all this fuss would have been avoided if the correspondence had been tabled when the question was asked. It was unfair to the Prime Minister for him to be led to make such an erroneous statement through no fault of his own, and whoever the responsible Minister is he should apologise and apologise publicly. It is only due to the Prime Minister and an effort has been made to smother the whole thing by loud talk and drawing the proverbial red herring across the trail. Now I am doing the Prime Minister a public service because certainly the members of this House and those who come here to listen might go away with a wrong impression. Well let the person who gave the wrong information bear the blame, as the Prime Minister has enough to shoulder at the present time in trying to keep the crowd together. I strongly support the amendment proposed by Major Cashin, the hon. member for Ferryland District, and trust same will get the support of the whole House.

MR. DUFF—Mr. Chairman, first of all I wish to congratulate Major Cashin on the stand he has taken in breaking away from the Government party and in taking an independent seat on this side of the House. I must say that from the first I never thought that the Government would try to carry out this policy of increased expenditure that they brought before the House a couple of weeks ago, because in the minds of the people of the country to-day it is most ridiculous. Here we are saddling the country with increased taxation and increased duty, and the Prime Minister went to the country a year ago and pledged himself to reduce taxation and expenditure.

(Reads.)

And certainly I agree with him. But what have they done? Absolutely nothing for the fisheries of this country. They have increased the duties so that the fishermen can't catch fish now

and make a decent living. This tariff if it goes through will be the means of driving hundreds of people out of this country. Our fish markets are in a bad shape and now to make matters worse the Government intends to drive the people away from their native land. We are preparing for a tourist traffic a $700,000 hotel in St. John's and the rebuilding of the dock. We always thought that the dock was a necessity in this part of the island, but certainly we can't believe that it is necessary to spend three or four times as much as the dock cost originally to repair it. They are fooling themselves with the idea that they are going to get big ships to come into this port. We have not got the facilities, we have not got a sufficient number of men here to do the work entailed in a big job. Even small ships that are compelled to come here by force of circumstances will not get permanent repairs for the simple reason the work cannot be done as cheaply and expeditiously as elsewhere. Temporary or permanent repairs on small ships would not necessitate the spending of two million dollars on the Dock and for the reasons mentioned.

When we were coming along by Holyrood the other day the waters were teeming with herring. In other countries this is considered a very valuable fish, but what has this country done in the matter of turning that into cash? The tourist traffic will never do it. What are they doing in Norway with the herring? They have production plants over there where they gather these herring and produce from the herring which comes into this country as lard whilst the refuse from this industry is used to feed cattle. We send away out of the country for cattle feed help to keep up other countries whilst we have around our shores hundreds of thousands of fish food that is suitable for man and beast.

Here we are out on the Atlantic and the only man who is any benefit to the country is the man who goes out in his boat and catches the cod out of the water. They are producing what we have to depend on for our living. They are the warriors and we are the camp followers, and we are here making laws and the last man to be considered is the fishermen. I regret the Government sealing ships were so unfortunate, although the Government divided the berths among their own side. Then again I believe that the captain of the ship should have the choosing of his own men when giving berths for the sealfishery, and probably you would not have had a ship coming in port against the will of the master as she did. This is one of the foolish things that the Government does.

Now Mr. Chairman, to come back to the tariff. I certainly cannot agree to increase the duty on the imports, and I believe that if the duty was left the same as last year that that same amount of revenue would be collected this year as last year. But by increasing the duty you are going to discourage the trade and you are going to have reduction of imports. The people are going to be worse off and we will not obtain any benefit. There is another matter in the manifesto of the Prime Minister that I wish to refer to.

(Reads.)

I was returned as the representative of Carbonear and the first thing that came to my notice was that one of the fire wardens appointed by a former Government was turned out of his position, and it is generally known to the people of Carbonear that there is no work there for fire wardens. If they dismissed that man I could not have a word to say, but there are two men placed in his position. And when they appealed to the Prime Minister he said he knew nothing about it.

This matter is in connection with

the Post Office. A new official was required at Bristol's Hope, and a certain party was recommended to the Minister. She was not at all suitable to the people owing to her house being the most inconvenient, but the people of Bristol's Hope were not allowed to have any views on the matter. The people had to take what the Department gave them although against the wishes of the residents.

Then again I heard that there was a likelihood that Mr. W. F. Guy would be discharged. I came up here and was told by a member of the Executive Government that he would not be discharged without consulting me. After I gave him Mr. Guy's family war record, but the promise was not kept. I say it was a dastardly thing on the part of the Government to do such a thing.

Speaking of the Post Office I think that it should be taken out of politics altogether. If the Minister of Posts has done some cleaning up, I am glad to hear it. But I would like him to go in and see the Postal Telegraph Office on the corner of Military Road. I would like him to have a look at that. That office is in a disgraceful condition for a city like St. John's.

One of the things introduced by this Government is the Re-distribution Bill. Next election there will be 40 Members instead of 36 in this House looking for jobs for friends. Again we have Commissions of all kinds. We have the Liquor Commission. We have three Commissioners. The Commissioner who was there before has been pensioned with a salary of $2400. I would like to draw the attention of the Government to the fact that in Alberta one Commissioner was appointed, and they found that one man could do the whole thing. We were told that we were going to have a Pension Board last year that was going to act free of cost. And what happened. We found that like all the rest they want their salaries.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

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

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on to-morrow.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, April 30, 1925.

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

MR. LAKE—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Lawn, High Beach, Lorries and Point Crewe in the District of Burin, with regard to an improved mail service in that section of the coast. I know the needs of those people there, and I feel sure that their request is a reasonable one. I ask that the petition be referred to the Hon. Minister of Posts whom I have also written on the same subject.

HON. MR. LONG—Mr. Speaker, I have very much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition.

MR. BROWN asked Hon. the Prime Minister if each Electoral District will be treated on a per capita basis as regards employment to be given in re-railing the Government Railroad; also to ask what rate of wages will be paid per hour or per day.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—That is a matter entirely concerning the Railway Commission, and it has

not been dealt with by them thus far.

MR. BROWN asked Hon. the Prime Minister: (1) If tenders for crushed stone for the Dock will be called for and if W. I. Bishop Co. are tendering for same; (2) if tenders will be called for carting of crushed stone from Crusher to Dock, if not, why not.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Lee, who is in charge of that work for the W. I. Bishop Co. is making enquiries in an endeavour to get crushed stone as cheaply as possible for the requirements of the Dry Dock.

MR. ASHBOURNE asked the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the Table of the House a list of all persons supplying butter to the Government institutions, stating the quantity supplied by each from the first of July, 1924 to the present time, and the price per pound charged for the butter.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—The answer is being prepared.

MR. ASHBOURNE asked the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the Table of the House a list of all persons supplying fresh meat to the Government institutions, stating the quantity supplied by each from the first of July, 1924, to the present time, and the price per pound charged for the meat? Also, to lay upon the Table of the House a list of tenders received for the supply of Meat for all of the Government institutions.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—That answer has been tabled already.

MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the Table of the House a list showing the amount of merchandise taken out of Bond by the Imperial Tobacco Company from January 1st to April 8th, giving the dates each amount was taken out.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—The answer is being prepared and will be ready to-morrow.

MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Colonial Secretary to lay on the Table of the House a copy of the Public Messages sent over the Governemnt Telegraph lines on April 27th, 28th and 29th.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—I beg leave to table copies of the messages sent out on April 28th and 29th; the only copy in the office of messages sent out on the 27th has been already tabled.

Hon. the Minister of Justice presented the Report of Select Committ- consider the petition of the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company, Ltd., and Newfoundland Power and Paper Utilities Corporation, Limited, as follows:

"The Select Committee appointed to consider the peition of the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company and Paper Utilities Corporation, Limited, beg to report that they have considered the matter to them referred, and that they recommend that leave be granted for the introduction of the Bill prayed for, and a copy of which is hereunto annexed.

(Sgd.) W. J. HIGGINS
JOSEPH J. LONG
THOS. J. POWER
A. E. HICKMAN
GEO. F. GRIMES.

On motion this report was received and adopted, and the Bill entitled "An Act to Confirm the titles to certain Lands at Corner Brook" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Hon. Mr. Long gave notive of question.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the 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. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman. Since you have proceeded this evening rather rapidly with the various items of the Tariff, I would like to crave the indulgence of this House to make a few more remarks in connection with the tariff before it is finally disposed of. I think that when the facts of the situation as regards the debate that has developed from this tariff become known to the country, the country will have been quite satisfied that the Opposition members, at least, have done their duty in the face of great difficulty in opposing this tariff. I should like first of all this afternoon to avail of this opportunity to congratulate Major Cashin on the independent stand which he took here the other morning. Major Cashin's position left no other course open for him, but to take the stand that he did. It was courageous of a young man new to the political arena to take such a stand. He refused to smother his conscience. He refused to allow his political ambitions to over rule what appeared to his to be his manifest duty on behalf of the fishermen, the laborers and the average workingman of this country. He has been severely criticized in certain sections for his action, and severely criticised by men who have not half the courage he has.

Now, in passing, I want to refer to an item on Major Cashin's position that appeared in the Evening Telegram of April 29th.

(Reads).

I do not know, from a political point of view, that Major Cashin's defection from the Monroe Party has been welcomed by the Opposition, but I do know from another point of view that the Oposition have been in favor of that defection. That defection has been welcomed by the Opposition because it goes to prove that the contention that was held last year, and which we consistently made from this side of the House this year that the Monroe Party was not in a position to carry out their pledges to the electorate. They made pledges to the electorate that they never intended to carry out; and Major Cashin saw the force of these opinions and saw no other course open to him but to take the step that he did.

The Daily News asserted in an editorial that by Major Cashin's action he has ruined himself politically. Stuff and nonsense! We are come to a pretty pass in this self-governing Dominion when an honorable member of this House cannot assert his independence. We have come to a pretty pass when an honorable member cannot take a stand for himself according to his own opinion, without being told that he has ruined his political career. We have heard the expression used on the floors of this House: Hypocrites! Well, I have to say now that some of the hypocrites who are of the opinion that because a man asserts his opinion he is ruined politically are going to find themselves out a great deal in the long run, and for Major Cashin's action there has been deputed all sorts of ulterior motives. The insinuation came from the Prime Minister himself that there was a suspicion in his mind that Major Cashin left the Government on account of ulterior motives.

Now many of the members of this House, by casting their minds back to a previous government, will remember the incidence of a government member who left his party and took his place on the opposite side. I refer to Mr. Frank Archibald who left the Squires Government. Now the attitude of the Prime Minister of that day towards Mr. Archibald, and Mr. Monroe's attitude towards Mr. Cash-

in, is quite dissimilar. I started yesterday to look up Hansard, but unfortunately, could not find the reference; but, Sir, the Government of that day wished him well, they cast no implications, did not dispute, and they made no insinuations against him as regards the reason for his action. Sir Michael Cashin was the leader of the opposition at that time, and he said that he was not anxious to have Mr. Archibald in his party, but under the circumstances he said there was no other course left to him but to congratulate Mr. Archibald on the stand that he took. Now, compare that with what happened in this House the other morning. When the honorable member made his stand against the Government all sorts of motives were attributed to his action. Now I hold no brief for Major Cashin. I hold no brief for his father. We have fought the Cashins and fought them hard; but we fought them clean and in the open, and we did not stab them in the back. It is not presumed that that is the stand the Government took the other morning. Now when we make our stand against the government, we represent the man on the street, not only the man on the street, but the hundreds and thousands of loyal Newfoundlanders and, on their behalf, we have stood out against the proposals of the Government with regard to this tariff. The Finance Minister smiles. He has a right to. Mr. Cashin left the Government the other morning, and not because of any ulterior motive as has been suggested, but because it was in the interest of the people of the country, and a large and influential part of the public opinion of this country are behind Major Cashin in the stand that he has taken in regard to these proposals. What could the Hon. Member do? He made every attempt to induce the Government to reduce taxation in respect to the things in which the fishermen of this country are most interested in, the products of the Ropewalk and the Tobacco Factory. I take it that Major Cashin made advances to the Prime Minister seeking to have these reductions made and all that he got for his pains were snubs, and there was nothing else for him to do but what he did do. The electorate of this country are to be the judges of his action and when the occasion is offered the electors of Mr. Cashin's district will know the value to place upon his actions. Mr. Cashin has not come into the Opposition ranks. He has taken an independent stand in this House. He has taken a stand in this House on the principles that I have outlined. The remark was made here in this House last night, I think that it was made by Mr. Halfyard, and he said that the Government thought that they were snugly entrenched. The Government is snugly entrenched in so far as the number of rank and file of its members is concerned, but they are not snugly entrenched in the hearts of the people of this country. As I pointed out in a previous speech, the Government would not have been returned with a majority if there were four hundred votes cast the other way. If these four hundred votes had been cast the other way the Monroe Party would not be in office to-day. The Government is only firmly entrenched in so far as the number of its members in this House are concerned. They have no mandate from the people of this country to bring in this huge increase in the tariff that we are debating here to-day. I maintain, Mr. Chairman, that there is sufficient in this tariff in itself to demand an appeal to the country. There have been general elections fought on lesser issues than the tariff that is now before the House.

I submit that at a time like this to

come down here and increase the taxation to the extent that we are doing it is not the time to bring in a budget speech that estimates a surplus.

We had criticisms hurled at the Squires Government from this side of the House, and were told that we should not have the surplus that was estimated at that time of seventy or eighty thousand dollars, which was only sufficient to meet the contingencies that might arise. There is not any justification for you to estimate a surplus at the present time.

Mr. Chairman the point that the Minister of Finance has raised has borne out my argument. My argument is that at a time like this when you are increasing the taxation it is not the time to have an estimated surplus of a quarter of a million dollars. The Finance Minister stated that there were four millions of dollars left in the Exchequer when they left power in 1919. That four millions of dollars was obtained from surplus revenue. Instead of having that surplus there should have been a reduction of taxation, if the Finance Minister found himself in that position, I do not know or care who was the Finance Minister of that time. In the face of this increased burden of taxation there is the spending of the two millions of dollars on the road policy to build roads for the encouragement of the tourist traffic. And for the pleasure of tourist that might come into the country. Spending two millions, I thank you. And then you guarantee the hotel proposition. The hotel that nine out of ten men of this country are satisfied will never pay. $13,500 a year for thirty years for a hotel in St. John's and what for? This is a part of the tourist policy that may or may not be a success. I do not say there is not some field for the tourist policy in this country, but I say that there is not sufficient field to justify the spending of such a huge sum of money as this. The average man who comes down here on the Silvia or Rosalind in the summer is not the man who is going to come here and spend three or four weeks in an expensive hotel. I have some considerable knowledge of the West Coast, and I have known some of the best class of tourists that have come here from the United States and from Canada and they are the men who do not want to live in hotels, because they are tired of them. They want to go out in the open country and rough it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would not have taken the time of this House if I could not attempt to review the situation and offer some reasonable criticism on the budget which we are now debating. Of course if the Finance Minister does not see the point in what I have to say, then that is his business. It would be useless for an hon. member take up the time of the House if he had not some pertinent criticism to offer. Mr. Chairman, we have been in this House for something over two months and what has been done? Can the Government point to one single action of theirs that show a serious attempt to carry out the promises made in the Manifesto of the Prime Minister when he went to the country. We came into this House on the 18th day of February, we had a long Speech from the Throne and the most that we have done during the session is to pass legislation making for the expenditure of money, rather than the reduction of taxation and the reduction of expenditure. Everything else notwithstanding, that will be the issue upon which the Government is going to be judged by the people. There was a hope and there was the opinion that when the present Government took office that some efforts would be made to reduce taxation and expenditure. Hackneyed

phrases are of very little use. We were accused of squandermania. The Squires Government was accused of squandermania. It was accused of throwing away millions of dollars and of entering into all kinds of schemes that were of little or of no benefit to the country. What is the position to-day? It is that the Government that had set up the high standard when it went to the country is not one wit better than the Governments that proceeded it. The average man looking on had the idea that things would get better. But where is the justification for the spending of two millions of dollars on tourist roads. The tourist who has money to spend comes to Newfoundland and goes up to Bonne Bay to shoot caribou, or he goes to rivers or ponds, or the Codroy Valley, or somewhere to catch salmon; and he wants to rough it. He is tired of hotels, and he wants the open country; he has been living in hotels all the time, and he is only too glad to get clear of them. He is not coming to Newfoundland to spend his time in an hotel. It is my opinion and the opinion of thousands of others, that the Government has not been well advised in its move in connection with this hotel proposition; the Government will soon find that it has made a mistake in thinking that it is going to get any revenue out of this tourist policy. I certainly think that the Government might very well do something in a small way to encourage tourists to come here, but it should not embark on this policy to such an extent as to spend two million dollars on roads, and to guarantee a hotel, because in my opinion you are not going to get anything from it.

What is the position as regards our own local roads between settlement and settlement? If you have to spend money on roads the first thing you should do would be to help the people move around between their own settlements, by building proper roads for them, and repairing the roads that are already there. But the idea of the present Government is not to build roads for our own people—for Newfoundlanders, but for the stranger that is going to come within our gates. Our own roads are deplorable, and in a frightful condition.

I may as well tell you that you are going to be called upon before long to spend thousands of dollars on repairs to the Deer Lake road; and in connection with that road, I challenge any man to say that it has not justified its existence since it has been built. The expenditure on that road has been well justified. Everyone who knows anything about the road will have to admit that. The people of St. Barbe District—from Flowers Cove up who are working on the Humber and at Deer Lake are finding that road very useful; the W. I. Bishop Co., Limited, and Goodyear Brothers, are finding it very useful in their operations. It may have been that that road was built under circumstances which made it cost more than it should ordinarily have cost, but I tell you now that that money which was expended on that road has been justified. It has not been used as a tourist road, but as a road for the benefit of the people in the vicinity of it. It has been a benefit to the people through whose territy it passes.

I will move from the Deer Lake Road and go to Bonavista. What is the condition of the road to-day between Bonavista and Catalina. We want ten thousand dollars spent on that road, and on other roads right up the shore. The Prime Minister must know about those roads, and of the condition that they are in. I do not want anyone to think that I am unnecessarily biased or prejudiced in my criticism, but I submit that it

would have been a wiser policy for the Government, if they wanted to help the people out, to have put the roads that are already built in better repair instead of spending two million dollars on new roads. I personally cannot entertain the tourist policy of the Government as being a sane or reasonable idea.

I have referred to the tourist policy of the Government, and I have referred to the hotel project. There is no need for me to reiterate all that I said the other night in connection with the dock. I pointed out here that the attitude which the Opposition took with regard to the dock has been justified. The Government had some saving common sense come to their rescue, and it was obliged to bring down the services of an independent engineer. If the time that we spent here in this House in talking on the dock accomplished nothing more than that, it was after all justified.

I remember some remarks made by the Prime Minister this session, when he said that he was prepared to accept any sane and reasonable suggestions that came from either side of the House. Well we have made some suggestions that everyone must admit were sane and reasonable, and we are continuing to make them, but I fail to see where the Government, as a Government, has been prepared to accept those suggestions; but in every instance they had to come back to the suggestions that came from us, and act upon them, because there was pressure brought to bear on them.

The question is coming—and coming fast, and it is aggravating the minds of thinking people, of where are we, and whither tending. I remember the other morning I was reported in the Daily News as having painted a very gloomy picture. I would like to be the last man in this country to be branded as a pessimist. But the Government must be aware that thinking people everywhere are concerning themselves with this question of taxation seriously. We have got to the position to-day where we are spending ten millions of dollars annually. Last year I think our total exports amounted to about twenty one million dollars. Our public expenditure to-day is in the vicinity of ten million dollars. How much longer can we continue at that rate? How much longer can the country afford to keep on spending money at that rate? I believe that if the Government of to-day had made a real and serious effort to carry out their pledges to the people, to reduce expenditure, that they would have been in a much more fortunate position to-day. You got a mandate from the people of the country to reduce expenditure and to reduce taxation. But to-day you cannot point to one iota of evidence that you have made the least attempt in any direction to do it. There are the figures and they speak for themselves. You cannot come in here and ask for increased taxation to the extent of seven hundred thousand dollars, and then the next minute say that you have made an effort to reduce taxation. I do not minimise the position that the Government found itself in. I do not underestimate the position, and I quite realize that the Finance Minister has on his hands to-day a very big job. Any one who had taken the position of Finance Minister would have a big job on his hands. It is no easy matter to know just where your revenue is going to come from, and how to figure out the financial position of the country to-day. The people to a very large extent have their lessons to learn. The public has got to manifest itself throughout the country for a better system than obtains at the present time. When a man takes an

independent stand and leave the ranks of the party, they say that a blow has been struck at the system of party Government. It is a question that is occupying the minds of thinking people all over the world to-day, that it is questionable whether the system of party Government has not broken down all the world over. General elections mean more expenditure. Opposing politicians come out on their platforms and they deplore the conditions existing in the particular section which they are seeking to represent. One night one man gets up on the platform and says you have no post office here. If you return me to power I will see that you get a post office. That is all platform talk. The next night the opposite party has another meeting, and another man gets up and says exactly the same thing, though perhaps in different words. On polling day one of those men is elected, and what is the result. The honourable gentleman comes back with his party, and immediately begins to agitate for the post office, or bridge, or wharf, or whatever he may have promised, until he gets it; and while he is doing that, there are twenty five more men doing exactly the same thing. It is said to-day that the men in high office do not make public opinion, but follow it. I say that it is time in this country for something to be done to develop a healthy public opinion in regard to some of these important public matters which I have referred to.

I have said before in this House that we are not increasing our earning power. We have as hard a time as we can to make both ends meet now. We are less able to bear our burdens this year than we were last year. Consequently, how much less are we going to be able to bear the extra burden that is going to be imposed upon us by this increased taxation.

It is all very well to talk about taxation and tariffs. It is all very well to say that you should do this, that, the other thing; but where are we going to get the money to meet the extra taxation, is what I want to know, when our people are not in as good a position to earn, this year as they were last.

There is no business man in this house who knows anything about our fish markets who will say that we are going to get as good a price for fish this year as we did last year. There are people to-day who say that there was too much paid for fish last year. And I have already said that we are not going to be so fortunately situated as regards labour this year as we were last year. Very well, if we have a reduced price for fish, and less labor for our peoople, I ask in all fairness where do you expect the earning power of the people to come from, and where are you going to get the money to meet the extra taxation imposed by this tariff.

I wonder if the Government, as a Government, individually and collectively, has taken the trouble to review the whole situation, so that they can give their views. I would like to hear some honourable member opposite get up and tell us what his opinion is. I see my friend Mr. Chambers, the honourable member for Burgeo over there, who is a business man, who has had a large experience of the business of this country. He must surely have concerned himself with these problems, and I would like to get from him an unbiased opinion, telling us what he really thinks of these things. Do not be afraid to tell us, Mr. Chambers. It is all very well to have a quiet little chat in the lobbies, or in the club, or on the street, but this is the place to tell the people what you think of the sit-

uation as it exists in Newfoundland. All the soldiers are not in one camp, and it may very well be that in multitude of counsellors there is wisdom. I am pleading for reduced taxation, and it is not because you are over there supporting the Monroe Party that it is going to damage him or cause any trouble if you tell us what you think of these problems.

To get back, Mr. Chairman, I say that it is our bounded duty here as representatives, on whatever side of the House we may be, to give some consideration to these problems with which, in the interests of the country as a whole we have to seriously consider and concern ourselves. I cannot see where the money is coming from, or where our people are going to be able to earn the money to pay the extra taxation that is placed upon them by the tariff which is before us to-day.

I believe there was a time when the Finance Minister sat on this side of the House, in somewhat the position that I am in now, and he argued that if we reduced taxation we would get a better revenue, because the people would have money, and would spend more. It is only a short distance from this seat to the place where the Finance Minister sits today, but it is funny that the Finance Minister should have changed his views in the passage from here to there. I believe Mr. Bennett supported that position; he is credited in Hansard as being in favour of that position. If that was their position then, it is singular that it should be changed to-day. Their stand to-day is not in line with their previously expressed views. It seems to make a great difference from what side you speak as to what view you hold. That is one of the weaknesses this country is suffering from. I would like to draw attention once more to the fact that this tariff is lowering the standard of living of the ordinary people. You say you have placed flour, pork and beef on the free list, and feel satisfied that you have done something great. But you have reduced the people to a position where they will not be able to get enough to live on. You are not improving the standard of living of the fisherman and laborer, but you are most certainly lowering it. Take a few of the articles which the ordinary man uses when he had a dollar to spend and we see that this is what you have taxed. The increase on clothes as Mr. Grimes said the other day has been advanced 20 p.c. During the last few years the people have been in straitened circumstances—they had to go almost naked, and had only enough to obtain the necessaries of life. Now just as they are beginning to get on their legs again and pay up for the suffering which they underwent the last few years, you put on this excessive tariff and render it impossible for them to even appear decently dressed. You are lowering the standard of living of the common folk and that I emphatically state is not the prime duties of a good Government. It is your bounden duty to do something, and everything, to improve the condition socially, morally and physically of the people, but by this tariff you are degrading the people who sent you here instead of elevating them. The sorry aspect of the whole thing is that you have reduced the taxation on those who could well afford to pay it. You took the income tax off those who could afford to pay it, and shifted the burden in the other direction. You have removed it from the Banks which probably will be no kinder to us now than ever they were, and placed it on the common people. These are things which the Government will find it difficult to offset, and the injustices of this tariff are going home

to them, as the facts daily become patent. Government Members have said that we of the Opposition were indulging in useless talk without offering any suggestion. But I suggested the other night that you should not remove this tax from the Bank, but give us a new tariff, and draw up your own plan of taxation. If you had given the matter better consideration we would not be in the position we are to-day to so strongly oppose your budget proposals. I make these remarks not in the spirit of causing obstruction, but in duty to the people who are already overburdened, and if possible to point you in the right direction. You have forgotten your duty and outraged the people, and the day is not far distant when you will be called to give an account of your stewardship. You must listen to our criticisms whether you follow it or not, as it is merely a statement of facts, and I believe when this session closes I shall have done my duty to those who sent me here and sounded a note of warning to you.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, this section, 263, amuses me.

(Reads Section)

When I had to move an amendment to have the duty on ready-made clothing reduced from 65 to 52 p.c. I cannot let that clause pass without having something to say on it. I regret that I have a cold, but before I leave this House I expect my voice will be gone altogether. I have still some important matters to speak on, such as references made by the Honorable the Minister of Finance in his speech yesterday, and things which I learnt after leaving the House, and I promise that they will be revelations. I want the Honorable Mr. Sullivan brought in here. It is just as well for us all to understand one another as we go along. Now I want to ask the Honourable Mr. Sullivan if he is getting a pension from the Department down here of $174.00 a year.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—That is not correct.

MR. CASHIN—It is correct—it is in the accounts.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—It might have been there.

MR. CASHIN—It should never be there. I have nothing against the Hon. Mr. Sullivan and when I was told of this I denied it, but I was assured it was correct, and then I and Mr. Ashbourne turned up the accounts and we found it there.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—I have not been receiving it.

MR. CASHIN—You have, but you never did anything in the war. You were in Scotland cutting spruce fir when we were dying in the trenches of France.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—My pension was reduced every time I went before the Board.

MR. CASHIN—What were you before the Board for—You were never wounded, you only had bronchial troubble. That Board should be fired out of existence to give you a pension which should go to some poor fisherman. I know a man in my district—his name is Barnable—and he was in the Army and Navy. He has a wooden leg and is going around practically starving while you are drawing a pension. That is the man who ought to have it. You are one of what they used to call on the other side, "dug-out Colonels." While we were in France you were going around London having a good time. I saw you there myself when I came back from the trenches full of mud. I had to return in ten days and you were enjoying yourself. I am not getting 174 cents of a pension and I don't want it. But there is a man Brown who was in my regiment and needs a pension and he told me you were drawing it,and if I make a motion here now

to the House to cancel it I would be doing what is right. I wonder is it correct that the Government is going to put an extra amendment in the Bill now before the Upper House in order to give Mr. Sullivan a departmental office? That Bill is sacred to the memory of Mr. Lake, once a Grand Bank fisherman, but now a capitalist. The Minister of Finance made a nasty insinuation here yesterday and the "Daily News" commenting on what he remarked said that he did not ask the Colony for five thousand dollars for signing bonds in connection with the loan. Well I would like to ask who did get five thousand dollars for signing these bonds? I am waiting for an answer?

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Mr. Chairman, may I be permitted to make an explanation? The pension that the honourable member for Ferryland refers to comes from the other side, and amounts to something like $7 per month now. It may have been more than that, but all pensions are reduced gradually by the medical board. If the pension was given me by the British Government that is not my fault. The King's regulations provided for pensions. I am not getting any pension from this country, and it was one of the agreements that the British Government made, namely, to pay these pensions, when the Forestry Corps was being formed. I did not want to go across in command, but when I was wanted I was not afraid to go and do my bit. The statement made by the same honourable member for Ferryland that the Government were going to make alterations to a Bill to make a departmental office possible for me is absolutely false. The honourable member says he heard the rumour on the street. Well I heard lots of rumours on the street, but I would not stoop so low as he did to repeat them. With regard to that section in the Bill which provides for a man taking a departmental seat six months after an election, I would like to say that if ever I get a departmental office, I will not be afraid to go back for re-election, and I have no reason to be ashamed to go back to my district for re-election. As I said before, it is not $174 that I am getting from the British Government; it is more like $84, having been cut down by the board, and probably at the next board it may be further reduced or discontinued.

MR. CASHIN—Your pension should be cut out altogether. I am paying my part to the British Government on account of what we spent on the war. Now I was a member of the Railway Commission with Mr. Sullivan, and every thing that was done by that Commission was done in the dark. Take the steamer that you were sent over to look after. You were not recommended and approved of by the Railway Commission; but by the Executive Government, and after you went they passed a Minute-of-Council to pay your expenses. And then you are prepared to take $174 blood money, money that you never earned. I do not begrudge any man getting any money, but I do begrudge him getting money that he never earned, and is not entitled to. Now I want to tell Sir John Crosbie that if he meant my father in mentioning five thousand dollars for signing bonds, I hope, Sir John will leave the Finance office in as good a state as my father left it after ten or twelve years of office. There is one thing my father never did or wouldn't do. If he fired a man for committing himself he would not take him back, under any pressure, after ten months and give him full salary for all the time he was dismissed and increase his salary $500 a year besides.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Chairman, I want to contradict that statement. The insinuation con-

cerning Mr. Chafe which was made here a few days ago by the honourable member for Ferryland that Mr. Chafe was taken back and his salary increased is positively untrue. Furthermore, I want to say that Mr. Chafe is like other gentlemen in the department who are prepared to go before a Commission. Now when that Commission has functioned the honourable member for Ferryland will be able to decide who is right. With the rest of the remarks of the honourable member I shall have something to say later.

MR. CASHIN—What the Finance Minister said is only like water on a duck's back to me. Now I am making a comparison with the Prime Minister's speech and the way it was doctored and sent out around the Island in the public message.

(Reads Message)

That is a deliberate and absolute fabrication, and the man who wrote it knew it was incorrect when he wrote it. Anyhow he probably will send a better one tomorrow. I attacked the "Daily News" yesterday and if I have accomplished nothing else I have made that sheet a bit decent. Articles were written about me yesterday for attacking certain members of the Government, but there was nothing written against them for attacking me. Now with regard to this tariff I am going to fight it to a finish. The Minister of Justice is here now and I want to ask him what he has done in the matter. When he and I sat in Opposition together we were all the time attacking the Government of the day on labour, starvation, hunger and all the rest of it, and he was one of the most pronounced members of his Party in attacking the Government. I ask him now what has he done or attempted to do for the labourers of St. John's since he came back? Nothing. Last year there was a strike on among the St. John's labourers, and the Government nor Mr. Higgins took no action in it at all, except that they fell in the police force, numbered them off from right to left with fixed bayonets, formed fours, right wheel, quick march to Water Street East. Then they left turned, reformed two deep, ordered arms and stood at ease. That is what happened to prevent the labourers of St. John's from getting what they were looking for. Now I fought for the people in my district and I am going to continue fighting for them as long as I am able to stand up, even if I am fighting fearful odds. Mr. Higgins gave an explanation in lawyer fashion about that clause in the Redistribution Bill, but I want to tell him to-night that he was responsible for having it put in there in an attempt to bar off St. John's East, where the people are crying for proper representation in this House. We have no right, whatever, to deprive men of it. Now the Minister of Justice and the other members of the Government are not the holy men that you imagine they are. They are all drawing down big salaries. $5,000 and upwards they are getting. For some of them $10,000 a year is nothing. They are getting a big rake off in lawyers' fees, and then they take off the income tax off themselves and slap it on the poor man of this country, and then they expect me to come in here and swallow it holus bolus; and that is the way they helped the fisherman and the poor man of this country. The last six months of their regime you will have another manifesto to deceive me and to deceive this country. The great fault in all governments and the great fault in this Government is that there are too many promises. There was never a man came to me yet, that if I could do anything for him I did it, and if I could not do anything for him I told him "no." I intend to carry

out any policies that I may inaugurate if I am going to remain in politics for any lengthy period. Why, men all over the country had been promised jobs by the late party. They would promise them the world. It is only natural that they would be looking for work, and now when they come up and ask for work they are told that there is "nothing doing." Some of them are not even told that. They are told to come down tomorrow or Sunday or some other day. Send a fool further. These are the actions of this Government. Now, I am supposed to be a loyal Newfoundlander and they do things like that, and I am to remain a member of the Monroe party. That is what I was supposed to do.

Mr. Chairman, before I go any further I want to thank very heartily every member of the Opposition. They have fought them well and they will fight them to a finish, and fight them straight, that when I left the other party the other night and placed my case before this House the Opposition members backed me up. When I moved an amendment here last night they backed me up, and I want to thank them, and why should I thank them? Because I consider that they are doing their duty to their constituents the same as I am doing mine, and we are not trying to make politics out of it at all. When I came over to this side they granted me the courtesy of giving me a hook in their room to hang my coat and hat on. But looking at it from a jocular point of view if this tariff goes through, as it is likely to, there will be no need for a place to hang up our clothes because they will have become so expensive that we will not be able to buy them. We will have to come down here with the proverbial fig leaf and legislate to the people of this country. I am glad that Sir John Crosbie did not mean my revered father when he was making some remarks yesterday. If he did it would have been my duty to take it up for him as he is not here himself. If he was sitting in this House I would not have to take it up for him. He is well able to do it himself; although some people thought that he was going to die. If he had you probably would hardly think of saying the De profundis for him. But he is coming back to this House, please God. That is all that I want to say about that. As long as the Minister did not mean that I am man enough to" draw in my horns" on it. I appreciate the reply that he made to Mr. Chafe. I wish he had told me that before.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have been informed by another detective this afternoon, though he is not in the Government ranks that the Government Executive had banded together and had said well let him talk. We will put it through. This was in front of the Court House. Alright, Mr. Chairman, let him talk. I owe a duty to my country and I am going to stay here till I drop, and when I do drop and if I recuperate I will not want any pension for it.

(Reads)

Have they not done nobly, Mr. Chairman. But it is not their fault. That was up to the Government. It was up to the Government to whittle it down. It is the Government, and the Government alone, who are to blame for putting 50 or 60 p.c. duty on readymade clothes, and 15 p.c. on works of art. It would have been better to have left that out altogether. It looks ridiculous.

Now yesterday Mr. Winston Churchill delivered his budget and both the Labour Party and the Liberal Party are attacking him just the same as we are attacking the Minister of Finance and the Government to-day. I have not read it yet, and I have only seen a part of it. Now many persons

have referred to my leaving the Monroe Party, but in England politicians are always changing sides. Why Winston Churchill has been in every part in the House of Commons. I wonder if the fishermen and the labouring men of the country will appreciate it. I know that the Government must have appreciated it, because they did not think that it was worth their while to read it over. I think that in the words of a famous French General in English that this shall not pass. That is the only thing that I can do. And this tariff shall not pass if I can stop. it. This says that the Commission worked with dispatch.

They took over two years to finish it. I agree with Mr. LeMessurier when he made up the tariff. He knew that there had to be scope for extra taxation, and the Government had to be given scope, but he did not tell them to take the income tax off themselves and put it on the people of the country. Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Member for St. John's West sees fit to interrupt me in this House. Now I can tell the member for St. John's West that I am about to eat him up. Mr. Chairman, if you do not call the Hon. Gentleman to order, as it is your duty, I will have to see that he keeps order in this House. I would like the Hon. Gentleman to explain to this House why he is in the Monroe party. He is not in the Monroe party for the people of this country. He is in the Monroe party because Mr. Hickman, who he went to first turned him down and then he had to ask Mr. Monroe.

MR. BROWNE—I think that I should be allowed to give a personal explanation.

MR. HALFYARD—I rise to a point of order.

MR. BROWNE—The Hon. Member for Ferryland opposite is hardly the man to say these things about me, because he himself has proved himself a traitor to his party. He has no reason for the statements that he has made about me. He does not know what has taken place between Mr. Hickman and myself. Let him ask Mr. Hickman if he likes and he will find that there is nothing to my discredit in what took place between us. I would like to tell Major Cashin that he should make sure of what he is saying before he passes such remarks. I want to tell him that I have as much independence as he has. He has not a monopoly of independence. I tell him that there are as good members in this House as the Cashins. I am as good as a Cashin even though my name is different from his. I want to tell him that and I would like him to remember it. It is not because his name is different from mine that he has the right to stand up here and make statements which he knows nothing at all about. He makes the statement that effects me when he says that the tariff effects me. He mentions the fact that a person of salary of five or six thousand dollars is going to get a saving on the tariff. I say that he ought to go to school and find out about the making up of the income tax before he makes such statements. I must ask the Hon. Member in future not to make such personal remarks about me.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—I am prepared to take whatever the Minister of Justice is prepared to come along with. But neither of the Hon. Gentlemen is in my party. Mr. Cashin is not among those that I lead and the Hon. Member for St. John's West is on the other side of the House, but I do not like the inconsistency of the Minister of Justice when he gets up here and asks Mr. Cashin to retract.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I think that the Hon. the

Leader of the Opposition is making a snarle.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—I am not trying to make a snarl at all. I am thinking about the dignity of the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN—Now if the disturbance in the gallery does not stop I will ask the police to remove those responsible. I ask the sergeant-at-arms to keep order, and if it is not kept I will have the galleries cleared.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—I hold no brief for Major Cashin or for the Hon. Member for St. John's West, but I think that the Hon. Minister should in all fairness refer to both of the Hon. Gentlemen in the same way. As I said before I am trying to preserve the dignity of the House.

MR. CASHIN—When I went to school I did not go on charity. Cecil Rhodes did not die to send me to school.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Chairman, that statement is not worthy of Major Cashin. I believe that he is too honourable to make a statement like that. If a man has brains enough to win the Rhodes Scholarship I trust that he is not the man to insult him on the floors of this House. I assure him . . .

MR. CASHIN—I . . .

MR. HALFYARD—I rise Mr. Chairman on the point . . .

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. It is now in the capacity of the Attorney General of this House that I rise and out of respect of this House. When I spoke just now I made the statement that I thought that the hon. member would withdraw that statement because I said that he was too honourable to make it and that it was not worthy of him, to attack a person with brains enough to win the Cecil Rhodes scholarship. The suggestion that he made was the hon. member for St. John's West was educated on charity because of the death of Cecil Rhodes. I know sereval of those that have won the Cecil Rhodes scholarship in this country and I pay every respect to them because they are all worthy of it, and they were not educated on charity.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, the point of order has been raised. I ask the Hon. Minister of Justice if it is right to have this apply to one of the hon. members and not to another when he has called the first a traitor.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —It is not.

MR. CHAIRMAN — I have said before that these remarks should not be passed, and I do not want to have to repeat it. I am going to ask the hon. member for Ferryland if he will be kind enough to withdraw these remarks.

MR. CASHIN—Alright, Mr. Chairman, I withdraw them.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—I just want to say that I think that it is very inconsistent for the Hon. Minister of Justice to take the point for one hon. member and not to take it for the other.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —If the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition is looking for trouble he will find it himself. The Minister of Justice is able to look after himself when the occasion arises. It is out of respect for the hon. member for Ferryland himself that I said that he was too honourable to say that. I thought that he would not want that statement of his on record. I did not say it because Mr. Browne is on this side of the House.

He made an attack on a person of brains when he said that because the hon. member won the Cecil Rhodes scholarship he was educated on charity. I want to say that the

himself in this row just at present. But I said that out of respect for the hon. member for Ferryland.

MR. CASHIN—I have taken it back and there is nothing more to do with taking back what I have been called. The Prime Minister is the only man who took back anything that was said to me. I think that the Prime Minister was gentleman enough to take it back. When I called anyone a traitor I called him a political traitor. And I mean it. Perhaps they are trying to frighten me because I am alone. I can tell the hon. gentlemen that I am as brave as they are.

Now Mr. Chairman when Mr. Le-Messurier made up this report he said that the duty could be taken off. It is your duty in this instance to take it off. And the Government has been derelict in its duty. If I have been out of order I regret it. I have not had an Oxford Education because I had to go to work at a very early age. When I was thirteen I had rowed the low oar in a trapskiff for six months.

I think that when we come to a point of order that some of the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House are out of order because they are reading the papers while I am speaking.

(Reads Tariff Commission's Report)

A masterpiece. Here is the masterpiece. It may be a masterpiece from the Commission's point of view, I agree. But now the Government bring it in here, and tell us it is a masterpiece, and tell the people of this country that it is a masterpiece. And they are soaking the blood out of the people of this country with their masterpiece. And to-day you come in here and want masterpieces of art imported into this country at 15 per cent. duty on it. I have put an amendment, and I agree that I do not know how to draft it, but it is not my duty, but if I was paid for it and had passed through the necessary schools to do it, I would do it. Where is the solicitor of the House—that is his job. It is not my job to draft amendments here—none whatever.

(Reads)

I state, Mr. Chairman, that it is going to be a most herculean task for the fishermen and labouring men of this country to pay extra taxation imposed upon them by this new schedule. A most herculean task, and one which they do not deserve to have put upon them, and one which they did not except, one which we did not promise them. We did not promise them that. As I said before, if I make a promise I would do everything in my power to carry it out. But we have not done everything that was in our power. We have made no attempt to carry out the promises outlined in the Manifesto of the Prime Minister.

(Reads)

I agree with that. It has received the support and endorsation of a certain section of the trade of Newfoundland. Certainly, it has, but it has not received the support of the majority of the people of this country, whom we are here to represent and whom as politicians, as their legislators, we have betrayed. It is a very difficult word. I have been called a traitor, and if it is being a traitor to stick out in the interests of the fishermen and labouring classes of this country, then I will be a traitor every time.

(Reads)

Certainly it differs radically. It differs in every degree. They have not taken off the duty on anything but hooks. The reason for that is that they are not manufactured in Newfoundland. That is the reason that the duty is taken off hooks. But if there were a hook factory in Newfoundland, you would find that from 25 to 30 per cent. would have been put on them.

(Reads)

I agree that it has been constructed on the group plan. But it is so constructed that you would have to be an expert to find out what rate of duty are on the articles to-day under the tariff.

(Reads)

And the people of this country regret it as the greatest imposition that has been placed upon them in the last forty years, and I defy contradiction here to-night. I have pledged myself to stand for them, and as I have said I am going to stand up here until my voice is gone, and my legs fall under me. They were going to close the House of Assembly to-morrow. It was their original intention. They may close it, but not while I have life left in me, and not unless I die to-night.

(Reads)

They offered no criticism. Certainly they did not—the local trade. This tariff does not effect them. It has been the greatest boost the local trade has had this last twenty years. Why? Because most of the big houses on Water Street to-day have had their goods imported this last three or four months, at the old rates of duty, and they are to-day selling the very same goods at the new tariff rate; and again I defy contradiction. What has the Government done to stop that unnecessary profiteering that is going on on Water Street? Therefore, I am told that I am a traitor—because I did not vote for that. As I said—I am a traitor, and proud of being a traitor, if that is the cause of me being a traitor.

(Reads)

Can we get the trade statistics under this tariff. I claim that according to that tariff that you are killing trade in Newfoundland. It is going to kill the trade of this country; and if I was not sincere, in what I am saying I would hardly think it worth my while to come down here and talk about it. But I mean it, and to prove it Mr. Chairman, if we all, or any of us live, unless they shoot the traitors, to go back to our constituents, we will tell them what we have done; and after there has been a general election, we will get our answer. Then the people will tell who the traitors are. The candidates will be hopping all over the country; hopping in and out, trying to see who is going to get elected, and who is not—figuring out how they will get off best. That is politics in Newfoundland to-day.

(Reads)

Mr. Chairman, as I stated before, they have not taken the recommendations that were sent to them. They asked for the recommendations of certain people outside, and then they did not take them. Did they ask for the recommendations of the local trades unions, and organizations of labour? No. Sir. They did not ask them. They considered only the trade. They neither considered them, nor did they care At least the Government did not care, and does not care, because they had this tariff report when they came into office. In spite of that they kept this report from the time they came into office, and all during last summer, and never talked it over. The Finance Minister admits it. The first thing that we find in the speech from the throne is that the Income Tax and the Business Profits Tax would come off; knowing quite well when they did it that they were going to bring in this extra taxation on the poor people of the country. They would have done very wisely if they had kept the Income Tax and the Business Profits Tax on themselves, and kept this extra taxation off the poor people who could ill afford to pay it.

(Quotes Report)

Certainly they laboured to help local trade. Here is a tariff written for a year and locked up in the Colonial Secretary's Department, and the

Government have not troubled to labour to assist the people whom they induced me to go out and fool. But I did not fool them, as I told them I would leave the party who would take taxes off themselves and put them on the poor.

A new schedule was submitted to the Board of Trade—that is an interesting sentence. If this was done a year ago and the trade saw it, isn't it only natural to think they would immediately commence to import goods in order to protect themselves. That's what they have done to-day, and the stores have added this tax on the goods they imported six months ago. I agree that if you reduce taxation the business people would be up against it, but this thing was given out a year ago, and they acted accordingly as good business men would.

(Quotes)

I should say they would send word to the Commission that there was no fault to be found with them. And why—because they immediately imported goods and put the duties on, and cleaned up from $600,000 to a million, and the Government is to blame for it.

(Reads)

Who comes under the head of Miscellaneous Manufacturers—The imperial Tobacco Co., The Ropewalk, The Clothing Factory and other corporations. These are producers that should not be in this class at all. When they mentioned the working people, did they remember the four thousand men that were starving at Sydney. As I said before when we had the big fire here a ship was sent with relief from Halifax in twenty-four hours, and this is a nice way we are returning their kindness.

(Quotes)

I have mentioned all these gentlemen and not one of them represents the fishermen. They represent themselves, and it is only natural to think they would look out for their own interests. They did not figure on helping the fishermen or labourers of the country, and the Government know they made a mistake, but if they were big enough the least they would do is to bring back the duty on clothing, lines and twines, tobacco and such other essential articles the way it was before. But no—they became bull-headed because Cashin left them, and Mr. Hickman and others on this side criticised them and they said "No" we will not put back the duties, we are a "big united party." I am doing everything I can to induce them to bring back the duties on the articles I mentioned, and if they do so, I am sure they will not regret it.

(Quotes)

There is not one fisherman or labourer asked to give evidence. Everyone and everything else was considered, but those who are the mainstay of the country.

(Quotes)

It has given everyone an opportunity to present their view, but did this Government give everyone a chance. I ask the Hon. the Minister of Finance if they gave me or others in the party a chance to express their views. I ask him didn't he table this tariff without asking the views of anybody, and then they all came to the opinion that it should not be looked at. I claim to-day that while there may be clever men in the Executive, there is not one who represents the fishermen or the labourers of the country. There is not one who even takes any interest in them, because in bringing in this tariff, the Finance Minister said in so many words in his introductory remarks that he had not given it any thought, but asked the House to take it as it was, and next year he would try to bring in a new one. That's what he asked, but I say that if he was sincere he should have kept this tariff out.

It was the duty of the Government to do it, and if necessary they should have kept the old tariff into effect and leave the income tax and profits tax on until next year, when the House and the Government could then bring in the proposed new schedule of a tariff and let us have it explained properly. That is the business of the Finance Minister and he knows that what I am saying is correct. The information to hand on the fisheries of the country was not considered at all by the Tariff Commission, and I think they erred. No notice was taken at all of the recommendations put forward by the different magistrates of the country who live amongst the fishermen and know their circumstances. Then again, what expert opinion did the Government have on that Commission in connection with the fisheries? None. Still we are told we are traitors if we do not vote for this tariff. The Government got recommendations from the outport magistrates and then consigned them to the wastepaper basket. Would it not make dogs and cats laugh? Why the members of the Government did not read this report of the Ttariff Commission until it was tabled in the House here. I make that statement here now subject to contradiction. Now it must be admitted that, under this tariff, an attempt is made to drive the young fishermen out of the country. Our population has not increased to any large extent for some years past, and we are very often asked the question why has it not increased? My opinion is that a tariff such as this is not an inducement to people to come in here and live and it is an inducement for Newfoundlanders to get out. I have heard the Prime Minister state in this House, and he gave his personal assurance, that lines and twines would not cost any more this year than they did last year. Whilst I do not doubt the Prime Minister's word, I would like to ask if that ten per cent. was not put on would they be cheaper this year? Several honourable members of the Government as well as the Opposition, apparently, are not taking any interest in the tariff because they adjourn to their rooms and smoke their pipes while the debate is on and say let the fishermen pay the piper. Surely it is not the job of the Tariff Commission to encourage and develop our main industry. Look what Canada has done for farming and what Nova Scotia has done for fishing, and I might say that most of the fish in Nova Scotia is caught on the Grand Banks. Now what have we done in that direction? If past Governments have done nothing that is no reason why we should do nothing. This Government promised the fishermen and farmers everything, but gave them nothing, and do not intend to give them anything. Last year in this House we voted two million dollars to be spent on highroads and to-night the Government has got no policy outlined for the spending of that money. The loans were raised and we got to pay the interest on them. It cost over a hundred thousand dollars to get that four million dollar loan. Therefore is not this the time for the Government to outline that road policy, if they have one in view. We are told by a member in another House that the Government have a road policy, but we are told in here that the Government got no such policy. Now which is correct? The House will close within a few days and I understand it is the intention of the Government to form a commission of gentlemen who do not represent anyone in this country but themselves, and who are going to get practically supreme control of the spending of that two million dollars.

Now if that is fair I don't know what to think of it. And I think that the hon. members of this House should have a voice in saying what way the money should be spent, because the people of this country have got to pay

it back sooner or later. If we don't pay it our children will have to pay it or our children's children. To-day in Newfoundland we are steeped in debt. We have an industry over on the West Coast which I trust Mr. Lake will guard well when he gets there. I hope and trust that he will look after the interests of the Newfoundlanders. But in reference to that I want to tell Mr. Lake that he is taking on some big job to go on the directorate of any company that involves $30,000,00, and that it takes some experience. I personally don't think that I would be competent to take that position. You will be getting up against financiers of repute. People who know every trick of the trade. You would want to stay up all night watching them and Mr. Lake is going up there for the interests of the people of Newfoundland because of the ten millions that the Government has invested in that concern. Now here is where I get after the Government.

(Reads.)

If a local industry in this country was protected and they have got further protection under this tariff, and as the Commission has sent in its report recommending certain things to be done, it is the bounden duty of the Government after reading the report of the Commission, which they did not do. In fact when the report was asked to be laid on the table of this House it had to be hauled out of a pigeonhole down in some Government office. That is my opinion in regard to the report. I venture that not three in the Executive Government have read it.

(Reads.)

I agree with the Commission. I am not like some members of the Government who want to go back and dig up old sores of late Governments, because I believe now if late Governments have made mistakes, and future Governments will make mistakes, and the present Government have made mistakes, it will not do any good to go back and criticise the Government of four or ten years ago. We have got to remedy the present standing of conditions in this country.

(Reads.)

Right. They have no power to reduce or increase taxation. That is the duty of the Government. The Government alone are the people who have erred. And how have they erred? They have erred on the wrong side. They have taken the income tax off themselves and put it on the fishermen and the labourers of Newfoundland. That is how they have erred. While we may not be blessed with the education of some of the members of this House, at least I have got a certain amount of common sense because I have not got to pay my income this year. But I should have to.

(Reads.)

Now that 25 p.c. was taken off in Mr. Warren's regime, and this tariff that we have got here to-night is going back to the Squires Government of three years ago. And the Commission were told to go and make a new tariff and put on the duties. They acted according to instructions. They put it on, but where did they put it on? I am surprised at any hon. member in this House attempting to defend that tariff. If I was going to prepare for an election campaign to-morrow I would not have to get up any propaganda or to tell any stories about Monroe. All that I would have to say would be tariff, tariff, tariff. And I predict that any man who was boosting that tariff would never be nominated in Ferryland District, because they would drive him out of it.

(Reads.)

Now when the Tariff Commission sent their report in the income tax was not off. No sir, as far as the Tariff Commission's duty was concerned they carried it out. And they have endeavoured to make the tariff bear equally on all the people. What did the Gov-

ernment do? They ignored that tariff report, and they made the tariff bear not equally on all the people because they took it off the rich man after they got this report. There would have been some slight excuse if they did not have this report. But there is no excuse now. None whatever, because we can't get away from the fact that they took the income tax off themselves and shoved it on the poor man of this country. I know it and they know it. And the Prime Minister the other day, when he replied to my remarks on the various items of the tariff, made no defence whatever of taking the income tax off the wealthy man and putting it on the poor man, which is an admission on his part that he was wrong.

(Reads.)

Now 15 per cent. has been put on works of art and paintings and 65 per cent. on readymade clothes. I wonder how many works of art were imported into this country last year? It would be interesting to find out. But I think that the Government would have made themselves look much better if they had left out works of art. When I came across that sentence in the tariff this afternoon it disgusted me so much that it resulted in my holding up this House until half-past six, and the Government asks us to come in here and put a duty of 15 per cent. on works of art and the labourer has to pay 65 per cent. on a suit of clothes. Now, Mr. Chairman, after looking over this matter and considering it I hope that they will make that duty from 65 per cent. to 52 per cent., and I don't want the credit for it. They can have it themselves.

(Reads.)

They had no power to proceed but the Government had the power to proceed. They ignored the Commission. They told the fishermen in so many words that they had no earthly use for them and the labourers and the middle-class man in this country. They told them that they had not any use for them. That is the attitude that they adopted.

The public is making application here to-night for relief and you absolutely refuse—absolutely refuse it. And the Finance Minister will come in here next year with a surplus of from two hundred and fifty thousand dollars to four hundred thousand dollars. You are going to bring in a surplus with some of the people of this city out of work. People are coming to me every day looking for work. But the Government has done nothing for them. They might have started the work on the dock and have given them some employment but for some of the gentlemen of the Upper House who stopped it. And then the Government had an engineer down from St. John, New Brunswick, to tell them that the Bishop and the Crandall proposition was alright. I stood by the Bishop proposition and I still stand by it. That million dollar proposition was the best one and I still think so. That passed this House and when it went to the Upper House some of the gentlemen up there stopped it and it has not started yet. They are trying to dictate to the intelligence of this House, if we have any intelligence here at all. The work should have been started two weeks ago. That was my idea. We should have taken no notice of them whatever. Our people are hungry in St. John's and they have been looking for the work on the dock for a long time now. And from the present indications the work will not start for another ten or twelve days. And this will mean that it may not be finished this fall because the weather in the months of December and January are not suitable for doing concrete work. When I was speaking with Mr. Bishop he told me that he would like to start as early as possible because, as I said, the weather conditions in December and January are not suitable for concrete work. And now the dock will not

be in condition for another twelve months.

I am going to get copies of this Tariff Commission's report and send them to the people of my district. Because they will not be able to see it printed in the papers I will have to send it myself.

They are going to abolish the duty on jams and jellies. I am sure that the fishermen of this country will be glad to hear that. But they have put the duty up on lines and twines. They have put it up on tobacco. What will the hook and line man have in his grub box when he goes out to the fishing grounds now in the early morning. Mr. Chairman, I suppose he will have a jam and a jelly—a jam and a jelly.

I know just as much about the fishermen of the country as Mr. Lake knows about the pulp industry on the Humber. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that there is a member in this House who is capable of holding his own with these financiers that will be over there. This is a great big forty million dollars concern and the hon. member for Burin will be lost. Mr. Lake is going to give the bank fishery up and become a capitalist. I congratulate you, Mr. Lake.

MR. LAKE—I thank you.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE —I beg to draw your attention, Mr. Chairman, to the fact that it is now half-past six.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, May 1st, 1925.

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

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the electors of St. John's East on the same subject as the petition I presented a couple of days ago. This petition is largely signed by people whose names were not on the first petition. I give this petition my hearty support and I ask that it be given consideration by the Government.

This is the only petition that I have presented since I came into the House and it is that the Government open the district of St. John's East for a bye-election. It is the same petition that I presented yesterday only it is signed by different people.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, I beg to suport the petition.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from the inhabitants of Random Island, Shoal Harbor and Clarenville and vicinity. They ask for a bridge to be built across the Bar at Smith Sound. Secondly, they ask that a motor road be built extending from the head of the bridge down to Britannia. And thirdly, they ask that a carriage road be built from Britannia to Hickman's Harbor. The petition is signed by 230 electors at Britannia and vicinity. Now the idea that a bridge be built across Smith Sound is not a new one. It has long been an inconvenience for the people of Random Island when they have to connect with the railway at Shoal Hr. or Clarenville. The bar is so shallow that it will not admit of any size boat passing over it and the question has been raised as to whether it should be dredged so as to make it passable for boats to pass over the bar or whether it should be bridged. Evi-

dently the people themselves are the best ones to decide as to what is the better plan. It would mean a considerable saving of money for the people of this section of the district and it would no doubt increase their earning capacity. As this is a very costly matter perhaps the Government, if the whole of the petition cannot be granted this year, might be inclined to consider one of the headings of the petition. If it could be arranged it would mean a considerable improvement in the conditions of the people of Random Sound and Smith Sound. They have hardly any means of transportation over the above mentioned Sound. If the Government would see its way clear to have the road built from the head of the bridge to Britannia and up Random Sound via Lady Cove to Elliott's Cove, it would make a circuit of the whole island and it would then be a beautiful drive not only for the people there but also for the people who might visit there. I beg to support the prayer of the petitioners and I hope that the Government will see its way clear to grant their request. If they cannot grant the whole of the petition I hope that they will do the best they can. Perhaps they may consider either one, two or three of the parts of the petition. The roads there are now in a bad state of repair and they should be fixed up. The petition is signed by the Rev. Robert H. Mercer and two hundred and thirty others and I ask that the petition be referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. GODDEN—I am sure that the petitioners know what they want and I beg to support the petition.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the residents of Leading Tickles in reference to the building of a road. This is in need of attention on account of the fact that the children have a long way to go to school and it is absolutely necessary that it should receive attention. I ask that the petition be referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to support the petition and seeing that it is such a small amount and will put the road in good condition for the school children of the place, I hope that the Government will see its way clear to grant the petition. I beg to support the petition.

Hon. Mr. Long presented Report of the Select Committee respecting the application for legislation of the Western Railway Limited, as follows:

The Select Committee appointed to consider the Petition of the Western Marine Railway, Ltd., beg to report that they have considered the matter to them referred and notwithstanding that due and sufficient notice has not been given of the intended application for the Bill in question they respectfully recommend that leave be granted for the introduction of the Resolutions in the form hereto annexed.

(Sgd.) Joseph J. Long,
J. R. Bennett,
Peter J. Cashin,
W. W. Halfyard.

MR. CASHIN gave notice of question.

HON THE MINISTER OF FINANCE —I beg leave to say that the question has already been asked by Major Cashin about the duty on the tobacco and it is in course of preparation and it may be here this afternoon. With reference to Col. Sullivan I can answer that question now. Col. Sullivan or nobody else received any money for the raising of the loan except the Bank of Montreal for the advertising on the other side. Nobody else whatever received any money.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the Minister of Finance that the question that I asked before was for 1924. This question is for 1925.

MR. HALFYARD gave notice of question.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Did you say the number of vessels that have been repaired on the dock since its inception?

MR. HALFYARD—Yes. Mr. Prime Minister. That would be very important information and I would like to have the answer. I hope that the Prime Minister will make an endeavour to have it answered. We could then find the earnings of the dock in the past.

HON. MR. LONG asked Hon. the Leader of the Opposition to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing how many messages he sent to the South West Coast and other places advising people to send in messages against the duties put on Lines and Twines. Also state to whom these messages were sent and Table copies of same.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Speaker, I beg to reply that as the Leader of the Opposition I sent no telegrams.

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 a Tax on Certain Incomes," and "An Act Respecting a Tax on Goods Imported into Newfoundland," without amendment.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they have passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 4 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of Legislative Disabilities and the Vacation of Seats in the House of Assembly" with some amendments, in which they request the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

HON THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Speaker, In connection with these amendments I would like to ask that they be allowed to stand over until to-morrow as I have not had the time to consider them. It will be remembered that in the past we have adopted the English Act which says that the election shall take place within six months from the date of the proclamation. And it is thought that this might in some cases be too long. I would like to ask that they be deferred until to-morrow . You might have the election in December and the proclamation might not be issued until April or May so that instead of six months it might be stretched out to ten or twelve and so the suggestion is that we make it within six months after the date for the polling for the elections for the General Assembly. With your permission Mr. Speaker I would like to have the consideration of these resolutions put on the Order Paper for to-morrow.

On motion consideration of the said amendments was deferred till to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the 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. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that the hon. members submit the amendments and have them take the vote at the reporting stage of the Committee. I have no intention to raise any objection, but no amendment lowering the tariff can be moved unless there is a corresponding amendment made in the resolutions in the other direction. So I suggest that the hon. members would have the amendments prepared and handed to the Chairman and then they might be put at the reporting stage of the committee. I merely make the suggestion as that is the most convenient proceedure.

MR. CASHIN—I thought that it was

the duty of the solicitor of the House to make the amendments in writing. But does the Minister of Justice say that they must be in writing?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —They need not.

MR. CASHIN—Do I understand that the amendments to the tariff must be made after they have all gone through?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE

HON. MIN. JUSTICE—That the procedure I say is this that if a member makes an amendment to the tariff he must have a change also for making up of any money that would be lost by the amendment that he has made. If there is a reduction made in one diection then there must be a means of making it up in some other way. That is always the parliamentary proceedure. I merely make this as a suggestion.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman: When I finished my remarks a few days ago I stated that I thought that the Government should follow the procedure established elsewhere. At the time that the Labour party was returned in the English elections they had promised a reduction of taxation and it will be remembered that when they came into the House of Parliament they brought in resolutions to that effect. In the session of the fall of the year Mr. Philip Snowdon the Chancellor of the Exchequer brought in a number of proposals that put some articles on the free list for which duties had been collected for three or four years previous. Not only that he reduced the tax upon incomes although he did not remove it altogether. And the result was that there was considerable relief to the taxpayers of Great Britain not for one class or for the other class but for all classes. Now the position that we take is that the Goverment has been in power now for nine months. It could not be expected that they could bring in any proposals at the last session but after they have been nine months in office they have had plenty of time at their disposal to go into the tariff and to have consulted not only the importers and the manufacturers but the people as well. I would like to ask the hon. member for St. John's West who is supposed to be a representative of the Labouring men of this city, if the Government has consulted him on this tariff and if they asked him about the articles that should have more taxation put upon them when they were coming into this country. And if you were not it shows that the Government did not, when they were considering the tariff, take into consideration the question of how this was going to effect all classes of the community and the country. And that shows that they were derelict in their duty, that they did not take seriously the promises that they had made during the election in the Spring of the year. A prominent member of the Government had been going round the city visiting debating clubs and associations of various kinds outlining a policy that the Government should follow in this country, and he went on to say that all the department should be cut down, and that there was no need to have two departments existing where one could do the work, and that the number of officials that were in the employ of the Government was so numerous that you could not go into any department without tumbling over them. All this sort of talk was given out to those who attended these meetings, no matter whether it was in St. John's or in the outports; where a delegation was sent in order to stampede the electorate of this country into believing that a new policy would be inaugurated along these lines; but we have failed to see them carry out that policy.

As the Premier very properly pointed out on two or three occasions

since this debate started, that you cannot have any reduction of taxation without a reduction of expenditure; and they have had nine months in which to go through the various departments, and see what they can lop off, and where they can take away a lot of unnecessary expenditure that has been going on for the last many years.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—We have spent four of those nine months in this House listening to you gentlemen.

MR. GRIMES—Still they have done that elsewhere within the same time, and I think that Newfoundlanders ought to be just as capable and progressive as any other class of people informulating schemes that concern the welfare of the people.

In 1914 the debt of this country was $23,000,0000.00. To-day it is $66,000,0000.00. That is to say that in ten years the debt of this country has increased 275 p.c. Now this debt to some extent was partly due to the war, and it was also due to a certain amount of unnecessary expenditure which had been cropping up from year to year, which was making the taxpayer's dollar become less every time that taxation was increased as a result of that borrowing. At the same time, in 1914, Sir Michael Cashin delivered his Budget Speech, and at that time the revenue required for the carrying on of the Government was about four million dollars. But to-day it is necessary to ask the people of this country to pay over $9,560,-000.00 to carry on the same Government that in 1914 only required four million dollars. In other words the cost of running the Government in Newfoundland to-day has increased 130 p.c. How does that concern the taxpayers of this country? Let us look at the trade of the country. In 1914 the total trade of this country was $30,000,000.00—to-day it is $48,-000,000.00. In other words the total trade has increased only 65 p.c. during the same period that the public debt has increased 275 p.c., and the cost of the running of the Government has increased 130 p.c. How does that effect the taxpayers of the country to-day. It means this—that out of that $9,560,000 that is required it is necessary to collect from every family in this country one hundred and ten dollars more per family than it was necessary to collect in 1914. And what does that mean to the wage earners to-day? It means that in order for him to pay this $110.00 extra taxation to carry on the Government of this country, he has to have an increased income over what he had in 1914 of $400.00 a year. Now I would like to ask to-day if the labourers of this country, whether in the city or in the outports, whether his income has increased to the same extent as the cost of Government. There is only one answer to that. The answer to that is that for the past four months we have had to help the people to keep them from starving, and that to-day you have spent from 60 to 70 thousand dollars in passing out a dole. A thing which has never been done, except on one or two occasions in the history of this country. But this year we have had to pay out seventy thousand to save the people of this city and outside the city. I say that the situation is serious because the taxes are so high to-day that the earning people of this country, the mechanics, the labouring men, and the middle classes have only sufficient to tide them over the twelve months of the year; and that is a condition of things that we are likely to have for many years to come, unless we increase the earning power of the people to a much greater degree than it stands at the present time.

We to-day find ourselves in this

position that we are in the same way as they are in England. We will have to do the same as they are doing in England to-day, and their action is decried by many. There are even several labour leaders in England who think that it is going to be a most disastrous experiment. They saw that a very serious condition was facing them in the old country. We have our lessons to learn and we can very well look at the Government of Britain who to-day has voted a sum of sixty million pounds, in order to build up highways, and in order to improve railways, and other works of that kind, so that instead of paying out the dole, and having the people get something for nothing, they will be getting work and getting with it an independent spirit; and they will feel that they are performing something, so that they will be able to look their fellow men in the face and say that they have earned an honest dollar.

We could very well learn the same lesson that England has learned, when she had the same experience as ourselves. Mr. Chairman I consider that our Government fell down. The Government should have gone along the same policy as the British Government, and instead of these people being a public charge to-day, these men could have been able to earn some money, and go down and buy their goods where they wanted to, instead of having to go to the place that is selected for them.

I say, Sir, that the taxation is bearing so heavily upon the labourers, and fishermen, and clerks and middle classes that they have to pay at least twice the taxation that they had in 1914, and the vast majority of the wage earners to-day is not earning that amount; and that means that a large number of them are bound to have the greatest difficulty to make both ends meet when the year's bills are coming in at the end of the year.

You can go through all the small grocers' shops in the city and in the outports to-day, and you will find that they will all tell you the same thing, that they have hundreds and even thousands of dollars owing to them on their books to-day from people, whom the grocers will tell you they belived had an honest intention of paying when they contracted the debts, but which they were prevented from paying because of the bad conditions in the country. But despite that fact, and despite the fact that the people are heavily taxed to-day we are asked to pile on more taxes onto them, and make it more difficult than ever for these men to pay their bills; and consequently not only damaging the people themselves, but putting these grocers out of business.

While I am on this point I would like to say a word on behalf of the small grocers of the town to-day. I venture to say that if seventy five per cent. of the people who have been given credit by these small grocers to-day, had gone down on Water Street to some of the big merchants on Water Street, they would have been told that there was no credit there for them. That if they wanted to get anything from them they would be told to put down the cold cash. I say, Mr. Chairman, that it is not a creditable position that the Government is in too-day. I say that these grocers have done a service for this community, and for the Government, because by giving these people credit they have saved the Government thousands of dollars which the Government would otherwise have had to pay out in relief. Therefore, I say that the Government should expend that money in such a way that these people would be able to pay their bills at the grocers. Let the money get back to the grocers who

have helped the Government out.

No, Mr. Chairman, I submit the Government should provide the Ways and Means whereby the laborers would be given employment, and then the conditions of to-day would not be in existence. Of course, we are charged here when we talk of keeping the tariff down, that we are trying to kill local industry in Newfoundland. But that is far from our minds, we want to encourage local industry, and see money coming into the country. We want to see the money staying in the country, and not going out for goods that should be produced here, but when we know today industries are paying from ten to fifteen per cent, in some cases, even on watered stock, have we a right to tax the people even as much as 6 p.c. to swell the profits of those who are already receiving big dividends. If these industries were in a position that they were paying no dividends, but sinking money, it would be different altogether, but when we know that dividends are being paid even on watered stock, I say that it is grossly unfair to the mechanics, laborers and fishermen, that they should be forced to pay more out of their pockets when their earning power is less than it was before. The tax on readymades—that is the amendment we were talking about—We say put the duty back to 52 p.c., and reduce it on the goods that the every day man has to import and leave them in the position they were before. But to increase the duty to 70 p.c. on an article which is used by every laborer, mechanic and middle class man is to deal out injustice, and it will come back later on your shoulders in a way which you will not like. As I said before, the man who buys a pair of overalls has to pay 25 p.c. more than before, the one who buys a shirt has to pay an advance of 25 to 75 cents, the woman who buys her kitchen dress has to pay from 75 cents to a dollar more than last year, and the same applies in proportion when she buys an apron or anything else. If a poor woman to-day buys a pair of overalls for her child she has to pay from 25 to 75 cents more than last year, according to the value of the article. Do you call that right, or giving consideration to the working people. I say that it is the greatest injustice ever perpetrated by any Government in Newfoundland. No administration before dared to put on an increase of 70 p.c. in the duties on the articles used in the everyday life of the country. Not only was that done in connection with readymades, but take the household remedies to-day used by the poorer classes. Take the case of the man who has to go home to an outport where there is no doctor, and who takes minard's liniment, radways, vaseline or some other common article with him. Today he has to pay 50 p.c. more for it. Is that what you call a square deal to all. Those who use these articles are not the wealthy, who formerly paid an income tax, and have now been relieved of it, but they are the poorer classes, the fishermen, laborers and mechanics. This also affects his wife and children. Take an article like spirits of nitre on which we were paying 40 p.c. last year. It is used everywhere by doctors, and sold in all drug stores for use in the prevention of fever, and it is a necessary article everywhere. On this article which is so necsesary and affects every family, there is an increase from 40 to 70 p.c. This is another instance of so called square deal. Then there is aromatic spirits of ammonia, which is used by physicians in cough mixtures. Last year it was 40 p.c., but now we got to pay 70 p.c. on it. Everybody knows that in the winter cough mixtures are largely used by those who do not

partake of brandy or whiskey. A great deal of these mixtures are used by the people, and this article which goes into them has now to pay 70 p.c., and that is called a square deal. Mr. Chairman, I can take several other items used as household remedies, and point out that they bear the same rate of increase. This applies to methylated spirit also which are used for medicinal purposes. It is used by people who are sick, and who have become sore from lying in bed, to harden the skin. Are we considering the sick poor when we increased the duty on this article from 40 to 70 p.c. And that is the statement I want to reiterate—no thought has been given to fixing this tariff on a basis that would be equitable to all the people. In 1914 we were running the country at a cost to the taxpayers of less than four millions, and tea, pork and sugar were put on the free list. To-day you got to take nine and a half millions out of the pockets of the peoople to carry on the affairs of the country. In the face of this you told the people that the Government of the country was costing too much, and you were returned to power on that cry, but in nine months have largely increased the taxes on the people. Therefore, at the present time nobody takes the Government seriously. Last year there were 26,000 people did not go to the polls to vote, because they had learned that politicians making promises were not carrying them out, and that will occur next year when the people find they have been deceived by you. It is easy to read the signs of the times—the working classes are forming a federation of labor with the object of taking up these matters, and how that movement will work out will depend on the manner in which the Government will handle the question. We all know what happened in Russia on account of the unjust treatment of the people, and what the country is going through too-day. If you do not stop this increasing of taxation, the people here will think and act the same as they did in Russia, and can you blame the man who has a family to support, and cannot get enough to carry them along if he did break loose. The working people here cannot find steady employment—many classes like the longshoremen do not get more than seven months work, and in that time they have to earn enough to do them for the whole year. If you make it harder for these people to pay for their goods I say there is only one conclusion they can come to, and that is they will say "Patience has ceased to be a virtue." The men are forming this federation of labor, and whether they conduct themselves peaceably or otherwise will depend on whether you ameliorate their conditions or not. We have referred to the mechanic, and the position he is placed in to-day, the man who carried on construction work, or wants to put up a building, the man who wants to buy tools. To-day they cost him from $1.50 to $2.00 more than they did last year. Is that a position in which to place these men? If their wages had gone up in proportion there would be little to complain of, but when we find the necessaries of life and the tools with which they make their living largely increased, while their wages have not, we can understand the feeling of the people throughout the country towards the Government. I say to the Government, if you are seriously concerned as you say you are about the welfare of the people and the man with the small income, then you will be quite ready to accept the suggestion that has been made and leave the tariff as it was on the necessaries of life. When you do that there will be some reason to claim that you are interested in the working classes of

the country; but otherwise there is only one conclusion to come to and that is that you have failed to carry out your promises and that you stand condemned, faithless, untrustworthy and not worthy to have the confidence of the people any longer.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to speak at any great length as my voice is about gone, but I feel like having a crack at to-day's "Daily News" over the scene that took place in the House yesterday, and I want to ask you, Mr. Chairman, if you consider if that paper is fair in its view? Why did it not tell the whole truth and nothing but the truth? It told that I got in wrong, but it didn't tell about any member of the Government getting in wrong. If the Minister of Justice is here to administer justice, it is part of his job to see that I get justice equal with any member of the Government side. The "Daily News" this morning did not mention in its report anything about Mr. Sullivan's pension for war services. That was part of the proceedings yesterday. You did not put that in. You only put in what was thought would deceive the people of this country, particularly in the outports, although this paper does not go into Ferryland very much. I have got hundreds of letters and telegrams from my constituents endorsing the stand I am taking with regard to this tariff. Yesterday we were speaking of works of art and compared the duty on them with the duty on clothes, and whilst I have done everything in my power to induce the Government to reduce taxation for the benefit of the working classes of this country, evidently they do not intend to reduce taxation. Now I do not care for the "Daily News" or for any other paper in this country. The Minister of Justice brought me to order, but he said nothing to the man on the other side. I would also like to repeat again this evening that Mr. Sullivan ought to be ashamed of himself to be accepting a war pension and the "Daily News" have not got type large enough to put it in black letters and display it all over the city; but the Daily News got type large enough to assail me because I have the courage of my convictions. Talk about prohibition and milk and whiskey. They started in to print the report of the Tariff Commission this morning. Well I serve notice now that they better start tomorrow morning and publish Colonel Ross's report and various other reports that I propose to read to this House. In making one of my last appeals to the Government of this country on the tariff I tell them in all sincerity that they have betrayed the electorate of Newfoundland. The Government considers it right to slap on this proposed taxation and I consider it wrong, and whilst I am using every means in my power to induce them to reconsider their proposition, I feel that if the great mass of the electorate were to assemble in this city and those people who elected you ten months ago and demanded of the Government, who are the paid servants of the people, to take off these duties, you would have to take them off, and I am not speaking in any rebellious sense in making this remark to strengthen my argument, the Prime Minister said in his manifesto that if returned to power he would reduce taxation.

If the people who put the misplaced onfidence in you got in a body and marched to this House and demanded you to resign or to take off the additional taxation that will crush the life's blood out of them they would be quite justified. In thanking the members of the Opposition for supporting the Amendment now before the chair, they feel, as I do, that it was their bounden duty that they owe to their constituents. I

think that it is their duty to get the party together and I want to say right here that they have cut Cashin out. Let them take up their duty. It is our job. That is the promise that we gave to our constituents. Are they prepared to do that. They are prepared to do nothing. But the people of this country will settle with you when they get the opporutnity. In reading through the tariff we had arrived at Mr. Dempster's recommendations.

(Reads)

And I notice in the comments on Mr. Dempster's remarks in reference to double ratings for jams and jellies.

(Reads)

The Government has seen fit to ignore the recommendation of Mr. Dempster and the Commission have taken 15 per cent. off jams and jellies and they have stuck it on readymade clothes. Mr. Chairman, you can't put forth any reasonable argument to substantiate that. Jams and jellies are not used by the fishermen or the labourers. Some years ago during one of the late Governments they took the duty off sausages and you want to take it off jams and jellies. Is that a fair deal? That is anything but fair, and in backing this amendment to a finish I want to warn the Government that before they put this through to consider the matter again, and I want to tell them now that there are several more amendments that have got to be made to the various items of the tariff.

There is 15 p.c. taken off jams and jellies and an extra 25 p.c. put on readymade clothes. Surely any business man apart from politics altogether would see the evil of his way there. They are sticking the duty on lines and twines and tobacco. Give the fishermen jams and jellies. It is fish and brewis that a lot of them eat in the morning.

MR. BROWNE—There is no duty taken off jams and jellies.

MR. CASHIN—Now we had a scuff yesterday, and you are after another one now. I am not going to be interrupted by the Hon. Member.

MR. BROWNE—I am only correcting what you said. The rating of the last few years is not the present year.

MR. CASHIN—It is really a reduction during the last few years. But there is nothing during the last few years about a reduction of duty on lines and twines.

MR. BROWNE—Nobody is talking about lines and twines now. You are going away from the subject. The fact is that you don't want to admit your mistake.

MR. CASHIN—I admit my mistake. I admit the mistake I made when I had any connection with a party that had you in it.

MR. BROWNE—Now the Hon. Member better take care because if he is going to start making personal attacks on me I am going to make some personal attacks on him.

MR. CHAIRMAN — One moment please. I want the Hon. Members to recognise the fact that the Member for Ferryland is the Hon. Member for Ferryland and must be addressed as such. And the Member for St. John's West is the Hon. Member for St. John's West and must be addressed as such.

MR. CASHIN—(Reads)—What rating have we had during the past few years, that is my point. This tariff report was sent in in March 1924, which means that this report has been in the hands of the Government for nearly a year, and they have not been decent enough to consider it or even read it. And even if jams and jellies have nothing to do with the fisheries of this country what about works of art, and 50 or 65 p.c. on readymade clothes? You are split-

ting hairs when you talk about 5 p.c. off of jams and jellies and 15 p.c. off of works of art. As we go through this report we will get some more information.

(Reads)

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am considering whether I will read it all over again. I don't want to, but if the Hon. Member opposite keeps interrupting me I will have to speak until I drop. My Hon. friend, the Member for St. John's West, has seen fit to come in here and to make personal attacks on me. Why has he picked me out. My answer is this, and I challenge him now. Resign your seat and come up to St. John's West and see where you will get off. And your whole team, sir. You would need some education to find out where you are going to get off then. You would need an adding machine to count up my votes in comparison to yours. Here is a challenge tonight on the tariff. Here we are talking about jams and jellies and lines and twines and everything else, and the fishermen of this country are worse off to-day than they were a year ago. Take the fishermen who are coming into town to-day to get their supplies, only to find that they are gone up 20 p.c. more than they were last year. In some instances they won't be given supplies by the merchant. It looks to me as if the prospects of the fishery are not going to be as good this year as last year, because we are attempting to destroy our main industry. And we are giving it the finishing blow in this tariff. Now my challenge is this: If you think that you are doing right and you are conscientious about it, go to the people to-day. You would imagine that because they are here and they are given charge of everything by the people that they are solidly entrenched. I have seen people solidly entrenched and they have been blown out of it. There will be a barrage put down on the Newfoundland Government as it is known to-day. One of the most intense that was ever known during the Great War. Mr. Chairman, my blood boils tonight when I think that I went to the District of Ferryland and deceived the people. And I am surprised at a man of the calibre of the Prime Minister deceiving the people who sent him here. He deceived them, sir, in his short manifesto.

(Reads)

The Government was against the people. Now I don't say that the people are going to be liberal in the future. They can't be liberal because the incomes from the fisheries this year will be nothing. That is if we have an average fishery. I am referring now to the hook and line man. I think that a fairly good catch of fish would be fifty quintals. Now let us figure that out. We will say that the man has three or four members in his family. Let us put down his catch at eight dollars a quintal. That would be four hundred dollars. Where is that man going to get off at the next fall. How is he going to live with lines and twines 10 p.c. and tobacco increased 5 or 6 cents a pound. I don't know how much jams and jellies are imported, but I do know this, that it is the duty of the Government to take the extra duy off clothes and tobacco and lines and twines, and give the fishermen of this country a chance. What about the West Coast fishery. What have you done for them this year? And that brings me to another point. The West Coast disaster. Mr. Chambers had to go out on the street and get a public subscription, and do you think the Government would give him a few dories, second hand dories, to send to the people up there? They had to depend on the charity of the people of Newfoundland and not on the Gov-

ernment. What about the Sydney strikers? What are you doing for them? Are you going to ship them off a consignment of jams and jellies? You have done nothing of a concrete nature. Ask any common sense man; education is not everything. A lot of it makes fools of some of us. Carry out your promises and the country will appreciate it. Deceive them and they will have their revenge. Now I don't want any more controversy about jams and jellies and works of art.

Mr. Chairman, I will reserve any further remarks till I come to the lines and twines in this tariff. And I want to tell this House right now that if the people of this country rose in rebellion and drove us out of this House I would not call them rebels in any sense.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I would like to take advantage of this opportunity to deal with the matter which is of much importance to my constituents. I refer now to the report on the railway, where it shows that service made a profit up to December 31st of $152,137.68. I think in reply to a question of Mr. Ashbourne as to the earnings and expenditure of the Railway for January and February, it was shown that there was a loss of about $30,000 more than for the corresponding months in 1924-1925. The loss is greater by $30,000 for the two months in the preceding year. At December 31st, 1924, the profits of the Railway were less than for this year by $11,000, and add the $30,000 to this, it makes over $40.00 worse off at the end of February than we were last year. The earning power of the Railway is really much less now than it was last year. Construction work at the Humber is practically finished, especially at the Humber Canal, Deer Lake and Howley, and the only work of that kind of any imortance which is now going on is at Corner Brook. The increase in the earnings of the Railway was caused by the thousands of men going and returning last year, increasing the passenger earnings, and the freight earnings were increased by the carrying of materials for the contractors. I understand in one month last year the Railway received $40,000 for the transportation of materials. All this is now over, and it will not be duplicated the coming year, which is a matter to which the Government should have given consideration. I presume that when we go into the additional estimates, the Government will take a vote for the loss on the operation of the Railway, for as sure as we are here, there will be a loss which cannot be estimated at present. That is something we have to face, and our position in connection with the earning power of the Railway is not so favorable as it was twelve months ago. Another matter to be considered is the expenditure resulting from the increase—perhaps necesarily so—of the pay of the section-men, and also the number of these men. But it is all adding to the burden of finances of the country. I do not agree with the policy of the Government in managing the Railway. They may have good intentions, but you cannot eliminate the thought that the management is purely and simply a party machine, and it does not put the members of the Railway Commission in a very enviable position. It has been suggested that there is no reason why members of the Government could not share in the gain that accrues to those who are interested in the supplying of the Railway, and in my opinion it would be better for such members to have nothing to do with the supplying. It is also thought that the fact of the Government being in charge is not giving the General Manager a free hand, because if an em-

ployee is brought to book, suspended or dismissed, he can come back with the retort that he will see a representative of the Commission or of his district about it which is an intimidation, and prevents things going on as they should. The Railway has cost us millions, and I think it will continue to cost us more, and the earning power will not be such to make it an asset. Therefore if the Government have not thought of having the Railway run by a private concern, I think they should give the idea consideration, and make the arrangements as soon as possible. While the Railway shows that it is earning money is the best time to enter into negotiations for its operation by somebody else, and we should not wait until it shows a loss to do this. My object in speaking of the Railway, as I stated before, is to draw attention to the fact that some of my constituents have had cattle killed by the trains, and early in the Session I asked for a statement of same in connection with such killing from 1923-1925. I have the statement showing numerous applications for cattle being killed and those claims number some hundreds. The parties I am interested in are Mr. R. J. Pretty, of Dildo; Mr. Manuel Efford and Mr. Efford of Dildo. On May 5th, 1924, Mr. R. J. Pretty had two horses killed on the same day. The claim was sent in on the 9th. Mr. Efford had one killed on the 6th and Mr. Green of Heart's Delight another, so that all these were killed about the same date. Compensation has been given to parties who had cattle killed before and since. Some of those were paid through the Agriculture and Mines Department.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Under the agreement with the Reids no claim was paid if the animal was killed over a mile outside a settlement.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Pretty is in a hard position and we have gone about—from pillar to post I may say —but still he has got no compensation.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Altogether clear of politics, we have refused to pay claims for cattle killed outside a mile from a settlement.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Was not that the position when you were on the Commissioon, Mr. Halfyard.

MR. HALFYARD—I really thought the Government intended to give this matter some consideration as the refusal of these claims is an injustice.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Tell us someone who has been paid for an animal killed outside the mile limit.

MR. HALFYARD—You will find that by reference to the Dept. of Agriculture and Mines.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—No such claims were paid by this administration.

HON. THE MINISTER OF POSTS—If Mr. Halfyard has a list I would like him to read it as I am interested in this matter.

MR. HALFYARD—I think that something should be done in connection with these outstanding claims, and that the Railway Commission should give the matter proper consideration. The greater number of the claims for cattle killed were paid and I hold the rest should be paid in a similar way. It appears that Pye's claim had been disputed, and then it was brought before the Railway Commission and it was decided to pay it. Now I positively say that if I had been elected on the Government side that the claims I have referred to would have been paid. Why hold them up on mere technicalties? Who can define the settlement when Dildo is only two miles from Broad Cove. According to the list I have

here everyone of the claims for cattle killed up to May of last year were paid except those of Pretty, Efford and Ivany. Now I do not think that is a square deal. Where a poor man is concerned he has to be governed by the strict letter of the law and therein again is the policy of the present Government being carried out. I know that in the Manifesto issued by Sir Michael Cashin in 1919 there was a clause in it which said that a commission would be appointed to enquire into all claims made against the railway for cattle killed whether such claims had been refused by the Reid Newfoundland Company or not. I think it is a great hardship on the owners of cattle to have their claims left outstanding. I do not see anything just or right about it, and I do not see why all claimants should not get the same consideration from the Railway Commission, although I do not say for a moment that the Prime Minister would favour discrimination, and I again ask the Government to re-consider outstanding claims in which cattle were killed a mile and a quarter outside a settlement instead of a mile?

I do not know whether the time that has been taken up in discussing this tariff has had any influence on the minds of the Government, but any one here this afternoon who listened to the speech made by Mr. Grimes would certainly have been convinced that the tariff as it is acts very unfairly on those who can least bear the burden of taxation. I am sure that that will be appreciated by Mr. Little and every member of the Government that this new tariff will bear heavily upon the fishermen and the labourers of this country. Now it may be difficult at this juncture to do anything that will redeem the unfortunate position that we find ourselves in at the present time in considering the financial policy of the Government. The initial mistake was to increase expenditure, and if it is not too late I would certainly appeal to the Government to reduce taxation before we are finally committed to this financial policy for the ensuing fiscal year. The great surprise that the people of this country experienced was that every promise with very few exceptions has been forgotten. If not forgotten, every action of the Government is contrary to what the people expected. Now in May of last year when the different parties were appealing to the country for their support the policy with which the Monroe Party went to the country as expressed in the manifesto was that public expenditure would be cut to the bone. Mr. Little, the Hon. Member for Bonavista, joined the Monroe Party with the object of trying to reduce expenditure and taxation. And I am sure that he must be a disappointed man at the present time to be a member of a Government that cannot see its way clear to keep the pledges that it made to the people of this country. Mr. Chairman, I feel quite sure that Mr. Monroe when he appealed to the electorate of Bonavista Bay was quite determined in his own mind that if he was returned as Prime Minister of this country that he would do all in his power to put his promises into effect. That he would bring about a different condition of things with regard to the public expenditure. After eight or nine months we find that the expenditure has been increased. The salaries have been increased. It was said then that many Government officials were not wanting their salaries. Well I don't know of any individual case where an official has been dismissed for not earning his salary. On the other hand we have increased the number of officials on the whole and their salaries have been increased. But the gospel that was preached was

that there were too many officials. That there was to be less number and more work for the individual and that they were to be paid accordingly. And in that way we would have greater efficiency. Now, Mr. Chairman, we have gone in the same old way. Now I am appealing to the few members who are sitting in their seats on the Government side at the present time. It would be no good in appealing to anybody else. They have the destinies of this country in their hands.That is with regard to the financial policy of the Government and the taxation. And I am sure that if some of those Hon. Members were to express their thoughts they would say "Halfyard, what you say is right."

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—I am afraid that you have got evil thoughts in your mind, and I just want to keep you on the narrow road.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that any member in this House can interrupt when he likes and the man in the gallery if he makes the least noise is called to order. I think that that is a breach of the rules of this House which should not be tolerated by the Chairman of Committees. The Members of this House may not agree. They may not appreciate the lengthy remarks that I am making. But we often have to sit and listen as an act of courtesy whether we agree or disagree with what is being said.

Mr. Chairman, is it the intention of the Government to have the committee rise now?

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—I move that the committee rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Honourable the Minister of Justice the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend 'The Industrial and Provident Societies Act, 1919.' "

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, I think that the Hon. Members opposite are aware of the contents of this bill. The Hon. Member for Twillingate, Mr. Brown, was not in the House the other day, but perhaps the purport of the bill has been explained to him. He has probably had representations made to him in so far as the co-operative societies of Grand Falls are concerned.

There is nothing in the measure but what must have been the original idea, the words two hundred dollars must have been a mistake, as in the English act the amount that is stated is two hundred pounds and representations have been made to us to have the same thing apply here. I introduced the measure myself because I promised them that it would be done before the end of the session. I think that I can commend it to the House, and I think that there is no reason why the House should not adopt the measure.

MR. BROWN—I rise to support this bill which has been introduced by the Hon. Minister of Justice, in connection with the Industrial and Provident Societies Act, 1919. It relates to the Co-operative Society of Grand Falls, and as I understand it from the Minister of Justice the English act reads two hundred pounds, and there are some of the members of the

society asking for the concession so that they will be able to put in the same amount of money. I know a little about the society because I come from the town in which it operates and so I beg to support the bill, and I think that I can assure the Minister of Justice that the Opposition side of the House will support the bill also.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman, I beg to support the bill, and I think, as Mr. Browne has said, that the members on this side of the House will also support it. I think that if we had more co-operative societies that it might be a good thing for the country. I beg to assure the Minister of Justice that the measure has my support.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Chairman, I beg to support the Bill. I have had some knowledge of the gentleman in charge of the Co-operative stores and we have had very satisfactory dealings with him, and I think that this is what should be done for them.

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 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.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—With the permission of the House I would like to move that the Bill be read the third time now.

With unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend 'The Industrial and Provident Societies Act'" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the legislative Council with a message requestion the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Second reading of Bill "An Act Respecting the Avalon Telephone Company, Limited."

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that this is not a party measure. It is simply a private measure given us by Mr. Murphy to bring before the House. I have no interest in it whatever and I suppose that Mr. Murphy thought that as Leader of the Government that I should bring it before the House, and I leave it to the House to consider it for themselves. Mr. Murphy, in the original telephone bill, did not get the right to raise money on his assets. He was not permitted to mortgage the property of the company and so get money on it, and it is for that particular reason that he puts this bill before the House, because his son is at present in the United States trying to raise money on account of the Avalon Telephone Company, and for that reason he would like to have the bill which he has brought in here put through. That is his only particular interest, but he asks at the same time that his Telephone Company have permission to extend the service to Bell Island, South Side of Trinity Bay from Old Perlican to Chapel's Arm, Whitbourne, Placentia Junction, the towns of Placentia and Argentia, and St. Mary's Bay. Speaking personally, I may say that I do not see any objection to giving him the rights for the extension that he asks for, because I do not think that it is likely that any other telephone company will ever have any desire to install telephones in these particular places, because they would not be able to get enough business to make it worth while trying it, and some of these particular places are trying to get the telephones. The representatives of the districts will know more about that than I do. All that I know about

is what the Telephone Company is asking for in this bill. We suggested two things when they brought the bill to us. One was that we should only give the concessions under the condition that the Company would install the telephones within twelve months so that we would not be giving exclusive rights to anybody if the work was not to be done immediately. The other was in protection of the Government or the Railway Commission or any other public department so that if they wanted to install a telephone they should have the right to put it in, even though Mr. Murphy had the franchise. So, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to press the second reading to-day. I dare say that some of the Members of the Opposition would like to have the time to consider it. I just want to explain that if it is agreeable to the House we might have it read the second time and we would have made an advance and then would be able to refer it to the committee on the next sitting. If the Opposition have any objections to the principle of the bill we will be glad to hear it.

MR. DUFF—Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the Avalon Telephone Company bringing their telephones to the places mentioned in the Bill, but I do not see why we should extend any more franchise to them than they have at the present time. The same people have a fifty years' franchise for the towns of Heart's Content, Carbonear and Hr. Grace, and they also have a fifty years' franchise for the towns of Spaniard's Bay, Brigus, Bay Roberts, and in fact all round the Bay; and they have a thirty years' franchise for the telephone within the districts of Ferryland, St. John's East, St. John's West, Harbour Main, Bay de Verde and Port de Grave; and now they are asking for the same exclusive franchise for Bell Island, the South Side of Trinity Bay from Old Perlican to Chapel's Cove, Whitbourne, Placentia Junction, the towns of Placentia and Argentia and St. Mary's Bay; and in many of these places they have the telephone installed already. I have no objection to them putting the telephone there, but I do object to the thirty years exclusive franchise being granted to them, because no company should be granted a franchise for such a long period. In fact, a company that has been operating for the time that this company has been operating should not be granted any other exclusive franchise for any period.

I would like to say for the information of the House that the directors of the Avalon Telephone Company are also the directors of the United Towns' Company that operates the electric light in those settlements; and all those settlements in Conception Bay have been holding meetings for the past two or three months protesting against the way that this Company is mulcting the people. As was said on a former occasion, when this Company was seeking the lighting franchise they said that they would supply electricity for 3 cents a kilowatt hour. To-day they are charging twelve cents. We have, however, in that same district another electric light company that is willing to supply electric light for three cents per kilowatt hour; but as the former company has the exclusive franchise, this company can not light; and for that reason, and for the reason that these people have not been fair, and have not showed the spirit that they should have shown towards the community, I protest against the Avalon Telephone Company having any further exclusive franchise or monopolies.

Now the United Towns Electric Co. some years ago installed the telephone in the towns of Harbor Grace, Heart's Content and Carbonear, and their first charge was twelve dollars

per year. Just as soon as they got the franchise, however, they rose the rates to twenty dollars per year, and many of the people over there protested against the charges, and threw the telephones out.

Then you know what happened about the Seal Cove plant. They took advantage of the Government of the day, and talked about the cheap rates for lighting that they were going to give to the people of St. John's; and just as soon as they got all the concessions they desired, they sold out to the St. John's Light and Power Company, and we still have to pay the same old rates.

For these reasons I would not like to ask this House to give these people any further exclusive franchises. And further, when it comes to allowing these people to cash their franchise, I think it is most ridiculous. What is going to happen here, if these people are allowed to do this. You will probably find the same people who are running the Street Railway and the electric light here in St. John's going in with the telephone people; and then you will have a great big monopoly here in St. John's, running the whole concern.

For these reasons I protest against the granting of this or any other franchise to the Avalon Telephone Company; and I can assure you that the people of Harbour Grace, Carbonear, Bay de Verde and all the other districts around Conception Bay are behind me in this.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, in this connection I may say that I have no objection to the granting of this franchise, or extension of Franchise, to the Avalon Telephone Company, but I may say that in the past I am afraid we have not been very particular about the conditions under which franchises were granted.

A few days ago I presented a petition from the inhabitants of Tilton, an important settlement in the district of Harbour Grace, praying that they might have the telephone installed in their settlement, which is only about a half mile or a mile from the main line to Harbour Grace. After I had presented the petition I wrote the Avalon Telephone Company asking them to have the telephone installed at Tilton, and I thought it could be done almost immediately because the settlement was so near the main line. But Mr. Murphy told me that Tilton was three miles away from the main line. I told him that he was mistaken, because it was, at the most, three quarters of a mile away. Then it suddenly occurred to me that I was entirely in Mr. Murphy's hands, and he could install a telephone at Tilton or not just as he pleased. I do not think that that can be regarded as a proper position. Prior to the granting of this franchise there was nothing to prevent us from installing a telephone where we pleased, but now it appears that we are entirely in Mr. Murphy's hands. There is no sense in installing a telephone ourselves there now, because we cannot communicate, except over Mr. Murphy's system. It occurred to me then that the time was opportune, and that we should have some provision in the agreement providing that where the need for a telephone in any particular place should be proved satisfactorily, that he should be compelled to put a telephone in.

It appears to me that under this agreement they may ask for the franchise in any particular district if he had given absolutely no service at all. That is not a proper position. It is a position which, if it is at all possible, should be remedied. There should be some party to whom this question should be submitted—the Colonial Secretary or the Minister of Justice, or some other authority, who

could say whether the request for the telephone was justified; and if it was found to be justified then the request should be acceded to.

However, I think that Mr. Duff will quite appreciate that the telephone service, as it exists outside St. John's, is not a very lucrative investment; and I feel sure that the small amounts collected by the Company for toll calls are only sufficient, and I am not sure of that, to pay for the upkeep of the telephone service outside the city. But, of course, we do not know what the future may hold in store for us. We do not know what development might take place, which might make the telephone around that section a very lucrative investment indeed. Therefore, I agree with Mr. Duff that we are a little bit lax in making exclusive contracts. We do not serve the public interests to the extent that we should. I feel sure that Mr. Murphy must be commended, however, on his enterprise in this connection. He has probably done something that nobody else in the country has ever attempted before, in regard to the extension of the telephone and electric light, but Mr. Murphy should not have unlimited power. I say that it is a very vicious principle, and one that, if at all possible, should be remedied; and I trust that when this is referred to a select committee, it may afford the opportunity of having all these matters rectified.

HON. PRIME MINISTER — Mr. Speaker, in discussing this matter with Mr. Murphy it was very clearly understood that we were not going to give him the exclusive right; and it conserve the public interests to the ex- appears that the bill is a little ambiguous in that matter, because in the beginning of the bill it say:

> WHEREAS by the Act 9 and 10 George V., Capter VI., the Governor in Council was empowered and authorized to enter into a contract with a person, firm or corporation for the establishment of an improved modern telephone system with long distance connection "upon such terms and conditions as may be acceptable to the Governor in Council including the Grant of an exclusive franchise for not exceeding thirty years."

Then later on the bill says:

> AND WHEREAS the Company by its petition to the Legislature has prayed that they be granted the exclusive rights for the term aforesaid . . . . etc.

And then the bill merely goes on to say WHEREAS it is expedient to grant the prayer of the petitioners— but the bill itself, in clause one says:

> "The company is hereby granted —**the right**" . . .

It does not say "the exclusive right"; but I was going to suggest that instead of putting in this clause three, that gives the Government the right to put telephone lines over these sections, that we should eliminate that clause, and insert in its place a clause to the effect that nothing in this Act contained should be construed as conferring exclusive franchise upon the company.

I do not know whether that would overcome Mr. Duff's objection, but it seems to me that if we give them simply a right to instal telephones, and not an exclusive right, that ought to deal with that flaw.

With regard to the other clause, I do not think that anybbody can object to any company raising money on its assets. That is a right that is always granted to a company; and every company is privileged on its incorporation to mortgage its assets for the purpose of raising money for the purposes of the company.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY — Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that it is immaterial whether the exclusive right is granted in this in-

stance or not. They have the right for all around Conception Bay and other places also. What difference does it make if we give them the exclusive right in connection with this particular section they are asking for now? I do not think it will make very much difference, because Mr. Murphy already has the exclusive right all around the Bay and in St. John's, and we could only comunicate over his lines.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the position taken by Mr. Duff, the hon. member for Carbonear, on this question, and also the suggestion made by the Hon. Colonial Secretary to those who will have charge of the Bill; but I think that some steps ought to be taken to protect the public against having any further increased rates thrust upon them. Mr. Duff has pointed out that the rate for electric light was three cents per kilowatt hour when the company started operations, but now it is twelve cents; and in connection with the telephone there has been an increase of from twelve to twenty dollars a year. Surely the company should have some consideration for the public, and surely the Government has some means of protecting the public against such extortionate charges. I think that some steps ought to be taken in this regard, and when this Bill goes to a select committee these matters should be given very careful consideration.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Avalon Telephone Company" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Select Committee to consist of Hon. the Prime Minister, Hon. the Colonial Secretary, Mr. Puddester and Mr. Duff.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the Bill entitled "Of the Inspection of Ships" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the Bill entitled "An Act to Repeal Chapter 174 Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Passenger Acommodation on Board Steamers and Vessels'" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole on to-morrow.

MR. HICKMAN—I would like to ask the Minister of Marine if it is the intention to make the alterations as to the sizes of the stem, kelson, sternpost, etc., as discussed a few days ago.

MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the Leader of the Opposition I would like to say that it is not the intention to do so this present year as the ships built during the winter were built without regard to these. If a new clause were introduced as to these sizes of parts these vessels would be shut out. I saw Captain Randell on the question and he was of the same mind as myself, that it would be a hardship on the people who have attended to their craft this year in accordance with the regulations which have been in force the last ten years. It was suggested by Captain Randell, and I agreed, that we meet on Monday to discuss this matter of the sizes of parts and it will be brought in for another year. We talked it over and the Captain and myself agreed that it would be a great hardship on the people, who probably raised money from their merchants to fix up their schooners, and did so in agreement with the old regulations. Some of these, perhaps, would be turned down under the clause dealing with the new sizes and, therefore, it would be unfair, though we decided to discuss the subject and introduce it another year.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Speaker, I

would like to ask the Minister of Marine if he is aware of the number of schooners which have been rebuilt, or are being rebuilt, and which have not ben hauled out of the water?

MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I heard of only two.

MR. ASHBOURNE—I have here a copy of certain correspondence between the Union Shipbuilding Company and the Department of Fisheries. I take up this matter because on of these schooners rebuilt this year is owned by Mr. Kearley of Herring Neck, in the district which I represent, and with permission of Hon. the Speaker I would like to read it to the House.

HON. THE SPEAKER—It occurs to me that this is a discussion referring more to committee stage than to second reading, and I would suggest to the honorable member if it would not inconvenience him that this correspondence be read in committee stage.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Encouragement of Shipbuilding" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Second Reading of a Bill "An Act to Confirm the Titles to Certain Lands at Corner Brook."

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading, I may say that this is a private Bill, but as I pointed out before it refers only to the confirming of titles so that the company concerned willl be sure of the property forming the town site at Corner Brook. I have the plans here showing the outline of the scheme, and at the request of the solicitors of the company I assure the House that this Bill is only to confirm the titles to the lands.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the Bill entitled "An Act to Confirm the Titles to Certain Lands at Corner Brook" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said bill be referred to a Select Committee consisting of Hon. the Minister of Justice, Hon. Mr. Long, Hon. Mr. Power, Mr. Hickman, Mr. Grimes.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they have receded from amendments made by them in and upon the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 74 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Old Age Pensions'" and have passed the said Bill without amendment.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE —Mr. Speaker, I give notice that 1 will on to-morrow move the House into Committee of the Whole on certain Resolutions relating to the Western Marine Railway, Limited.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on to-morrow move for the suspension of the Rules of this House with regard to all matters now before the House, or to come before it at the present session.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker , I would like to ask Hon. the Prime Minister if there is much more business to come before the House?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — Only two more Bills, and if we can get through the tariff we will be able to close early next week.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Hon. Minister of Finance if he is going to answer my question regarding a comparative statement that I asked for the other day? It seems to me that the information must have been in his hands when he made up his budget, and if he has that information I want to know if I could get it by Monday?

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE —In answer to the hon. member, this question is being prepared in the Custom House. There is a great deal of business to be done in connection with the new tariff so we are pretty busy down there, but I will have that information for the hon. member in the course of a few days.

MR. GRIMES—There is another matter that I want to speak about. I want to draw the attention of the House to the unemployment in the city. We have talked a great deal about local industries and the encouragement of them, but there is one industry that appears to me to be ready to go ahead. I refer to the Milling Company. I don't know whether the Finance Minister could give an answer to the question at the present time as to what is the nature of the misunderstanding between the Milling Company and the Government.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE —That matter is coming before the Government betwen this and Monday and the matter will be decided then.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, Mr. Palmer has indicated that he does not think that his people would be able to put up this mill unless we put a duty of 25 cents on flour. That is a matter for the Government if he puts it up to us in the shape of a hard and fast proposition. When he indicated to us that he was going to put up a flour mill here he did not stipulate that he should have a protection of 25 cents on flour. He knew that the duty was off and he admitted to me the other day that he so understood. He had hoped that the duty would be put back but he had made no stipulation to that effect. I think that I explained to the House that we should provide some anti-dumping legislation to prevent the flour mills of Canada from sending flour here at such a price that they would put the concern out of business, and I suggested to him to go to a lawyer and have some legislation enacted so that we could consider it. Today the solicitors told me that they did not think that he was inclined to do anything unless he got an absolute assurance from the Government that they would put on a duty of 25 cents per barrel on flour.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker, I quite agree with the Prime Minister that before we enact any legislation in connection with this flour mill there should be some guarantee that the work is going ahead. If such a guarantee is given I suggest that the duty should be put on flour and bring in the capital of this man. As far as the extra 25 cents on a barrel of flour it makes no difference to anyone. I don't think that would be any hardship on the importers of flour. I suggest that if that is all this man wants and if that is going to get the capital for him to start this indusry going, that it is a very small thing for us to do.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Speaker, when we consider the employment that this mill will give, the greater revenue that will accrue from this industry and the increased earning power of the people as a result, I think that 25 cents is not worth talking about.

MR. HALFYARD — Mr. Speaker, whatever agreement has been made between the promoters of this flour mill the Government should stand by it, and they should not interfere with it in any way.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, May 4th, 1925.

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

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY —Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay on the table of the House the report of the

Child Welfare Association for the year ending December 31, 1924. This report was asked for a little earlier in the session but I did not get it from the secretary until Saturday, so I am tabling it now.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Speaker, I beg to state for the information of the House that we have been advised from Ottawa that the counsel engaged in the Labrador Boundary case has left with the Canadian case for the other side, so it can be assumed that the cases will be ready to be exchanged within six weeks from now.

Mr. Halfyard gave notice of question.

Mr. Brown gave notice of question.

Mr. Scammell gave notice of question.

Mr. Cashin gave notice of question.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Rules of the House with regard to all matters now before the House or to come before it during the present session were suspended.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions relative to the Western Marine Railway, Limited.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE —Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, these resolutions are in connection with the Western Marine Railway, Limited, which was incorporated under the Companies Act in 1910, and as all will remember at that time there was a lot of money subscribed, and then certain things happened and then the money was not all paid up, and now the dock owes thirty-five thousand dollars and they have absolutely no means of paying it, and if there is not some help forthcoming they will have to close down. After consideration the Government has decided to guarantee the debentures for thirty-five thousand dollars and the interest at six per cent. In considering the matter we thought that to close down this dock would be very serious for the West Coast. What you notice is that the Government has a lien on all the property as a security for the debentures, but from the reports we have received we feel confident that they will be able to take care of all their liabilities. We felt that it would be absolutely a pity for this dock to go out of existence for the sake of thirty-five thousand dollars. We have given the same support many times before, at least in all the Governments that I have been in, rather than have the industries go out of existence. It is a great assistance to the banking fishermen on the West Coast and some of the Government steamers have been on it and we have found it very successful. We feel confident that with the assistance that we are giving them that this company will be able to get on their feet and that they will be able to met everything that comes up, and we feel sure that it is only the right thing for us to do to give them the assistance. I will just read the resolutions through.

(Reads Resolutions.)

I do not think that there is anything more than that for me to say. I think that every member of the House is just as cognizant of these facts at I am.

MR. HICKMAN—Is there to be a sinking fund?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE — Yes, it is the intention to have a sinking fund if more than the 6 per cent. is earned. I know that it is not in the resolutions, but the dock is charged with the interest of these bonds.

MR. SCAMMELL—What is the authorised capital of the company?

HON. PRIME MINISTER—$110,000.-00.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE —

The authorised capital is $110,000.00, and I think there is something like $67,000 paid up.

MR. GODDEN—Do you know the value of the dock?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—I am not able to tell you the value of the dock, but I know that it is of great value to the people of the West Coast, and I am quite convinced that it would work a very great hardship to let it be destroyed.

MR. HICKMAN—Has that dock a guarantee at the present time?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—No, and never had one.

MR. HICKMAN—Do you propose guaranteeing the interest on that $35,-000 only?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE — Yes.

MR. HICKMAN — I think there should be some provision made for a sinking fund.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—It is not essential, because the payment of principal and interest is a first lien upon the dock.

MR. HICKMAN—But if they are thirty-five year debenture bonds, that will not come due for thirty-five years, and I think that there should be provision made for a sinking fund.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I do not think that there is any necessity to provide for the sinking fund, because the dock company has no doubt that it will be able to pay off one thousand dollars each year, and maybe two or three thousand, and there is nothing to prevent them getting rid of the debenture bonds inside of thirty-five years. The company feel sure that they will be able not only to meet the interest each year, but they hope to be able to pay off at least one thousand dollars of the principal. They can provide for a sinking fund for that purpose.

I may say that perhaps the Minister of Finance and Customs did not quite explain that the dock had cost $110,-000, and that the people of the West Coast have put up $67,000 in cold cash themselves, none of which they can get back until the Government is satisfied for any money they may have to pay out, so that we have an absolute security of a dock worth $110,000 for an advance of $35,000.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that, but the Government is of course only guaranteeing and are not taking up the bonds. I understand that the company wants to clear off that debt of $35,000 which they owe the Bank of Nova Scotia. My object was just to see that the thing was put in proper form so that the Government would be protected and so that no money would be paid out until they had a sinking fund to take care of that $35,000. If they had substantial earnings they might be in a position to pay off some of that, but if the bonds were held by people who wanted the bonds as an investment, they would not let them go unless bonds were issued under those conditions. The first year redemption bonds would have to be redemed at a premium of say 106 or 107. However, I give my support to the principle of the Bill. I certainly think that the West Coast is well worthy of being assisted, and I am sure that the people who have charge of this dock are people who will see that everything is done properly. They are not extravagant people but economic people, and they will see that the best attention is given to the dock.

MR. DUFF—Mr. Chairman, do I understand that the Government is going to guarantee the payment of the interest on this $35,000?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE — Yes, that is what is in the Resolutions.

MR. DUFF—Well I do not think that this is practical legislation. I am quite in sympathy with the people of the West Coast, and I also know that Governments in the past have done the same kind of thing, but only in recent

years. In former days the Government did not guarantee private enterprises, although recent Governments have done it. I am surprised that the present Government is following in the footsteps of those who did such things. If it is possible for the Government to assist the people of the West Coast in any other way, such as sending their boats there for repairs and cleaning, I would be quite in sympathy with anything they did, but guaranteeing private enterprises, this is a very foolish thing indeed, and I do not think that it is the duty of the Government to do it. I know of several other companies and public utilities, too, who are in debt to the banks in large sums of money, and it seems that all they have to do is to make out resolutions and bring them in here before the House and the Government must back them in the same way. I cannot agree to the principle.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE— Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to Mr. Duff that this is a very different proposition to anything I have seen this year, inasmuch as the Government become the absolute owners of that dock, which is worth $110,000. It is certainly a very different kind of guarantee from what we have been putting through in this House, inasmuch as we are to become absolutely owners of the dock until we are paid our $35,000; and the people who are running this dock, are very good people, and are sure to run it economically and well; and therefore I have great pleasure in supporting such a proposition; especially as I feel absolutely confident that we will not be called upon to pay anything at all

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed the said Resolutions without amendment, 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 Relating to the Guarantee of Debentures of the Western Marine Railway, Limited" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time presently.

Whereupon, on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Guarantee of Debentures of The Western Marine Railway, Limited" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon, on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Guarantee of Debentures of The Western Marine Railway, Limited."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester 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 said Bill without amendment.

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a third time presently.

Whereupon, on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Guarantee of Debentures of The Western Marine Railway, Limited" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill 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.

Notice of Question

(1) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing what amount of goods was taken out of bond by the Imperial Tobacco Company from January the 1st, 1924, to April the 8th, 1924.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—I beg to inform the Honorable Member for Ferryland that the information will be here in a few minutes.

(2) MR. HALFYARD asked Hon. the Prime Minister if any Agreement has been made between W. I. Bishop & Co., and the Railway Commission or the Government, if so: (1) To lay a copy of such Agreement on the Table of the House; (2) Will the proposed expenditure of one million dollars include all new machinery, new sheds etc.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I beg to table the reply.

(3) MR. HALFYARD asked Hon. the Prime Minister if it is true that the Government has engaged a Principal for the Junior College, if so, to give: (1) His intellectual and professional qualifications; (2) His years of experience in college work; (3) The names of the Colleges in which he has served and in what capacity; (4) To lay on the Table of the House a copy of the Agreement, showing the term of his engagement and his annual salary.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I beg to table the reply.

(4) MR. HALFYARD asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing: (1) The number of rails that has been ordered for the Railway; (2) In what quantities will they be received; (3) What is the method of distribution of such rails along the track that is to be re-railed; (4) To state from whom the rails were bought, and the cost of same.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I beg to table the reply.

(5) MR. HALPFYARD asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing: (1) The names and number of all Ships other than local repaired at the Dry Dock since its inception; (2) The nature or extent of repairs to each Ship; (3) The Contract price of the repairs to each Ship; (4) The number of men employed to repair each Ship; (5) The wages paid for repairs to each Ship.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I beg to table the reply.

(6) MR. HALFYARD asked Hon. the Prime Minister is there a vacancy in the House of Assembly, if so: (1) To give the date when the vacancy occurred; (2) Is it the intention of the Government to conform to Section 4 of Chapter 4 of the Consolidated Statutes entitled "Of Legislative Disabilities and the Vacation of Seats in the House of Assembly," which reads as follows: "Whenever a vacan-
"cy shall occur in the House of As-
"sembly, the Governor shall within
"six months after the happening of
"such vacancy, issue a Writ for the
"election and return of a Member for
"the District in respect of which such
"vacancy has occurred."

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I beg to table the reply.

Orders of the Day

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Honorable Members will find on their desks printed copies of the Council's Amendments to Legislative Disabilities Bill, and we can proceed with this now, or defer it till tomorrow if the Members want more time to consider. It was suggested early in the Session by the Honorable Member for Fortune that we dispense with a Member having to go back for re-election in six months after his election, if he accepted the Departmental Office. In the form in which the Act was sent

up from this House, the period might be more than six months, as it read "from the date of the proclamation calling the election." It is altered now with the idea of avoiding a second election, if the member is taking office with the same party for whom he contested the election. If the Members wish, I would be pleased to let the matter stand over until tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the 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. Puddester took the Chair of Committtee.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Chairman, I do not know if it is the wish of the House that I should read these Resolutions through, but if desired I will do so. It will be remembered that in the course of the debate earlier in the Session, it was stated we were hurting small tobacco factories, and I think Mr. S. Faour's name was brought up. It is not the intention of the Government to be harsh on any manufacturer, and I am quite willing to change the number of employees from ten to eight, so that this factory will come under the $200.00 clause. This is to pay part of the salary of the excise officer, but I think this will meet the case. This is the only change in the Resolutions, but as Honorable Members want them read, I will do so. I would also like to explain that the matter of Condensed Milk and Patent Baby Food has been considered, and there is no change in it.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, as this tariff is about to pass, there are one or two remarks that I would like to make in connection with the Railway, as the matter has been drawn to my attention by a reference of Mr. Halfyard, and while the question is not concerned in the tariff, it is very important from a financial point of view. I was a Member of the Railway Commission for six or seven months, and wish to make a few final remarks before the final touches are put on the tariff. The Railway is one of the largest departments under control of the Government, and I may say in passing that though it is not represented in the House, it is let loose to be run by people who are not responsible to anybody. The Commission meets once a week and the Members are handed the agenda by the Manager, and unless there is anything special to be brought up nothing further is done. Perhaps there may be a few tenders to consider, but generally there is little made known about the Railway. We are spending large amounts on the Dry Dock and Railway, and I think we should get some returns for the expenditure. I think it will be borne out by Members of the present Government that both these Depts. are inefficiently run, and there is no discipline in any branch. The Railway as it stands to-day has a surplus of employees who are drawing salaries of from $8,000 down to $2,000 a year.

Salaries are paid higher than that are paid in any other departmental office of the Government to-day, and are we getting real value for the money spent on these officials. To-day we are about to embark upon a very expensive proposition, namely, the re-railing of the railway from here to Clarenville and the General Manager of the railway is at present out of the country on a holiday. Possibly he will be back soon, but at the same time it is my contention that when such large sums of money are to be spent we should have some one up there to see that the money is properly spent.

With regard to the dock upon which we are about to make an outlay of

something over one million dollars. The dock is a public utility and cannot be done without, and it has got to get proper attention if we want to maintain our present strategic position on the Atlantic. That department needs to be thoroughly gone into and members of the Railway Commission know as well as I do that things have taken place in connection with the dock that would not bear the light of day, if properly investigated. Consequently, I am convinced that that department needs a thorough cleansings. It might be said what had this got to do with the tariff. Well, in order to bring our tariff lower we must cut our expenditure. From Canadian figures that I have before me to-day showing the way railway officials are paid in Canada, this Government, through the Railway Commission, should cut down the salaries of those who are managing the railway at least thirty thousand dollars a year, and I cannot believe that this cannot be done. As a matter of fact I feel perfectly satisfied that if the Government would discuss this matter from every angle that they would feel satisfied also that there could be a considerable saving effected on the salaries of some officials employed in connection with the railway and dock. To-day you have the anomoly up there that some officials are under-paid and some others are overpaid. Imagine three men pulling down twenty three thousand dollars a year between them in salaries. Also I contend that with the finish of the Humber proposition this country will be faced yearly from now on with a deficit of from three hundred to four hundred thousand dollars. The last few years the railway paid because the construction of the Humber plant gave the railway considerable freight and passenger traffic which will not be given when that plant is in full operation. After the Humber is in full swing, we will have nothing else in that direction to turn to. There will be nothing doing with the Gander proposition this year. Therefore, I would advise the Government to get to work and appoint your commission of competent men, go into the workings of the railway and the dry dock, and I feel sure that you will come in here next spring and tell me that with proper management and proper economy that you can save thirty thousand dollars a year on the railway alone by a reduction in salaries. And the same applies to every other department of the Government. We have Mr. Woodford with Colonel Ross's report asking that twenty odd officials of the Department of Posts and Telegraphs be paid off. I realise that if you lay them off you are going to have men out of employment, but if the Government went to the expense of bringing Colonel Ross here to investigate that department then the money paid him and paid in connection with his visit was money thrown away when his instructions were not carried out. What was the use of bringing that man down here and prepare a report when the report was pidgeon-holed and not acted upon. And the same applies to the Department of Public Works to-day. Why this department has not had a meeting of the Board for three or four months, tenders there have not been receiving the attention that they should, and people have been getting patronage from the department who are not in business at all. Now I consider that very unfair; but when the Government promised everything and they hope to carry out some of their promises. In my last appeal I want to state that the putting on of this extra tariff on the people makes the Government itself a vampire of poverty and a scourge, because you have taken the burden off the strong shoulders that could bear

it and placed it on the weak shoulders that are staggering underneath it; and the members of the Government have proved themselves to be industrial cannibals for cutting down the duties of industries that were already over-protected to-day and turning down the fisherman who has got to produce wealth for this country, if, indeed, he will ever survive to it. The Government bamboozled the fishermen and labourers of this country and got them to vote for you on the plea that you were going to clean up and give a square deal to all, and then the moment you are returned to office you forget your promises, and the Government today is being written down as a crowd of pleutocrats, and the people are losing confidence in you every other day. Is it not better for the Government to yield gracefull to an irristible force than to stubbornly oppose it, and then be finally destroyed as a result. Would it not be better for the Government if when this tariff was first laid on the Table of the House to accept the suggestions that were made regarding it. The Government realized their position and they knew that the tariff was unfair. If they had to leave the old tariff as it was in force, and then during the coming summer have a new Tariff Commission formed, composed of competent people who understand the business of this country, and then next winter bring in a tariff here and have it discussed intelligently, everyone here would have an opportunity of discussing it and then proper revisions could be made in your tariff. But this tariff is brought in right at the moment the main industry of this country is about to be started, and which is likely to be destroyed under the present conditions of this tariff. We need a Government that is really with the masses and not the classes of this country and cannot be bullied around by people who represent no one but themselves. In making my final bow in connection with the tariff, I have one final advice to give. I do not intend to attack the press individually, but I tell you, Mr. Chairman, that the editor of a paper should be a high priest of civilization. What has the Press of this country done to benefit the general public in the march of progress? Is it not history that it's only duty seems to be on the popular side; not on the right side? I read an article the other day dealing with politicians who sometimes do not see their way clear to side with the Government in which they may be associated, and I will read for the information of the House a few of his remarks.

(Reads)

Now I think that the Press during the past week in this City have been following in that line, but I do not think that they have succeeded in telling the people of this country that I was either a traitor or a detective, and I believe that when the time arrives that I will not be left to follow the crowd on crutches. The Press of this country has kept good men out of politics. Why? Because they feel sensitive over the way politicians are attacked. I want to say that the Press is not everything in the political life of this country that it pretends it is. You can get more votes out of a bulls-eye shop sometimes than out of all the papers that are published here.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, I am glad that the leader of the Opposition requested the Finance Minister to have these resolutions read. The very first clause of the resolutions, to my mind, struck a very discordant note. I want to ask the Finance Minister if this Clause is a part of the old Revenue Act of 1905.

We have discovered that this Resolution to which I have drawn the attention of the Executive is not a part of the original Act. Now I am not

going to dispute the wisdom of the Government at the present time in making such a provision as this resolution calls for; but I would like to call the attention of the Government to the fact that they are making a very long step here. I am no apologist for any government, and I want to state here this afternoon, the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. I think it was last year, either late in the Squires administration or else during the period of the Warren administration that the Governor-in-Council saw fit, on the recommendation of certain people, to make certain rules and regulations regarding the prices of goods, boots in particular, coming into this country. The people who were imposed upon by these regulations went to their solicitors. The case was taken to the notice of the Executive Government. I do not think it ever came into Court; if it did perhaps the Minister of Justice has some recollection of it. The Government backed down on their position. I was a rank and file member of that administration, whether it was the Squires administration or the Warren administration; but, personally, I was outspoken against the action of the Executive government on that particular matter, and I am also outspoken against any such provision being made to-day.

We, to-day, have boot and shoe factories in this country. Now I don't want to argue that anything should be done to undermine these industries. It seems to be right to protect all these classes of industries and capitalists in this country, but it is not well to go to the other extreme. Do I understand from these resolutions that if the Governor-in-Council sees fit, at any time, the Customs authorities can take the boots or the clothes manufactured outside this country; and if the invoices are not satisfactory to the assessors, the Governor-in-Council has that power. I am entirely in opposition to the idea. It is enough for the Custom House to satisfy itself that a fair value is being put on the articles coming into the country without further raising their value by taking the value of an article manufactured in Newfoundland as the basis. I can go to the United States to-morrow, and I can go into any bargain store and can get boots at a dollar a pair. I can bring them down to the Custom House here in Newfoundland; but because Mr. Archibald is making something similar, I have to be penalized in my business, although I am giving the people of the country cheaper boots. I submit that is not fair.

MR. HIGGINS—It does not mean that.

MR. SCAMMELL—I would like for someone to tell me what it does mean. We are all seeking information.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—The three last lines refer to that. "For home consumption the States or place of export."

MR. SCAMMELL—I am trying to offset a situation which has just been referred to. I don't want to see the Governor-in-Council in a position to go down to the Custom House or the Bond warehouse and say that because my invoices of goods coming into the country are somewhat less than the value of articles of a similar nature manufactured in Newfoundland as regards the cost the Governor-in-Council can raise the value of my goods. I want to give the consumer the benefit of buying a cheap pair of boots or a cheap suit of clothes, if he at the same time is satisfied as regards the quality. I am not at all struck with this anti-dumping clause. As this clause has not been included in the 1905 Act, that ought to justify the Government in making an explanation as to

where the necessity is for including this in the present Revenue Act. I am opposed to this resolution, and I am speaking from the point of view of the consumer who has to pay the piper in the long run. I hope that the Governor-in-Council will not be given the power to act in the way that I have just referred to.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—In reply to the Honourable Member, that would be an utter impossibility, since in 1905 there were no such things on the horizon as there are today. You refer to boots at one dollar a pair. Why, they are coming into this country now at twenty cents a pair, and it can be easily seen that you will have to have something in these resolutions to cover that thing. I have seen the most marvelous boots for twenty cents a pair that I have ever seen in my life, and if there is no dumping clause in this resolution I don't know where the Custom House will get off. People will be bringing into this country goods that would not be legitimate stocks at all, and they would not be paying anything like a legitimate duty. That is the reason why that clause has been put in by the previous governments, to get over that and avoid trouble.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Scammell has represented the case of the boot business. Now, Mr. Archibald who is a constituent of mine,—I don't say a political supporter—has taken a very strong stand in this connection, and I think a very justifiable one. Of course, it must be borne in mind, that as far as the Newfoundland market is concerned in the production of articles such as boots, etc., our position is in very many respects unique. Newfoundland buyers who go into the United States market very often can buy boots fifty per cent. cheaper than Canadian buyers. The reason is this. There is a convention between the United States and Canada with regard to the exchange merchandise, and as Canada is a very large market, the producers are not in a position to cut their prices for that country owing to the possibility of trade interference. Over-production is rampant since the war, particularly in the boot business. A tremendous fillip was given to the boot business during the war. In the United States prices were very high and boots soared to a tremendous price. These factories have been trying to exist ever since, and with their big additional equipment they have produced a great deal more than the markets can absorb. The result was that there was a big over-production in boots, and they had to find markets for those boots. It would be suicidal to send them to Canada, it would also be suicidal to send them to the West Indies where the United States has a large trade; but they come here to Newfoundland which is an out of the way place and with which they have no particular connection, and they say "take all those boots at twenty, fifty or a dollar a pair."

As the Finance Minister says, there are boots coming in here for twenty cents a pair, but you know that boots could not be produced in this country at anything like that price. If we are going to have the revenue collected on boots coming in here at twenty cents a pair, why, you would have the men, the boys and the girls who were working in the shoe factory starving within a year. I think this is a step in the right direction to protect the industry that we have here, and give it as fair a deal as we are giving to those who are sending the boots in here. I think it is a very serious matter for our own people to have those cheap boots coming in here and sold to the detriment of our own industry. If we don't protect our own industry in this town,

this town will not be fit to live in, and the same is true of Hr. Grace. I know a little about what the people are up against in Hr. Grace. These people are trying to keep their factories going and give employment to a number of men, girls and boys. And it might be interesting to note that we have only one third of the boots that are used in this country manufactured locally. There are twice as many boots brought into Newfoundland as there are manufactured. Look what it would mean if we could stop the importation of boots altogether. There would be twice as many employed in the factories as we have at the present time. We are at the present time the regular dumping ground for the overproduction of the United States and Canada. I have had some experience in this direction myself. I was purchasing a certain commodity some years ago at a wholesale House in Canada, and this commodity cost me at the rate of four dollars a hundred pounds. I went to the manufacturer at Montreal and I got the same thing for $4.20 per hundred pounds. When I told the wholesaler of this he thought that I was misrepresenting the case, that I was telling an untruth, and I asked him to ring up the manufacturer and ask him what such and such a commodity cost when shipping to Newfoundland buyers and the answer was $4.20 per hundred pounds. He was told that there was a special price for Newfoundlanders. He was told that there was an overproduction and that they had to get clear of it somehow. And I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the provision in question that gives the Minister of Finance the right to take these goods and charge more or add more on the invoice price is a reasonable and equable one because he makes it possible for the producer in Newfoundland to carry on his business.

MR. SCAMMELL—Now I think that we should try to reason this thing out. The point seems to be this: I take the case of the boots that are coming in at twenty cents a pair or at a dollar a pair. The man goes down there and has the invoice and produces it at the Custom House, and then with the value placed at one dollar the appraisers of the Minister of Finance and Customs looks at them and says that they should be more, and then he makes it so that the invoice cost is at one dollar and fifty cents. That is the first point. But suppose then that we have another regulation that says that in the case of a similar article that is being manufactured in Newfoundland it is two hundred per cent. more, and then you place a charge of fifteen per cent. more on the fifty cents difference. And the case is that first of all you appraise the boots and raise the price, and then you may have another regulation . . . .

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—That dumping clause is in the 1921 Act.

MR. SCAMMELL—Without pressing the argument any further and despite Mr. Bennett's laudable efforts to encourage home industry, I must say that in the way that I look upon the matter the consumer has to pay in the long run. And there is another thing and that is that we are not encouraging the Newfoundland manufacturer to produce the home article as economically as it can possibly be done, and so give the people the benefit of the cheap commodity. If this were not the case it would make the local manufacturers put the article up as cheaply as possible and get them on the market as cheaply as possible so as to be able to compete with the imported article.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, it will be borne in mind that we have several local

factories for the manufacture of boots and shoes. There is the case of the Harbour Grace Boot and Shoe Company and they are making a very creditable effort to make the industry a good one. Any one that may have visited the Exhibition last year must admit that the stall of boots and shoes that this company had there was a very good one. They have not got any great amount of capital. They are struggling along and they are very industrious, and they are trying to get their goods in and they are succeeding to a certain extent. But the dumping of the overproduction of the American factories has made it a very difficult matter for them to get along. In the first place it has brought down the price of the local manufacturers, and the person who eventually benefits is not the consumer but the person who imports the goods, because they make the price just a little under the price of the local article. Of course it is hard to think that we must put up the price of any article, but we must protect any home industries that we have and give them every encouragement that we can reasonably give them.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—I would like to ask the Minister of Finance and Customs if the Government has considered making any change in the importation of raw material since the formation of the new tariff.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, if that had been considered and any attempt made to carry it out it would have upset the whole thing. This is just a thing that is to be tried and we are going to see just what will happen. I would just like to point out one thing for the information of my friend, Mr. Scammell, in connection with the anti dumping I think like the Hon. the Colonial Secretary that the consumer does not get the benefit of the goods that come into this country at the low prices. I will give you a case in point. I went into a certain place with a gentleman who understood dry goods and on looking around the store I saw that on one line there was a number of suits that were marked forty-five dollars, and on the other line there were some more at a price of twenty five dollars, and I said to the man who was with me that I thought that these suits were the same material and he looked at them and he told me that I was right. I asked the proprietor about it and he told me that some people come into the store and they think that the twenty five dollar suit is too cheap, and then he shows them the forty five dollar suit and they think that because it is not so cheap that it is alright. From that it can be seen that it is not the consumer that makes the saving.

MR. HALFYARD—My opinion is that it is a debatable question as to whether the protection policy is the best thing for Newfoundland. We have a population of two hundred and sixty thousand people spread over a coast line of two thousand miles, and the portion of this population that is engaged in the manufacturing industries is not more than two thousand people, if it is that. And then this protection is at the expense of the rest of the 258,000 people. And I think, that if there were no protection and no anti-dumping act that it would be more in the interest of the people of Newfoundland. The point that has been raised by the Hon. Member for St. Barbe is well taken. The Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs says that the consumer does not get the benefit of the reduction of the prices of the goods that come in here. But that is a reflection on the honesty of the business people. Of course it is right that a legitimate profit should be made, but

in the case of these imported boots and shoes it sometimes happens that the profit made is two hundred and fifty per cent, and then they are in competition with the home manufacturer who cannot make any profit by selling their boots and shoes at the same price. The result of this protection is that the people of this country who purchase the boots and shoes have to pay considerably more than they would otherwise have to pay. However, it is a matter of opinion as to whether we should give protection to the various industries that we have in this country. This is only an expression of opinion and possibly the Government may change its policy in this respect in the years to come. However, at the present time I do not suppose that anything can be gained by debating the question.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words with regard to these resolutions, and the matter of protection. I asked the Prime Minister a few days ago to consider giving a little more protection to the farmers; and then the gentlemen on that side of the House denounced the idea, but now the Government has become very excited about protection of an industry which employs only about five or six hundred men. That is surprising, because at the same time they are turning down an industry which employs between five and six thousand men. In fact I might say that right throughout Newfoundland there must be ten thousand men employed by that industry, and between five and six thousand depend practically entirely upon it. Still these people have no protection. You are charging 10 p.c. ad valorem duty on potatoes which can be raised absolutely in Newfoundland. Capt. Randell put the matter correctly the other day when he said that he was not in favour of putting too much protection on an industry for which most of the raw material was imported; but in this industry all the raw material is here. It is the same not only for potatoes but also for other farm produce. I contend that we are not giving enough consideration to this industry, although the Government the other day voted $25,000 for the encouragement of agriculture. Considering that, and the number of people employed in that industry, I submit that it is not considered at all. You must consider that the people who prosecute the industry are mostly fishermen, and they are not being protected. I know that St. John's people eat potatoes too, but they are protected to a certain extent, because the factories in which they work are protected.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, in reference to these resolutions I would like to have this one explained. I understand the Minister of Justice to really on these articles, and the say the other night that the duty is Executive Government is only taking power to take it off. Do I understand that we should be collecting duty on, for instance, pork to-day.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—No because the position is to-day that the extra amounts provided will not will not come into effect until they have been gazetted.

MR. CASHIN—Did you issue a gazette?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—No.

MR. CASHIN—If we pass this now it is law?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Yes. What happens is that immediately this tariff is adopted this notice will be published in the Gazette. In other words, the old act is repealed, and this one takes its place.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, supposing the Government decided tomorrow that they wanted more money, they need not publish that Gazette,

and then if a man wants to get a hundred barrels of pork he will have to pay the duty on it.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I do not see how, having announced that these things are on the free list, we can go and put them on the duty list; although it was suggested the other day that we should put twenty-five cents a barrel on flour, although Mr. Halfyard did not agree with the idea.

MR. HALFYARD — Mr. Chairman, with regard to that duty on flour, I am sorry that I was not here when the debate in connection with the agreement between the Newfoundland Milling Company and the Government was in progress. What I intended to say was that whatever agreement there is between the Government and the Milling Company, the Government or the Company should stand or fall by that agreement.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE — I may say that there is no lawyer that could make a saner statement than that.

(Reading Resolutions.)

MR. HICKMAN—Does this clause mean that the Governor in Council can take up the matter of duties on machinery imported for any special purpose, or for any industry that is in competition with another of the same kind. Has the Governor in Council power to say what the duties shall be?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE — I take it that it means an establishment of a new industry, and the Governor in Council has power to fix the duty on the machinery coming in.

MR. WARREN—I suggest that the word "New" be inserted in the clause.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE — I am agreeable.

MR. WARREN—Is that a new Resolution

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—It was there before.

MR. WARREN—In other words this repeals the Audit Act. The Audit Act provides a refund of revenue.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Perhaps it is the intention to refer to clause 23 not 22; the latter is the Customs Act.

MR. WARREN—Hon. the Minister of Finance tells me 22 is the Customs Act, and if that be so there is a direct conflict with the Treasury Act.

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.

On motion this report was received.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move the following amendment to the Tariff:

(Reads amendment.)

It is admitted by everyone who has any interest whatever in the trade and commerce of the country that the tariff is unfair because it bears too heavily on the shoulders of those who are not able to carry the burden. This tariff was made up by a Tariff Commission appointed by the late Government and this tariff was laid upon the table of this House without any consideration having been given to it by the Government. The tariff is unfair and unjust in many ways and it hampers the chief industry of the country. The imposition of the extra duty upon the necessaries of our fishermen is too great a burden for them to bear. Speaking some time ago on this tariff, reference was made to certain industries that are over-protected by this tariff and I made reference to an industry where lines and twines are manufactured. I said then that this duty on lines and twines should never be there. The fishing industry is now a very costly one and it will not pay a man to catch fish unless we reduce the cost of a fisherman's outfit. In dealing with industries that have a great

deal to do with our fishing industry some time ago I made mention of the Colonial Cordage Company, because that Company manufactures mostly the things that the fishermen require, such as lines and twines. Now the lines and twines used by our fishermen are principally imported, and even with this duty on lines and twines will still be imported, because they are found to be the best. Usually our bank fishermen use the imported steam tarred lines and on which a duty of fifteen per cent. will be imposed under this tariff, and I cannot see how the fishermen of the West Coast will be in a position to prosecute the bank fishery, nor can I see how the representatives of the West Coast can vote for this tariff, particularly Messrs. Lake and Long, who represent Burin District, the home of the bank fisherman. Mr. Lake knows well that very often a bank fisherman finds it difficult to make two ends meet, without the imposition of additional duty and increased taxation, and he knows that there has been periods on the West Coast when the price of fish was very low and a great many people were driven out of business. Now if Mr. Lake knows how difficult it is for a bank fisherman to make a do of it under the old tariff, how does he expect him to make a successful voyage with the imposition of this new duty on lines and twines. Then again, besides lines and twines there are dory oars, lanterns, splitting knives and everything pertaining to the fishery imported into the Colony and on which there is a duty ranging from fifteen to fifty per cent. Now I do not see how a man like Mr. Chambers, representing the District of Burgeo, can vote for the tariff in view of the hardships his people are going through and have gone through in that section of the West Coast. The fishermen there are called upon to endure untold hardships and sometimes even disaster, as was experienced a few months ago, and I do not see how Mr. Chambers can conscientiously defend such a tariff which is going to put an additional burden on the people he represents. I might also refer to Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Walsh and Mr. Sinnott, who represent men who carry on the fishery in Placentia, St. Mary's and Trepassey Bays, men whom these representatives know have all they can do to make two ends meet and who now are going to have a greater hardship inflicted upon them by the imposition of this new tariff. Mr. Warren, the member for Fortune Bay, also represents a big fishing population. I refer to the hardy bank fishermen of Harbour Breton, Jersey Harbour, St. Jacques, Belleoram, English Harbour, Garnish and others in that section, and men who are crying out to-day against the irregular imposition of this new tariff.

Referring again to the protection afforded the Colonial Cordage Company, I would like to say that whilst I am in favor of all industries in this country being protected to a certain extent so that every possible person can be employed, still I think that an industry in such a strong financial position as the Colonial Cordage Company does not need further protection. The Colonial Cordage Company has paid large dividends and has large reserves and do not need any further protection from this Government at the expense of the fishermen of the country. If it were a dwindling industry I would be one of the first to try and help to put it on its feet again, but when it has such large reserves it needs no further protection, particularly when it costs so much to produce fish in this country, as we have to compete with Norway and Iceland, who sell fish in the same markets as we do and at lower prices. It must be remembered also that our

foreign markets are in bad shape and almost bankrupt, and exchange is so low that it is impossible for us to raise the price of fish on them. Last year the catch of fish was small but the price was high, and the consumption fell off, and that is an argument why these extra duties should not be imposed upon the fishermen. Now I do not want to appeal to the Government on behalf of the fishermen alone because there are other classes of workmen who are going to suffer under this new tariff, and there are industries that are not going to prosper with additional duties imposed on them. The Prime Minister told us in his speech that the Colonial Cordage Company is a great help to the people because they carry large stocks of goods that they let out on thirty days' credit and that they give the people time to pay for them. But I would like the Prime Minister to know that the Colonial Cordage Company is not the only concern in this city that does that, and it is no argument for that Company being over-protected at the expense of the working class of people. There are other concerns that import ropes, twines and other materials and who give them out to people on thirty days. Now the Imperial Tobacco Company is another industry that is over-protected and at the expense of the fishermen also. Tobacco, although it might be looked upon as a luxury, is really a necessity for ninety per cent. of Newfoundland fishermen. The Imperial Tobacco Company are paying large dividends and should not be over-protected like it has been in the past. There are a great many other things, particularly articles of food, that this new tariff bears heavily upon. It is all very well to take twenty-five cents off a barrel of flour and put $1.20 on to a sack of peas. Now our round peas that are used mostly by the poorer class of people throughout the country are gone up one hundred and fifty per cent., whilst the duty on split peas, which are used mostly by the better classes, have gone up only fifty per cent. Then you must take into consideration that when you pay extra duty on goods that the man who imported that article figures on the cost of it, figures out the additional duty and then figures out his profit.

Now the Government has seen fit to take the duty off gasoline. Gasoline is used by fishermen in this country, but by taking the tax off gasoline it is but little help to them from the standpoint of revenue. It would be far better if the Government kept the duty on gasoline and took the duty off something else in the interest of the fishermen, because most of the gasoline coming into this country at the present time is used by people who have motor cars. By taking the duty off gasoline it is free to all, but if the tax was collected all round you would be better able to take the duty off something else and you would be relieving the fishermen more of their heavy burden. The total duty collected last year, we are informed by the Minister of Finance, was $80,000 on sewing machines. Under the new tariff that will mean a collection this year of $120,000. Nearly every poor woman around this country, if she manages to get one at all, uses a sewing machine. Sewing machines are used in the homes for mending and making clothes and for doing work for clothing factories in St. John's. In fact many an industrious and economical woman makes a living for herself and her children on that class of machine. And this article among other things should also have been taken into consideration by the Government before they laid this new tariff on the table of this House. Another thing on which there is additianal duties imposed and which were the cause of interesting discussions

in this House a few days ago is jams and jellies. The honourable member for Ferryland referred to the duties being taken off these articles and the member for St. John's West, Mr. Browne, claimed they were taken off before. The reduction, I understand, is ten per cent. Now these articles that are principally used by the people who are well-to-do in life. The poorer class of people use prunes and raisins and dried fruit, but the duties have been raised on these articles, which is another proof that in the consideration of the tariff the Government did not consider the amount of the duty that should be on each article of the tariff. Now in reference to the dumping clause, I agree in one sense with the Minister of Finance and Customs that some kind of a dumping clause should be inserted. He showed here this afternoon boots that have been purchased for twenty cents, so that kind of thing should not come into the country at the low rate of duty because after all the consumer is not the person who benefits by the low invoice cost. But I doubt very much if the Minister of Finance ever went into the shoe manufacturing industry of this country which employs a great number of people. Perhaps they can employ more in that industry and it should be gone into, and if it is an industry that is struggling along it should have protection given to it and the duty on the materials that are used in this industry should have the duty reduced on it. The Colonial Secretary told us that two-thirds of the boots that are used in Newfoundland have to be imported, and if that is the case I think that it is time that this industry was looked into, because there is no reason why all the boots should not be manufactured in our own country. I saw shoes at the Exhibition last year that were manufactured in Harbour Grace, and without knowing very much about boots I think that these were of the sort that would suit people of the highest class, and I do not see what reason there is that all the boots that are used in Newfoundland should not be manufactured here. I think that the Minister of Finance should go into all the industries of this country and find out what profit they are making and see what are in need of protection and what do not need protection and see also that they are employing as many people as possible. I understand that the duty on material for making ladies' shoes of fairly good grade is ninety cents and that the duty for material for making the shoes of the best grade is about a dollar and thirty cents, and it is very difficult for an industry to compete with the imported article with an import duty like that on the raw material. Now the Minister of Finance told us this afternoon that this tariff was only a trial. That it was going to be a trial until the next session. Well if that is the case I think that is a very dangerous thing to put this tariff through in the present form with the prospect of a change at the next session of the Legislature.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE —Pardon me, if I did say that I did not mean it. What I mean to say is that it is almost impossible to make a tariff so that it will be perfect. Of course if it is found that there are certain things that are not as they should be then they will be taken up and looked into.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITIION—I took down the words of the Minister at the time but I may be wrong. That is what I thought that he said. If the Government considered doing that I think that you would find that there would be a considerable drop in the revenue of the country, because there would not be nearly as much imported as nobody

wants to fill up his shelves and then find that the duty has been reduced and the value of everything that he has on the shelves reduced correspondingly. And the same thnig applies at the present time in the case of the increase of duties, because all those who have stocks in have put up the price of goods and they will make a substantial profit on the increase of duty. Now this is a very thoughtless policy of the Government. I presume that they have thrown the responsibility for the tariff that they are putting on the country on the Tariff Commission. Perhaps that is one of the reasons why they are not prepared to have the tariff adjusted at all. These are the principal things in the tariff which I think will bear most heavily upon the people of this country and it is for this reason that I propose the amendment. It reads as follows:

(Reads the amendment to the tariff.)

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that after listening to the remarks that have been made by the Leader of the Opposition I think that if he makes statements in this House he should know what he is talking about. I have replied to these charges before but the same thing has been said so often that I do not want to have to contradict it any more. It is very painful for me to have to so often defend a company in which I am personally interested. The Colonial Cordage Company has been made a political football of for years, and if members come into this House and attack that company they should be prepared to back up their statements with facts. The Leader of the Opposition said that the people on the West Coast will not use the local made lines, and because of that they find that the extra duty will bear heavily on them. Now I want to tell the Leader of the Opposition that the value of the imported lines and twines last year was twenty-three thousand dollars, and the sale of lines and twines by the Colonial Cordage Company for the same period was two hundred and fifty thousand dollars, or more than ten times as much.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—I said some of the people.

HON. THE RIPME MINISTER — What the House understood from what you said was that most of the lines and twines that were used on the West Coast were imported. There are about three firms that are importing the lines that are used by the bank fishermen. One of these is Harvey & Company, who happen to be agents for a firm of foreign manufacturers. And I can say here that it is nearly entirely the local manufacture that is used on the West Coast, and I think that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition ought to be a little more conversant with the facts before he makes such statements. The hon. member for Ferryland reiterated a half dozen times that there was an extra protection of two and a half cents a pound for the Imperial Tobacco Company. I challenged his statement and I offered to put up thirty dollars against his thirty dollars and then have the figures submitted to a chartered accountant, and then if the local industry was being protected by one cent then I was prepared that my thirty dollars should go to any orphanage that he named. The only reply that I got was that if he had thirty dollars he would buy some clothes for some poor man. Now, Mr. Speaker, I submit that these things could not have been done for other than a political motive. One would almost be inclined to feel that Mr. Grimes the other evening, when he was speaking on the tariff and when he referred particularly to the little girl with the new dress or to the little girl who wanted

the new dress, or when he referred to the tooth paste from which he thought that the duty should be taken off for poor children, I say when he said these things that one would feel that he was most earnest that the duties should be takten off and perhaps he is, bu one would think that the contention would be that the best way to cut down the expenditure would be to reduce the expenditure, and yet he and Mr. Hickman and Mr. Halfyard and Mr. Cashin come before this House and argue that it is necessary to open the District of St. John's East for the filling of Mr. Vinicombe's place. If reduction in taxation is really desired the argument should be that an election in St. John's is not necessary. If no election is held we can save three thousand dollars for the three years by not filling Mr. Vinicombe's seat. You can save one thousand dollars by not having to take the list of voters of St. John's East and another five thousand dollars by not having that election. And while the constituency is represented in this House by such splendid men as Mr. Higgins and Mr. Fox I do not think the electors are concerning themselves about the matter very much. And I think that if you asked the people of St. John's East whether they would prefer to have an election to fill the vacancy or have ten thousand dollars taken off their taxes I think that they would take the ten thousand dollars.

I claim that party politics is being used. Last year it was the same kind of politics when the Bonavista election was coming on. I said before that when these gentlemen came back to this House this year they were different men and did not want to push political issues, but now that Mr. Cashin has left the ranks of the Government, they think that something might change the men on this side of the House and so they have appealed to Mr. Chambers and Mr. Long, and Mr. Lake, and the other members, and they ask if they can sit there and see the duty put on lines and twines and the other things.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that it is only politics that the members of the Opposition have been playing when they have so strongly criticised the increase of taxation, and it is only politics that they have been playing when they speak of St. John's East and ask that the district be opened for election.

MR. GODDEN—Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the amendment that has been proposed by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER—Perhaps the Hon. Member means that he wishes to second the amendment that has been proposed by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. GODDEN—Mr. Speaker, I wish to second the amendment that has been proposed by the Leader of the Opposition. I have already voiced my sentiments regarding this new tariff and I do not propose to enter into any further prolonged remarks in criticism, but I feel that I must point out to the House the fact that when the new tariff was first tabled the public was simply amazed at the increases that were proposed, but now that the increase of the tariff is being felt day by day that amazement has turned to consternation.

I still contend that the Government made a big mistake when they brought this new tariff before the House and made it effective. When it was too late they realized their mistake, and I suppose that they would consider it too much of a loss of dignity to withdraw it; but I venture to say that we shall have many more tariff changes before a year is out, and that those changes will be much wiser than those in the new tariff which we now have before us.

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, it would be wrong to allow the tariff to be passed through this House without making an issue of it. The idea of the tariff, we were given to understand, was that it would be simpler in form, and that the new duties would not be further advanced. I say that as a result of the Tariff being adopted by the Government without the criticism and consideration of both sides of this House, the result has given us a tariff that is just as awkward in its composition as the old one, and there are various remedies that must be made; otherwise there are going to be alterations every day.

It had been my purpose to bring in various amendments, but they were so many in number—between thirty and forty mistakes that I noticed in the tariff, that I thought if I brought in so many as that I should only defeat my own purpose, and I intend to point out just three or four of these alterations that to my mind must be made —alterations, and in some cases insertions, which to my mind are necessary.

In the first place, when I first spoke on this new tariff, I mentioned that on page two of the tariff resolutions, number 20, that there was no provision made for the duty on these articles, viz., Tapioca, Sago, etc., except when imported in fourteen pound packages; so that when you go to pass on those articles in bulk, you have to ask first what is the rate of duty. As a matter of fact, those particular items should be placed in another category; they should be placed in the same category as Rice and Beans. I suppose it is too late to make suggestions, but I was going to suggest that these particular articles when imported in bulk should be levied on at 3c. a pound, which would leave these articles practically as they were before.

The next thing that I notice is on page 4, No. 56, relating to goods coming in from Spain, which are duty free during the currency of an agreement between Britain and Spain. There is an omission of peanuts from that section. I wanted to suggest that the Committee should add peanuts, as lots of these come from Spain and there is in reason why those should be charged duty whilst walnuts and almonds are free. That is merely an opinion, I take it, which must be remedied.

The next thing is on page seven of the Tariff, referring to sugar. For the last years. until recently a large business was done with the British West Indies in connection with profitable freights on brown and yellow sugar from those places. The duty as it is to-day is two cents a pound—the same on this West India sugar as it is on the American sugar—refined American sugar. The cost of the American sugar and of West India sugar is practically the same in the first instance, but the American sugar is more favourably received, because it is white. However, in view of the profit that might come to us by the freighting of the West India sugar, I consider that an insertion should be made in No. 72 of the Tariff, as follows:—

"Sugar imported from the British West India Islds., 1c. lb." That is just half the rate that is placed on American sugar; and why I suggest that reduction is this, that in the first place American Refined Sugar and British West India sugar cost about the same. Then if the duty on these is the same, it means that the consumer will not but the West India sugar, because it is not only a different colour, and is not refined like the American sugar; but if the price in Newfoundland were say two cents less per lb. for West India sugar, we would sell larger quantities, the same as we did a few years ago; and that is a thing that we want to bring about, because not only do we ship large quantities of fish down to the West Indies, but we

have a chance of getting the freights from there, and that is a thing which we should not lose. That is a suggestion which I throw out with every good intention.

As I said before, I know scores of amendments or remedies that are necessary to be made in this tariff; and I believe that although the Government of to-day will not withdraw, much as it would like to, I really believe that within twelve months they will have to reconsider their action and bring in something better. But before you do bring in anything new, be sure and let us view it from all angles, free from party politics. Let us have a sane tariff.

I do not purpose to hold up the business of the House longer, but I have much pleasure in seconding and supporting the amendment brought forward by Mr. Hickman, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, and that amendment, I believe, reflects the opinion of practically everyone in this country.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the amendment that has been introduced by the Hon. Member for Harbour Grace, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Hickman, and seconded by the Hon. Member for Trinity, Mr. Godden; and in speaking on this amendment I would like to point out to the House that the position which I have taken on this tariff has been one which has not been dictated to me from any partisan or political viewpoint.

The Prime Minister a few moments ago spoke about the way in which ten thousand dollars could be saved by the people in St. Johns East in regard to the bye-election there, and the filling of the seat which has been vacated by Mr. Vinnicombe, the Hon. Member for St. John's East. I would like to remind the Government that they have not yet voted the salary for the Board of Liquor Control, and under the Act that requires to be done this session.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—I would like to inform the Hon. Member that that will be included in the additional estimates.

MR. ASHBOURNE—I was wondering whether or not the Government had overlooked it, and whether or not they would be anxious for the public to know that these three men are going to get thirteen thousand dollars between them, which I understand is the case. I think myself that one man would have done for the job. I have the greatest confidence in the ability of the Chairman of the Liquor Control Board, Mr. Mifflen. I feel sure that he is a very capable man, and I believe that he could have managed the whole thing, and thus the Government might have saved about eight thousand dollars to the colony.

As regards the politics—that is a poor argument by the Prime Minister that our viewpoint has been dictated by politics—and that we are trying to turn this tariff into a matter of politics. The public as a whole has been sadly disappointed in the bringing in of this tariff, and the increasing of taxation, at a time when they expected to be relieved from excessive taxation, which has been unfortunately thrust upon them.

A few nights ago I received the following letter, sent to me from Harbour Grace. and seeing that it is for the public good—pro bono publico—and is addressed to the members of the Government, to the Members of the Opposition, and the Editors of the press, and to all and sundry whom it may concern. I would like to state that it seems to me that the Government has not devoted its energies or time to giving the consideration to the tariff which they should have, and which the people of the country as a whole were expecting of them. Since this tariff has been laid on the table of the House, I feel sure that the Hon.

members opposite me have regretted very, very much the fact that the tariff was ever changed, and that the new tariff was ever introduced into this House. I know that we have to get revenue, and I know that we have to pay our bills, but when it comes to taking off the taxation from one class and putting it on another there arises a question which needs to be gone into very carefully and thoroughly, so that no person, or no party will be unfairly treated. As I said several times before, and as I wish to state again, I want it to go on record that I am opposed to this tariff, because it increases taxation upon the people of Newfoundland.

The Government, when their party went to the country, promised reduced taxation and reduced expenditure, and instead of carrying out that promise, instead of fulfilling their promises to the electorate, they have seen fit to come in here and increase expenditure and increase taxation.

Now we did not expect—no one expects—but that there will be certain anomalies in the new tariff. As the Honourable Minister of Finance has said just now, it is a very difficult matter to make a perfect tariff. We know that, but I would like to hear some pronouncement from the Government that they will not tinker with this tariff without giving the trade due notice. There has been a lot of money lost in this country through tinkering with tariffs—lost and made—and it is very unfair and should not be encouraged. It does not tend to stabilize trade, it rather tends to make the business people of the country more disgusted with the politicians than ever before. A man on Water Street to-day—a merchant does not know where he stands regarding the tariff.

He does not know whether or not more changes are to be made without warning and I urge the Government to make a pronouncement on this matter and I would point out to the Hon. the Minister of Finance that this is essential in order to get the business of the country on a firm basis because if the people think the duties are going to be removed they will not import goods and there will be a big falling off in the revenue. I urge the Government to give notice to the Trade and the country that changes are going to be made. Now as to the amount of public monies to be spent throughout the country—the two million dollars on roads, the money for re-railing the railroad and the fixing of the dock—it is not hard for the Government to make a definite pronouncement as to how this is to be spent. There is no doubt that the fishery prospects for this year are not as good as last and there will be a great deal of hesitation on the part of the supplier and the merchant as to how far they can carry on. What we want is development in the fisheries, and anything that may tend to retard it should only be agreed to after the greatest consideration. I will not speak at any greater length on the Resolutions but I wish to point out that the present policy of the Government is not in accord with their promises when they came into power. As to the districts represented on this side of the House, in view of the fact that the taxation has been increased all over the Island, I hope the money to be spent will be evenly divided and the people of these districts will be given a chance to make a remunerative living outside their ordinary avocation as fishermen.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker, although the hour is getting late I cannot let this Tariff go through without making a few remarks in connection with it. I might have sat here and listened to the deate and probably would have voted for it when the time came without saying anything only for the fact that during the last 8 or 10 days, the mem-

bers on this side of the House have been called everything from cannibals to brainless heads. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will take that from no man—I will not stand for such blackguardly remarks. I have been in this House for 20 years, and I have heard members get up and fight hard and make good speeches—some sincere and some of a political nature—but I have never heard the like of the abuse that has been handed out here in the last 10 days. It has been made out that we are no good but I am here to tell all and sundry if it takes me an hour or two hours to do it, that Winsor is one at any rate who has a spark of manhood in him. I want to tell the people in this House and in Bonavista Bay and all over the country, that I am a fisherman and I am here to do my best for the fishermen. I do not say this in the interests of my pocket but I have been claiming it for 20 years. I have always stood for the fisherman and laborer and took my medicine three times in Bonavista Bay opposing those who thought Moses had come on the earth again though I am glad to say they have now found out their mistake. I fought the election three times in Bonavista Bay—not in my own interests because if I had done that I would be better off than I am at present—but in the interest of the men whom I have been in the fishing boat with since I was six years of age and whom I expect to go with for the next twenty years. As I stated earlier in the debate, it has been claimed that Coaker did wonderful things for the fishermen of this Colony. I would like to ask the man who made that statement here to ask Tom Barbour who made from $18,000 to $20,000 under the fore cuddy of his boat and hauling his seine, what Coaker did for him. And I would like to ask hundreds of others like that man what Coaker did for them. I notice now that everyone in the Opposition side is now the friend of the fisherman but were they their friends three years ago when the price of fish was down to $4 a quintal and the fishermen were going out of the country in hundreds because they could not earn a livelihood here. They were not the friends of the fishermen then and though they have been asked from time immemorial to take off the taxes they refused to do so. I say that none of these on the other side who have represented this Colony the last six or seven years can stand up and say they were the friends of the fishermen as the taxes were higher then than they are now. The taxes we are putting on will not tally up the millions that were borrowed by the Opposition when they were in power and make up the deficit they left us as a legacy and which has to be paid. We have been called brainless heads and cannibals and I say I will not sit here and let any man call me that. He may think the fishermen and others in the country will agree with him but I have seen members here who crossed the floor on taxation and other questions but woe to their fate before they were very much older. We must have this taxation but if we were not burdened with the legacy of debts that were left to us when we came into power there would be no need for it. As I said before the bills are still coming in every day and I say the Hon. the Prime Minister or Minister of Finance cannot carry on the affairs of the country without taxing the people. As I said before all are the friends of the fishermen now but I have been always consistently interested in them and am here now in their behalf.

(House rose till 8 p.m.)

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker, in reference to the amendment before the House the Leader of the Opposition had the kindness to mention the duty on lines and twines. He made reference to a number of members on this side of the House but he did not men-

tion any member from the Northern Districts. But I may say that the Northern people of this island are as much interested in this tariff as any part of the country. I suppose he did not mention the Northern Districts because he thought that most of the lines and twines that were used by the Northern Districts came from the Rope Walk. I may say that during the debate in this House it was stated by the Leader of the Government that lines and twined were not more expensive this year than last year. Therefore I can't see what effect it would have on the fisheries. Well then if by putting on an extra 10% duty on lines and twines and as far as I can find out there was about $2,300 worth came into the country last year. Then if the extra duty will cause that much lines and twines to be made in this country and will in for the welfare of the people of this country then I wish to put myself on record as being against the amendment now before the House. When I joined this party I joined it in the belief that anything that Monroe would bring in here he would bring on for the welfare of the people of this country, and I have yet to be persuaded that it is not so. There are several items in this tariff that we may not all agree with but under the circumstances I am personally prepared to let it go into effect this year and if it is possible to have anything reduced in another year I have no doubt that it will be done. As I said here before we were left great legacies and therfore the money has got to come from somewhere to pay for the taxes. We have been charged with putting on the taxes on the poor man and taking them off the rich man. They claimed that pork, beef and flour are the commonest diet of the fishermen and we have taken off a certain amount of the tax of those commodities. And some other members that spoke were in favor of it. We have taken off the income tax and other taxes during this year have been taken off. But I say right here that I am a supporter of the Monroe Government and I am still as strong a supporter as when I came here. And I feel that at the end of the four years I will be prepared to go and take my chances with the fishermen of this country as well as any man in it. I was told last year that my people in Bonavista Bay would not stand for it. Time was a fortune teller and I found I was correct and I feel sure that anything that was supported by me on the floors of the House with regard to taxes that the people have confidence enough in me to be prepared to put up with the consequences for the next four years. I intended to speak on this Bill before it came to this stage but through a gentleman ringing me up over the telephone I was unable to deliver my speech before the amendment was brought in but I have no doubt that I will be able to deliver it when the House is in Committee on Supplemental Supply.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Speaker, I am sure that we all regret very much that the stringency of the rules of debate in this House has not permitted the Captain making his speech which he has been preparing for the last three weeks and we look forward with pleasure to the next session when we shall have an opportunity of hearing this speech that the Captain has given us due notice of.

Now there is an amendment before the chair which I am afraid that I cannot support. I want to be perfectly frank and say that at an early hour this afternoon a gentleman on this side of the House showed me the amendment that he was going to move and I was prepared to support and to vote for that amendment. But it was a surprise to me when I heard that another amendment had been moved which I cannot support. And as the rest of my party is not here and as I

cannot get a seconder for my own amendment all that I can do is to register my protest against certain portions of the tariff and then I cannot vote for this amendment.

What does this amendment say. It says that after spending three or four weeks discussing this tariff and after allowing every item to go through to cut it all out and to go back to the old tariff. And that after the Finance Minister had made all the estimates for the year. That would only make confusion worse confounded.

If the gentleman who had moved the amendment had showed me the amendment I would have added my support to his but to come in here after three or four weeks work and ask the Government after passing the tariff to lay it aside without any recommendation would be merely to stultify our cause and for that reason I cannot vote for this amendment. Now the Prime Minister said a few words this afternoon as a peroration and what I consider an insinuation to this side of the House that by moving this amendment we were only playing politics. Now I don't know as I can altogether dissociate myself from a charge of that sort and I don't think that the Prime Minister can. I would like to ask him what he means by "politics." If they are wrong he ought to be ashamed to be in it. I was listening to the Colonial Secretary about six weeks ago about politicians. He said that it was no disgrace to be a politician. I am only paraphrasing what he said. There are good and bad politicians and it is only the bad politicians that ought to be held up as being bad in politics. Now the mere fact that an amendment has been proposed to this motion is no ground without some further counts of accusing us of playing politics. What are we all doing. The Government is wholly political and it is run by politics that has been referred to I fear that one will admit that I am playing politics. But I am not ashamed of it. I have been in political life now for a great many years and I suppose that I shall be in it for a great many more and as long as I don't do anything that I am ashamed of then I am not ashamed of being called a politican and of being told that I am playing politics.

I leave that subject now and I come to one that more nearly concerns this House. There is one thing that the Minister of Finance must keep secret and not divulge and that is the tariff policy of the Government. That is an unwritten law that must be observed on all occasions and the Minister of Finance has observed that law so strictly that he has had trouble with his own party on account of it. You cannot go into a party meeting and discuss a tariff before the Minister of Finance lays it on the table. It is too dangerous. But it may surprise members of this House to know that although the Minister of Finance and Customs preserved the unwritten law to the best of his ability and was unable as much as he would have liked to discuss it with his party still before it was laid on the table of the House, and I want to say this that he made the Budget speech on the 8th of April, the news was in London on the 6th of April as to what he was going to do. There was a leakage somewhere. I do not blame the correspondent of the London Times. He is a journalist and did what a journalist should do. It is Sir Patrick McGrath. It is his duty to find out all the information that he possibly can about things of this sort and this was published in the London Times.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE —Mr. Warren, would you mind reading the despatch.

MR. WARREN—Yes. Dated, London, April 6th.

(Reads the despatch.)

"The recess will end on Easter Monday when the Budget is expected, and

also a new tariff measure involving the complete revision of the existing tariff which has not been revised for 20 years, though it has been amended in some respects every session. The proposals for the revision have been drafted by a Commission, which has been holding sessions for the past two years, and it is understood that the Government hopes that the Legislature will accept them without change, as otherwise a considerable prolongation of the session is inevitable."

That is clear information that the tariff that had been revised by the Tariff Commission was to be tabled by the Government. I merely draw the attention of the Government to it. I do not criticize them for it and I say that is the duty of a journalist to get what news he can. But there must be a leakage somewhere. There is no doubt that if that had happened in a previous government we would have heard more about it. Now in connection with the amendment and laying aside the case of the tariff because it is going to bring a hardship on the people of the country, I want to say that the Minister of Finance and Customs has said, and it is not my intention to delay the House for any length of time because I have already given my criticism on the Budget, but the Minister has to have a revenue and it must be got by means of taxation. I consider that the duty on clothing is too high. I think that the duty on clothing could be reduced and the money raised on some other articles that will not bear so heavily. The duty on clothes is a hardship to the people of the country and will only bring into the revenue of the country thirty-three thousand dollars more than last year. In that I do not consider readymades alone. There are other raw materials that do not go to the factories and I think that the duty on these could be also reduced. I think that the duty that would be reduced in this way could be raised by a duty of twenty-five cents a barrel on flour. I have already pointed out that in three months the price of flour has fluctuated two or three dollars and in that case the increase of twenty-five cents a barrel on flour would not be noticed at all. There has been a lot of criticism on the reduction of the income tax. but anybody who has studied economics will find that the income tax is the last tax that people want and the first tax that they want to have reduced. Of course the income tax is really levied on those who have a little more money than others and that is after they have paid all the other taxes. In other words it is more or less a capital levy. Now if you take off the income tax you allow so much more money for circulation. When the income tax is paid it goes to the Government, but when it is not paid it is put in trade so that in that way it is a certain form of capital levy. Take any country in which the income tax is one source of supply to the Government. Take England for example. For six months before the Chancellor of the Exchequer delivered his budget every paper and man, woman and child was wondering how much was going to be taken off the income tax. Two years ago a shilling a pound was taken off the income tax. Everybody threw up their caps with joy. From the poorest man to the richest. Mr. Winston Churchill only took off six cents in the pound; the people expected a bit more. In Canada the income tax is comparatively away down. If the Minister of Finance and Customs in Canada could get clear of the Canadian railways and take ofl the income tax he would go to Heaven with a halo around his head and be canonized by the Canadian nation. If the tariff was arranged so that it did not bear very heavily on any particular part or industry of the country then you would have what is called a scien-

tific tariff. I believe that if this tariff had been taken into consideration a little more according to some settled policy of the Government as to the position they are going to take with regard to certain industries then I think that there would have been very much less criticism of this measure than there has been as it is. I am not going into details again. The Prime Minister said this afternoon that lines of local manufacture were mostly used on the West Coast, but this is not the information that I have at all. I understand that most of the bankers use the imported lines and twines. This matter has been debated a great deal during the last ten days, but the object that is the main industry of the country has not been encouraged while there is protection given to industries that are in a flourishing condition.You do this when the main industry of the country is in a languishing condition. The Leader of the Opposition suggested this afternoon that we should raise the duty on gasoline. He said that most of this was used in the motor cars. I confess that I cannot credit this. Practically all the motor cars that there are in St. John's and Harbour Grace and around the bay, and I think that you will find that there is as much gasoline used in Fortune Bay as there is in all the motor cars in the places that I have mentioned. It may be that the Ford cars run on their reputation instead of gasoline, but the facts are that there is more gasoline used for motor boats than in motor cars.

Now sir, talking about motor cars. It may be considered to be absurd but I think that the duty on motor cars should be reduced. I understand that this duty has not been increased. I think that if the duty on motor cars were reduced by fifteen per cent. that it would be a good idea because every car that comes into this country is a workshop in itself. I know that the motor car is the rich man's luxury, but the rich man pays for it. And if the rich man did not pay for these luxuries I wonder where the poor man would get off. I have a motor car that is going to last me for the next four or five years and it is not going to effect me personally. But a man cannot bring a motor car into this country at the present time without having to pay wages to someone. If a man buys a suit of clothes he wears them out himself, but if he buys a motor car he has to pay for different things such as gasoline and parts and other things. I do not know how many garages there are in St. John's, but there are not enough of them and those that are in the business employ a great number of men. Every motor car that comes into this country means a great diffusion of money. and I believe that if the duty were reduced by ten or fifteen per cent. we would get twice as much revenue even then by the increased number imported as you do at the present time. That is alright. But you cannot get away with the argument that the motor car is not more than a rich man's luxury, than any other industrial concern in which he invests money, and at the same time provides employment for other people.

Mr. Speaker, I felt that I had to get up to explain my position. I had intended to vote for the amendment as originally proposed, but I do not propose to vote for it now nor do I propse to vote for the tariff, so that before the question comes, you will see me, Mr. Speaker, disappearing through the bar of the House. I do not agree with the tariff. I do admit that I see no chance of reducing it, but I think that some alteration might have been made in the incidence of taxation, that it might have been put on some other articles, and removed from the articles which makes it bear so heavily on the people who are less able to pay it.

As I do not agree with the tariff I cannot vote for it.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Speaker, at this juncture I would ask if you would mind interpreting the amendment.

Clerk reads amendment.

In view of the debate which has taken place on the tariff, and in view of the expressed opinions on the tariff from the Leader of the Opposition down through every member of the Opposition party, there is no other course open for me than to support the amendment now before the chair. This tariff has made history in Newfoundland—for weal or for woe—from our point of view—for woe.

The independent member for Fortune Bay, Mr. Warren, has just stated during the course of his remarks that he could not vote for the amendment now before the House because that amendment proposed that the tariff which is at present before the House should be withdrawn, and that a new tariff, or the old tariff which in this instance would be a new tariff, should be substituted in its place. And he felt that the interests of this country would not be well served by supporting such an amendment, and by introducing the old tariff. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the interests of this country would be well served if we remain in this Legislature for another month debating a new tariff, and one which would save this country one million dollars in extra taxation. I do not propose to quibble on the niceties of amendments and the manner in which they should be placed before this House, but I submit that it is the duty of this house to this country—the duty of representatives in this House to the country if we can find a way out, if we could by supporting this amendment induce the Government to reconsider their actions and have the taxpayers of this country one million dollars, then I submit that it is our bounden duty to stay here and do it.

We move to-day that the Government do not proceed with, but reconsider and revise this tariff, and save the taxpayers of the country some money.

That was the very point which the honourable member himself stated. He regretted the increase in taxation, and he could not possibly have read the amendment as closely as I thought he had when he stood up to make his remarks this evening. Much can be gained and duty well done to the people of this country if we can oblige the Government to consider our amendment—if we can oblige the members to consider our amendment, which we have placed before the House and support it. In view of the attitude, however, which the Government has taken towards our position from this side of the House, and in view of the fact that their ranks are solid on the question of tariff, perhaps there is nothing to be gained by prolonging the agony. The fact remains that to-night we are witnessiing an act which in my opinion, imposes the greatest burden upon the people of this country that they have been called upon to bear since we have had responsibie Government.

The independent member for Fortune Bay has stated that his one objection to the tariff, and his strong objection to the tariff was that it was protecting industries that are well to do, and totally ignoring our most important industry—the fishery. For the information of the House I would like to put those remarks into plain language, and tell just what he means by that.

The hon. member for Fortune means in effect that we were protecting the Ropewalk in this tariff, and that by this tariff we are subsidizing an industry which has already made fortunes in big dividends for those interested in it. He means also that we are protecting the Tobacco Factory,

and helping an industry that is well to do, and making big dividends, such as the Tobacco Factory is making. He also means that while we are giving these protective rates to these well-to-do industries, and wealthy propositions, we are forgetting the most important industry of Newfoundland. I do not mince words, and I do not propose to mince my words as long as I hold a seat in this House, and when I make a statement of any kind in this House I am going to make it in a way that will not need paraphrasing in order to be understood.

The attitude that we have taken here throughout the whole discussion on this tariff is one that is consistently borne out by the amendment that is now before the House to-night. If the Finance Minister will assure this House to-night that he would be prepared to take this amendment into consideration, there is not one on this side of the House who would for a minute object to staying here for another three weeks in order to get the country back to the position which we want—the position as regards taxation at the present time.

The Prime Minister made some remarks here this afternoon. He made a very poor case. If the Finance Minister and the other gentlemen who got to their feet this afternoon, are the most able apologists that the Prime Minister has in the House, then I can say that he is in a very unfortunate position indeed. What is the position? The position is that the Government is bringing down a tariff, and they are asking the people of Newfoundland for Customs revenue on their own estimate to give seven hundred thousand dollars extra—and that means seven hundred thousand dollars extra taxation for the people of this country. We estimate, however, that that tariff is going to produce one million dollars extra, and that is not all the story. The whole story is that the Government that is doing that, is the Government that went to this country pledged to reduce taxation and expenditure. That must not be forgotten, Mr. Speaker, and will not be forgotten.

It is not enough to say that this side of this House have not given any suggestions as to what should be done with the tariff. It is not enough for the Prime Minister to say that from this side of the House we have been talking politics. If we have from the 8th April till now—all I have to say is thank God for politics. The politics that we have been talking since April 8th when this tariff was introduced is politics of the highest order—politics founded on true principles—politics which have for their object the alleviation of the burdens which bear so heavily on the taxpayers of this country.

Capt. Winsor this afternoon said it was only now that the fishermen have any friends in this House. He made some reference to the days when fish was down to four dollars a quintal, and I would ask the Hon. Minister if he does not remember when there was a Minister of Marine and Fisheries who, when he saw fish going down and saw that the fishermen were going to be under a heavy loss, bought Labrador fish and so put the price of fish up that year. We bought fish that year because the tendency of Labrador was to go lower. We may have made a mistake. but the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries was one of those who went up and down the country damning us on that occasion. We bought Labrador fish that year following the example of Norway and England, in an attempt to encourage the fisheries. In England they spent a big lot of money on buying herring, only to dump it overboard—but they had helped out the fisheries. In Norway they bought any amount of fish and then turned it into guano—but they had helped the fisheries. They

spent thirty millions of dollars. But we only bought eight or nine or ten thousand quintals of fish, but by doing that we stabilized the price of fish all throughout the country—and you say that to-day at last the fishermen have friends in this House.

I would like to ask the Hon. Minister what about the friends of the fishermen who were petitioning, who were hawking petitions all around the country, praying for reduced taxation and expenditure. I presume that the minister of Marine and Fisheries never saw that petition, and had no acquaintance with those men. I would like to ask the Hon. Minister also who was the man who said that the claims of the United Fishermen were justified —that in the granting of those claims lay the salvation of Newfoundland— and then the Hon. gentleman sitting opposite to-night will say that only now have the fishermen friends in this House.

The Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries has attempted to justify this taxation, and has spoken of the millions of dollars that has been wasted, but he never made reference to the millions of dollars that had been squeezed out of the people of this country by means of surplus revenues; and then the Minister of Finance is coming in here with an estimate of a surplus revenue of two hundred thousand dollars, when there is no necessity or excuse for such a step.

The Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries when he was going to Bonavista last Fall was told that the liquor question would be first . . .

The Speaker rules Mr. Scammell out of order.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Speaker I accept your ruling and propose to be very relevant. I have here a document relative to the expenditure of $45,000 in Bonavista District, and I think that is very relevant to the matter of taxation and expenditure. The Minister of Fisheries was very much exercised this afternoon over the question of expenditure and tried to argue that the Government was doing right and proper in connection with taxation and that his action would be justified by the electors of Bonavista Bay. Mr. Speaker, we are here to-night in the final stages of this Budget. We finalized this session an increase in the expenditure to the amount of $450,000, and this was done by the Government which was pledged to reduce taxation and expenditure. Now how can the Minister of Marine justify his position when this document I have here says the Government spent $45,000 last year just prior to the bye-election in Bonavista Bay. The Government would be well advised to accept this amendment and the proposals which have emanated from this side. By its conduct the Government has not shown that it has given consideration to this report of the Tariff Commission, but it has shown that it gave no thought at all to the recommendations of that Commission before they brought them in here. We submitted the proposition that you ought to reinact the old revenue act, that you should not reduce the tax on the Banks and that you should leave the Income Tax intact. But instead of that you ignored our suggestions and you have come down here with taxation increased to the extent I have already mentioned, and I challenge the Minister of Fisheries to telegraph to his friends in Bonavista Bay and ask them to bring up their last year's accounts and compare them with the prices they will have to pay this year for supplies. I had intended to refer to some of the remarks of the Minister of Marine this afternoon; but as he and I have been ruled out of order, and he says he is going to refer to some of the

affairs of the country later, I will withhold my remarks till then, as I would be out of order to give expression to them at this juncture. The Opposition have done their duty and their criticisms can not be classed as the tactics of obstructionists in connection with this tariff. As far as we have talked and criticized our attitude cannot be regarded as for obstruction purposes. The salient features of this Tariff have now become patent to the public and you say you will remedy it next year —but you should eradicate the errors now right in the present session. It will ring throughout Newfoundland that the Government pledged to reduce taxation, in its second session increased that taxation to the extent of $1,400,000. As I said the other day, if you were true to the trust that had been imposed in you, and had taken the fishermen and tried to reduce the taxation, even though you failed you would not be harshly judged, but now you cannot show that you made a single effort to bring about the consummation of your pledges. Early in the session we asked that the estimates in connection with the railway be tabled, but this was not done, and only this afternoon Mr. Cashin showed that on the salaries of the railway officials alone there should be a saving of $33,000. But you cannot show that you have made the least attempt to reduce the taxation or expenditure, and all the facts go to prove the contrary. We will shortly be closing this House and I suppose we will have to go out and the people will be left to bear the burden who can least afford to shoulder it. The honourable member for Fortune can urge all the platitudes he likes on behalf of the rich and say that we have reduced the duties on motor cars, but I submit that the poor man is the one on whom the burden has been made harsher than ever. You have protected the big industries, but you sit idly in your seats and see the main industry of the country languishing without raising a hand to help it. You talk of taking the duties off pork, beef and molasses, but there is no thanks due you for that. You said that we took them off illegally, but you took care to take them off very quickly in a legal way, and there is no thanks to you for it. You are going to spend two millions for roads, thousands on the hotel project and increase taxation all round—that is your policy. I have yet to hear one man on the Government side—clear of the departmental heads—stand up and justify the actions of the Government. You have lowered the standard of living of the people and reduced them to the plane of living on pork, beef and molasses—is that good enough? You have reduced the status of the fishermen who are slaving day and night to keep the clerks, bookkeepers, politicians and all the others of the rank and file in their positions. Is that good enough? Newfoundland was to be a fisherman's paradise according to the pre-election promises of the government, and in this we have an example of what the Hon. the Prime Minister believes to be a paradise. I was on the other side of the House and we were called dummies because we did not get up and say something. But we have travelled a long distance since then and we have learned something, and I ask any member of the government side to get up now and say something in defense of their conduct. There is not one but believes the Government has made a muddle of the tariff, and not even the Minister of Finance will dare to get up and address a public meeting and attempt to justify that tariff. You were either fools or knaves, and probably had good intentions when

you came into power, but the road to hell is paved with good intentions.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Speaker, I object to the statement that we were either fools or knaves.

HON. THE SPEAKER — I must agree with the objection of the honorable minister.

MR. SCAMMELL—I accept your ruling, Mr. Speaker, and I retract the assertion. You went to the country with good intentions, but your actions do not show that you intended to act up to your professions. If you went to the country with the plea of reducing taxation why did you not try to do so. If you have not been able to carry out your promises to the people why don't you resign. You are now in your second session and you have not shown reason for the faith that taxation should be reduced but faith is dead without good works and you have no work to show to justify your conduct as to this tariff. As I see it, there is nothing for me but to support this amendment, and there is no need for me to repeat the criticisms that have been offered by this side from time to time. I throw back to the Hon. the Prime Minister the statement that we have preached politics in connection with the discussion of this tariff, but if we did we could not do anything else in view of the high stand taken by the Government when going to the country. Now, Sir, the curtain is about to be rung down on this session and the sum total of your legislation is the increase of expenditure by $450,000 and the imposition of extra taxation to the amount of a million dollars. We would be delinquent in our duty as an Opposition if we did not draw attention to the pertinent points in the amendment, and I commend it to the approval of the House.

On motion for adoption of the Report, Mr. Hickman moved and Mr. Godden seconded the following amendment:

"That the Government do not proceed with, but reconsider and revise this Tariff in order to avoid inequalities in taxation and the imposition of hardship on the people of Newfoundland."

Whereupon the House divided and there appeared in favor ot the amendment:

Mr. Hickman,
Mr. Halfyard,
Mr. Hibbs,
Mr. Scammell,
Mr. Randell,
Mr. Duff,
Mr. Godden,
Mr. Ashbourne,
Mr. Cashin, (9

and against it:

Hon. the Prime Minister,
Hon. the Colonial Secretary,
Hon. the Minister of Justice,
Hon. the Minister of Finance,
Hon. the Minister of Posts,
Hon. Mr. Sullivan,
Hon. Mr. Cramm,
Hon. Mr. Bradley,
The Minister of Agriculture,
The Minister Marine & Fisheries,
The Minister Public Works,
Mr. Moore,
Mr. Lake,
Mr. Sinnott,
Mr. Chambers,
Mr. Power,
Mr. Little,
Mr. Puddester,
Mr. Cahill,
Mr. Linegar,
Mr. Browne, (21)

so it passed in the negative.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker, as the members of the official opposition proposed an amendment which has been turned down by the Government, I would ask, Sir, with your permission that my party be allowed

to propose an amendment which I will read:

(Reads Amendment)

In moving the amendment in connection with these three items I do so to be consistent with the attitude which I have taken since the tariff came up in debate in this House. With your permission also, Sir, I should like to reply to the remarks of the Prime Minister this afternoon in reference to the Colonial Cordage Company, in which he stated that last year the Company manufactured $250,000 worth of lines and twines, as against $23,000 worth that were imported. I do not question the figures of the Prime Minister, but I would like to ask, if this ten per cent. had not been put on lines and twines would they be any cheaper this year? That seems to be the point that has been evidently overlooked, and in passing might I says also that lines and twines have been admitted duty free this year. The importation of $23,000 worth of lines and twines would not cut in much on the Colonial Cordage Company and consequently there is no reason why the ten per cent. tax should not be taken off the imported article. Now tobacco is looked upon as a luxury for the fishermen. To-day tobacco is gone up six or seven cents a pound. Now I do not think that by putting on the extra taxation on tobacco that the Government is giving much encouragement to the fishermen. There is another item, readymades and clothing, on which twenty or twenty five per cent. is imposed. That affects the working classes of people in this country very considerably; whilst tailor made clothes are only gone up ten per cent. Now this is another instance of class legislation, it appears to me. I do not intend to dwell at any length on these items, as I have already expounded my theory in that direction; but the Prime Minister stated this afternoon that my vote against this tariff was not sincere, and I beg to differ with him. I have just as much interest in this country as the Prime Minister has. It is not politics that prompted me to cross the floors of this House in a matter of that kind, but I would like to point out to him that I promised my constituents a reduction in taxation and a reduction in public expenditure, and I promised them that if I remained with the Monroe Party that that promise would be carried out or if not that I would get out of that party. I am perfectly sincere in my attitude and I challenge the Prime Minister or any other Minister in his Party to say I am not. I was against that tariff from the start. The Prime Minister also made a remark about expenditure in St. John's East, and he intimated that that was one of the reasons why I crossed the floors of the House. Go around St. John's to-day, East and West, and you will find out that the sentiment of the people is against the present Government. I received a message to-day from a man whose name I will not mention, but I might say that he does not come from my district. He says: (Reads Message)

I received hundreds of similar messages from my own district, and that is the sentiment throughout the whole country to-day on account of this tariff. Now in moving this amendment I trust that I will find some member whether in the Opposition ranks or in the Government ranks who have the same feelings towards this tariff as myself and who will get up and second the amendment.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in seconding the amendment proposed by the honourable member for Ferryland. While we were in Committee on the tariff these three items were debated at

considerable length and I fail to see why the Government cannot see its way clear to revise the tariff so as it will bear more equitably on all the taxpayers of this country, at least, in so far as these three items are concerned. Now tobacco is used by rich and poor, high and low, and tobacco in plugs is used mostly by the poorer classes while the well-to-do use it in some other form. It has been pointed out this evening by previous speakers that tobacco may be regarded as a necessity. I do not admit that, but when one has been using anything for a number of years he looks upon it as a necessity. It is no use for anyone in this House or outside this House to argue that the change in the tariff has not changed the price in tobacco. Whether the Imperial Tobacco Company are charging more for it I do not know, but the fact remains that the consumers are paying more for it today. In connection with lines and twines the point that should be borne in mind is that if an industry is flourishing, and does not need any further protection, why tax imported lines and twines. And if our fishermen prefer to use American lines and twines and cordage that does not interfere with the industry here, and I therefore do not think it wise on the part of the Government to put a tax on the imported article to the detriment of the fishermen. Anybody can see the point that I am trying to make. It is unnecessary, and it will be regarded by the fishermen as a hardship, because they will have to pay more for their lines and twines. That is the mistake that the Government has made and I trust that they will see their way clear to support this amendment. It does not mean that we will have to stay here one hour longer. We were told that first amendment would mean a revision of the tariff. Readymades of course. That is different; when the cost of readymades is known by everyone in this House. There is a suit of clothes that cost 20 dollars. Under the old tariff the duty would be $11.41. Now the duty is 14.00. Then of course there is the man who imports the readymades for sale. He will have to get the extra duty on the cost to the purchaser will be 20 or 25 p.c. more as a result.

Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to labour the question any further. There is a straight question before the House now. Are we going to turn down this amendment, which deals with three articles largely used by the labouring class and the producers of this country. It has been suggested by other speakers that the motor car is a little industry in itself. But the motor car produces nothing and nine tenths of these who use motor cars are not producers. Where do those men get their money to buy the cars? The tariff is alright from a revenue point of view, but you have to get down to the man who produces the raw article. The man who pulls the fish out of the water and the man who gets the mineral out of the earth, and the man who turns the forest into lumber. The man who tills the soil or produces vegetables, fruit or anything of this nature. Therefore this House should consider the amendment in its proper spirit, not because it comes from the Independent member, not because it may be supported by a member of the Opposition, but to show to the country and the people who sent you here that you have some interest in their welfare. We have gone so far with this legislation, we have come to the closing hours and you cannot see your way clear to make up your minds to remain in the House any longer, to revise the tariff; but I assure you from a political point of view that

although you have lost the support of those who sent you here, but if you support this amendment they may be inclined to excuse you. That tariff was introduced without any consideration. As the Finance Minister has committed himself to this policy it would be easy to vote for this amendment and relieve this hardship and lighten the burden of taxation to a small extent.

Certainly I think that the Government will give this the greatest consideration. They should seriously consider this before voting for this amendment.

In conclusion I wish to say that I heartily support this amendment.

HON. THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES—Mr. Speaker, on five different occasions during the 12 years past, four times during the general election and once during the bye-election, the people of the district of Placentia and St. Mary's have in no uncertain sound demonstrated to the country at large the absolute confidence that they had in my actions in this House since they honoured me with a seat in 1913 Honestly I sympathise with the members on the other side of the House who have been labouring this question since it was tabled, and I might say in passing that when the tariff was first tabled there were many features of it that were very abnoxious to me. At the present moment the tariff is not all that I would wish it to be. It is all very well for the members to get up and criticise this means of getting revenue. You would think that any man who would come in here in some mysterious way would be able to find hundreds of thousands of dollars, and at the same time to allow commodities to come in duty free. That would be popular legislation, no doubt, and I would be very glad to see the revenue got in that way, but it would be a matter of impossibility. Public monies are required for public works and money can only be had by the levying of taxes. Why since the present session has opened Hon. Members on both sides of the House have been presenting petitions from their constituents praying for various public works. I remember one afternoon I took my pencil and totaled up the sums of money that were asked for for Twillingate District. It was their duty and they deserved all the praise of the constituents for the fight that they put up in the interests of the people that sent them here. But surely the Hon. Members don't suppose that all that we have to do, or rather that the Minister of Finance has to do is to go down with some secret key and unlock some secret receptacle and get the wherewithal to build these public works. I have a seat in this House for the last 12 years, and no session has passed but that myself or my colleagues didn't present petitions and support petitions from the district of Placentia asking for important public works. I remember the first time that I presented a petition largely signed by the people of Placentia, asking for a fog alarm to be erected on the West Side of Placentia Bay, and the different Governments paid no attention to these petitions with regard to these public works. But the first thing that the present Prime Minister did in conjunction with the Minister of Finance was to make provision whereby these utilities would be given to the people whom I have the honour to represent in this House, and I feel sure that now when provision is to be made for a fog alarm at Cape LaHaye costing $15,000 to be followed by another on the West Side of Placentia Bay, followed by another costing $15,000, $45,000 in all for aids to navigation in a district that has been

neglected for the past seven years. I think that there is ample justification for me to support this measure now before the chair.

Now the bone of contention in this House the last few weeks in regard to the tariff seems to be the item relating to lines and twines. Well now the levying of duty on lines and twines is unquestionably a very popular criticism for the Opposition and a very unpopular action for the Government to levy such a tax. But on a close analysis it would be found that with a 10 p.c. duty on lines and twines if the figures as tabled by the leader of the Government are correct, which is that there was $23,000 worth of lines and twines imported in the country last year. Well then last year there was no duty on lines and twines, and as the Government have seen fit to impose a tax on lines and twines it is reasonable to assume that there will not be imported this year $23,000 worth. But even if there is this amount coming in from the outside on which the fishermen have to pay 10 p.c. duty that would be $2,300. Now then Mr. Speaker, dividing that amount between the 20,000 fishermen in Newfoundland it would be 12 cents a man. Now I ask in all seriousness does anybody suppose that the fishermen of this island are worrying because the Monroe Government is going to charge every individual fisherman 12 cents. They are more concerned with the various works that they have been promised and have not yet been started. They are more concerned to know what the price of fish is going to be. I was very sorry to hear the Leader of the Opposition in his criticism this afternoon when he stated that the fish market was going bankrupt. I think that that is a disastrous statement, and I hope that it wont go out and be published in the papers tomorrow. Such a statement may do very serious harm. I remember a short year ago when we appealed to the country we were told by the opposition of that day that codfish was going to be $5 a quintal. And we found that the fishermen became despondent. Nobody had the courage to go at the industry. That presentment did not turn out to be a correct one. The fish realised twice that amount. And I trust that it will be the same this year. It is only eight months since the General Election and the country does not want another general election for another four years. What the people want is for the Government to get to work. Probably after another three sessions the country and the Opposition will have an opportunity to discuss the works of the Prime Minister and his Government. And then if they find that at the end of that three years that the Prime Minister and his Government have fallen down, and I do not believe that they will find anything of the kind the country and the Opposition will be in a position to do things as they will please at that time. With regard to the tobacco and the lines and twines, the fishermen of the average fisherman uses in the vicinity of ten or twelve pounds of tobacco a year, and then granted that the price has gone up five cents a lb. that will only mean in the course of a year fifty cents that the average fisherman and labourer of this country will have to pay for his tobacco. I do not think that they will worry very much about that. There will be more money in circulation during the next few years than there has been in any time in my recollection, and so Mr. Speaker, with these few remarks, I do not intend to delay the House for any long time, but I think that I should not allow such an important matter as this to go through without discussing the issue, and when the opportunity comes to present myself to my con-

stituents, whom I have the honour to represent for the past twelve years I feel that so far as my record in this House is concerned, and as it has been in the past, that they will be satisfied. When the occasion arose before in this House I had not the slightest hesitation in taking my stand in the cold shades of opposition. There was no opposition. I had to make the opposition myself, and if the occasion arises again I know that I will be able to take my stand as I did on that occasion. But I sincerely hope that the occasion will not arrive, and at the present time I do not see any reason why it should arrive. I may say that I am fully in accord with the present tariff. And I feel that I am justified in the position that I have taken, and for that reason I cannot vote for the amendment.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Speaker, I beg to give my support to the amendment which has been introduced by the Hon. Member for Ferryland, Major Cashin. I agree with him and the members who have already spoken that this Government has no right to put the taxes on the necessities of the fishermen of this country, such as the lines and twines and tobacco; these being the first on the list. There is going to be no gain to the country by putting duty on cigarettes. It is making a monopoly for the Imperial Tobacco Company. The Prime Minister told us the other day on the floors of this House that there was no money in the cheap grades of tobacco, that are manufactured by the Imperial Tobacco Company. The reason that there is no profit made on the cheap grades of tobacco that is manufactured by the Imperial Tobacco Company is that they are making a tremendous profit on cigarettes and high grade tobacco so they keep down the price of the cheap tobacco and keep others from importing it. I say that the tobacco is the fisherman's luxury, and I see no reason why it should be further taxed. The Hon. Member for Placentia and St. Mary's says that the price of the tobacco has only gone up five cents a lb., and that the average fisherman uses about ten pounds of tobacco a year, and that only means an increase of fifty cents a year that this is going to cost him. But if he has to pay fifty or sixty cents more a year for his tobacco and two dollars more for a sack of peas, and so much more for some thing else, then it is going to amount to a good deal, and I say that it is an imposition that the price of tobacco should be increased when it is one of the few luxuries of the fishermen and the labourers of this country. Now, most of the cigarettes that are used in this country are manufactured in this country, and if I were to buy cigarettes in the United States for 1c. per package and bring them down here I could not attempt to sell them in competition with the Imperial Tobacco Company because of the protection that they have on the cheap grade of cigarettes which they manufacture and which are used in this country. There are no cheap cigarettes imported into this country. It is only the high class of cigarettes that can be imported and only a certain class of people can afford to buy them. Our people are taxed to this extent and the Imperial Tobacco has a protection of $115,000.00 a year on the cigarettes that are manufactured and consumed in this country.

Now in connection with the ready-mades and clothing, there is no necessity for this duty being put upon these articles. It has been stated on the floors of this House that the people of this country have found it hard to get sufficient to feed themselves for the last few years during the hard times and they have gone

practically naked and now they will find it harder than ever to clothe themselves and their children with this additional tax that is being put upon readymade clothing.

As to the duty on the lines and twines it is not necessary for me to labour the fact that the duty on lines and twines is giving a protection to the local industry. This is creating a monopoly just as in the case of the Imperial Tobacco Company. There are a certain number of fishermen on the West Coast who use nothing but the imported lines, and under this tariff they will have to pay fifteen per cent. more for these commodities. Now the Member for Placentia said that I made certain statements this afternoon in referring to the markets for Newfoundland fish, and he says that he hopes that it has not been put on the record. In the remarks that I made yesterday afternoon I made reference to the fish markets. I can tell him that my remarks have been reported by others and are now broadcast throughout the world, and he says that I should not make such remarks. There is no man here who does not know that because of the war the exchange of the countries to which we sell our fish has fallen very low. I said that the cost of producing the fish has increased and that we cannot increase the price on the other side because of the fact that the currency of the countries to which we sell the fish is down so low that they cannot pay any more. A case in point is Portugal. The Portuguese escudo was worth five shilling and four pence before the war, but now it is only worth two pence halfpenny. And when you consider that a country has to get so much of their money to make up the pound sterling we cannot very well see how they can afford to pay a higher price for their fish for consumption. I support the amendment very strongly because I know the effect that this will have on the standard of living, and that effect will be to reduce it by this extra eaxation, and there is nothing else for me to do in fairness to the people who sent me to this House of Assembly.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Speaker, as the Finance Minister of this country I may be misunderstood if this tariff goes through without my speaking to it. I have listened for the last ten or twelve days to the criticisms of the Opposition, and there was one gentleman in his remarks on the tariff who said what was perfectly true that the Minister of Finance was like the father of a family who was trying to make the two ends meet, and that is my object to-day. That is the reason of this new tariff, and this is the way that I am endeavouring to make the two ends meet for Newfoundland. I, nor the Government have no desire to increase the taxation for Newfoundland, but the position to-day is that the expenditure is nine and a half millions, and we have to find nine and a half millions of dollars to meet the bill. There has been things asserted in this House by some of the Members of the Opposition, but the Leader of the Opposition has not taken the same attitude because he is a business man, and he realises the condition of the business man. He has at no time in his speech decried the taking off of the business profits tax or the income tax. I think that if anything he has been very much in favour of these taxes being taken off. He thinks as I do that if the money has not to be paid that it will go back into the business. That is his stand. I did not think of myself when I took off the income tax or the business profits tax. I will spend just as much as before, and any little more that I

may have will go into the business. A great deal of the speeches of the members of the Opposition has been composed of the bugle cry of this House. Lines and twines. I would not do anything to increase the taxation against my friends of the West End, whom I have the honour to represent, or any other part of this country, and I want to say that I wish to see the Ropewalk going at full strength and employing not three or four hundred men but a thousand people, and to relieve the labour situation in St. John's.

Again, Mr. Speaker, the country today at large, the labouring man, and especially the labouring man of St. John's West is not worried so very much about this tariff. What he is worried about is this—let us get to work—let us do something, let us attempt to get to work, and if you will find labour for us, we will find the taxes. That is what the labouring man is saying to-day. That is the position in St. John's West—that is the position all over the country. They want to get to work.

I was associated with the Opposition on that side of the House for three or four years, and I sat there and fought certain things, and I fought them because I thought it was my duty to do so; and I would be very sorry for any member on the other side of the House not to do what he thought was his duty. His criticism of the tariff is absolutely one thing. If he was on this side of the House, he would be behind this tariff just as much as anyone on this side of the House today. But he has to criticize; that is his job.

Some member on the opposition was discussing the fishermen of this country to-night. Mr. Speaker, if there is one of them around this House to-night—if there is a fisherman from any of the Northern districts or from Ferryland District who knows the Prime Minister of this country, I feel sure that he will be surprised. If he wants to know what the Prime Minister was doing for the fishermen he may be glad to know that he has been rolling out goods as fast as they can go to help the fishermen. Is that being a friend of the fishermen or is it not? He has done a lot more to-day than many others; and my friend, Mr. Cashin, knows what I mean, and he knows that what I say is correct. And then someone gets up here and suggests that Mr. Monroe would want to penalize the fishermen of the country. It is ridiculous—absolutely ridiculous.

The Leader of the Government finds himself in this position, that he has found himself in a position that is not caused by his fault or by mine. He finds himself in the position that the country must have revenue, and the only way to get revenue in Newfoundland is through the Custom House. It is absolutely the only way to get it. Now, it has been stated by some honourable members in this House that we have increased expenditure by four hundred thousand dollars. I deny that suggestion. There has been no such increase. We increased it by two hundred thousand dollars in order to rebuild the dock, which is falling down around our heads. Is that the fault of this Government? We did not bring about the falling down of the dock. As far as the other amounts in that expenditure are concerned they have been voted, because they have been paid for the last two or three years back without putting them in the estimates. But we have been honest in our estimates, and we have voted them in this House; and that is the course that we intend to pursue in future, where it is at all possible to do so.

Mr. Speaker, as my friend the Hon. Member for Placentia and St. Mary's has said, there are some members on the other side of this House to-day who know the financial condition of this country just as well as I do. I give them credit for that. I have stated my case, and I am perfecly satisfied that there is no other way in which I can carry on Newfoundland to-day, except by having these taxes levied on it. My predecessor in office, Mr. Cave, I think it was, estimated that he would have in this country a surplus for the year of 1923-1924 of $143,000; and in actual fact he made a deficit of $1,-718,000, or pretty near $2,000,000. I hope that the present Minister of Finance is a bit better at figures than that. If he is not, God help Newfoundland.

I am told by some honourable members on that side of the House, as Finance Minister, that the Income Tax and the Business Profits Tax were taken off to suit the rich man; and then in another voice I am told, as Finance Minister, that I have dragged Sir Edgar Bowring through the courts and I should not have done it. If Sir Edgar Bowring or any other person, no matter who or what he may be, rich man or poor man, owes a dollar for income tax, I will collect it from him. If he claims that he does not owe it, and I consider that he does, I will bring him through the Courts. I brought Sir Edgar Bowring through the Courts, and the Court said that he was liable for the Tax, so I collected it from him as part of my duty as Finance Minister.

The Hon. Members of the Opposition seem to think that the fishermen have no friends on this side of the House. I want to tell them that I have fishermen who have accounts with me to-day, whom I supplied last year, and whom I intend to supply again this year. I fitted out vessels for these men last year, and supplied them. Some of them I took from off the wharves, and gave them full outfits, because they had nothing. I gave them new vessels,and when those men were finished they did not owe for the vessels, or for any part of them, and they drew a cheque for six hundred dollars out of my office.

As I said before, I say again—the fishermen of this country are not interested in the few cents on tobacco—neither are the labouring men. Neither are they worried about the lines and twines—that is merely the bugle call of the Opposition. No—that is not the thing that the fisherman is worried about. What he is worried about is this—when he has caught his fish, what is he going to get for it. That is the question that is worrying the people of Newfoundland to-day. But I am not going around trying to make everything look as black as possible. I do not go around making things seem worse than they really are. I do not want to go and tell the fishermen that the markets are going to be bad, and that they will get nothing for their fish this year. I will tell them that I see just as good a chance for them this year as I did last year. There is one thing that I want to say now, and I want some people to take a good bit of notice of it, and that is, that the the only thing I am afraid of is that some of the merchants will want too much profit on the fish before it goes in the foreign markets to be put in consumption.

I quite agree with my friend, the Leader of the Opposition, that exchange in foreign countries is not as good as it has been, and it has not been good for the last six or seven years. It is no better to-day than it was four or five years ago.

Another question has been raised in this House, about gasolene. I

think the Leader of the Opposition raised the question, and he practically inferred, if I understood him rightly, that we could put the duty on gasolene, and he also said that most of the gasolene brought into this country is used in motor cars. That is absolutely wrong, because the fishermen use a great deal more gasolene than all the motor cars in the country.

Mr. Warren, the leader of the Independent party, and my friend Mr. Cashin, who sit on the other side of the House, know this just as well as I do. Mr. Warren stated that it was the duty of the Finance Minister, if at all possible, to keep the tariff to himself before bringing it into this House and laying it on the table. I want to tell him that no one ever endeavoured to keep the tariff more secret than I did. I would like to tell Mr. Cashin, too, that there never was anyone who endeavoured to keep a tariff more secret than his father, Sir Michael Cashin, when he was Finance Minister of this country. I was in the Government with him then, and the first thing that I heard of the tariff was when he brought it in here. That was his job —to keep it secret, and I had no right as an ordinary member of the Executive Council to question him about it, or to ask him for any particulars about it. Not a bit. And I am quite sure that if your father was here now in my presence, he would say "Crosbie is right, Peter, and you are wrong."

Mr. Warren has also said that in the London Times, on the morning of April 6th an article appeared in connection with this tariff. That article, he said, apparently was sent by Sir Patrick McGrath. Well, neither Sir Patrick McGrath nor any other Sir knew what that tariff was going to be until it was presented to the Executive Government the night before it was brought into this House. No one knew the first thing about it until then; and if Sir Patrick says that he knew it, he did not get it from the Minister of Finance and Customs; and it is a pretty good ship that has not got a leak in it somewhere.

Another matter has been brought up here, Mr. Speaker, in connection with this debate, and that is the reduction of expenditure. The Monroe Government to-day has been in power for only nine months, and practically five of those nine months have been spent in the House, endeavouring to lay out a course to let this ship get out in the wind, and we are asked to do the impossible. I ask my friends of St. John's West if I did not when I was canvassing that district, and holding meetings in the Star Hall, emphasise the fact that if I was returned I would not be prepared to make any very great progress for about a year. I told that to the electors of St. John's West, and I also told them if they were not prepared to accept that, and to give me that chance to look around me, then I told them not to vote for me. I say that now, and I defy contradiction by anyone here who heard me speaking then.

For only about four months has the Government been outside—they have had only four months to endeavour to clean up. But even those four months have not been without result. Honourable members know that during that time I made big steps towards cleaning up matters at the Custom House. For what else was I there at four o'clock in the morning when some of the members of the Opposition were asleep until half past eight. Perhaps all the members of this House have not got all the energy that I have.

Then I was asked to go to the Post Office, by my friend the Minister of

Posts and Telegraphs. I went there, for the cleaning up of the Post Office and the discovery of all the robberies that were found out there and remedied. All that cleaning up was due to the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs and myself getting after these people and finding out what was happening.

The people behind the Monroe Party—the people who elected them are prepared to give them a real chance to reduce expenditure and clean up public affairs; and they are prepared to give them four years to do it. If they have not done it then, they can put them out; and if we have not done it by then, I for one think that we should not object to being turned out.

My friend Mr. Scammel made some references to Capt. Winsor. I am sorry that Mr. Scammell is not here to hear what I am saying, and explain what he meant. He said—"We bought fish." I do not know who he meant by "we." Did he mean the company that he was associated with. If he does I will tell him that it was the Government of Newfoundland that bought that fish, and I think that the Hon. Member for Trinity knows that that is so.

MR. HALFYARD—He meant the Government.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—It is for that kind of thing that we have to put on taxes to-day—for that and for several other items that we had nothing whatever to do with; and if there is a great burden of taxation on the people to-day, it is not our fault, or the fault of the Government I am associated with; and I want to tell my fellow men in this country to-day that the Monroe Government will be able to reduce taxation, and I am satisfied that the people are prepared to give the Government an opportunity to reduce taxation.

What is the use of anyone talking to the Government about dismissing people. If I turn out a man today, there will be twenty five more come looking for his job tomorrow; and if I tell a man that he is dismissed I find a member coming down to tell me that I ought not to have done it, and I ought not do this, and I ought not do that. Come, let us be serious with ourselves. Let us consider the thing rationally, I do not mind the criticism of the Opposition that is their job—that is their duty. Many times the Hon. Member for Trinity has sat down here and heard me talk to him, and I have no doubt that he took it then just as I am taking it to-day.

I feel that my duty has been fulfilled and all the criticism that can be directed against me will not deter me in doing my duty by my fellow-man. In all the criticism that has been levelled at us during the whole session there has not been one thing of a constructive nature suggested. All we can hear is "remove this, remove that" and not a solitary attempt has been made to show us, after twenty-one days' debate, how to improve the tariff. The best criticism I heard at all was on last Friday when the Leader of the Opposition suggested to put another $125,000 on flour and therefore on the people. The present agreement with the company stands and if we cannot stand by it we fall by it. I would ask the honorable members to remember that we have been only nine months in power and five of these we have been on the outside looking into the irregularities, but before we are done he will see more things than he has yet seen. He sees only the fringe of certain things now, but he will see far darker things before we are finished in the way of cleaning up. The question has been raised over and over again about the

two millions for the tourist policy or the building of roads. I supported that policy, and I do so to-day, because whether the outside tourists come in or not, the country needs the roads, and we have come to the stage now when we can use them ourselves, and no matter where they are built—whether in Mr. Ashbourne's district or mine or any other—they will prove an asset to the country for all time. Mr. Speaker, I would now like to refer back to the fisheries. We were told here this afternoon that the foreign markets are in a bad condition, but I want to say that only this morning, from the Italian market which the Opposition knows so much about, I had an order on my desk for 500 casks of fish at a price that I may say would pay me well. And on Friday I had an order for 500 casks for the Spanish market which may be bad, as is claimed, but to which it still seems we are able to sell our staple product. And moreover to-day we have only approximately 2000 quintals of last year's fish on hand. I want the fishermen to go down to Labrador with a good heart, because no matter how dark everything may seem now, there is always a silver lining, though it may not be visible at the moment. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak at such length, but when these amendments came before the House I opposed them on the grounds that we have to have the revenue to meet our bills. As the Minister of Agriculture has said, there is not a day but the Opposition asks for money to build roads or bridges or something else, and if they will only show me some way in which I can simply pick up the money off the streets I will willingly do it and be glad to see that they get the money they are clamoring for to build roads, bridges and anything else.

MR. LAKE—Mr. Speaker, I do not think I need add further to my remarks except insofar as to reply to the Leader of the Opposition who has challenged my right to vote on this amendment. I think the Honorable Minister of Finance has already completely given the answer, and I have but little to say. Lines and twines have been on the list for twenty years at about twelve cents a rand, but it is no expense to the fishermen, at least in my district, as it is supplied by the owners of the vessels. I think the Customs' Blue Book will show that last year only $23,000 worth of foreign-made lines and twines was imported into the country, and I assure the Honourable Member that this year practically all which is used on the West Coast will be of local make. There was a day when the fishermen of the South-West Coast used foreign made lines and twines, but that is not the case now. In 1922-1923 $53,000 worth was imported and last year only $23,000, which shows that most of the article used by the banking vessels is made locally. The lines and twines are bought by the owners of the vessels and do not cost the men anything as they fish on shares. Perhaps it would be a hardship on the owners to pay about $100.00 duty on the outfit of lines and twines for a schooner, but as we hope to have $8.00 fish this year, I do not think they will worry over it. As the Honorable Minister of Finance has said this evening, we must have roads throughout the country and a bill has just gone through to assist in the operation of the dock at Burin, so I do not think the people of that district will have any worry as to the duties on lines and twines. The duty has been taken off beef and pork and other articles, and there is no reason why a small duty should not be paid on lines and twines which seems to be a bugaboo

with the Members of the Opposition. I am glad to see that the tone of the House to-day has changed since a few evenings ago, when the Honorable Member for Ferryland and myself crossed swords for a short time, and that harmony now reigns, the trouble is over, and there is peace once more. I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the privilege of allowing me to make these few remarks.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Speaker, with reference to lines and twines, a great deal has been said in connection with this question, but there is one aspect of the matter that I would like to refer to. The Hon. the Prime Minister and other speakers stated that only twenty three thousand dollars worth was imported last year. To my mind that is the very best argument in favour of taking the duty off. If there were $250,000 worth, as the Prime Minister says, manufactured here as against $23,000 imported, what is the purpose of putting on the duty. Surely you cannot argue from the standpoint of securing revenue, as at the rate of 10 p.c., this would only mean $2,300, which is a very small amount indeed. It is a great mistake for the Government to place a 10 p.c. duty upon articles of this nature in order to raise this insignificant sum, the movement is a very unpopular one, and I would say that the game is not worth the candle. The only purpose that thic 10 p.c. duty will serve is in its tendency to eliminate outside competition, but have we any guarantee that the fishermen will not have to pay more for lines and twines and other fishing tackle on account of this application of duty? The Prime Minister has stated that lines and twines will not increase in price on this account. I do not think this is a fair position to place himself in; he has repeatedly rose in this House to defend the Colonial Cordage Company, a firm of which he is a large shareholder and director, and such a guarantee should not come from him. I was surprised to find the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, Mr. Walsh, assuming a new role here this afternoon. It is the first time that I have seen him fail to stand up in the interests of the fishermen. He and his colleagues represent one of the largest fishing districts in the country, and I naturally expected him to oppose the imposition of duty on anything that might effect an industry on which his constituents are depending for their living. Another matter that I cannot refrain from referring to is the alleged effect that the utterance of certain members of this side of the House might have upon the fishing industry the coming summer. Newspaper comments were also referred to as not being of a very encouraging nature, but Sir, if we are to judge by the effect of what was said in this House and the bearing which newspaper writings of the past four years have had upon the fishing industries and the fish markets, we would not have any industry or market left at all. What happened from 1920 to 1923? If we will let our minds go back to these years we will remember that certain gentlemen who now occupy seats on the Government side of the House were sitting here and indulged in preaching blue ruin both day and night. If their remarks could have any bearing upon the fish markets, it certainly would be difficult to sell fish, and as far as the fishermen themselves were concerned they would not only abandon the industry, but the lamentations were sufficient to cause the average fisherman to drown himself. In conclusion I would like the Government to reconsider this duty on lines and twines, it will not affect the exchequer very much, and the only effect it could possibly have

Geo. to B. Cayk.

as I previously stated is to create a monopoly for an industry here in St. John's.

Whereupon Mr. Cashin moved and Mr. Halfyard seconded the following Amendment:

1. That the duty on Manufactured Tobacco (Item 79 of the Tariff) be reduced from 48 cents per lb. to 45 cents per lb.
2. That the duty on Readymades and Clothing (Item 233 of the Tariff) be reduced from 65 per cent. to 52 per cent.
3. That Lines and Twines used in connection with the fisheries (Item 277 of Tariff) be stricken out and that the said Lines and Twines when used in connection with the fisheries shall be admitted into this Colony free of duty.
4. That duties to an equivalent amount of these reductions be imposed upon Works of Art and Motor Cars.

Whereupon the House divided, when there appeared in favor of the amendment:

Mr. Hickman,
Mr. Halfyard,
Mr. Hibbs,
Mr. Scammell,
Mr. Randell,
Mr. Duff,
Mr. Godden,
Mr. Ashbourne,
Mr. Cashin (9)

and against it:

Hon. the Prime Minister,
Hon. the Colonial Secretary,
Hon. the Minister of Justice,
Hon. the Minister of Finance,
Hon. the Minister of Posts,
Hon. Mr. Sullivan,
Hon. Mr. Long,
Hon. Mr. Cramm,
Hon. Mr. Bradley,
The Minister of Agriculture,
The Minister Marine and Fisheries.
The Minister Public Works,
Mr. Moore,
Mr. Lake,
Mr. Sinnott,
Mr. Chambers,
Mr. Power,
Mr. Little,
Mr. Puddester,
Mr. Cahill,
Mr. Linegar,
Mr. Browne, (22)

so it passed in the negative.

Whereupon the original motion for adoption of the Report was put and there appeared in its favor:

Hon. the Prime Minister,
Hon. the Colonial Secretary,
Hon. the Minister of Justice,
Hon. the Minister of Finance,
Hon. the Minister of Posts,
Hon. Mr. Sullivan,
Hon. Mr. Long,
Hon. Mr. Cramm,
Hon. Mr. Bradley,
The Minister of Agriculture,
The Minister Marine and Fisheries,
The Minister Public Works,
Mr. Moore,
Mr. Lake,
Mr. Sinnott,
Mr. Chambers,
Mr. Power,
Mr. Little,
Mr. Puddester,
Mr. Cahill,
Mr. Linegar,
Mr. Browne, (22)

and against it:

Mr. Hickman,
Mr. Halfyard,
Mr. Hibbs,
Mr. Scammell,
Mr. Randell,
Mr. Duff,
Mr. Godden,
Mr. Ashbourne,
Mr. Cashin (9)

so it passed in the affirmative and was ordered accordingly.

Whereupon the Bill entitled "An Act for Granting to His Majesty certain Duties on Goods, Wares and

Merchandise," imported into this Colony and its Dependencies," was read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "Of the Inspection of Ships."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman, I notice that in this section it is so stipulated that a man who contemplates sending a schooner to the ice has to notify the Minister of Marine and Fisheries not later than the first day of February. I would like to ask the Honorable Minister whether or not he thinks that is fair to schooner owners, because as he is well aware, conditions of ice around the coast vary so greatly during a few days that on the the first of February it may be almost impossible to get through the jam of ice. These conditions may hold in the middle of February and right up, sometimes, till even the first of May when a schooner might be able to get out to obtain a certain number of seals. To debar a sealing vessel going out and picking up old seals up to the first of May is not right. I think it would be rather unfair as under this section the schooner owner must notify the Minister not later than the first day of February. To-day we know that with the number of steamers engaged in the seal-fishery, there has been a falling-off in the number of schooners, and to-day we should do all we can to encourage people to go out sealing. Time was when four hundred schooners used to go out from St. John's and the outports to prosecute the sealfishery. To-day, I can assure the members of this house, as no doubt the Minister knows, the spirit of the sealfishery, that is the desire to go out and get seals by which he might earn a dollar, is just as prevalent amongst the fishermen to-day as it has been in the past. In fact, I was very sorry when a couple of days ago I received a message to the effect that a young man had accidentally shot himself while out catching seals. He was twenty five miles out from the shore in a motor boat trying to get some seals. That spirit is worthy of admiration and merits all the support and consideration that the Government could give. (I regret to say that the poor man passed away). I just used that example to show the daring of these men and to say that I think that section is detrimental to the sailing vessels.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—If you will turn to page 4 you will find that the inspector can be admitted at any time. Of course, that very same section struck me as it struck Mr. Ashbourne. The intention of that is, that any man who is going to repair his ship and get it ready for the sealfishery shall have ample time. I am sorry I had to mention this. If you had come down you would have been given a pretty fair show, because we are going to make certain amendments, and one of these amendments is going to make provision whereby we can inspect ships up as late as you like.

I took up this section with a lawyer, as it struck me as it struck you. He told me that, according to the section, the inspector can go aboard at any time. That section is merely put in so that nobody will be able to come back and say that he did not have time to have his ship put in shape.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, there is a point now that I would like to draw attention to, and which the captains of the ship may try to

enforce. Pressure is brought to bear on them, and they had things said against the captains when they refused to take passengers. They may not be conforming to the laws, and the steamer may be over-crowded. The Prospero, at one time, was at Twillingate and the captain, knowing that the ship was over-crowded, and in case of accident or that a serious loss of life might result refused to take on board certain people, they made complaints against the captain. There should be a clause in this Act so that people going to travel during the summer months their lives should be safeguarded by rules so that no captain would be running the risk of loss of life by over-crowding the ships.

MR. SCAMMELL—While we are on this section I wish to take this opportunity of saying that as far as this Act goes at the present time, I concur with the general idea of it; and I want to take occasion, Sir, to say that it must be somebody's important and bounden duty to say that the provisions as regards boats and the inspection of boats should be strictly adhered to. I was a passenger on the Prospero last Fall when she struck Green Island. Fortunately the sea was smooth. Had there been a raging sea, I have no doubt but there would have been a frightful tragedy; but the spectacle of standing on deck of the steamer, and seeing the life-boats sinking a few minutes after being lowered from the davits was the one thing that brought home to me the necessity of stricter regulations with regard to life-boats on passenger steamers. Captain Field had an accident that morning—Captains have had accidents before him, and captains will have accidents after him. I wish harm to no man—A tragedy was barely avoided that morning. I say that somebody should make it their duty that the life-boats are lowered every time that they are in port. As I have just said, the best of captains sometimes have accidents, and some day we are going to witness an awful tragedy. At that time the Government had a chance to do something to obviate this and did not do it. I do not care what money you may spend. I was tempted to write to the papers on this very same subject, but I felt that some notice would have been taken of this matter during the present session. So I am very glad that we have this act before us to-night, and I want the government to see that every possible precaution is taken to have the life-boats attended to every time the steamer comes into port. The boats should be overhauled and lowered and inspected as regards leaks, etc., and every precaution be taken to see that the boats are looked after, and that the lives of the passengers are protected.

MINISTER OF AGGRICULTURE AND MINES—Mr. Chairman, I want to support the attitude taken by the Honourable Member for St. Barbe, and I want to take this opportunity of offering my congratulations to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for having brought in this very humane act. On more than one occasion the very subject brought up by the Honourable Member for St. Barbe was mentioned by me in this House. As far back as three or four years ago I made a challenge to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that if he would go haphazardly and pick out any boat and put a crowd of people in it, it would sink. I trust that the Minister will see to it that the provisions of this Act are carried out in the letter as well as in the spirit.

It struck me that some of the Ministers and some of the Governments in the past did not think it worth while to bring in this very important legislation. I remember a short

time ago, when a very dear friend of mine decided to stick onboard a vessel. This friend of mine felt after some time that the ship was not seaworthy. He was articled but he left the ship and came to St. John's. He was arrested as a deserter and put back on the ship again. The ship put to sea and has never been heard of since, nor have the twenty men ever been heard of since either. If we had legislation of this kind at that time perhaps these twenty lives might have been saved to their country and their loved ones. At least it will be the means of protecting others in the future. Now clauses thirteen, fourteen and fifteen seem to me to cure a long felt evil. Those of the committee who know the conditions that existed in the past in the passage from Newfoundland to the Labrador must feel as I do about this matter. The conditions up to very recent times have been something similar to those of the olden days of the slave trade in the United States. The persons would be shut down in the hold of a small vessel on top of the ballast and cargo, and the fishery supplies. They would be down in this place for days and days before they could get fresh air, huddled together like cattle, and I must say that I am glad to see that the Minister has inserted this clause which will eliminate the recurrence of these conditions. I do not want to occupy the time of the committee, but I merely want to say that I give my absolute endorsation to this bill, and I wish to give my congratulations to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for having brought in this legislation.

THE MINISTER OF FISHERIES—In reply to the Hon. Member for St. Barbe I would like to say that this Bill that is now before the House has been a long time under consideration. Ever since I came back from the election in the fall of the year I have been trying to do my utmost with regard to this piece of legislation; because I happened to be aboard of the Prospero when she ran ashore at Greenspond. I was a passenger on her with some of my family. We put out the boat and I was asked to see that they got ashore alright, so I went in the first boat. The boat that we were using was the boat that was in constant use as the mail boat, but at the same time we had to keep constantly using the bucket. We landed on a rock. I was the only passenger, there may have been one more, but I do not think that there was, who stayed on the ship to do what we could to help out. But when we came off the rock we did not have a boat at all. We found the boats ashore in Greenspond all full of water. If you could see the boats that were up at the dock two weeks you would imagine that we did not have a boat at all. All the boats have been repaired since then and they have been tested by putting thirty men in them to see that they are water tigh. Someimes a boat is alright, but when the topsides are put down in the water it is found that they are leaky. It was for that that we had the boats tested with the thirty men in them. As far as I can see, practically every precaution should be taken, and I agree with the Hon. Member that every precaution should be taken. We certainly have been going around this country in a condition that should not have been allowed. Now we have had the boats of the Government steamers attended to and they are put in good shape.

MR. SCAMMELL—Do you think that we have the best kind of boats?

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—We have the boats that have been built in the Old Country.

MR. SCAMMELL—Is that the class

of boat that is best for the service around this country?

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—We have the clinker built boats. And these boats are used on practically every ship. Some people think that the straight seam is the better one for keeping the boats tight. But with perhaps one or two exceptions that is the class of boat that is being used in this country to-day on the steamers.

MR. LAKE—Mr. Chairman, I also wish to congratulate the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for having brought in this legislation. I have not gone into the bill very closely, but I do not think that it has gone far enough. This may be alright around this port of St. John's, but how about the Glencoe or the Clyde or the Dundee that never come near the city of St. John's for eight months of the year? I was on the Glencoe three or four years ago when she struck a rock. Lifeboats were lowered and down they went. But we were only a few yards from the shore and we got the passengers ashore without much trouble. I think that we ought to bring in some legislation to see that the captains of the ships are brought to task. Now there is another thing that comes to my mind. I have a brother with the Canadian Government in connection with the wireless, and he was down at Cape Race making some tests, and he told me that the captains of the local ships do not get their distances correctly as they should. They should be able to get it correctly by means of the wireless. I think that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries or somebody from this House should make it their business to have the captains toe the line in this respect. Now what legislation have we here to make the Captain of the Glencoe or any other ship have his boats tested every two weeks? That is what I would like to see. You might have it done here in St. John's, but there are times when the ships are not in port and they will not do it. I was in the Dundee in Bonavista Bay a long time ago and I refused to go in the boats. I said that they were not fit and I told the Captain that if the passengers were allowed to go in them that I would have him reported. Of course he swore at me, but I did not mind that. And it is for these reasons that I think that under the present proposed legislation that we have not gone far enough.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—What provision would you want?

MR. LAKE—I would have it seen to that the captains of the ships observe this law to the point. I would make the challenge that with the exception of the mail boats that there are no vessels in this country with the proper accommodation for an emergency. I went across with nothing else but a dory.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I would like to point out to the Hon. Member that we cannot very well go farther than we are going here. If the captains of the ships do not carry out the regulations that are here in this act they are guilty of an offence under the act and liable to the fine. I think that there is not going to be any captain who is going to set himself contrary to this act. And then it would be very difficult for a captain not to carry out the regulations of this act because it would be impossible to keep the matter quiet with the large number of men that would be on the ship. If he did not see that the boats were in the proper condition before they were launched you can be sure that he would be reported. Otherwise what other machinery could we have? The only thing that might be done

in addition would be to have men going all around the country to see that the boats were in proper condition.

MR. LAKE—I think that a copy of this act should be prepared and sent to every captain. They should be sent to every ship and every Custom House officer in the country also. But I am sure, Mr. Chairman that in the outports that not fifty per cent. of the vessels have all the requirements of the law. I intend to see that the steamers plying in my district are looked after in the right way. The law is alright as it reads, but it will be no use unless it is put into effect.

MR. SCAMMELL—What I want, Mr. Chairman, is to ask the Hon. Minister if he is going to be responsible for this legislation, and as long as he is going to be responsible for it, I want to ask him to see that it is carried out. Even though he should become a nuisance, I want him to see that it is carried out. I hope that having brought in this legislation he will see that its provisions are observed, and that the Act is carried out to the letter. If he does that, he will have no blame coming to him at all.

CAPT. RANDELL—Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that as I have had very little chance of reading this Bill, I am not quite clear on the provisions embodied in it. I would like to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if there is any provision made for the equipment of passenger ships, in this Bill as regards what they must carry in the nature of boats, and life saving apparatus?

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Section 12, Sub-section 7, says:

> "If an inspector, after inspecting the machinery or equipment of a ship is of opinion that its use in loading or unloading her cargo would be unsafe or dangerous, he shall so inform the master of the said ship, and the use of such machinery are equipment in loading or unloading until permitted by the Inspector shall be unlawful."

And Sub-section 5 of the same section says:

> "If an inspector reports to the minister in writing that he considers that the hull, machinery or equipment of any such ship is in such condition that she could not make the voyage or trip . . . . without endangering life or property . . . . .the Minister shall direct such ship to be detained, etc."

I think those two sections cover Capt. Randell's question.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Besides that, section 8 says:—

> "No ship carrying passengers or engaging in the sealing industry shall proceed from any port in the Colony on any trip without adequately equipped seaworthy boats sufficiently to safely and conveniently carry the passengers and crew on said ship."

And under what is called The Merchant Shipping Act there have to be so many boats between so many passengers; and that would come within the inspection.

CAPT. RANDELL—It is true that in Section 8 there is some reference made to carrying boats, but I don't think a boat would be very much use unless it was properly equipped.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Section 8 says "adequately equipped, seaworthy boats," and in the Merchant Shipping Act there are certain requirements for the equipment of a boat.

CAPT. RANDELL—If this country has adopted the Merchant Shipping Act, and there are provisions in that act relating to the equipment of boats by which we have to abide, then of course this Act is alright.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—I think Section 8 covers it alright. It puts it

up to the inspector to see that the boats are properly equipped seaworhy boats.

CAPT. RANDELL—I would like to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if the master or owner will be liable in case of a boat not conforming with the provisions of the law?

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—In Section 16, it says that the master and owners are liable in some cases, and in some cases the master. The master is responsible for the carrying out of the rules.

CAPT. RANDELL—Then I think that if the master is to be responsible for the carrying out of these rules and is going to be penalised that there is something lacking in this Bill.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—The owner is always responsible for the master, who is merely his agent.

CAPT. RANDELL—I think it is somewhat in the nature of a hardship for the master to be always liable for the carrying out of the rules, as regards equipment, when he probably cannot get what he wants from the owners.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I agree with you, and I think that this is the proper bill to remedy that state of affairs. I think you made that same complaint the other day and I agreed wih it.

CAPT. RANDELL—I think there should be some provision in this Bill making the owner liable.

MR. WARREN—I think there is a great deal in what the honourable member for Trinity has said, particularly in view of subsection d of section 11, which reads:

> "If any boat be leaky or otherwise defective, or if equipment be insufficient or defective, all defects shall be remedied and all shortages supplied at the earliest possible opportunity."

Then turning to section 16, sub-section (f), under which the master is guilty of an offence against this Act if the provisions of section 11 are not observed. I think that is going a bit too far. I quite agree that the master should be liable if he does not see that everything is properly done so far as the ship is concerned, when it is within his power to see that it is done properly.
boat be leaky or otherwise defective,

Supposing under Section D, if any the question of repairs is entirely up to the owner, but he has been left out here. It is the duty of the owner to repair a defective life-boat, but under this form he has not been called in question at all. Even if the master reports and the owner says he will not make repairs, the latter is not held responsible.

MINISTER OF MARINE—Then the ship cannot sail.

HONORABLE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I think we could use the words "owner" or "master."

MR. WARREN—I would go further and carry the point expressed by the Minister of Marine. In some cases a master does not report as he does not think it worth while. If he does, and the owner will not make repairs, the master cannot do it. Section D reads: (Reads Section)

The earliest possible opportunity is when a Captain reports, but if the owner says carry on, and then something happens, the owner gets free and the captain is penalized. If the master reports and the repairs are not made, the captain now is responsible. The Marine Department might take action against the master, and in the trial it may be found that he did report the need for repairs.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Then action could be taken against the owner.

MR. WARREN—What is the objection to putting in something in the Bill to make the owner liable instead

of the Captain. If the master reports, say a boat is leaky, you cannot prosecute him.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Why not make it master or owner, or both.

CAPTAIN RANDELL—Mr. Chairman, in connection with this Bill, I would like to bring to the notice of the Government the Merchants' Shipping Act, which covers this whole situation much more fully than this Bill, of which there is therefore no need. Under the Shipping Act full provisions are made covering the equipment of boats, life-belts, survey, and everything in connection with the saving of life. If we adopt the Shpiping Act in its entirety, all this would be covered. It applies perhaps more especially to foreign-going vessels and not so much to those engaged in coasting, but I think it covers all the matters mentioned in the discussion here.

MR. WARREN—The Act does not apply in its entirety here.

CATAIN RANDELL—I am sorry I did not have more time to go through this Bill, but I think the adoption of the Merchants' Shipping Act would meet the whole situation.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, for the information of the Members opposite, we have altered the Section to read "Master or Owner" and put in the words "the Captain having reported to the Owner," which will exempt him from liability.

MR. WARREN—That covers the point satisfactorily, unless the Bill is torn to pieces in the Upper House.

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 amendment.

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a third time presently.

Whereupon on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the Bill entitled "Of the Inspection of Ships" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Repeal Chapter 174 Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Passenger Accommodation on Board Steamers and Vessels."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester 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 said Bill without amendment.

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a third time presently.

Whereupon on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Bill entitled "An Act to Repeal Chapter 174 Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Passenger Accommodation on Board Steamers and Vessels" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Hon. the Minister of Justice presented the Report of the Select Committee on the Bill to confirm the

titles of certain lands at Corner Brook as follows:

"The Select Committee appointed in connection with the Bill entitled 'An Act to Confirm the Titles to certain lands at Corner Brook' beg to report that the Committee have considered the matter to them referred, and recommended the adoption of the Bill hereunto annexed.

(Sgd.) W. J. HIGGINS,
JOSEPH J. LONG,
THOS. J. POWER,
A. E. HICKMAN,
GEO. F. GRIMES.

May 4th, 1925.

On motion this report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, some time ago some member of the Opposition asked about some trouble that occurred at Corner Brook and Magistrate Scott of Curling was instructed to proceed there and try the ringleaders. He reports:

(Reads Magistrate's Report)

I think it will be satisfactory for the House to know that apparently peace and harmony reigns in that section now and that no one is coming on to the Penitentiary as a result of the trouble.

Hon. the Prime Minister tabled Report of Newfoundland Patriotic Fund, 1924.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, May 5th, 1925.

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

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from certain inhabitants of Stanhope in Twillingate District in connection with the main line road between Stanhope and Brown's Arm. The petition is fairly largely signed. I give it my hearty support and beg that it be referred to the Department to which it relates.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a very largely signed petition from the people of Bay Roberts in conection with the matter of street lights. About eight or ten years ago, when the United Town's Electric Company were bringing their wires through the settlement, they put up seven street lights, but a large portion of the town was left without them. Certain places are very dangerous, particularly on a dark or stormy night when it is very difficult to get around. The petition asks that lights be placed in the more dangerous parts, especially along the main road. I have great pleasure in heartily supporting the petition, and I hope something will be done in connection with the prayer thereof.

Mr. Scammel gave notice of question.

Mr. Halfyard gave notice of question (1)-(2).

Notice of Question

MR. HALFYARD asked Hon. the Prime Minister if it is the intention of the Government to give Trinity District any Bay Steam Service this season.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I beg to table the reply.

MR. BROWN asked Hon. the Prime Minister if the Government or the Railway Commission intends employing Captain John Field, late Captain S.S. Prospero, in any capacity; also if the Government or Railway Commission intends employing Mr. S. Peckford and Mr. E. Saunders, late Officers S.S. Prospero, who were dismissed last Autumn and if not why not.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, the reply has not come down from the Railway Department yet, but

I hope to have it for the Honorable member to-morrow. I may say the Government are trying their best to find some employment for Captain Field, and we hope to be able to do something in this connection.

MR. SCAMMEL—Mr. Speaker, I beg to thank the honorable the Prime Minister for the intimation he has given the House that the Government is trying to give Captain Field some employment. His case has been the same as that of many others. Only last evening we put through a Bill in connection with the inspection of life-boats, and I think that in connection with that position, you might find employment for him. It will redound to the credit of the Government to find employment for such a man as Captain Field.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY —Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the suggestion that some employment is found for Captain Field. For years he did good work on the Prospero, and I think he is most deserving of our consideration and, therefore, I would like to associate myself with the views expressed by the Honorable Member for St. Barbe. I would like to mention that Captain Field is not altogether out of work at the present time, as he is under half pay, but I think a man of his ability should be found steady employment in a suitable position.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE —Mr. Speaker, I wish to endorse the remarks of both the previous speakers in this connection. I look upon the accident which befell his ship, as one which may happen to any captain who is engaged on this coast, and I am fully in accord with the decision of the Railway Commission, of which I am a member, to find something for Captain Field. A man who has been sixteen years navigating around this coast deserves every consideration at the hands of the Government, and I, therefore, support the suggestion that he be given employment most heartily.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker, with regard to this matter, we all know that Captain Field was mate of the Prospero since she came to the country and Captain of her for several years on the Northern route, and as far as his accident was concerned, the man has not been born who can navigate this coast without an accident. This is not the first time I have appealed for something for him to do, and to the prayer expressed by the previous speaker, I give every support.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Speaker, without wishing to take up the time of the House, may I ask the Honorable Minister of Finance if the payment of money due the Officers of the Glencoe for salvage work in the Straits last year has been arranged.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE —Mr. Speaker, the matter has not been finalized yet but I think that on the adjustment being made by Lloyd's Surveyor, the money will be allocated to the men. That is the way this sort of thing has been handled in my experience. I have not seen the final papers yet and I was asking Mr. Russel for them before he went away but they had not reached his Department up to then.

MR. SCAMMELL asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to give a list of the parties to whom he sent the 200 letters acquainting them of his intention to introduce legislation at the present session re Bounty for Repairs to Ships and outlining what the proposals were to be and also to lay a copy of such letter or letters on the Table of the House.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—As soon as I see Mr. McFarlane I will be able to supply the answer.

MR. SCAMMELL asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing what road monies, either Main Line, Local or Special have been sent out

to the District of St. Barbe since February 24th last (1925) and to show names of parties to whom Grants have been sent in each case, and also to show what balances remain to the credit of the District from the various grants for the present fiscal year (1924-25).

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—I beg to table the reply.

MR. SCAMMELL asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing what Marine Grants, if any, have been sent out to the District of St. Barbe since February 24th last (1925) and to show names of parties to whom grants have been sent in each case to show what balance remains to the credit of St. Barbe District from the Marine Grant for the present fiscal year 1924-25.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I beg to table the reply.

MR. SCAMMELL asked Hon. the Prime Minister to Table a statement showing what hotels have to date made application for a Liquor License under the Alcoholic Liquors Act, 1924, and also how many of such applications have been considered by the Board and how many acceeded to.

HON THE PRIME MINISTER—Applications have been received from George Ryall of Botwood and Agnes Walsh of the Goulds, but they have not yet been acceded to.

MR. CASHIN asked the Prime Minister to lay on the Table of the House the names of the Road Commissioners if they have been appointed; if they have not been appointed who they shall be and when does the Government anticipate appointing them. Also, give the rate of pay the Government intends giving for work done on roads and on the dock.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I beg to table the reply.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could obtain the answer from the Honorable Minister of Finance to two questions I asked a few days ago.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE —I was just about to rise to pass them over to the honorable member. I may say that I took a lot of trouble to get the information, and I hope it will prove satisfactory to him.

MR. SCAMMELL—As to Question 1 on the Order Paper of April 30th, I would like to ask the Honorable the Prime Minister for an answer as it seems the Hon. Minister of Posts is a hard man to get information from.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —The question was only asked a few days ago, and we will see about the answer when the Minister comes back to the House.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE —Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ashbourne asked me for a comparative statement of duties of last year compared with this year. I consulted with the Deputy Minister of Customs and his Assistant, and that inform me that it is impossible to give an answer to the question this session,as it means a great deal of work which would handicap these officials in attending to their other duties for ten or twelve days. I am very anxious to get the information for the honourable member, but if it will do him in a month's time I shall be only too glad to furnish him with a copy of the statement.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Speaker, the information I wanted to get from the Deputy Minister of Customs and his Assistant is the amount of revenue they estimated to collect under this new tariff after they sat on the Tariff Commission. It seems to me that possibly some member of the Tariff Commission might have figured out the amount of revenue collectable under the new tariff on the basis of one year's importation as compared with another, but as the session now is drawing to a close I have no desire to add further work on the officials of the Department of Customs.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Speaker, may

I crave your permission to ask the honourable the Colonial Secretary if he will be good enough to undertake to have a pamphlet prepared giving members of the House information with regard to the present standing of the electoral districts of the country under the redistribution bill. I believe the Government should prepare a statement defining the settlements comprised in the various electoral districts as defined under the present redistribution bill, as taken from the last Census. I would like for the honourable the Colonial Secretary to get a staff to work and start in to get that work done. I am sure that members on both sides of the House would appreciate very much that information. Name out actually and distinctly the various settlements comprising each electoral district.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY —Mr. Speaker, with your permission I would like to ask the honourable member for St. Barbe what he wants to know exactly. If it is a question of total population, under the redistribution bill, that can be readily answered, but if it is to get at each settlement as it appears in the Census for each district that will take a little time and it will be necessary to employ an extra staff to engage in the work. At the same time I have much pleasure in stating that I will undertake to have the work done and I will have copies sent to every representative in the House. I can quite appreciate the desirability of having that information because the complexion of every district will be changed and it will be a guide to honourable members who are looking in advance for a resting place for the next general election.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—Mr. Speaker, with your permission, sir, I desire to move that a message be sent to the Legislative Council requesting the return of the following bills: An Act respecting the payment of certain fees and charges by stamps; An Act respecting the operation of Saw Mills and An Act respecting Crown Lands, Mines and Minerals.

Petitions were presented by:

Mr. Scammell gave notice of question.

Mr. Halfyard gave notice of question.

On motion of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council requesting the return of the Bill sent up entitled respectively "An Act further to Amend 120 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'of Crown Lands, Mines and Minerals,'" "An Act to Amend Chapter 24 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Payment of Certain Fees and Charges by Stamps," and "An Act to Amend Chapter 34 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Operation of Saw Mills.'"

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 Chapter 83 of the Consolidater Statutes 1916 (Third Series) and Acts in Amendment thereof," with some amendments in which they request the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Speaker, with regard to the Council's Amendments to the Judicature Act I might explain that the Legislative Council are not so much to blame for the alterations but they are the result of second thoughts. The sections regarding libel and slander for a judge are withdrawn and when the other amendments are read it will be seen that they concern nothing more than certain procedure when drawing juries.

On motion of Hon. the Minister of

Justice the said Amendments were read a first time.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the second reading of these amendments. As honourable members will notice by listening that there is nothing different in the amendments except as regards jury drawing. Thirty-six men are to be summoned and out of that thirty-six men twenty-three are to be drawn.

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the said Amendments were read a second time and passed, and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting that body that the said Amendments had been agreed to without amendment.

Second reading of Council's amendments to the Disabilities Bill.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Speaker, as I intimated the other day in this House in view of the fact that this question arose from a recent discussion of this House. I thought that in the same spirit we ought to discuss the amendments made by the Council. The Council amendments shortly amount to an idea that might be divided into two aspects. There is one aspect that is worth while considering at first. I must frankly admit that our Bill as sent up to the Council Chamber for the first time was worded "Six months after the calling of the House of Assembly." They amended that by making it read "Six months after the date of the General Election." And if it is the desire of the House that we ought to make that clause read as the Council suggests, in that case there would be no disagreement amongst us. Concerning this amendment there is one feature that was half suggested to me in this House but it did not occur to me at the time that it was worth bothering about. It was suggested to me that the Bill ought to be framed that in the event of an election, and a close election, that a party ought not to be allowed if they hapepned to have the Government behind them to practically buy up men by giving them ministerial offices, and therefore they would not have to go back to the country for re-election. I must say that for the benefit of the House that that contingency occurred to me as more or less remote. So much for number one amendment.

The second amendment strikes me as being a reflection upon the integrity of candidates or members of any party who might have offered themselves for a constituency. You will remember when this Bill was before the House the second last day there were certain things to be considered. Now I may say that all the members of this House, both those on this side and those on the other side, are in the same box as regards this amendment. I did not consult any of my own side. I have never talked about that suggestion to any of them. I felt that as it was a matter that arose in Committee I did not encourage it. Now we are faced with the idea as to whether in view of the fact of the Legislative Council having suggested these amendments whether we ought to accept them.

(Reads.)

I would be very glad, Mr. Speaker, if with your permission the members would be allowed before committing ourselves to the passing of the Bill to express their views on the matter. I see a lot of good in these amendments from the standpoint of making clear the party affiliation which is so strong. It also seems to me to be a reflection more or less on the calibre of the members who are offering themselves for a seat in the House of Assembly.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Speaker, as this amendment arose out of the suggestion that I made here when this Bill was before the House originally,

I have taken a greater interest in it than I otherwise would. When this Bill was before the House before I thought that as an amendment to the Bill might be added a provision that if a man accepts office within six months after polling day he need not go back for re-election irrespective of party affiliation.

I made that suggestion in all good faith and it was accepted by the House unanimously. It went off to another place for approval and I find that out of my suggestion has come back these amendments, which imply nothing more than that from the Prime Minister down on that side of the House and from the Leader of the Opposition down on this side, we are nothing more or less than a herd of cattle that can be sold in the auction market. And further than that we are told that this suggestion means that we are open to corruption and bribery, and I feel that over the door out here ought to be hung a sign "Abandon all hope ye who enter here." As soon as you get into this House, no matter how, it is stated that you are open for sale. As it stands now it is so that anybody who had anything to do with a Government either as leader or as an ordinary member knows that before the party considers him and before he goes to the country as a straight party member that there are offers made to members of that party who go and contest a district. There are promises made to him that if he goes and gives support to a party that he will receive a ministerial office in the event of the party being returned as the Government. That is perfectly all right under these amendments. In other words, a man can be bought before an election but he can't be bought after.

I would prefer to see the wording as it was, but if the Upper House doesn't accept that, then I say cut out the section altogether. But certainly I would not be a party to a section like that and safeguard future candidates and members whom the Upper House don't even know from bribery and corruption.

Now under this amendment, on nomination day supposing the Prime Minister leads one party and the Leader of the Opposition leads another. Suppose there is an election next fall. Under these amendments every man who stood for the Prime Minister would have to sign a declaration saying "I am a supporter of the Monroe Party or "I am a supporter of Mr. Hickman." Now if Mr. Monroe is elected again then he can put in office any member of the party without going back to the country for re-election. But he can't go to Mr. Hickman's party and say "We would be glad for the services of somebody in your party." The member may fight it out with Mr. Hickman and leave the party and become an independent. The Prime Minister can't come and ask him to take office without that man going back for re-election. Then if Mr. Hickman was the leader of the successful party under those amendments he could appoint all his officials without their having to go back for re-election. But what about the unfortunate individual who does not support either party, who goes to the electorate as an independent. He can't take office with either party without going back for re-election under these amendments. I fail to see any reason for that.

You may have three or four independent members at the next election and then they would not be eligible for office. According to that a man has no business to be an independent and the people have no business voting for an independent. A man has to belong to a party to be elected in this country. And it has to be a recognized party at that. Now, sir, I am sorry that this reflection has been

cast upon this House by those other gentlemen, and since I have brought this matter up in the House I am finished with it and I do not intend to have anything more to do with it. I made the suggestion and I think that the suggestion was a good one, and if it cannot be carried out I think that we should cut out the whole thing.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, I must say that I was very much surprised at these amendments that have come down from the Upper Chamber and the least that we can say about them is that it looks to me as a reflection upon the integrity of the members of this Chamber. I certainly agreed with the principal that was expressed in this House the other day when we decided that members may take office under a new Government if they take the office within six months after the election. The practice in England is eight months. Then to be on the safe side have it made six months here. Previously a member of the House would accept office under Government then go back to his constituency and ninety-nine cases out of a hundred would be returned. This Act obviates the necessity of this and the expenditure of a lot of money and time without any purpose whatever, but these amendments seem to me to be contrary to the spirit of the Election Act. If the Government that is in power goes to the country the departmental heads will qualify under the name of the department that they hold and therefore it is not necessary to have the insertion of this amendment that we have had from the Upper House. If Mr. Higgins has to go on an election to-morrow or next week or whatever time he may go for election, he would be returned as the Attorney General as his election papers would set forth. But I think that the amendment as I see it is absolutely absurd. I have no desire to make any aspersion on the gentlemen who made this amendment but I think that it is not what we should expect from this Upper Chamber when we are making legislation concerning this Chamber alone. We are the representatives of the districts and should be alone responsible in this instance. So I think that we should send a message to the other Chamber that they pass the Bill that we sent up to them.

MR. SCAMMELL—I do not suppose that when the independent member the other day spoke on this matter he thought that he was going to draw down on his head the hornet's nest which we have seen in tihs matter this afternoon. The Minister of Justice was very fair then he presented these amendments to the House. Personally I have not given the matter of the amendment or the original Bill any considerable consideration, but I have become acquainted with the general outline of the matter. We have copied the British Constitution and one of the principal characteristics of that is its flexibility, and if an amendment of this sort has the effect of lessening that characteristic, there is no reason why the members of this House should contemplate entertaining the Bill for one moment. It may be very well for the gentlemen in the other Chamber to suggest these ideas to us, but after all we are the responsible people. I am going to say right here and now, and I ask every individual member to supoprt me, and that is this, that these amendments should not be entertained by this House, and that we send a message to the Legislative Council asking that they concur with the original Bill that we sent up to them and that we do not consider adopting the amendments that they have sent down to us. Now there are many things to be considered in the circumference of this matter, but there is one situ-

ation and it is this, that it is alright for the Government when it goes to the country for re-election. The Ministers all go to the country under their official titles and the Prime Minister has but little trouble, but where does the Leader of the Opposition find himself? The Leader of the Government is alright because he has his ministerial heads all designated, but the Leader of the Opposition cannot designate the members of the rank and file of his party who are to become departmental heads.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —The members of the Opposition have merely to say that they are supporting the Leader of the Opposition. The position of the Leader of the Government is the same as the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCAMMELL—That is the point on which I am not clear. If the Minister says that the position is perfectly the same then I accept the statement. Now let us take the position of the independent member. This says that you cannot have an independent member. There is to be no more independence. A man has to forswear allegiance to a leader of a party before he goes to the constituents for election. Now I submit that we cannot entertain this amendment. I suggest that we send a message to the Legislative Council to that effect.

MR. BROWNE—I wish to associate myself in this debate with the previous speakers who have spoken on these amendments that have been sent down here from the Upper Chamber and I say that we have an Act that is already intricate enough. In the words of my hon. and learned friend from Fortune Bay the passing of this would mean "Confusion words Confounded" and I feel that this is taking away that honesty of purpose which men pride themselves upon, and that they are not to be trusted any longer. A candidate must declare himself as a supporter of a leader of a party or he is not eligible to go into the Executive. That is all very well but suppose the Leader of the party should die or resign or have something else happen to him, what would happen then? A new leader would mean another general election. Because of these reasons I must say that I do not agree with it at all. All these rules and regulations and conditions are established for the man going out for election. There is too much red tape already and I am inclined to agree with the Hon. and learned member for Fortune that we should not consider these amendments and I would like to go, on record as supporting what he has said.

MR. HALFYARD—I regret that I have not given the amendment the consideration that it deserves but after all I cannot see that there is anything to be gained by this House exercising itself by pronouncing disapproval on the action that has been taken by the Legislative Council. These are men who are supposed to be men of experience and that granted I think that we ought to have some respect for their recommendations. I contend that all the politicians are not in the House of Assembly. There are just as good politicians outside of this House as there are in it. It was only the other day that I was talking to man and he made some remarks that were not altogether complimentary to the politicians.

I had to remind him that a seat in this House of Assembly did not altogether constitute a politician, and that when we were honoured with a seat in this House it does not change our dispositions or characters altogether. We are about the same sort of individual as the man in the street, and if a man is dishonest after he comes into this House, he generally had a tendency to dishonesty implanted in him before he gets here.

Be that as it may, the question is are we to accept these amendments or

recommendations of the Upper Chamber in connection with this Bill. There are two sides to every question, and when any member appeals to any constituency for their support, the electors would like to know what party he is going to support, and it is a great disappointment to the electorate when they find that a man who was elected to support a certain party see fit for certain reasons to support some other party. Of course that does not affect the independent candidate, because he is elected merely upon his merits, and there is no misunderstanding. He is sent back to the House to support whichever party he thinks is serving the interests of the country best.

However, as a member of this House I would not be in favour of voting for anything that would infringe upon the rights or privileges of this House, or of the members thereof, or of any individual who feels disposed to seek election to this House of Assembly. After all there are some good points in these amendments, and I am not inclined at the present time to speak so strongly against them as some of the honorable members have. After all we as members of this House should provide the legislation that is best for the country. I am inclined as a rule to take a stand one way or the other, and without further labouring the question I beg to support the amendments that are now before the chair.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — Mr. Speaker, this is a matter that is entirely for the members of the House to consider individually, but I want to say that I agree very much with Mr. Halfyard's remarks on this matter. It seems to me that we should be very careful about considering amendments sent down from the Upper House, because they are sent down in the best spirit and with the best intentions; and if the Upper House did not make any amendments to any Bill, then it would not be of any use.

I do not agree with the remarks of the Hon. Leader of the Independent Party at all. I am very much inclined to think that the people vote for a party and not for the man; and if that party has a certain policy—whether it be the policy of Monroe or the policy of Hickman—which they put before the country in the shape of a manifesto, and the people of certain districts decide that they prefer one policy to the other, then they vote for the man who is a member of the party having that policy, because of the policy and not because of the man. Then I think that if that man changes and decides to follow a different policy and goes under a different leadership, I think he ought to go back to the country for re-election. That is my view. I think there has been a reason and a very good reason in the past for sending men back for re-election. I do not know what that reason was, but it must have been a good reason or it would not have been put there in the days gone by.

It appears to me to be senseless for a Prime Minister, or any other Minister, who has been elected to have to go back to the country to be re-elected two months after his election, when the people know very well that he was going out as Prime Minister, or whatever other office it may have been, and consequently I agree with that change; but there is quite a difference between that and the case of a man who is elected to supoprt a policy and then two days after the election going over and supporting another policy.

I feel that this is a good amendment, and while it is not a matter of party politics but a matter for the individuals of the House, I, like Mr. Halfyard, am going to give this amendment my support because I think it is in the best interests of the country generally, and I think that a man who changes his policy within a

few days after election should have to go back to his district and have his altered opinion endorsed by the people that elected him.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Speaker, in regard to this amendment, I find myself in the same position as my honourable friend the member for Fortune Bay. Every man who goes out with a party is elected with that party. That is alright—but take the position like that of the hon. member for Fortune who came out as an Independent member. He had no party affiliations whatever, and the people of his district sent him back with an absolute discretion to do what he thought best for the country. But then if he decided that it would be in accordance with his representation to go over with the Monroe party, or with the Opposition party, he would have to go back to his district. If that is what this amendment means I am going to vote against it.

If a man goes out with a party, and then differs with a party I do not understand why he should have to go back to the country. The Upper House may have its opinion, and honourable members here may have their opinions, but I have my opinion, and I am going to stick by it. If I were elected as an independent member of St. John's West and if I thought it was in the best interests of my district to go with the Monroe party or with the Hickman party surely you do not think I should go back and get elected again. I do not see why a man should be penalised for being independent. That is my opinion, and I am going to vote against that amendment, for that reason. I do not think that any man going to the country should be placed in the position of having to swear allegiance to a party. That would put me in much the same position as the Hon. Member for Fortune to-day, and I think the Upper House must have forgotten that we had any independence in this House. Therefore I am going to vote against this amendment.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker, this Bill has brought about a very considerable amount of discussion, and as it goes on it brings about very much more argument for and against the Bill. When this Bill was put through this House the other day I think I voted for it at the time, but now since the new amendments have come back from the Upper Chamber, it seems to me, since hearing the arguments of Mr. Warren against them this afternoon, that the Upper House was against this Bill for many reasons. That Bill was brought in here for a purpose by the Government, and now it comes back here with so many amendments which, not being lawyers, we cannot all understand; but it comes back here, as it appears to me, as a direct slur against the members of the House of Assembly. Personally I think that these amendments should go back to the Upper House again, and that they should be asked to pass the Bill as it was sent up to them; and if they do not do that, I suppose they can do the other thing.

We have to take into consideration our position in the matter. This Bill was brought in here for a certain purpose, and these amendments have resulted. I do not think that these amendments should be voted for by this House. I do not know what insinuations the Upper House wished to draw, but it seems to me that the Upper House was opposed to this Bill, and wanted to tell us so in different language.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, apparently all the members have spoken on this Bill. I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the indulgence of the House, and I ask that this matter be deferred for further consideration. I have no use for the man that can be bought—he is dead;

and I think that the party that would buy a man is a dead party too.

I am concerned with the question of whether or not this Bill can be regarded as a reflection upon the integrity of the members of this House. If I am satisfied that that is the case, I have no doubt that I shall recommend that this be given no further consideration.

As a matter of fact I think that this declaration of faith, as I have already stated, is the only basis for sane Government. I think that the time for a man to declare his allegiance is before an election and not after. At the same time, if these amendments cast any reflections upon the integrity of members of the House I shall immediately recommend that they be thrown out. I have not yet come to a conclusion on the matter, and I would ask that it be deferred till to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice consideration of the amendments made by the Legislative Council in and upon the Bill sent up from the House of Assembly entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 4 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Legislative Disabilities and the Vacation of Seats in the House of Assembly,'" was deferred until to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

Additional Estimates

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Chairman and Honorable Members, if you remember when we were going through the estimates the matter was raised of salaries in connection with the Pension's Board, and after the Government had given it due consideration, they decided on the following increases:—

Secretary	$300.00
1st Clerk	250.00
2nd Clerk	235.00
3rd Clerk	235.00
Filing Clerk	220.00
Assistant Clerk	120.00
Clerk & Stenographer..	100.00
	$1,460.00

The next vote is $200.00 for ferry from Middle Pinchard's Island to Newtown, B.B.

The next is for $600.00 for Registration Clerk G. P. O.

MR. HALFYARD—Who is it?

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—It is impossible to remember all the names, but I will find out. In the Justice Department there is an increase of $750.00 which is for Deputy Sheriffs in the Outports, the appointment of which was discussed earlier in the debates. In the Liquor Controller's Department there is $5,000 for the Chairman. I do not think it is necessary to mention his name, as I believe all the Honorable Members know it. The other commissioners are Mr. Nicholas Vinicombe and Mr. Joseph Peters who get $4000 each. We had to take this vote here, but it is paid out of the Liquor Department. Now the additional vote is $86,010.00 but since that vote was taken, realizing the great need of the district representatives for the repairing of roads, wharves, bridges, etc., and after a great deal of talk and criticism of the Tariff, and after hearing the oft expressed wish of the Opposition for the reduction of expenditure, and after realizing that the wharves and marine works were falling down, the Government has decided after grave consideration to have voted $150,000. I think this will be justified by the need of keeping up the wharves etc., which are property that belongs

to us all. I think that all will agree that the granting of votes for main roads as in the past have been an absolute farce. The money should be voted in the proper way, and if I am Finance Minister in the coming year I will see that it is voted as it should be. I think that even the Opposition members and even the Independent party will agree with me in this. I do not think there is much else to say as to the additional votes, but I went into the matter fully and I ask that this $150,000 be voted now. After these matters are deal with we can come along with Supplementary Supply.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, I want first of all to thank the Hon. the Minister of Finance and the Government for the attitude they have taken in connection with the salaries of those concerned with the Pensions Board which is a matter that it will be remembered I advocated. I think that all in the Department have been considered, though I have not my book here now to consult on this point. I advocated the increase from the standpoint that if one got a rise all should get it.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Chairman, in my ambition to get through quickly I skipped the vote for the Marine and Fisheries Dept. We had a debate you will remember on this department and we voted $20,000 which was not in the Estimates, and also $50,000 for fog alarms and lights. In connection with this extra amount it must be remembered that we must have lights at Corner Brook as they are needed as aids to navigation there, and also at other points. I think the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will explain this vote.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, I feel that to a great extent these additional estimates are necessary, though possibly it would be easy to criticize them if one so desired. It has been mentioned that $150,000 has been voted for the repairing of bridges, wharves and marine works, and at that rate the vote for Ferryland alone would be about $3600. I do not see how I could see fit to put that all in one settlement, and I hope later to get this matter fixed up. One place would eat it all up according to this arrangement.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, I think the Hon. the Minister of Finance has done well in discussing the Estimates and Supply, but I would like to know how we are going to spend this $20,000 in connection with the fisheries. Now the Minister of Agriculture has stated that $45,000 is to be spent for lights and fog alarms in Placentia which leaves only $5,000 for the rest of the country. I would like to hear the Minister of Marine explain what his department has in view as to the spending of this $20,000 and his programme as to the outlay of $50,000 for the lights and alarms.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the honourable member for St. Barbe I might say that I am unable to answer his question at the present time, as the Fishery Board does not meet until to-morrow evening, when it will be decided for what purpose the twenty thousand dollars will be expended. With reference to the $50,000 voted for lights and fog alarms, I would say that there is one fog alarm erected at Point LaHaye, P.B., one at Marticott, P.B., one at Bay of Islands and one at Peckford's Island in the district of Fogo. These alarms cost in the vicinity of between $12,000 and $13,000.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, I notice in these estimates an additional vote for the Department of Public Works. It was stated here a few days ago by the honourable member

for Ferryland that to his certain knowledge the Board had not met for a considerable time. Now I would like to have a pronouncement from the Minister of Public Works as to how many meetings were held by the Board this year and also who are the members of that Board at the present time?

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Chairman, I do not remember how many meetings we have held, but we have held quite a number, and we did all the business that was necessary to be done. The reason why no meetings of the Board were called lately was owing to lack of time and because nothing of a special nature was required to be dealt with. If anything special does come up I will call a meeting. At present there are four members of the Board, namely, Mr. Linegar, Mr. Gould, Mr. Whiteway and Mr. Power. The work of the department has not been in any way impaired even though meetings of the Board were not held regularly.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, of course the members of the Pensions Office will appreciate the action of the Government for increasing their salaries, and I think that the underlying thought that prompted the honourable member for Ferryland to mention this department is because it is composed of returned soldiers. Now with regard to making the salaries of these returned soldiers compare favorably with the salaries paid officials of other departments, I would gather and conclude that these returned soldiers are very fortunate in being employed as members of the Pensions Office. Now there are other returned soldiers working in other departments who are just as painstaking and efficient as the returned soldiers of the pensions office and still have to work at much less salary. There is a returned soldier in the Department of Posts and Telegraphs named Fred. Bursey. He was chauffeur with a salary of $1200 and now his salary is reduced to $846. I cannot imagine that this man is intentionally disrated. He gave his service for his country when required like all the other returned men of Newfoundland, and may be many members of this House would have gone overseas if their ages allowed them. Now I do hope that the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs will give some consideration to Mr. Bursey's case, which is an outstanding one. Through no fault of his own, but on account of changes that were made in the department in which the office of chaffeur was cut out, he is now getting a reduced salary and is engaged as an assorter. I know that the Minister of Finance who has some knowledge of the Postal Department will see the injustice that has been done to this young man and will see the unfairness of increasing the salaries of returned soldiers in one department and reducing the salary of any returned soldier in any other department. Perhaps, there may be some other returned men that should receive the consideration of the Government as well as Mr. Bursey, and I am sure that if their salaries are increased on Executive authority no person in this House will find fault with the Government for remedying something that has been overlooked and unintentionally done wrong.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Chairman, I am more or less in accord with what the honourable member has said with regard to the salaries of returned soldiers, other than those who work in the pensions office and in all probability provision will be made for them in next year's estimates. On behalf of the Government I might say that there are lots of things that we will

give consideration to between now and the next session of the House. It must be readily understood that we cannot do everything in ten or twelve months, and I am sure that myself and the Ministers associated with me will see as we go along that public expenditure will be arranged justly and equitably to all concerned.

MR. HIBBS—May I ask the Finance Minister if there are any other special grants outside that $150,000.-00 for urgent public works.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—No. I feel that is all we can expend.

MR. HIBBS—I would like to mention that in the district of Fogo there are very necessary public works that require attention this year. May I explain. In 1921 the Government imported a key-stone well drill; it was purchased for the purpose of drilling wells, to secure a pure water supply throughout the District of Fogo. Every Hon. Gentleman who occupied a seat in the House during the years from 1912 to 1919 will remember that Mr. Halfyard who represented the District of Fogo at the time took occasion at every session of the House to advocate that something should be done to supply pure water to certain sections of that District. The formation of Fogo Islands and Change Islands is such that it is extremely difficult to get pure water in many places, unless the strata several feet below the surface is tapped. Outbreaks of typhoid fever have been attributed to impure water. Consequently an effort was made by me to remedy this serious state of affairs. In 1920 I advocated that a well drill should be imported for that purpose as it was the only practical way of securing good water. The Government very generously supplied the drill. It was sent down to the District of Fogo operated during a part of one summer with considerable success, considering the difficulty of moving the machine over badly built roads. The people of Barr'd Islands and other places are seriously handicapped in this respect. The fishermen after their strenuous day's work are obliged to bring water in barrels and other receptacles to supply their home for the following day. It is often too difficult a task for the women folk and the men are compelled to secure sufficient water for the following day, and even then it is just soft surface water that is available, and as a result there are often outbreaks of typhoid fever. This water has been analysed and the report condemns it as unfit for human consumption. It is absolutely necessary to have wells drilled to produce pure water in communities where there is nothing but solid rock formation. This type of drill is the same class of machine that was used in the Humber era. There is another feature of this matter that I would like to point out to the Prime Minister and the Government. This machine would be invaluable for operation in any section of the country where there are good roads. It is a traction machine that moves under its own power, and it is a pity to have it lying up for years when it could be rendering good service in other parts of the country. The cost of operating this machine for the season in Fogo District would be about $1500.00, and if we can secure that amount we will be able to bore wells at Barr'd Island, and then we would move the machine to Fogo and finally to Change Islands. Some years ago a considerable sum of money was spent in putting down ordinary wells at Change Islands with but very poor results. Wells were put down and concreted, but in spite

of this only highly coloured surface water was secured. There is a surface bog there, through which .the water drains, rendering it undesirable for domestic use. The machine must serve the needs of Fogo District before being moved elsewhere, and I hope the Government will see its way clear to allocate a special grant to operate the machine during the present year. It was imported specially to give water to Fogo District. It is a very heavy machine and is very difficult to negotiate over bad roads and weak bridges, but is capable of doing very effective work while in operation. The cost of drilling a hole would depend on the condition of the ground. The idea is to bore a six inch hole, even through solid rock until water is found. Sometimes you get an overflow, but if the source is lower than the well site you are obliged to use a pump. In conclusion I ask that the Government provide the necessary funds so that this work may be started at the earliest possible time as it is of extreme importance.

MR. CASHIN—Some time ago the Minister of Justice presented a petition about the police. Evidently the intention was to ask the Government to consider it under the additional estimates. I wonder if he intended to do anything in that direction.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I would like to say in connection with this matter that the Government has not yet had a chance to decide as to any definite policy about it. The increasing of the pay of the police can only be done in one way. The police and firemen should all be increased. I have already given my own personal views before the Council. Reference has been made to one or two individuals for their good service, but it is only fair to say that the same argument could be produced on behalf of any of the members of the Force. The great trouble lies in the big gap between the head and the next in command. The Inspector General gets $3,600 and Superintendent O'Neill $1500. Looking at it in this way it would mean that every other member of the Force has to be tailed off from him. In other words the man who is only a few years in the Force would be getting a very small salary.

Supplementary Supply

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman and gentlemen I do not know whether you have your estimates with you, but I may say that the total of the supplementary supply is $505,905.51. And add that to the last year's vote for 1924 and 1925 and you will find that it is $9,410,000. Therefore the estimates to-day for the public service is $9,353,793,01. As I have already stated we are trying to do away with this supplementary supply as much as we can, so that people of the country may be able to see just what the votes for the various items are.

Extra House of Assembly Vote.

That is in connection with the short session of last year. I think that there was a test case in the Court, Mr. Carter was plaintiff, and now as a result of this we have to pay this amount.

(Reads)

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—I may say that the matter of the hospitals is being investigated by a commission appointed to go into the public institutions. We have had no time to go into the matter as yet, but I presume that as soon as the House closes that we will be able to get to work and get some work done. There are a great many anomalies that are at present existing in the

public institutions and we are going to have them cleaned up just as soon as we can get to work on them. On St. George's Day the Commission went through the asylum, and I am sure that there was considerable information obtained as to the running of the institution. The General Hospital is one of the institutions that will have to be given considerable attention. With regard to the fares of the Hospital that is a thing that is absolutely in the control of the Board of Governors, and that is a thing that has come up here before. But there seems to be no definite idea as to just how the thing is run but that is another matter that will have to be adjusted so that everybody will be able to understand. If a patient goes into the hospital he is not allowed to pay more than a dollar a day and the cost of keeping a patient is four dollars a day. If a rich man or any member of his family goes into the hospital he is not allowed to pay more than the dollar a day.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—I would like to ask the Hon. the Colonial Secretary if there is going to be an appointment in connection with the Lunatic Asylum.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—I may say in that connection that Doctor Parsons is gone to England on leave of absence for the purpose of getting some special treatment for some disabilities resultant from the war. During his absence Doctor Grieve has been appointed visiting physician. Doctor Parsons reported to the Hospital Commission that there was a number of cases of a surgical nature that he was not able to handle by himself and that it would be necessary for him to have assistance. At the present time Dr. Moores has been appointed as consultant with Dr. Grieve. But there have been no appointments made, but I think that it may be necessary to have them made when Dr. Parsons comes back in the interest of the patients that number 370 persons.

MR. WARREN—I would like an explanation from the Minister about that amount of $3,600 for the examination of beetles.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—Mr. Chairman, when I took offce I found that my predecessor in office had been in communication with the Canadian Government with a view to having an entomologist come down here and examine some timber areas that were reported to have been destroyed by certain forest insects. Like the Hon. Member, at least I hope I do not do the honourable member an injustice when I say that he took the matter as a joke, but like a great many people in the country we looked upon this question of forest insects more or less as a joke until I had certain correspondence from certain parties, and had a conversation with the entomologists at Ottawa; but after he showed me the damage that had been done to the Canadian forests by these insects, I began to see that this was a very serious matter indeed.

We have in this country at the present time an industry, which I predicted in my address a few days ago would within three or four years be worth about twenty million dollars to this country. We are committed to a liability of ten million dollars in connection with that same industry, and it is only right that we should do all that we can to make it a success. But that industry is absolutely dependent for its success upon our forest areas, and if those areas were by any means to be destroyed, that industry would suffer a terrible loss. Therefore we must do

all we can for the preservation of our forest areas.

We have already had complaints from various districts of the ravages of a certain insect, which is causing a lot of damage amongst the trees. Amongst other places we have had complaints from Carbonear, and around Gambo; so that it is obvious that the damage caused from this source is not confined to St. John's alone, as was at first thought.

The expenditure that has been made on this matter has been a mere drop in the bucket, compared to what we will have to expend if we are to make a real effort to stamp out this danger, and everyone must realize that we have to do something.

On my visit to Canada last year I went to Ottawa and visited the head of the Forest Department there; and found that he had made a thorough examination of certain specimens that were sent from here, and he stated that the situation was so serious that it was no longer a joke for us. He then acquainted me of certain work that would have to be done preparatory to his visit to this country which I hope will be next month. He would be very seriously handicapped if he had to start in himself, and make an examination of the areas supposed to be effected without any preliminary examination having been made prior to his arrival; and therefore I employed the services of Mr. Arthur English, who is, in my opinion, a very competent man to do the work that he is performing at the present time. He is making an examination of the various forest areas of the country; and we have a report of the work which he has done up to the present time, down at the office, which I will bring up tomorrow; and when Dr. Swayne comes down here next month there will be a lot of preparatory work done, which will facilitate him in making a speedy investigation of the forest areas affected. When he goes around these districts he will be accompanied by Mr. English, who will be of great assistance, having already been over the areas.

I think that the amount voted—three thousand dollars—is only very small to pay for that investigation. Mr. English is getting paid $150 a month and expenses.

MR. DUFF—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister what part of Carbonear the beetles damaged.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE—I do not know but a request was sent from there for a man to be sent there, and we sent him.

MR. HICKMAN—How long have these beetles been in the country and how did they come here.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE—They were here before I went in office. Mr. Bailey tells me that they caused damage at Deer Lake about 20 years ago, but the trees then attacked recovered. The trees damaged at Nagle's Hill, however, will not recover.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Chairman, I think this is a matter which should receive serious attention and not consider it as a joke. Not far from the city there is a section of forest which is affected considerably by these beetles. One cannot but notice it at quite a distance because a large section of the forest has become dry, however there is no doubt whatever about its existence. In other countries greater care has been taken to preserve its forest areas from this ravenous pest, and I think that the Minister of Agriculture & Mines has taken a wise step in having an expert come down to investigate the trouble and find out to what extent our forests have been effected by this insect. I am glad that the Minister has obtained

Mr. English to do some special work, as I know of no better man in this country than he for the work. He has been identified with work of similar nature in Canada and must have learned considerably through his experience there.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Chairman and honourable members, I do not wish to raise a question that will lead to debate, but you will remember that when I was discussing the matter of the loan, I stated that former Ministers of Finance had received certain monies—I showed the statement to Mr. Cashin before he went out of the House—and I said Ministers had been paid for signing their names. There are some instances in particular for which I cannot see what they were paid for, and I want to say that in connection with loans nothing whatsoever has been paid me. Here is a statement of the exact position.

(Reads statement)

As far as I can see there is some justification for the payment as to expenses, and if I had to go abroad in connection with a loan I would expect to have my expenses paid. But how Sir Richard Squires, the man who was never going to do anything wrong, could get $5000 while his Finance Minister also got $5000 at the same time, is something I cannot understand.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, in connection with the subsidies and this vote of $11,000, I am interested to the extent of hoping to get a steam service for Trinity Bay, but the Government has not yet come to a decision as to what is to be done. The time has now come when the people are moving about in connection with the fishery business which is the most important business in the country, and I wish to draw the attention of the Hon. the Prime Minister and the Government to the need of some steam service on Trinity Bay. I am sorry the Government has not been able to see their way clear to give Bonavista and Trinity a combined service and with all due deference to the opinions expressed by others, that money would be saved there and the people would get a service that they badly need. You cannot afford to give us a separate service in my opinion, and that belief is confirmed by the statement of the expenses for the Malakoff last year.

I trust that the Government will give this matter some consideration. I am not asking to have any extra expenditure incurred, nor do the people want it. They are satisfied to put up with a weekly or fortnightly service. A service was very much needed there last Fall as the people who were catching herring found it very difficult to ship their products to market, and they intimated to me that if they only had a fortnightly service it would be better than none at all. Now I do not think that the Government can afford to give both Bonavista Bay and Trinity Bay a separate service. Even if you do give Trinity Bay a motor ferry service on the north and south side it will cost a lot of money, whereas a steamer plying in both bays would give a better service. However, if it is the intention of the Government to have the same service in Bonavista Bay as they had last year, and we have extra taxation from that that the people all over the country will have to pay, I hope that the Government will see their way clear to give Trinity Bay some service this year, and there is more reason now under the new tariff that they should get some service. I am sure that this matter must give the Executive Government some concern because it savours of discrimination. Bonavista and Trinity are neighbouring bays and the people live and

work under similar conditions. It has been said by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that some people in Trinity Bay do not want a steamer. That is correct so far as Port Rexton, Trinity East and Trinity proper are concerned. These places are served by the "Prospero" and they have a train calling there regularly; but around the outlying places in Trinity district the people are absolutely cut off, and it is a great hardship on them by not having some means of travel or for the transportation of their freight.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word or two on the subject of steam subsidy. The service last year in the Straits of Belle Isle was very unsatisfactory, though I do not say that for some years past it has been an entirely satisfactory service. We are in the position that the "Sagona" in the Spring of the year makes a trip or two from Battle Harbour to Bonne Bay and Bay of Islands, and after making a few trips she is replaced by the "Home" and then in the Fall of the year the "Home" is taken off again and replaced by the "Sagona," so that the interruptions in the service last year made it very unsatisfactory. The "Home" is not satisfactory for that service, because she has outlived her usefulness, and I would like to see the "Sagona" or ',Glencoe" there. Then there is the Bay Islands service. I would like to see Bonne Bay served better than it Bay of Islands service. I would like to see the steamer call at Bonne Bay twice a week instead of once, and I think that if the Railway Commission would concern itself with this situation that they could make the arrangement alright. We have a lot of men working around Bay of Islands who want to get to Bonne Bay twice a week, and I might say that the business interests of Bonne Bay and Bay of Islands are similar. I would like to see a better service between the places I have mentioned than what has been happening in the past, and I trust that the members of the Railway Commission will pay some attention to the remarks I have made.

Before resuming my seat I would like to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries who is the Herring and Lobster Inspector provided for in the Additional Estimates?

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the honourable member for St. Barbe I might say that there is actually no Lobster Inspector, and that the salaries in the Estimates are for Herring Inspectors, but it is necessary to have a man to see that the rules and regulations concerning the close season on lobsters are carried out.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, with regard to the Marine & Fisheries vote for Herring Inspectors I understood that the new regulations for the curing of split herring do not commend themselves either to the catchers of herring or those who cure split herring. I know that applies to Trinity district. I had a man in my office the other day and he told me that quite a number of people who have always been identified with the herring business in Trinity Bay have gone out of the business altogether on account of these rules and regulations, and I trust that the Fishery Board will give the matter further consideration. How many Inspectors of herring do the Fishery Board think they will require if they regard every one who catches four or five barrels of herring as an owner or manager of a plant?

What has been suggested is that in nearly every community where herring is caught some one in that community buys them. What he should

do is to brand them and then the act would be complied with.

(Reads)

(The House rose until 8 p.m.)

The Chairman of Committee resumed the Chair at 8 of the clock in the evening.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, when the Committee rose I was speaking on the subject of the regulations concerning the catching, packing and curing of herring—split herring, and I was attempting to draw the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and also of the House to the fact that the new regulations were not meeting with the approval of the catchers and curers of herring. I think that the objections raised by those who are directly interested in the industry are well founded, and their objections should receive the consideration of the Fishery Board.

It has been stated by those who are supposed to know that it is practically impossible to carry out the regulations, as the Government will not be able to find money enough to pay the number of inspectors that would be required to carry out the provisions of the Act, and I feel quite sure that the Chairman ex officio of the Fishery Board, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, will take the matter up with the board at their next meeting and make some amendments so that the Act will be workable, and will not in any way retard the prosecution of such an important industry.

Everything in connection with our fisheries should be helped; and no impediments should be put in the way of any of the fisheries. The intentions of the Fishery Board may be laudable and commendable, but still it appears that due consideration was not given to the drafting of the rules and regulations. That applies particularly to the branding of the herring in such small lots as two or three barrels. It may be quite possible that an Inspector would have to be sent many miles in order to inspect such a small quantity of herring as two or three barrels.

As I stated this afternoon, the best plan is to have the herring collected, and branded at some central point in the different outports. The phrasing of the act is not very good. For instance they use the word "fresh" where I presume they meant "new," and they talk about getting the barrels out of water and all that sort of thing.

But the chief thing that we have to consider is the encouragement of the prosecution of the fishery, and to help and not to hinder those who take advantage of the herring coming round the waters near them from taking whatever herring they can for the good of themselves and for the good of the country.

Mr. Chairman, that is the only object I have in talking on this vote for inspectors of herring, and I trust that the Minister will take my few remarks in the spirit that they are meant. My intentions are good, though I may not put them all in the best possible manner.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs made reference this afternoon to a loan, and the raising of loans, and I would like to take advantage of this opportunity to ask the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs to give me a little explanation—to give the House a little explanation in reference to the correspondence which was placed upon the table some time ago in reference to the loan. The Minister of Finance and Customs at that time informed us that he had made the best possible deal in the arranging of the loan, but there is some correspondence here, and there is a letter here which is addressed to Capt. Victor Gordon, the High Com-

missioner of Newfoundland; and signed by Messrs. Coates, Sons and Company. This is a copy sent to the Minister of Finance and Customs with a letter dated January 15th from the High Commissioner's office; and this letter states that Glyn Mills & Co. with themselves were prepared, subject to agreement on points of detail, and if conditions remained unchanged to take up the loan at from 100½ to 101. Further on the letter states that in making up the form of statement there would be expenses of 2 p.c. in reference to the loan. It is just a little matter that I would like to have an explanation on.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Chairman, if the Leader of the Opposition will remember, the other day I explained this matter and I told him that due almost entirely to his attitude as expressed in this House last year, I had given this assurance—I had given my assurance as Finance Minister that no tenders for loan would be accepted until it was advertised.

Would the Hon. Leader of the Opposition let me have all the correspondence to have before me while I make my explanation.

The letter I want is not here, but I think the Leader of the Opposition will find a reply among his papers from Commissioner Gordon dated January 15th. What I want to point out to the Leader of the Opposition and the House that all the correspondence that passed between the Commissioner in London and myself was with the object of endeavouring to raise the loan with the best possible results to the Colony. Glen Mills and Coates & Co., and the other financial people did not make a definite offer at all. They merely said, "let us handle the loan and we will take charge of it," but they would not offer to underwrite it. As I already stated in this House the Government advertised in papers in Canada, England, the States and Newfoundland and the best offer was accepted. If Coates & Co. and the others wanted to take the loan, why did they not do so. Why were they asleep. If I was right this evening in referring to the matter of Finance Ministers raising loans in the past, there is a matter yet outstanding of nine thousand and odd dollars in connection with a loan for which no vouchers whatever can be found. I am sorry I have not the statement I read this evening with me at the present moment or I would read it for the Leader of the Opposition. I am not referring to what the Leader of the Opposition said, but I want this House and the country at large to understand that if we lost anything at all in connection with this loan it was lost by way of advertising. I think the right thing was done and the tender which we thought was right was accepted in the presence of the Hon. the Prime Minister, the Assistant Manager of the Bank of Montreal—which is practically the financial agent for Newfoundland—and Mr. Bruce. Not an offer was received from any firm in England. There were many tenderers, but I do not remember their names—some of them come up over night and want to do the work of arranging the loans for the country. This loan was raised properly and the day after it was raised we got a cheque for the proceeds. I do not know if this explanation is satisfactory to the Leader of the Opposition, but I want to state emphatically that every dollar possible to secure for the Colony was obtained by me. I was at work for months trying to arrange the loan and any man in my position should do the same. I do think, Mr. Chairman, that if a man has to go abroad to raise the loan, his expense should be paid, but I certainly cannot understand how a Prime Minister

can get $5000 in connection with a loan when his Finance Minister gets another $5000. I want to say to the House now, that while I am Minister of Finance the raising of a loan will not cost the country a penny as far as I am concerned personally. If I had to go to England to negotiate a loan I would expect to be paid my expenses, but if I were already there and had to sign the bonds I would not take a penny for it. It might take a week to sign them but I would not expect to be paid a penny for that. All I would expect is the salary that was voted me. Now what I and the country at large dislike, is the attempt on the part of some people to say that the Minister of Finance is trying to make money for himself. Now when a man goes up to Government House and takes his oath to do his best for the interests of the country, I think that is a low and unjust opinion to have of him. I hope I have made it clear to the Leader of the Opposition that as far as loans are concerned neither the Government, myself or any other minister has made money out of them. A slur has been cast that the Hon. Mr. Sullivan made money out of this loan, but that is absolutely untrue. While on the other side of the water he did all he could in connection with arranging the loan, and I would have a different opinion of him if he had done otherwise. He wired here as to what he could do and was given instructions and I have the cablegrams that passed between us. The best possible terms were secured when the tender of the Dominion Securities Co. was accepted, and I have no regrets whatever for taking their offer as it was in the very best interests of the country. But to-day the position is that all politicians are looked upon as rogues and robbers. No matter how honest a man may be, or attempt to be, all we can hear is that he made this; he made that." I want the House to understand and I am going to say it so that all can understand, that while I am Minister of Finance I do not want a penny for my work except the salary voted me and my sessional pay, and the day I take any more I will clear out, and the man who leaves that office as clean as I will at the end of four years will have nothing between him and his conscience. We have been imputed all kinds of graft but "Woe to him of whom everyone speaks well." I know I am not on that list so that I am quite safe. An honorable member interjects that this is sacrilege, but that quotation has been used here before. Now if there is any particular question the Leader of the Opposition wants to ask in connection with the loan, or if he can find anything wrong with the arranging of it, I will be glad to answer it or give him the explanation. A great part of the loan was used to pay for the rails which we secured under the Trade Facilities Act, of which Mr. Warren gave me some knowledge last year. We have nothing to regret in this connection as by purchasing in Great Britain we were helping out the unemployed there. Again I say I think the country did well in this connection and the affairs of the country are not one bit disturbed by it. Now Mr. Chairman I do not want to get into a heated argument, but if I do I promise it will be a hot one. In conclusion I want to say that I will be glad to give any information I can on any matter in connection with my department.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, I think an explanation is due in connection with the loan, and I wish to say that if the lines in connection with the arranging of it had been followed as described it would be alright, and instead of putting it through a broker in London it would be under-

written at a higher price. I want to know if a firm in London offered Commissioner Gordon to put it on the market at 100½ or 101 with a maximum expense of 2 p.c. Even if the terms were 3 p.c. I want to know why that offer was not accepted and to know if the Minister of Finance will explain how he accepted the terms which he did.

Every loan put on the market whether Government, Provincial or Municipal is advertised everywhere, and then the bids are published afterwards and the one who tenders the successful bid is also published, and that is one reason why we want to have the particulars of this loan to satisfy the House. The Finance Minister evidently does not want to be asked this question, but I think that in fairness to him and to everybody else concerned in this country it is well that we should have the explanation to-night. I made no insinuation against anybody. The only thing that I asked for was the correspondence that transpired in connection the raising of the loan. I could not get it at first and if the Minister of Finance and Customs had given the loan for sale I understand it might have realised 101 less the expenses. This loan is selling today for 101 according to the information furnished us. When in England Mr. Sullivan was an active man and did his best in connection with the loan, and, therefore, we naturally wanted to see the correspondence that took place between him and the Finance Minister, and now we have it before us.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the Leader of the Opposition that if this loan had been underwritten by the Company he has named we might not have got as much out of it. There is a stamp duty to be paid and the Dominion Securities Company must pay it. Now I trust he is satisfied with the explanation he has got from me. I am certainly in accord with the Leader of the Opposition that the Finance Minister should advertise for this or any other loan, as it is necessary to protect himself from the vicious tongues that are abroad. I agree with him that a loan should not be raised privately; but should be raised publicly and openly. I think that the principle is sound that no loan should be floated until after it is advertised to give the financial world a chance to bid on it. I hope that it will not be my privilege for the next four years to have to raise a loan on behalf of this Colony, nor do I want to come in here again to ask this House for authority to raise another loan. As my friend, Captain Randell, put it, I am supposed to be the head of a family and to try and make the two ends meet, and if I can do that for this country for the next four years I do not think I shall have to hang my head in shame as a Finance Minister. If expenditure has to come down it has to come down, and, I, for one do not want to saddle this country with any more loans, and my opinion as Finance Minister is that Newfoundland's interests are best protected by not having to resort to the raising of any more loans.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, in discussing this matter there is one matter I omitted. I would like to ask the Finance Minister why after advertising for the loan in Newfoundland currency a bid was accepted in sterling without further advertising or making known to the large financial houses in London that you were open for a sterling bid?

HON. THE FINANCE MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, the reason the bid for that loan was accepted in sterling was that at the time we opened the tenders there was a contract on for

rails and we had to decide that afternoon to accept that loan in order to get the advantage of the Trade Facilities Act, as if we set it aside any longer it might mean that we would lose the advantage of getting the trade facilities.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, I regret that I was called away from the House this afternoon as the Finance Minister was explaining about former Finance Ministers and their connections with loans. His remarks the other day on the tariff would lead the outside public to believe that former Finance Ministers, whoever they were, got $5,000 for merely signing their names on bonds. My father happened to be a Finance Minister for many years, and I took the trouble to ask him if he ever got $5,000 for signing bonds, and I think the present Finance Minister can explain that the only thing paid my father was his expenses going to Canada and the United States in connection with loans.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Chairman, when I made the statements of the amounts paid to former Finance Ministers in connection with loans I was not thinking of the father of the honourable member for Ferryland. What I meant particularly was the sums paid to Sir Richard Squires and his Finance Minister, Mr. Brownrigg, and I do not know what they were paid $5,000 each for signing their names to bonds for the same loan. Sir Michael Cashin got $2500 on one loan (1918) and $2500 for another loan (1919), but that was for services and expenses in connection with proceeding to Canada and the United States, according to the Minute of Council I have already read to the House, and if I was sent abroad directly in connection with a loan I would expect my expenses to be paid.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, my object in bringing that matter up was to correct an idea that got abroad that my father had been paid $5,000 at any time for just signing his name to bonds, as appeared in that Minute of Council.

There is just one other matter I would like to refer to and that is that I do not see any provision in the estimates for an extra Customs officer in Cape Broyle.

HON. FINANCE MINISTER—There is no Customs Officer at Cape Broyle.

MR. CASHIN—Possibly I might enlighten the Minister in this respect. There is a young man up there acting for the Customs Department in connection with smuggling, and as a matter of fact he has gone so far as to search people's houses during the last ten days. I suppose he must have instructions from some one or some department. I know he is not doing this kind of work for nothing.

HON. FINANCE MINISTER—This man is not stationed at Cape Broyle, but in St. John's and he is doing good work all over the country.

MR. CASHIN—Is he employed in the Customs service?

HON. FINANCE MINISTER—Yes, and his salary is voted in the estimates.

MR. CASHIN—Now if there is any intention of paying additional salaries they should appear in Supplementary Supply so as we can understand where we are. I asked the Prime Minister yesterday if the new Road Commissioners were appointed and who they were and I have not yet got his answer. My object in asking the question is that this House voted two million dollars last year for tourist roads and I fail to see why we as representatives should go out of this House to-morrow or next day and not know the policy of the Government in connection with this matter because I think that we should know something about it before the

House closes. I would also like to know what is going to be paid to labourers who work on the dock and on the roads. While I have no axe to grind with Mr. Bishop, I think the Government has to pay the Bill, and the same applies to the Road Commission. Now I think that laborers of St. John's East and West who will be employed on that dock should have some understanding as to what their rate of pay is going to be. Take a man carrying the hod, for instance. It is a very difficult job and more difficult than carrying the barrow on a mercantile premises.

It used to be an old saying in the United States that there was only one class of people and these were Irishmen. Newfoundlanders are Irish to a great extent. Now, I consider that the man who carries the hod on the dock should get at least thirty five cents an hour. This is my object in asking the Prime Minister what the Government's policy was in connection with the road, because I considered and I still consider that two million dollars is a considerable amount of money; and, suppose for argument's sake that we close this House to-morrow, and leave it to the Executive Government to appoint three or four individuals who would be responsible to no one in this country, I think, Sir, we would look rediculous in the eyes of the public. I think, Sir, this is a matter of sufficient importance to be brought up here, and the members of both sides to be given a fair opportunity of airing their views on the matter. On that two millions we have to pay the interest out of the pockets of the people of this country. It comes to about a hundred thousand dollars a year, and I would like to hear from the Prime Minister to-night if the Government has any set programme, and if they could give us some idea of what it is going to be, I don't think they would be going out of their way, or doing anything wrong if they told this House what programme the Government has in connection with the tourist policy and the building of roads and where and who is going to have charge of them. Certainly, the Government will have charge of them; but certainly if two million dollars is left in the hands of people responsible to no one, I don't think that is right, and I feel that we should have some of the opinions of the members in this House. Why should three or four men or even the Finance Minister of the Colonial Secretary control the spending of these monies and we not know anything about it?

Whilst I am on my feet I would like to draw the attention of the Government to the fact that I have been after a considerable number of public utilities for my district during the past nine months, and that the Government saw fit last year to buy a Court House for Ferryland. I believe, myself, that a public wharf would have been much more beneficial. As I understand it now this court-house has been converted into a gaol. I don't think that reflects much credit on the people when they ask for a wharf and are given a gaol. In that criticism I have no personal axe to grind. I would like the Prime Minister to outline, this evening, if they have any policy in view, because if they have, then it is due to every member in this House to know something about the spending of two million dollars.

MR. WARREN—Before this discussion goes any further, I think I owe it to myself and to my colleagues who were in the Government in 1919-20-21-22 to make some explanation of the Minutes that have just been read by the Prime Minister. In 1918 Sir Michael Cashin raised a loan, and my recollection is that in November 1919

a Minute of Council was passed voting Sir Michael Cashin five thousand dolars for service in raising the loan, and in addition to that he was paid any expenses that he incurred. In 1920, Sir Richard Squires was Prime Minister. I was Minister of Justice, and a member of the Executive. Sir Richard Squares very successfully raised a loan of six million dollars that year.

Now I am not concerned with the wording of the Minute which Sir Richard Squires put in the Minutes; but it was distinctly clear to us and from the way the Minute read, and in the bye-election in St. John's January, 1920 it was stated Sir Michael Cashin had received $5,000.00 in connection with the loan, and we concurred in giving Sir Richard Squires $5,000.00 for service in connection with loan, for two reasons; the first one was that Mr. Brownrigg was very ill at the time and Sir Richard Squires took over the department of Finance and Customs in addition to his own duties, the second reason was that it was conclusively proved that Sir Michael Cashin had received five thousand for his services. Under the circumstances, Sir Richard Squires was justified in accepting the same amount, and apparently Sir Richard Squires put it in the Minutes that Sir Michael Cashin had been paid. Now this is news to me that we were mistaken, that Sir Michael Cashin had only received two thousand five hundred for expenses and not services and I think, in justice to myself and my colleagues, and in justice to Sir Richard Squires that it should be made known that when we voted all that five thousand dollars we did so for two reasons; first because Sir Richard Squires had undertaken the duties of Minister of Finance, and had very successfully raised a loan in strenuous times, and secondly because he was following a precedent set by Sir Michael Cashin. I just wish to say this in justice to myself and to those who were associated with me at that time.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—The only thing I would like to ask the hon. member is this. What has that to do with the 1921 loan. At that time Mr. Brownrigg was Minister of Finance. As I said possibly he did not understand it; but it is the 1922 loan that I cannot understand. Sir Richard Squires got five thousand dollars and Mr. Browrigg got five thousand. That is the serious part of it to me. If the Minister of Finance, Mr. Brownrigg, took five thousand, where did Sir Richard Squires come in? and if Sir Richard got five thousand, where did Mr. Brownrigg come in?

I would like to ask the Minister if he has any recollection of the Minute that gave Mr. Brownrigg the five thousand?

MR. WARREN—I have no recollection of that Minute. I know that on one occasion Mr. Brownrigg was ill and Sir Richard Squires raised that loan and went away the next year to sign the bonds and was paid for that; but I don't remember any Minute except the first one, and I am surprised to hear that Sir Michael Cashin was not paid five thousand for signing bonds. I am sure there was a Minute to that effect that he was paid that amount. There was a Minute for five thousand that he was paid, and we then followed that precedent because we understood that if a man succeeded in raising a loan it was customary to pay him five thousand for it.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Here is a copy of the Minutes made in November 8th, 1919. Reads:

On one loan he got five thousand dollars. The only Minute shown here for Sir Michael is this twenty-five hundred dollars. He raised a loan in 1918 and did not take any amount, then in 1919 he raised a loan and took the two amounts at that time. The Minute is dated the 18th November.

MR. HALFYARD—The hon. member for Fortune has spoken on the question of raising loans, and I don't think that anybody would expect the Finance Minister or the Prime Minister to give his time and energy in the interests of the country, whether raising a loan or anything else, without being paid for it. I trust, Mr. Chairman that the Minister of Marine & Fisheries will always be governed by such charitable notions. They are not just. A man should be paid for services. The Hon. Minister knows that if he were to do the work of two departmental heads I don't think that he would refuse recompense for it.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I spent more time before six o'clock in the morning on work in connection with my department than all other ministers have spent since they went into power.

MR. HALFYARD—Whether a man gets up early or late we all know that when Mr. Brownrigg was the Minister of Finance and Customs that he was a very sick man and he was not able to attend to the work of the department and the Prime Minister Sir Richard Squires did the work. And he did the work very successfully and there was the precedent to pay Sir Richard Squires for the work that he had done. Now we are not talking about the votes that every body knows about but those votes that people do not know about. I do not think that it is worthy of this House to make any point about it because the Finance Minister did the work of the country and if a man is doing work for the Colony it is only right that he should be paid.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I do not want to delay the debate but the Hon. Member for Ferryland has addressed a couple of questions to me and I suppose that I must answer them. Now he is right when he says that two million dollars is a lot of money and it is because it is a lot of money that the Government is not going to rush wildly to work and try to get clear of it. We have to appoint the commission and I think that I may mention for the information of the House that these will be nominated at the next meeting of the Executive. It will be the duty of the Commission together with Mr. Hall to come before the Executive and make recommendations as to what they think would be the best policy and then the Government will in turn consider the suggestions that they make and made their decisions irrespective of districts or parties and solely with the intention of the development and the husbanding the tourist traffic interests of this country. It will take about three years for the spending this two million. It is not intended to spend it all in one year. It is the intention to go slowly about it and to ask Mr. Hall and the Commission as to where it can be spent so that we will get the best value that can be got by spending the money on roads or anything else that may be desirable for the promotion of the tourist policy. As regards the dock the same thing applies. Just as the two million dollars is a lot of money and we have to be careful about the spending of it so is the one million dollars that has been provided for the dock a lot of money and we have to see that we get the best value for the money. It is alright for the gentlemen in this House to get up and say that the labourers of this city should get thirty-five cents an hour. Nobody wants to see them get more than the Government and I do. If a labourer is worthy of his hire I am only too glad to see him get all that he is able to get. But I look upon this matter of the dock just as I would look upon the discharging of a cargo of molasses at my own wharf. I want to get the best value that I am able to get.

The public moneys do not belong to me. They belong to the public. It

is very easy for a politician to chuck out the money with both hands but I do not believe that he makes himself any more popular because the general public knows that it is up to the Government and the Commission to spend the money where they can get the best value for it. And for this reason Mr. Bishop who is to rebuild the dock is to employ the labourers and we will not bring party politics into it at all. He will employ the labourers and we will have Captain Byrne who has been interested in the labour problem for some time come down there and take down the names of the men who want to go to work and he will give them to Mr. Lee the man in charge of the work and then Mr. Lee will try to arrange the labour for the men. But if any man is not doing his work satisfactorily he loses his job and some other man gets his place| We are going to leave the matter of labour entirely in Mr. Bishop's hands and he is to get the best value that he can get. To the House and to the people of Newfoundland generally, I want to say that we are going to manage this as we would our own businesses and we are going to get the best value that we can for the money that we have to spend. The hon. member for Ferryland made reference to the Court House that was bought at Ferryland. The Bank of Montreal erected that building at a cost of twenty thousand dollars and it was purchased by the Government at a cost of three thousand dollars. It is very suitable for a gaol or a court house or for whatever they may use it. I do not know of any representations that have been made by the Hon. Member for Ferryland or anybody else for a wharf but I hope that they will be able to get a wharf just as soon as we have the money for them to build it.

MR. CASHIN—I thank the Prime Minister for his reply. I know that the Government is not going to spend the two million all in one year. I agree with the Prime Minister when he talks about not bringing politics into the matter but I think that there is the impression abroad that politics will be brought into the matter and all the talking that the Prime Minister and myself will do for the next six years will not take that impression away. As I said I agree with the Prime Minister when he says that we should not spend the two millions all in one year but I think that if there is a special spot or a place that would be especially interesting from the tourist point of view then I take it that some of the money will be spent on it this year. I was not very much in favour of this tourist policy but if there is going to be money spent surely the members of this House should be told about it. That is my point. With regard to the dock the Prime Minister said that Mr. Bishop would have all to do with the labour. My answer is that Mr. Bishop will have a job to get the labor. I suppose that they are to get the labour as cheaply as they can, with the assistance of the Employment Bureau. Now there has been considerable discussion in connection with the payment of certain Ministers of Finance in the past in connection with the work that they have done in the raising of loans. I agree with the Minister of Finance that any man who does work for the country he should be paid for it. And I am sure that every Finance Minister is of the same opinion. If a Minister of Finance goes to England or New York for the raising of a loan his expenses should be paid. Now the point that I wanted cleared was that a former Finance Minister who happened to be my father got money for simply signing the bonds and I want it clearly understood that he did not get any money for merely signing his name. I am sorry if I have been the cause of delaying the House to-night but I want to thank the Minister of

Finance for this copy of goods taken out of the bonded warehouse by the Imperial Tobacco Company for the past four months. I think that there must have been something wrong because I notice that last year for the same time the company took out 8,610 pounds of tobacco and this year for the same time they took out 16,710 and during the some time last year they took out 314,000 cigarettes and for the same period this year they took out 789,000. I merely point this out for the information of the House. It may be to benefit in the change in the tariff. Of course I am not making any charge.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Now there was just one thing that has been raised to-night that I do not yet quite understand. The point was raised by the hon. member for Trinity and that was in connection with the payment of the $5,000.00 in 1922 to the Minister of Finance for work in connection with the loan. I am sorry that the member for Trinity has left his seat.

And it has not been explained to me yet. The hon. member for Trinity is not here now. Mr. Halfyard knew that I was going to come back, and he never waited to make any explanation about it. Mr. Warren honestly told us that he had no recollection about it, but the hon. member for Trinity has disappeared. I would like to have him here to explain why, if Sir Richard Squires was entitled to get five thousand dollars for services in connection with the raising of a loan, the Finance Minister of the day was also entitled to get five thousand dollars. Did it take two men to get a loan, or was it because there was precedent for it from some preceding Government.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, I have been in this House of Assembly for a number of years, off and on since 1904, and my constituents have often said to me —"well you ought to be a wealthy man." Well, I said I have been there for some time, and I have never got any more than my salary; and my salary at one time was pretty small—three hundred dollars a year. I am glad that I have lived long enough to stand here on these floors of this House of Assembly and be able to say that now I know how these people got rich quick.

As far as I can judge from the letters and the Minutes of Council that Sir John Crosbie brought in here this afternoon, most of the people who have gone away out of this country to raise a loan or to do anything else for the country have been given extra pay. And why should they? If I am Minister of Marine and Fisheries getting my salary for my eight hours work per day, if I am sent up to the United States or to England to look after some fishery matter in connection with the country, why should I get extra pay for it? I cannot be in the United States doing work for Newfoundland and in Newfoundland doing work for Newfoundland at the same time. If I go there, I am still drawing my salary. I agree absolutely that expenses for such trips should be paid, but I do not see why one should have got five thousand dollars.

Someone has said here that Sir Michael Cashin got that five thousand dollars for signing his name; but someone else has said that he did not get it for signing his name; but the real fact is that no one seems to know what he did get it for. That is what I would like to know—what was he paid that five thousand dollars for? If he did get it for signing his name, he would have done a few hours work for it at any rate. But I say that the whole idea is all wrong. We have heard an awful lot on the floors of this House of Assembly during the last eight days about charging the fishermen an extra few cents on to-

bacco and on lines and twines, and there has been a wonderful row about it by the same people—Mr. Halfyard, and Mr. Warren, who sat down and paid Sir Michael Cashin or Sir Richd. Squires or any other, Sir, five thousand dollars for going away and having a trip, and signing their names, as some one said. The unfortunate thing is that no one seems to know what they were paid for. Mr. Halfyard argues that if a man goes out of the country to raise a loan or for anything else, he should be paid extra for it. I say he should not. If you think that his brains are so valuable that they are worth a bigger salary, then for Heaven's sake pay him the extra salary and let the whole country know it.

When we came into power there were scores of people who were getting their salaries out of contingencies, and nobody knew they were getting them, or what they were getting. I do not say now that the people who were drawing these salaries did not deserve them, as far as they were concerned. Probably they gave value for them. I do not say that the positions should not be filled, but what I do say is that the least that should be done would be to put the salaries in the estimates, so that the public can see where the money is going to be spent, and what money is being spent.

As I said before, there has been a great deal of fuss made about this Highroads Bill, and we have been told across the floors of this House that we should never have voted two million dollars for Highroads. Now, Mr. Chairman, I say here to-night that I voted for two million dollars to be spent on highroads, and I state here now that the north side of Bonavista Bay is going to have some of that two million dollars spent there, because there is no other part of the country which needs and deserves it more. It needs roads all the way from Gambo down to Musgrave Hr., where there is hardly a bit of road. The past Governments must certainly have been neglectful of that part of the country as far as roads are concerned.

Now I am proud to say that I had occasion to go round to Placentia Bay last year. I suppose I should have been paid for that. I admit that I was well paid for it, because I had my eyes opened when I went out to Holyrood, and took an automobile, and ran over to St. Mary's and St. Joseph's and right out to the very point where the lighthouse was built, in an automobile. I left that and came back to Colinet, in an automobile, and went down to Placentia Bay, and in to the town of Placentia, all in an automobile. And still down on the North Side of Bonavista Bay, we have had to swim the rivers to get to our homes. Now as long as the Government with which I am associated sees fit to spend two million dollars to encourage tourists to come here, I am going to see that the North Side of Bonavista Bay gets its share to build a road from Gambo to Ladle Cove, because they deserve it.

I do not know so much about Carmanville as I do about Musgrave Hr. But I do say that that section of the country from Newtown down to Carmanville needs a road, and needs it badly—much worse than any other part of the country needs it—bar none. And when I go and see how the rest of this country, and particularly the southern portion can get such roads that automobiles can go all around it, I say that those who have been representing Bonavista district in the past have been neglecting their duty, and they have not looked after the district as they should have if they were making any attempt to carry out their promises, but they have been making fools of their constituents.

MR. SCAMMELL—Last night I made

use of the expression "made fools of," and you saw fit to call me to order, and I would like to draw your attention to the fact that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has made use of the same expression with regard to late representatives of Bonavista District.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—They are not in the House.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Are you one of them? If the hon. member is as much interested in Bonavista District as he makes out, I hope he will go up there at the end of four years.

Mr. Chairman, I stand up here to voice my sentiments, and to say that it is wrong for any Sir or for any Minister or anybody else to get paid extra for services when they go out of this country to raise a loan or to do anything else. I admit it is right that they should be paid their expenses; but if they go to England or to the United States they have a good time. Even when the Minister of Justice and the Prime Minister and the Colonial Secretary went up this year to Ottawa they had a good time. Why they cleaned up all the curlers up there; so that as far as curling is concerned, they had a good time—just as good as they would have had if they were at home.

Why did it not come out in the estimates that Sir Richard Squires or Sir Michael Cashin got five thousand dollars for signing their names, if they even did that, and there seems to be some doubt if they did even that. I am told to-day that they did not get it for signing their names. I would like for Sir John Crosbie to tell me what they did get it for?

MINISTER OF FINANCE—It is a mystery to me.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Therefore, I say it should come out in the estimates where the public can see it.

I stood up here last night to vote in favour of the duty on lines and twines, and for several other things. I want to say that if at the end of four years, I am not able to justify myself in the eyes of my consituents in Bonavista Bay, then I will take my defeat like a man, but I feel sure that at the end of four years I will have the same confidence reposed in me by the people of Bonavista Bay that they reposed in me last year. I know that I have been defeated several times, but I just want to say now, that when it comes to spending that two million dollars on roads, Bonavista Bay is going to get its share.

MR. HICKMAN—In reference to the discussion which has taken place on raising loans, I think that when a member speaks on that subject he should be just and fair to those who may have received this amount. Now, these amounts that were paid to Sir Michael Cashin were paid by the Executive of which the Finance Minister was one.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—I do not remember anything about passing it, but I must say that if Sir Michael Cashin was paid for his expenses, that is another matter, but I do say that there is another minute here for a man called Cave who went to New York and back again, and he only cost $1,250.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—He must live more cheaply.

MR. HICKMAN—My argument is this. I think that the minute covers two amounts of $2,500 each.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—I must say myself that I do not know.

MR. CASHIN—There were two loans, one of four million and another of three.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—I do not think that it was two loans. I think one was the paying off of a loan.

MR. HICKMAN—I was going to say

that it covered the expenses for two trips which Sir Michael Cashin took in reference to the loans. He was not paid each time he took a trip, but before his Government went out of power in 1919 they paid these two amounts to him, which were due. They were two different amounts contracted for expenses on two different occasions.

If the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs will remember he also paid other amounts to other gentlemen which were just as large if not larger, at the same time. They were paid to a certain legal gentleman who was connected with the Government. He put in his bills; and if I remember correctly when the Government paid these amounts to Sir Michael Cashin they also paid a certain large amount to the legal gentleman, to whom the present Government in the near future, if I am not mistaken, will be paying large amounts.

I am sorry that the Prime Minister is not here, because I wanted to make a few remarks in reference to what he said to-night.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Would you explain Mr. Halfyard, how, if the Prime Minister was entitled to $5,000 for raising a loan, his Finance Minister was entitled to $5,000 more?

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, it would take us longer than we can afford to explain the doings of other Governments other than the last one. Mr. Brownrigg went to New York twice in connection with loans and was paid a certain amount, but I give past Prime Ministers and Ministers of Finance the benefit of the doubt, and I do not think they would have taken any money if it were not due them. It may be all right to criticize here, but we are not the arbiters of their consicence. Personally, I got nothing as I did not have to go away, but is it surprising that people wonder if we are not all blackmailers and grafters when we are broadcasting to the world that all politicians here are crooks and blacklegs. Is it any wonder in the face of this that people question us or doubt our sincerity and good faith? I do not agree with the remark that it is a picnic to go away in connection with loans or any other business of the country. Ministers in the past had to go away on financial and other matters, but they had no picnic. The time they spent in other countries was strenuous and filled with work, and the only holiday they had was when they were on the steamers crossing the Atlantic. It is not just to ourselves and to the Government to be giving out the idea that we are always doing something for our own benefit. I do not think there was any real holiday in seven-eighths of the cases where Ministers had to go to Great Britain, Canada or any other country on business, and the only thing that savoured of a picnic was the last visit of the Delegation to Montreal. Their doings were advertised from day to day, and I hope they enjoyed being up till five o'clock in the morning. I do not think we should be tainting ourselves of taking money without doing anything for it.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Chairman, I am no wiser now than I was before, and I still want to know why these Ministers got this $5,000 each.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, continuing my remarks, I have finished in connection with the payment to Sir M. P. Cashin, but I would like the Hon. the Prime Minister to hear what I have to say and perhaps he will be able to give me some explanation. He says it is the intention of the Government to spend this money on the Dock and roads as judiciously as possible, get the best returns for it, and pay the workmen

the highest wages possible. That is a good policy, but I want to tell the Hon. the Prime Minister that, while that is commendable, there are certain transactions in connection with some departments of the Government that call for explanation. Some time ago the Railway Commission, of which he is Chairman, advertised for tenders for coal, and I understand the contract was awarded to two members of the Commission. I have no doubt he will say there is no reason why these should be debarred from tendering, or why their offers should not be accepted if they are the lowest. But I hold a different view. Take coal of which there are many grades. We find that a miner or dealer in England or elsewhere can quote figures for a dozen different qualities at prices which are as many dollars in the difference. I claim that if a man on the Railway Commission gets a contract for coal he is in a position to judge of the standard of that coal, and that should not be.

MR. SULLIVAN—Why not include Members of the House and the Executive as well.

MR. HICKMAN—That suggestion bears out my argument. The members of the Railway Commission pass on the coal as to its standard, and this should not be if the Honourable the Prime Minister wants to carry out his policy without extending favors. There should not be two Members of the Commission which consists of only four or five to decide this matter of the standard of the coal. At the present time tenders are being asked for the supplying of cement to be used in connection with the dock—something like 35,000 barrels. In the advertisement the conditions are such that no man unless he is a Member of the Commission can take the contract. The terms are such that the contract can be thrown over if there is the least fault as to the quality of the cement. There is a lot of provisions about testing the cement and I say that as a business man I could not under the circumstances put in a tender, and the only one who can do so is a man who is to be in the same position as judge of the coal. Perhaps the Honorable the Prime Minister will explain this, and if so I would like to hear him. This matter of preference has been much talked of, and perhaps it is only fair to allow him the opportunity to explain. Now I have a few remarks in reference to what the Minister of Marine said, and I am sorry he is not here to answer me. He said there has been warfare the last ten days about the tariff, and because the duty has been put on lines and twines and tobacco. I say we had reason to talk even for two months, as the duty on lines and twines is 10 p.c. and 5 p.c. sales tax, and at the present cost it means to the man who has to mend his trap about eight cents a pound, and if he used a thousand pounds to make a new trap it means $80.00. If that is not a matter for debate on the floors of this House I do not know what is. It saddles a man who replaces his traps, with a heavy burden, and it is our duty to stay here and to look into the matter.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to make any more speeches on lines and twines. I have talked four or five times on this subject and intend to say nothing else about it, except what I stated before, namely, that the Colonial Cordage Company have announced that they will not increase the price of lines and twines, unless the price of the raw material advances abroad, and consequently there can be no increase in the cost to the fishermen, as nine-tenths of the lines and twines are made by the local

company. As to the matter of the coal contracts to which reference has been made. We had before the Railway Commission the sealed tenders which were addressed to me as the Chairman of that body. They were opened in the presence of the member, including Mr. Cashin, who suggested that he would withdraw if we desired it. Altogether there were forty-two tenders, and when they had been properly listed we found that the lowest was from an English firm who offered the coal at twenty two shillings and six pence a ton, and we decided that if we found this dysart coal was alright, we would give the contract to this tenderer. We sent to Commissioner Gordon in London to get the analysis, and also that of the coal of Evans, Read and Company for whom the Honorable Mr. Sullivan was quoting, and he wired back that the dysart coal contained moisture of 12 p.c. and it appeared to be a poor quality. I think Mr. Cashin will bear me out in this. At the same time a firm in Glasgow heard of our enquiry—I do not know how they got the information—but they cabled out that if we would take a certain quantity of dysart coal, they would reduce the price by one shilling a ton. We decided against the dysart coal and awarded the contract to the firm represented by the Hon. Mr. Sullivan, as his price was lower than the others, and I want to take the responsibility as Chairman of the Commission. Mr. Sullivan was not present when tenders were opened and Mr. Cashin expressed his willingness to retire. Last year we had Cashin's coal and the engineers on the road said it gave every satisfaction; but we had no statistics, as there was none kept by the railway company, to show whether one quality of coal was better than another. Now I claim that they should have been in possession of statistics to tell us almost what an engine could do on each different quality of coal, and we should have had this information before us when we asked for tenders for sixty thousand tons. There was a suggestion that we could not take the risk of buying all English coal, and Cashin and Company's American coal being 75 cents a ton cheaper than the North Sydney coal we decided to split the contract up and give half of it to Evans, Reid and Company, and half of it to Cashin and Company. Now I can see my friend, Mr. Halfyard, saying "I knew you were not on the Railway Commission for nothing"; but if Mr. Cashin or Mr. Sullivan had not been members of that Railway Commission I would have given the order to these two firms. I might say that neither of these gentlemen were anxious about getting the order as it only meant 2½ cents on a ton for them and they knew they would be criticized, but I take the blame for giving the order for the coal and dividing it in the proportions mentioned. Sir John Crosbie and Mr. Bennett left the matter to me to decide because they did not want to do it. It was a very difficult thing to decide owing to the fact that there were so many tenders in, with so many different qualities, and we knew so little about coal here. I have to thank the Leader of the Opposition for bringing up this matter and I can assure the public of this country that we did the very best we could and we did it in the best interests of the country. The price of coal in St. John's to-day is no cheaper than it was this time last year, and yet we bought the same quality and quantity of coal as we did last year for a dollar per ton less, which will mean a saving of sixty thousand dollars by accepting the tenders of Evans, Reid & Co., represented by Mr. Sullivan, and of Cashin & Co.

That I think is somewhat that the country should feel gratified over.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, I want to put myself on record to corroborate everything that the Prime Minister has said with reference to coal contracts. Other firms tendered and we tendered at $5.65. Last year we also tendered on the same quality of coal against Sydney for the supplying of public institutions, and I am still under the impression that Sydney got some inside information at the time and cut down their price in order to compete with the price that we quoted. At the same time Mr. Sullivan quoted for an English firm. When tenders were asked for that coal for the railway there were some forty odd tenders in. Being on the Railway Commission, I thought it wise to keep my mouth shut, because if I ventured an opinion on the qualities of coal, although I have made a study of coal for some years past, people might afterwards throw up to me that the reason I got a share of the contract was that I was a member of the Railway Commission. Now I wish to point out to the Leader of the Opposition that if this coal which Cashin and Company is supplying the railway with this year is not up to the standard, Cashin and Company are perfectly satisfied for Mr. Hickman's firm to take over the contract. We gave our analysis of our coal this year just as we gave it last year. I am not going to comment on English coal because there are so many qualities of it. Personally I believe that the Prime Minister was right. The English coal had been tried and it was merely giving them a chance to get in on the business, and if the English coal suits this year opportunity will be afforded representatives of it to quote again next year. A great drawback in connection with the use of coal on the railway is that there is no one to tell you what an engine can do from here to Clarenville. There is only the Imperial Tobacco Company and a few other firms that can tell you anything what the consumption of coal means. But I think that the Raliway Commission did right in awarding the contract for coal, not because of Mr. Sullivan and myself, but because Sydney, which has been fleecing the people of this country for years past, came down on their price all of a sudden. Their price this year was $6 a ton. Now Sydney people are not as good as they are cracked up to be. Last year in connection with coal contracts I drew attention to the fact that the department of Public Works called for tenders for five thousand tons of N.S. coal for the supplying of the public institutions. The first day American coal was included in the advertisement and the following day American coal was cut out altogether. We had some American coal on hand at that time, but it was North Sydney coal that was asked for. We were in the coal business and I got to work, and I cabled Sydney to give us a price, and they replied and said that they would not give us a price, and that they were only quoting this coal through their own dealers, presumably, of course, because I was in the Government at that time. They practically told us that they did not want our business. They figured out then that we were going to have a shot with the American coal and they brought down their price $1.53 a ton. But did the people of this city get the benefit? Not much. These public institutions were coaled last year at $10.70 a ton while the consumers in St. John's were paying $13.00 a ton for the same North Sydney coal; and I might add that the cartage paid on that coal for the institutions was $2 per ton while the cartage paid on the coal delivered to householders was $1.60 a ton. What is wrong with Sydney? Why not give the people of

St. John's coal at the same price as they gave it to the public institutions? These people have been drawing the life's blood out of the people of this country and should be put out of business so far as this country is concerned. Sydney people had to come down in their price this year when quoting for the railway and still they did not get the business. They had been getting the railway business for many years, making a bonanza, because they had nobody competing against them. Our people have been bled white in connection with the use of North Sydney coal. There is coal selling in St. John's to-day cheaper and just as good, if not better, than Sydney coal. But the main point I want to emphasize again to-night is why did those people cut down their price $1.53 a ton for the supplying of Government institutions and would not cut down a single cent for the householders who have to buy coal here in St. John's? I think it is unfair and unjust; and it is also improper for them to come here and try and form a combine either in coal or in anything else. They came here absolutely to form a combine.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—They have it formed.

MR. CASHIN—They have not got it and they are not going to get it either. They are up against it now and if they want to get the business they will have to work for it, and they have no right to bully people either. I think those Sydney people played a rotten game with Newfoundland from the start. They have been drawing the life's blood out of the miners and the same applies to the people of St. John's who have been paying over $1.50 per ton winter time for coal more than they should have had to pay. It must not be forgotten that there are other mines in the world besides Sydney.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Mr. Chairman, I am glad the Leader of the Opposition gave me an opportunity to deal with the coal question now before the House. If the honourable member for Ferryland and myself had done nothing else during the last two years, we were, at least, instrumental in having the coal used on the railway lowered by two dollars a ton. I regret exceedingly that the Leader of the Opposition took the stand he did. Is it because a man is in public life that he has got to starve? Have we no right to compete in business? I am surprised at the Leader of the Opposition. He states that because we happened to be members of the Railway Commission we had no right to tender for coal. If it was wrong for us, in his opinion, for us to tender for coal, I say it was just as wrong for him when he was Prime Minister of this country for ten or twelve days for his firm to sell to the Government of that day.

MR. HICKMAN—I did not sell any.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Well, your firm did. Go up to the railway and you will find out what your firm sold during the few days you were in power, and if it was wrong for Major Cashin and myself to compete in a legitimate business transaction, it was doubly wrong for you as a Prime Minister of a Government to do as you have.

Now about that coal business. Some of us are prepared for a reasonable profit. A very reasonable commission. Others want to go the whole hog. The second last session of the House I got up here and made a statement that the Besco crowd were robbing the country during three or four years by overcharging on coal to the tune of $150,000 a year, and the events that have come to light here have proved that. This company came down here

last spring and sold coal to the railway six weeks before tenders were called for at $7.20 a ton, and I made up my mind that if they were going to get the contract awarded last spring they would have come down in their price. I put in my tender at $6.50 American mines which was equal to $6.55 that day. Cashin and Co., about the same time put in their tender $6.50 Canadian funds and the Besco people put in their tender. They were selling it six weeks previous at $7.20, but four weeks later they dropped their price, they found a leak somewhere, and they found out that Cashin and Co. were tendering for a different firm in America at $6.50 a ton. The year before they had supplied the railway with coal at $7.40 a ton. Last year, two years later although Cashin and myself were not on the Commission we saved the railway $60,000 on the purchase of coal. This year we were on the Railway Commission. My price was $5.49 for a Scotch firm whom I represent here in Newfoundland. They are a reliable firm. It is a firm that has coaling stations almost all over the world. That firm was prepared to do their best to get a large share of the coal trade of the country and I did not want them to send out here something that was not going to be any good. And I, like Major Cashin, advise that if on arrival of the first cargo if after satisfactory tests have been made and it is found that the coal is not up to the standard that the tender called for, I would tell them to keep the rest of it. I know that there would be some discussion over it. I knew that the people who tendered and had not got the contract would be disappointed. And I took very good care in the presence of the other Commissioners to tell the Chairman that I wouldn't buy any coal without being sure of what I was getting. That I would make investigations before purchasing any, and that I would get reports from reliable and disinterested people about the class of coal. I think that I made myself very clear on that point. I think that the Chairman of the Commission took every step to see that the coal that was secured was secured at the best price and in the best interests of the country. And I am sorry to think that the Leader of the Opposition should get up here and state that Members on Commissions or Members in this House have no right to live.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, earlier in the evening when this discussion opened Sir John Crosbie made certain statements and produced certain minutes of Council regarding certain loans and fees collected by the Finance Minister of that time in connection with those loans. Now Mr. Warren got up to defend his associates in the Government of his time. Now before Sir Richard Squires' time Sir Michael Cashin was Finance Minister and Prime Minister for one year. And I think that it is only right that I should explain the circumstances as regards these two loans that were raised during Sir Michael Cashin's time because I happened to be Colonial Secretary at the time, and I am responsible for the minutes as they appear there. I want to tell the history of these two loans. It will be remembered by many Hon. Members in this House that in the year 1916 the Government of the day under the leadership of Sir Edward Morris found for war purposes that they had to raise loans. We were then in the middle of the war recruiting campaign and naturally we were called upon to pay large sums of money for war purposes. He proceeded to New York and raised what was known as a short term loan. He raised that loan for three years only. Now that loan is not in question. In

1918 we required further monies and Sir Michael Cashin who was the Minister of Finance at the time went to New York, Montreal, Toronto and the various money markets to see what he could raise a loan for. He succeeded in raising a six million dollar loan. And for that he was paid $2500. Now that would be entered as expenditure on account of that particular loan and as Colonial Secretary I have to take responsibility for that minute. In another year he had to go again to New York and raise another loan to pay off the one raised by Sir Edward Morris in 1916. The amount raised by Sir Edward was $5,000,000. The sum raised by Sir Michael Cashin in 1919, three years later, as the previous loan had expired, was $6,000,000. Out of this he paid the $5,000,000 of the war loan. For that work Sir Michael Cashin was paid $2500 also. That accounts for the two amounts paid to Sir Michael Cashin. And I think it fair to Sir Michael Cashin, who is not present here to-night to make this explanation.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, I want to say a few words in reference to the remarks made by the Hon. Member for Placentia, Mr. Sullivan. Mr. Sullivan charges me with selling milk to the railway during my office of Prime Minister. I don't know of ever having sold any milk to the railway under those circumstances. If it was sold it was not through me and I had nothing to do with it. I would like the Hon. Member to tell us the brand of that milk and the price.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—I could not say just now.

MR. HICKMAN—Then you have no right to make such statements, for the purpose of broadcasting to the people of this country that I took advantage of my position and sold milk to the railway which I never did. I never sold anything to the Government during my term of office. I took the office that Mr. Monroe holds at the present time and I formed a buying Department owing to conditions that were going on and I saved $5000 on butter and eggs alone in supplying the Hospital, and Mr. Bennett will bear me out in that. Never during that whole time did the Government buy a single dollar's worth from my firm. And what right has the Hon. Member for Placentia to get on the floor and make such a statement without giving any particulars. You have no right to make such a statement. You have been playing politics all your life time. I have let you down easy. I have a telegram here criticising you when you were in England raising that loan for dealing with such a class of people.

(Reads Cable)

That refers to Mr. Sullivan, the Hon. Member for Placentia. I had not intended to read it. It is not my policy to get up and unduly criticise any man, and that telegram has been in my possession privately until I was made read it to-night when the charge was made that I took advantage of my position as Prime Minister which is absolutely untrue.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word in explanation and then leave it to the people to say whether I did anything wrong or not. A friend of mine over there told me that he was prepared to offer the Newfoundland Government £400,000 at 5 p.c. for 25 years. He had that much money to invest and he would give it to the Newfoundland Government provided that the Government would pay him a brokerage of 1 p.c. I don't see anything disgraceful about that. I don't see anything wrong about a man accepting a bond from the Newfoundland Government at 99 p.c. For that is what it would mean, 99 p.c. Let the

public say if that was a wild cat scheme. I wired Sir John Crosbie, the Minister of Finance, and told him the facts. Captain Gordon did not think that it was advisable to raise a loan from a private individual because it might lower our dignity. I did not make anything out of the loan. I think that if you will read the cables that I sent to Sir John Crosbie that you will see that there is nothing there that I am not able to get up here and defend. If the correspondence is published as it should be the people of the country will approve of the actions that I have taken. I spent a lot of time with financial people, including Scrimoque & Co., Hyjenson & Co., Glyn Mills, Currie & Co., Coates & Co., etc. We were using one against the other and were trying to beat them down so that we might get better terms for the loan. That is what I was doing over there. Now Sir I make the statement here to-night that in connection with the coal contracts if it is wrong for men on the Railway Commission to tender for coal it is equal wrong for any member of the Government or Opposition to sell goods to any Government Department.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—I would like to say a few words, and I am glad that this matter of the coal contracts came up. In connection with this matter I may say that Cashin and Co.'s tender for the American was the lowest one received and the Prime Minister thought that it was in the best interest of the Railway that we should accept this tender for thirty thousand tons of coal and that we should also give Col. Sullivan's Company the other thirty thousand tons. Now I do not see any reason why a man should not sell to the railway. What have we our business open for? Is it to close them up? Now I just wanted to make myself clear on this matter of the coal contracts and the Railway Commission. And I think that the best interests of the country have been served in what has been done. Now the Hon. Member for Ferryland said that the Besco people were bleeding this country. I do not know anything about that, but if you take the ordinary screened coal to-day that is sold around St. John's and this can be bought in the United States for about six dollars a ton c.i.f., you can very easily figure out the profit that the sellers are making on the coal. I think that if the railway is able to get this coal for $5.65 then the buyers of coal can get the ordinary coal for about six dollars and if a person were to get a paper and pencil he could very easily figure the profits on it.

MR. CASHIN—I would like to say that the price that has been named by the Minister of Finance is for the run of mine coal, and I want to tell the Minister now that the coal sellers of St. John's are not making a very large profit as he may have thought. When coal is bought for $6.75 and then sold for twelve dollars, and figuring out the freight and the overhead expenses there is not much profit for the man who is selling the coal. The stores on Water Street are making twenty five or thirty per cent. Now I know that the Besco Company could come down $1.53 for a special order. I merely point this out to the House. I want to thank Mr. Bennett for his explanation in connection with the twenty five hundred dollars that was paid a past Minister of Finance in connection with the loan.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Chairman, as this seems to be a regular "testimony" meeting, and as the question of coal came up in connection with my Department, I would like to say a few words in connection with the tenders that were called for last year. When the tenders for coal were being called for in the advertisements in the public press it ask-

ed for tenders for screened North Sydney coal. After that advertisement was published for a day or two, Major Cashin called my attention to the fact that he was able to supply American Household coal.

MR. CASHIN—The first advertisement asked for North Sydney screened and American coal, and the next day the American coal was left out of the advertisement.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—It was not intended to include American household coal, but the Deputy Minister of Public Works made a mistake and included the words "American Household Coal," but these words were left out in the newspapers after the mistake was discovered. After that Mr. Cashin saw me and stated that he was able to supply American Household coal, and on the following day the advertisement asked for tenders for American coal also.

When the tenders were opened it was found that the price quoted for the North Sydney coal was $10.70. Now that low price for the tender was due partly to the fact that the tenders asked for in the public press included American coal, and that was the chief reason why the Besco people brought their price down by $1.53. As a matter of fact the Department this year saved about sixteen thousand dollars as compared with the previous year on the purchase of coal for the public institutions. And that has been the policy I have adopted in connection with all the purchases that have been made since I took charge of that department. I just want to say that when I went to the country I took the policy as outlined by Prime Minister Monroe seriously, and I resolutely made up my mind that, so far as the Department of Public Works was concerned, and as long as I was in charge of it, I would have the best possible done to have expenditure cut down to the minimum, and I hope to be able to show this House next year a savings since I took charge of the department of from seventy-five to a hundred thousand dollars on the purchases for the institutions and other things.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman, I just want to refer to the fact that this afternoon the Colonial Secretary said that Capt. John Field was being paid seventy-five dollars a month. I would like to ask the Prime Minister, as the Chairman of the Commission, if he is aware that this payment has not as yet been made because since that was said here in this House this afternoon I have been speaking to Captain Field himself and he told me that he has not received a cent since the last of January. I would like to ask the Prime Minister if he can explain how this occurred.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I told the Colonial Secretary this afternoon that I did not know whether the commission had come to any decision on the point. I know that we were discussing the matter, and I know that Major Cashin thought that he should be put back on a ship. We were all anxious that something should be done, and I think we discussed the payment of seventy five dollars a month, but whether it has been paid or not I cannot say.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, in justice to the Prime Minister I would like to say that the matter came up during the second or third last meeting, and I do not know whether it went down in the official minutes or not, but I think that it was decided that we were to pay Capt. John Field seventy five dollars a month. I think that Sir John Crosbie brought the matter up.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—I think that Mr. Russell was told to fix the matter up.

MR. ASHBOURNE—I hope that this matter will be taken up at the next

meeting of the railway commission. There is one other thing that I would like to bring to the attention of the Prime Minister and that is the condition of the telegraph office on Rawlins' Cross. I do not know what they are paying there for rent.

But I think that something might be done to improve the condition under which the operators have to work.

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.

The Chairman from the Committee of the Whole on Supply reported certain Resolutions which were read a first time as follows:

Additional Estimates $236,085.00
Supplementary Supply 505,905.51

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.

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Certain Retiring Allowances" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time presently.

Whereupon the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Certain Retiring Allowances" was read a second time and it was ordered that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole presently.

Whereupon on motion of Hon. the 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. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Chairman, there is nothing I have to say about this Pensions Bill. These have already been passed in the estimates, and as they have already been debated, there is no object in my making any further remarks.

MR. HALFYARD—As far as we are concerned I think we may consider the Bill as 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 without amendment.

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

Whereupon on motion of Hon. the 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 the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs moved the second reading of the Bill entitled "An Act for Granting to His Majesty Certain Duties on Goods, Wares and Merchandise imported into this Colony and its Dependencies."

Whereupon the House divided when there appeared in favor of the motion:

Hon. the Prime Minister.
Hon. the Colonial Secretary.
Hon. the Minister of Justice.
Hon. the Minister of Finance,
Hon. Mr. Sullivan,
Hon. Mr. Long,
Hon. Mr. Cramm,
The Minister of Agriculture,
The Minister Marine & Fisheries,
The Minister of Public Works,
Mr. Moore,
Mr. Lake,
Mr. Sinnott,
Mr. Chambers,

Mr. Power,
Mr. Little,
Mr. Puddester,
Mr. Cahill,
Mr. Brown, (18)

and against it:

Mr. Hickman,
Mr. Halfyard,
Mr. Hibbs,
Mr. Scammell,
Mr. Rendell,
Mr. Duff,
Mr. Godden,
Mr. Ashbourne. (8)

so it passed in the affirmative, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time, and referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act for Granting to His Majesty Certain Duties on Goods, Wares and Merchandise imported into this Colony and its Dependencies."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester 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 said Bill without amendmend.

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a third time presently.

Whereupon on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the Bill entitled "An Act for Granting to His Majesty Certain Duties on Goods, Wares and Merchandise imported into this Colony and its Dependencies" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Confirm the Titles to Certain Lands at Corner Brook."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, as I intimated to the House before, it might take the assurance from me that this Bill will not interfere with private rights of any kind, and I want to explain it now in detail. It is not a public or Government measure, but one which I was asked to introduce, and as you may see from the notices in the papers, the Company interested only want confirmed to them the titles of the land comprising their town site. I have a plan here which shows the outline in detail. The land sold by different people to the company was held under Crown grants which stipulated roads might be run through it, or as far as streams are concerned, the public might have a right to traverse the banks. In other words the Company really wants the titles to the land confirmed in such a way that they will not later be bothered by people claiming they have a right to make a road through it, or to the traversing of streams as is allowed under the Crown grants. To put it shortly, it is like this. When the Grand Falls Company went out there they made their own town site, but the land being a grant from the Legislature was free from the usual restrictions, and in this Bill there is nothing more than to say that a little stream may be diverted, that the Company may lay out the town site as they wish, protect their water supply, and control the area around

their transmission line. It is not as if a huge lake was concerned, as the stream in question here is of no use to the public. Those who have been out there at Corner Brook will remember the diverting of a stream at the end of the town to make a playground, and this is only to lay out the town as they desire. When the Bill was presented the Justice Department went through it very carefully, and checked up with Mr. Noel the lands involved to see that the rights of private parties were not infringed, and we could find no reason why the company should not be given the control asked. This Bill merely embodies the conservative idea of making sure that no claims will be brought up later as to rights to the lands. They want to be untrammelled and not have people saying they have a right to pass through the land or put a road through it. It is not a Bill in which the Government is any more interested than the private members and I see no reason why the titles should not be granted. The plan here shows how the town is to be laid out, and if the members care they can see it. In this Bill the Company acquires nothing beyond what they already have except a small piece of land running back of the river to the source of the water supply. No rights of any person are violated by this Bill.

MR. BROWNE—I would ask the Hon. the Minister of Justice if the rights of the Government under the Trustee are to be affected.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—No, the whole position is they simply do not want to be interfered with in laying out the town.

MR. SCAMMELL—The Hon. Minister has referred to the company having an absolute title.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I said for practical purposes. Say for example, Charles Farnell has a Crown title—that is an absolute title though the Government has the right to run a road through the land. The Company only wants to prevent that. They want the land confirmed to them as they will be extending their works and buildings.

MR. SCAMMELL—I want to ask the Hon. Minister as to the last few lines of the Bill regarding the exception of lands to J. M. Alexander.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—This is one of those bits of draftsmanship which is really overproviding for the thing. Why the Company in this Bill are drawing attention to three particular things, is because these things are usually mentioned in public grants. It has been suggested we might put in the words "exception by the Government" but I cannot see how this would affect the trustee.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I would not like to be a party to not giving this Bill proper attention before it goes to the other Chamber, but the Minister of Justice, no doubt, has given this matter the greatest consideration and that is the reason why I would suggest that we consider the Bill read.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Committee to rise merely for the purpose of putting in the amendment on page 2.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on to-morrow.

Hon. the Prime Minister presented the Report of the Select Committee respecting the Avalon Telephone Bill as follows;

"The Select Committee appointed. in connection with the Bill entitled 'An Act Respecting the Avalon Telephone Company, Limited' beg to report that the Committee have considered the matter to them referred, and recommend the adoption of the Bill hereunto annexed."

(Sgd.) W. S. MONROE,
J. R. BENNETT,
J. C. PUDDESTER,
W. W. HALFYARD.

May 5th, 1925.

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Avalon Telephone Company, Limited.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, there are a few things about this Bill that I want to explain. It has been altered in some respects. To begin with on the fifth last line of the first page we have inserted the words "subject to exceptions and conditions hereafter."

Then take out clause three altogether which gives the Government power to build lines all over this particular district for telephones and make clause four into clause three. Then make clause four read as follows: (Reads)

In other words we have given the company in this clause the right to install telephones in districts that want them. Any other Company or person can put telephones in if they want to. The only clause of any importance at all, and I don't consider that it is one to be disputed, it is clause three that we have now numbered here clause four. This authorises the Company to raise money on their own securities. That of course is a concession that is given to any company that looks for it. It is something that this company would have had if they had looked for it in the original Bill. I find that Mr. Duff has not signed this Committee report because Mr. Duff is opposed to this Company on account of some electrical trouble he has had with the Company. But the electrical interests and the telephone interests are entirely different, and this is simply connected with the telephone and gives no exclusive power whatever. I don't think that any Member on the Opposition benches can possibly have any objection to what is asked for under this Bill.

MR. DUFF—Mr. Chairman, I have been on two Select Committees and I hope that I won't be on another. This Committee did not consider the matter at all. I am not a politician, but I thought that the Committee were appointed to consider the matter. I would like to say right here that there were only one or two members interested in this matter. Myself and Mr. Ashbourne.

Now there was an agreement between the Avalon Telephone Co. and the Executive Government, and I considered this matter, and I have not the faintest idea of what that agreement was. We are rushing too hastily in my opinion. Again I say that this Company has exclusive rights for fifty years and thirty years in this country which no other Government would ever give.

In 1923 when the first exclusive rights were given to that company, Mr. Higgins, the member for St. John's East, stated in the House that the people of this country would regret that the Government should have given the company exclusive rights for that long period. The Lord knows but the people of Conception Bay have regretted it. First the Government gave a 50 years monopoly and they gave a 30 years monopoly to the

Avalon and still they are asking for more. Now this would be an opportunity to right the wrongs of the people of Conception Bay who are suffering at the hands of these people. Now I know that the Prime Minister thinks I am unsympathetic with these same people. Well, I have no reason to sympathise with them. This company is charging 400 p.c. more for lighting our houses in Conception than other companies would perform the same services for. They made big money in the early days, and still when two other electrical companies are ready to come in here and give us light for 4 cents a kilowatt hour these people are charging twelve. Anyway I am satisfied now as long as they do not get exclusive rights.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS— Mr. Chairman, I think that I would not be doing my duty to my constituents if I did not have a word to say in connection with the privileges asked for by the Avalon Telephone Co., in connection with this Bill. I don't intend to oppose this Bill, but I want to take this advantage of the Bill being in the Committee stage to have a word to say in connection with the action of the United Towns Eelectric Company, which is intermixed with the Avalon Telephone Co., who propose to extend their wires to give the people of the outports telephones. The peculiar thing about these two companies is that they generally wait until the closing hours of the Legislature to bring a matter like this to the attention of the House. In the closing hours of last session they brought another matter before this House.

Now they are doing the same thing this year. It is sufficient for me to remind this House of the remarks made in reference to a telephone which the Company was asked to establish at Tilton, referred to by my colleague, the Colonial Secretary. And up to the time Mr. Bennett spoke we have not even received a reply from them. The people of the district of Harbour Grace have been very badly treated. Several years ago they got a valuable franchise in Harbour Grace because of a petition sent the Government of the day by the leading citizens of that district and Carbonear in reference to electric light. We were subsequently induced to drop burning kerosene oil and to wire our houses, offices and stores in order that we may use the electric power they had developed. We no sooner had the lights installed at a certain charge when the rates were increased. I had four lights in my home at a charge of 60 cents a month. After a few years a minimum charge of $1.05 a month was mode. We put these lights in under a definite contract, and now within the past year they are trying to force us to put meters in our homes with a charge of .12 cents per kilowatt hour. If we refuse the company comes along and uses the threat that if we don't put in the meters they will cut out the lights. Well, the company can't do everything they like. If I refuse to pay a bill for electricity consumed in lighting my office or house, then the company has recourse to the court to collect just the same as in any other case where a bill is owed. But anyway that is what they have been doing, and the point that I want to make is this, that the public in my district are not getting a square deal. And I am going to ask the Prime Minister that he and his Government take into consideration the appointment of a Public Utilities Commission the same as the people of Nova Scotia and other provinces of Canada have. And that would protect the rights of the people when we are giving a franchise in connection with the use of streets, etc. If Mr. Murphy's company confined their operations to the area originally

given them I believe that the charge for light could be reduced to four or five cents a kilowatt hour. Now, Mr. Chairman, while I am in favour of having all the improvements in services of this kind that can be given the people of the country, I am also aware, of the fact that this long distance telephone system is in competition with the Postal Telegraphs system which is owned by the people of this country. I think it is a very serious competition. I do not know what the receipts of the Avalon Telephone Company are, but I should imagine that the receipts of the Government service are considerably reduced. What I would like to see is a Public Utilities Commission appointed. Mr. Chairman, I merely wish to bring these matters before the House in connection with the Electric Company, and I say that something must be done for the regulation of the charges made by that company. So far as the bill before us is concerned it is reasonable considering that we are not giving any exclusive privileges. At the present time the charge for light is 12 cents a kilowatt hour; I think that the charge might be reduced to from three to five cents. And so I would again suggest that the Government take into consideration the appointment of a Public Utilities Commission to see that the people of the country are protected as far as the Telephone and Electric Light Companies and other public utilities are concerned.

MR. SCAMMELL—I must thank the Minister of Public Works for the interest that he has taken in this Bill. And I might remark that it is worthy of note that Mr. Murphy brings that measure in here and tries to get it through the House in the closing hours of the session. I asked that the Committee of the Whole on the Shipbuilding Bill be deferred until tomorrow but I did not think that we would have to consider still more important legislation in the matter of this Bill that is now before the House. I thought that when the Committee rose that we were going to be relieved of our duties as far as this evening was concerned. I would much prefer to consider the Shipbuilding Bill to the Bill that we have been going into for the last half hour. I say if I were to go to the district of Harbour Grace in company with Mr. Duff and Mr. Russell that we would sweep the district in opposition to the concessions that are being given to Mr. Murphy. I can remember that during the closing hours of the last session that Mr. Murphy came down here and asked us to assent to some Bill for him or for one of his companies. And I agree with the Minister of Public Works that the giving of more concessions to these companies would be an imposition on the people of Conception Bay. I submit of course to legal opinion that under this Bill that we are giving exclusive rights to this company. Now I think that we have given enough to Mr. Murphy. I am not going to go into the technicalities of this Bill but I think that we have made sufficient monopolies for companies of this kind. And I do not think that it should be expected of us to come down here at the closing hours of this session at five minutes to midnight and devote our energies and attention to the important legislation that this is. I say that it is outrageous. It ought not be asked for. The Prime Minister himself knows that a man is not able to devote his best attention to any business at midnight. It is all very well for the hon. member of St. John's West to say "Question". I frankly do not agree with it. I think it is outrageous to expect it of us.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — I have not any desire to press this Bill through here this evening but we are anxious to get through a certain amount of business so that we may

be able to get the House closed by Thursday. If I thought that the Bill was of much importance I would have it deferred, but I do not think that is the case. The word "exclusive" has been cut out. Mr. Scammell is out of the House while an explanation of the Bill is going on and then he jumps in and holds matters up in arguing on things that have already been explained.

(Reads.)

All that Mr. Murphy is anxious about is to get the power to raise money to carry on the work and that is the reason that he is desirous to have the legislation put through this session. As to being able to devote attention to matters of this kind I cannot see that it makes any difference to honorable members whether it is twelve o'clock in the night or two o'clock in the afternoon that legislation is discussed.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Prime Minister whether this Company has to pay four dollars for every telephone that it operates to the Government. We have a telephone system in Twillingate and we have to pay four dollars for each telephone. I do not know whether this company has certain rights under which it has not to pay this amount annually. If this is the case, then it would be, I think, something that would prevent other companies from coming in here in competition with them. I would like for the Prime Minister to give me some explanation of this.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, on the motion that the Committee rise I would like to ask the Colonial Secretary, or somebody on the Government side, if it is possible to look up the contract that was made between the Government and Mr. Murphy. There was an Act passed in 1919 but nobody seems to have a copy of the contract.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY — Would not that appear in the Acts?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE — No. In 1919 the House of Assembly authorised the Governor in Council to enter into a contract, and the original contract is down in the Colonial Secretary's Office, and we had it in the Justice Department to check up this Bill. It was expressly stated in the Act of 1919 that the contract did not need ratification, but that it would have the same effect as though it had passed the House of Assembly. That was the famous case that we have been quoting so much lately about authorising the Governor in Council to enter into a contract.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, the position was that in 1919 the Legislature conferred upon the Governor in Council the authority to enter into a contract. Well I wish to say now that I disapprove of the principle of the Legislature authorising the Governor in Council to enter into a contract of that nature. It is contrary to the rules of the House, and I think we ought to see to it that it is a practice which will not be encouraged; and I think that my sentiments will find favour with any honourable member who knows anything about laws and rushing laws through this House.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

And it being past midnight.

WEDNESDAY, May 6th, 1925.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and had passed the said Bill with some amendment.

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the said Billl be read a third time presently.

Whereupon on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Avalon Telephone Company, Limited," was read a third time and passed and it was ordered

that the said Billl be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Hon. the Prime Minister presented the Report of the Select Committee respecting the St. John's Street Railway as follows:

"The Select Committee appointed to enquire into the matter of the Bill entitled 'An Act Respecting the St. John's Street Railway' beg to report having considered the matter to them referred, and though full notice has not been given recommend that the attached Resolutions be introduced.

(Sgd.) W. S. Monroe,
John C. Crosbie,
W. J. Browne,
J. H. Scammell,
W. W. Halfyard.

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions respecting the said Resolutions on to-morrow.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until this afternoon at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, May 6th.

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

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Speaker: I beg to present a petition from the inhabitants of Stanhope on a matter which comes under the Department of Marine and Fisheries. The petition is for a public wharf which is badly needed. I give the petition my hearty support and ask that it be referred to the department to which it relates.

Mr. Halfyard gave notice of question.

Mr. Scammell gave notice of question.

Notice of Question.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Minister of Public Work, is it true that Mr. T. J. Murphy made the following tender, viz.: (1) to supply meat as called for by advertisement,—to the Poor Asylum at 16 cents per lb.; to the Sanatorium at 18 cents per lb.; to the Sudbury Hospital at 18 cents per lb.; (2) that the contract was awarded to another party for meat for the Poor Asylum at 19 cents per lb.; for the Sanatorium and Sudbury Hospital at 20 cents per lb. respectively; (3) if the lowest tender as submitted by Mr. T. J. Murphy was not accepted, why not.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS —(A) has been answered; "B" is not available to-day and "C" the same.

Mr. SCAMMELL asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the Table a statement showing in detail as far as possible how the amount of $22,000.00 account S.S. Priestman dredging was expended as voted in Supplementary Supply 1924-25.

Deferred.

MR. WARREN asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay upon the Table of the House a coupy of all correspondence (either by telegram or letter) between the Government or any Department thereof and any other parties on the subject of the exportation of herring to the Anderson Cold Storage Company at St. Pierre, and to ask if it is the intention of the Government to refuse a license for the exportation of herring to St. Pierre even if a bond is given by responsible parties that the herring will be cured and packed and will not be used for bait.

Deferred.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Minister of Agriculture and Mines to lay on the Table of the House a statement giving the number of persons employed by the Bell Island Mining Companies during the years 1923, 1924 and 1925 to date, with classifications re-

quired under the "Regulation of Mines Act," Chap. 131, Consolidated Statutes, also the number and nature of injuries and deaths during the years stated.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE—I beg to table the reply.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they have passed the Bills sent up entitled respectively "An Act to Amend 'The Industrial and Provident Societies Act, 1919,'" "An Act Relating to the Guarantee of Debentures of the Western Marine Railway, Limited," "An Act entitled 'Of the Inspection of ships,'" and "An Act to Repeal Chapter 174 Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Passenger Accommodation on Board Steamers and Sailing Vessels,'" without amendment.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, 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, 1925 and the 30th day of June 1926, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service," was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time presently.

Whereupon on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs the Bill entitled "An Act for Granting to His Majesty certain Sum of Money for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service for the Financial Years ending respectively the 30th day of June 1925 and the 30th day of June 1926 and for other purposes relating to the Public Service" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs 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, 1925 and the 30th day of June, 192, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester 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 said Bill without amendment.

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and it was order that the said Bill be read a third time presently.

Whereupon on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs 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 1925 and the 30th day of June, 1926 and for other purposes relating to the Public Service" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions respecting an Agreement between the Government and the St. John's Street Railway.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman: I would like to explain these Resolutions which are now be-

fore the Committee for consideration. Some little time ago there was a Bill suggested which when brought before the Government for consideration appeared to us to be obnoxious in a great many respects. It gave more powers to the Company than we thought they should have. One clause in it was the jitney clause which prevented anyone from driving a vehicle around any part of the town where the street car lines were operating and there were other portions of the Bill which we took exception to. It was decided eventually to bring the amended proposition before the House in the shape of Resolutions. These simply provide that the rails, rolling stock, cement and other material used solely for the street car service, are to come in duty free. I think it is generally known that the service has never made any money out of the operation of the street car system and this Company that took over the street railway with the Electric Light interests offered to the Government or Municipal Council to hand it over for nothing. They would give all the assets of the street car system and fifty thousand dollars besides if the Council would take it over and run it. They looked upon the street railway as something not likely to pay, and were loath to make any new expenditure on an obsolete system. Under these Resolutions, the Company will put in a proper and up-to-date system and they expect to spend the amount of two hundred and forty thousand dollars on the street car system alone. There was also in the former Bill a proposition to allow the Company to get in duty free machinery in connection with the development of their water power at Petty Harbor, and we felt that, as a Government we were more or less committed to letting it in on a former Minute-of-Council passed by our predecessors in office, although it had never been legalized by this House. We, consequently, decided to let the matter stand over pending our being able to arrange with the Company for a Public Utility Commission to look into the costs of the electric light and see that they cut down their prices and watch that they are making no more money than what is justifiable. It has been stated that big money has been made on the operation of the electric light system here just the same as Mr. Duff, member for Carbonear, quoted that the United Towns Electric Company had been making big money in Conception Bay, and whether rightly or wrongly it is claimed there is a bonanza made in this business and that the Company are unjustly charging for power. The Reid-Nfld. Co. were given authority to bring in machinery for their works at Petty Harbor, such as cement, free of duty, under Minute-of-Council, dated September 12th, 1923, as follows:

COPY OF MINUTE OF COUNCIL DATED SEPTEMBER 12, 1923.

It was ordered that entry free of duty shall be given to the machinery to be imported by the St. John's Light and Power Company, Ltd., for use in connection with the proposed new development of their water power at Petty Harbor.

September 15, 1923.

Sir,—I have the honor to inform you that the Executive Council has had under consideration, letter under date 4th September, with enclosures from Mr. C. O'Neill Conroy, on behalf of St. John's Light and Power Company, Limited, in which request is made for the free entry of certain machinery, to be imported by the Company in connection with the proposed new development of their water power at Petty Harbor.

The Government in Council has given favourable consideration to this application, and has ordered that the said machinery shall be admitted free

of duty. Will you kindly notify Mr. Conroy of this decision.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your obedient servant,

F. M. STIRLING,
Asst. Deputy Colonial Secretary.

The Assistant Deputy Colonial Secretary wrote this letter to Mr. Cave, the then Minister of Finance & Customs under date of September 15, 1923. At the time that letter was written the Reids were the owners of this proposition. They were trying to sell it out to the Royal Securities Company and the President of the Royal Securities Company, Mr. Lillorro was here arranging with the Reids to buy this Company out and it was pointed out to him at the same time they had got the consent of the Government to have the material imported for use at Petty Harbor duty free. We are now going to carry that out if we can get the Company to agree to a Public Utility Commission. It will also be noticed in the Resolutions that the only other clause of any importance is that the Company shall raise its street car rates to seven cents, but they cannot increase their rates until they establish the service satisfactory to the Governor-in-Council. I do not think that the Government will look upon that as giving the Company any great privilege, as in nearly every town now the sum of seven cents is charged for up to date street car service. They have no intention of extending the railway at the present time. When we were in Montreal Mr. Higgins was using every endeavour to get them to extend the service but the reply was that if they extended the service that they must lose money, and then if they lost money it would have to be made up by an increase in the price of electric light and power to the consumer here in the city. In other words the persons using the electric power in the city would be paying for the losses on the extension of the line and they say that there will be a loss if the line is extended, I strongly argue that the people of St. John's are concerned about the reduction of the cost of electric light, very much more than they are in the extension of the street railway. Mr. Killam pointed out the difficulty of making a street car traffic pay in a town built on the side of a hill, and he said that it would be impossible to extend the line at the present time. Now under this bill they have the right to charge a seven cent fare and I think that the people would be prepared to pay the seven cents instead of five if they got the improved service. Mr. Killam assured me that they had no intention of raising the rates until we are obliged to do so and certainly not until they deliver an up to date service. In consideration of these things we are allowing them to bring in their rails and other materials for the improvement of the road bed and we are allowing them to raise the rates because if we did not they would not be prepared to go ahead with the improvements.

Clause three refers to the speed at which the cars can travel and it provides that the safety speed shall be authorized by the Municipal Council. Formerly they could travel at eight miles per hour, but they say that they want to go at ten to make the service efficient.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed the said Resolutions with some amendment 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 Respecting an Agreement between the Government and the St. John's Street Railway" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered

that the said Bill be read a second time presently.

Whereupon on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting an Agreement between th Government and the St. John's Street Railway" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred o a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting an Agreement between the Government and the St. John's Street Railway."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister 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 said Bill with some amendment.

On motion this Report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a third time presently.

Whereupon on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting an Agreement between the Government and the St. John's Street Railway" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 81 Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Education'" was introduced and read first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time presently.

Whereupon on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 81 Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Education'" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 81 Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Education'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I would like to explain just what this Bill is. It is a short Bill. (Reads).

It simply means this, that there are a certain number of places in St. John's and possibly in Conception Bay and there may be some where else where certain denominations have united under the United Schools. And they want the right to function in the way of superintending. This Bill was found to be necessary in that respect and that is all that it amounts to.

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 without amendment.

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a third time presently.

Whereupon on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 81 Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Education'" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries

the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Encouragement of Shipbuilding and Rebuilding."

CAPT. RANDELL—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if this bill is not brought in this year more or less as a provisional matter; and that another session will see something further brought in by way of amendment?

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Yes, all these suggestions you made the other day will be embodied in another bill in another year.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Commitee.

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 without amendment.

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a third time presently.

Whereupon the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Encouragement of Shipbuilding and Rebuilding" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Confirm the Titles to Certain Lands at Corner Brook."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, the Committee rose last night so that I might satisfy myself and the House as to whether there was any occasion to insert certain words in Section 1. It was wondered if it were necessary to make reference to the position of the Government in the matter of guarantees, and on examination I found that we and the British Government were covered by the word "trust" and so our rights are fully protected. There is only one other matter concerned and that is the question of the cemetery to which the honourable member for St. Barbe drew attention, and I think that is covered in a way that is satisfactory to him.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, while we are on this Bill referring to lands and titles generally I would like to ask the Hon. the Minister of Justice if he would explain the position of the Government as to the Dominion Co-Operative Building Co., Ltd. There seems to be a diversity of opinion as to whether the Government is or is not responsible for the advances made to this Association by the Bank. It has been reported that the Government is not liable and without putting a formal question on the Order Paper I woull ask the Minister for the information.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Chairman, the situation as I understand it is that the Governor in Council became responsible for a guarantee of an amount up to $50,000, but there was no pronouncement as to other responsibilities filed. The order for the liquidation of the company has been filed, and it is not likely the proceeds from the sale of the property will amount to enough to pay off the liability. The Government has not yet accepted the liability and the question will likely be put to the Court. Proceedings have been taken to clear the matter up.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — I have a copy of the company's report—a unique document I assure you—and if the Leader of the Opposition

would like to see it I will bring it down here to-morrow.

MR. HICKMAN—I only wanted to know the position of the Government.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —In connection with this Corner Brook Bill, do the members of the Opposition want it read through?

MR. HICKMAN—That is not necessary.

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 without amendment.

On motion this Report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a third time presently.

Whereupon the Bill entitled "An Act to Confirm the Titles to Certain Lands at Corner Brook" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill 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.

Legislative Council's Amendments To The Disabilities Bill.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Speaker, in this matter we made no progress yesterday in the sense of making a formal motion, and perhaps it might be as well at this stage to take the first reading so that it may be discussed on the second reading and we will, therefore, be proceeding in the regular way. There may be some disagreeements on the amendments, and I would like to give room for further discussion on the second reading.

MR. WARREN—I don't know what the attitude of the Upper House may be but I think that it would be a great mistake to put on the Statute Book those amendments that have come down to us from the Upper House. For this reason: we would be the only country in the world in which the candidates for election must declare their loyalty to a certain man in order to be elected as a member of the House of Assembly. They must make a declaration of loyalty and fealty to the leader of their party on Nomination Day. No country requires a man to do that. And if any future historian in dealing with this amendment in the Election Act, or if a stranger comes here who is interested in parliamentary procedure, or our fellow members in the Parliamentary Society when they read this amendment that has gone through this House, what are they going to say to us when they meet us here? "This is a most extraordinary thing for you to do," they will say. "What is the object?" Why do you have to declare your loyalty to a man on Nomination Day and before Polling Day? Do we have to admit that we accepted this amendment that was sent down to us from the Upper House and in which we were told that we were open to bribery and corruption and that we could not be trusted? Now if a stranger comes down here and asks the reason for this peculiar legislation, that is what you are going to tell him: that the members of this House agreed that they could not be trusted. And I want to say here that rather than see that on the Statute Book I would have preferred not to have made that suggestion at all. I would rather that the old law be continued; and I say, sir, that to put this on the Statute Book we brand ourselves as wanting in integrity, as lacking in honesty and as seeking our own personal interests rather than the interests of the country.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Speaker, I entirely subscribe to the remarks made by Mr. Higgins and Mr. Warren. To begin with, there is every reason at this juncture why we should not consider these amendments or enter into any altercation, as these amendments are far-reaching. I

don't see any necessity for them. I don't see any good reason for urging the suggestion that a Minister who has gone to the country as a member of a district should not be called upon to go back to that district for re-election. Under this Redistribution Bill if you want to re-elect six Ministers you have to conduct six contests. That is the argument in favour of Mr. Warren's suggestion. And this is not what we expected when we sent this suggestion to the Upper House. And I am satisfied that we ought not to alter our intention and that we ought to draw the line just where the Minister of Justice defined this afternoon.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Speaker, I wish to place myself on record as being entirely oppposed to the amendment sent down by the Upper House. When a man goes to the country as a candidate of any leader or party he does not swear allegiance to that man or party personally. Rather is it that he subscribes to the policy outlined by the man and on that policy he goes to the polls and stands or falls by it. I think that it will be a very sorry day for us when we have on Nomination Day to sign a declaration that we are supporting and shall support Mr. Monroe or Mr. Hickman. It is questionable whether anybody worth anything would go to the polls and make a declaration to that effect. I think that it is a matter of the policy and not of the man. A candidate goes to the country and supports a certain party because of the policy of that party and not because either Mr. Monroe or Mr. Hickman is leading.

Now I agree with what the honourable member for Fortune said that it was a reflection on the integrity of the members of this House. I think that we have only to go back to 1908. There was a great test in Newfoundland at that time, when a party under the leadership of Sir Robert Bond came back with 18 men and another party under the leadership of Sir Edward Morris came back with 18 also. It was a deadlock. Each party came in and took their seats in the House of Assembly, 18 on that side and 18 on this side. And the thing went on for weeks afterwards and not a man would move to go from one side to the other. If you could believe all the reports that were circulated in the city at that time large inducements were offered to many of the members to leave either side, but a true spirit of loyalty prevailed. I think that the same spirit is alive in the candidates to-day as in 1908; therefore we should throw those amendments back to those who sent them down here and not even contemplate such legislation at all. I say that it is freak legislation and I would be long sorry to see an Act like that on the Statute Book of Newfoundland. Mr. Speaker, I oppose very strongly the passing of the amendment of the Legislative Council to this Bill.

HON THE COLONIAL SECRETARY —Mr. Speaker I have listened with a great deal of interest to the opinions expressed by the Attorney General and the member for Fortune. But the point that struck me as most oblectionable was that we are asked to put a section in this Act that presupposes some wrong doing on the part of the members of this House. Now I know that the view put forward by the hon. members in the Upper Chamber is that they want to safeguard the integrity of the political parties by having any member of this House accepting any ministerial office, go back to his district for re-election. Of course that is right and proper. Now I would like to ask this question. Suppose we accept the position of Minister of any Department, then does the member have to go back to his district. I say no. Even under the amendment he

would not have to go back. But he can leave his own party and go and join another party and there would be no penalty. Therefore there is only one inference to be drawn and that is there is a charge of bribery and corruption laid against the man who accepted an office of emolument. Now sir, I think that with all due deference to the opinions of the hon. members in the Upper Chamber that this House ought to have sufficient faith in the future representatives who may come to this House that a clause of that kind should be unnecessary. I think that we ought to have confidence in ourselves first before we expect the public to have confidence in us. Therefore if the hon. members are going to the country under suspicion, then it is necessary for legislation to be introduced that will make it impossible for them to do any wrong. Then we condemn ourselves out of our own mouths. But we are legislating not for ourselves but for the future. And we would be doing serious injustice to future legislators under these amendments, and I think that it would be an everlasting disgrace to qut them on the Statute Book. In the General Elections of this country there is no party. The spirit of the election act is that a man may go into the election booth but he is not allowed to carry any badge to indicate that he belongs to any party or sect and this amendment would be absolutely contrary to the spirit of the act. I take it that every man in this legislature is honest but this amendment would give one the impression that it would be necessary to legislate to make them keep honest.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the Amendment made by the Legislative Council in and upon the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 4 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Legislative Disabilities and the Vacation of Seats in the House of Assembly" were read a first time and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice were read a second time, and on motion Amendment No. 1 was agreed to, Amendment No. 2 was agreed to with some amendment. Amendments Nos. 3, 4 and 5 respectively were disagreed with, and laid aside, and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council to this effect and requesting the concurrence of that body in amendment to the said amendment.

Mr. Warren gave notice of question.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER--I would like to make response to that question of Mr. Warren's now because I happened to be about to bring the matter up this afternoon. The position as regards the herring fishery on the West Coast is this: recently representation was made to the Government that there was a number of people at Rencontre and the vicinity desirous of selling herring for the purpose of food supplies to the Cold Storage of St. Pierre to be barrelled there and exported to Canada and the United States or to some other markets. The Government considered the proposition and they were much afraid that it might be an infringement of the bait Act that they turned the proposition down and they said that they could not agree to the concession even though a personal guarantee were given that the herring would not be used as bait. A little later on we began to get messages from a gentleman named J. Herbert Anderson in St. Pierre. He said that he had secured controlling interest in the St. Pierre cold storage plant and on the thirtieth of April he telegraphed me as follows:

(Reads).

I telegraphed back. (Reads.)

Then after that I got into communication with Mr. Warren and with Messrs. Lake and Long, who had been

receiving messages from the West Coast, and they have satisfied themselves that the business was purely for food purposes, that it was a bona fide proposition, and that it would be a great mistake for us to prevent the fishermen on that coast from getting what could be made out of the exportation of three thousand barrels of herring at a season when they could not dispose of the herring otherwise ourselves. So I telegraphed that night, Saturday night, on my own initiative, to Mr. Anderson, and said:

(Reads message.)

And then Mr. Anderson telegraphed me on Monday morning, as follows: (Reads). I then called the Executive togther, and they considered the matter, and decided to send a message as follows: (Reads).

And then Mr. Anderson telegraphed back: (Reads).

The Bank of Commerce have advised me that they have been instructed to give the guarantee; and the bond has been made out and submitted to me this afternoon for approval. It reads as follows: (Reads bond).

That, I think Mr. Speaker, will satisfy the House that we have taken every precaution to see that there is no violation of the Bait Act, and that we are doing nothing which may in any way be construed as letting in the thin end of the wedge.

We hope that these people will eventually see their way clear to come and prosecute this industry in Newfoundland; and you will notice as I have noticed, that Mr. Anderson, who is apparently interested in this concern, is proposing to make some arrangements to get some people down here to do that work on the West Coast, instead of at St. Pierre.

It naturally occurred to us, as it might occur to all honourable members that it was difficult to see what was the object of bringing fresh fish to cold storage if they were going to be barreled at once and shipped away. But I understand that they have gathered together at the place a number of Scotch cure packers, and a number of Newfoundland labourers, and a number of barrels, and a general organization for doing this work, and they do not want to disturb it at this particular time.

I think that whatever their reasons are, and whether they mean to continue the industry at St. Pierre or not, I think that we are only giving them a temporary permit for this particular amount, and we are doing it solely in the interests of the fishermen who have those three thousand barrels of herring, which they want to dispose of at the present time.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Mr. Speaker, I would like to present a petition from the inhabitants of Kingwell, Placentia Bay, on the subject of a wharf. Those people are at a great disadvantage by having no wharf at which the steamers may land; and I would like the Government to see its way clear to give this matter some consideration. I therefore beg that this petition be received and referred to the department to which it relates.

I also beg leave to present a petition from the residents of Arnold's Cove, Placentia Bay, on the subject of a well. These people have no place to get water, and as a result of the bad water which they have had to drink lately, there has been a great deal of sickness among the people. I trust that the Government will see its way clear to get a good supply of good water for these people at the earliest opportunity. I therefore ask that this petition be referred to the department to which it relates.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, May 7th, 1925.

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 have passed the Amendments sent up in and upon the amendments sent down in and upon the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 4 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Legislative Disabilities and the Vacation of Seats in the House of Assembly'" with some amendments in which they request the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —I beg to move the second reading of these amendments. The position I regret to say is that we cannot compromise on the matter. Just now we cannot return this amendment.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—In reference to this amendment I think that it is too bad that we have to accept this amendment. This is a matter that refers to this House and I do not think that the Upper House should presume to amend a Bill of this nature. I do not think that we should agree to anything of the kind.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —I quite agree with the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE —Do I understand that by continuing to send back the amendments that it must become law.

MR. HALFYARD—I am in the singular position that I support the amendments. I hope that by the next session that most of the members will agree with me.

MR. WARREN—In closing the debate I regret that my innocent suggestion should be the cause of calling down such insinuations on the members of this House.

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the said Amendments were read a first time.

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the said Amendments were read a second time and agreed to, and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting that body that the said amendments have been concurred in without amendment.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they have passed the Bill sent up entitled respectively:

"An Act for Granting to His Majesty Certain Duties on Goods, Wares and Merchandise imported into this Colony and its Dependencies."

"An Act Respecting Certain Retiring Allowances."

"An Act Respecting the Avalon Telephone Company, Limited."

"An Act for Granting to His Majesty certain sums of Money for defraying certain expenses of the Public Services, for the Financial years ending respectively the 30th. day of June 1925 and the 30th day of June, 1926, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service."

"An Act to Amend Chapter 81 Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Education.'"

"An Act Respecting the St. John's Street Railway."

"An Act to Confirm the Titles to Certain Lands at Corner Brook," and

"An Act Respecting the Encouragement of Shipbuilding and Rebuilding," without amendment.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they have concurred in the request made by them for the return of the Bills sent up entitled respectively "An Act further to Amend 129 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled

'Of Crown Lands, Mines and Minerals'" An Act to Amend Chapter 24 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Payment of Certain Fees and Charges by Stamps," and "An Act to Amend Chapter 34 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Operation of Saw Mills,'" which said Bills are returned herewith.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—I beg to move that these bills be set aside. At least we might give them a decent burial.

MR. CASHIN—I beg to present a petition from the people of St. John's East and west that a minimum wage be paid for the work on the dock. I beg leave to read the petition:

Mr. Speaker, in giving the petition my support I would like to point out that there will be considerable work soon in connection with the Dock and also possibly the carrying out of the highways policy. Some of the men have pointed out to me that at 25 cents an hour and working steadily all the time it would be a job to make both ends meet and even at thirty-five cents an hour they will have nothing left when the work closes down and the Government will probably have to give the dole again next winter. I told them to present the petition to the House and I have great pleasure in supporting it and asking that the Government accede to its request.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker, I wish to support this petition as I think a living wage should be given the men employed on these works. If they are paid a wage on which they can only exist they will be unable to pay the bills which they contracted while they were out of work, and unless they receive enough to enable them to pay their back bills and support themselves and families they will be in the same position when the work ceases as they were last year, and it is the duty of the Government to see that the wages are made right for the men employed on the Dock and other works undertaken by the Government.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the notice of the House the fact that the doorkeepers have been here practically three months and as their remuneration is not large I would suggest that something be given them in addition to their regular amount.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Speaker, I beg to second that motion, and as the doorkeepers are deserving I think they should be given a bonus. I would suggest at least 50 per cent.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay on the table of the House the financial statement of the Dominion Co-operative Building Co., Ltd.

Notice of Question

1. MR. HALFYARD asked the Minister of Public Works, is it true that Mr. T. J. Murphy made the following tender, viz: (1) to supply meat as called for by advertisement,—to the Poor Asylum at 16 cents per lb.; to the Sanatorium at 18 cents per lb.; to the Sudbury Hospital at 18 cents per lb.; (2) that the contract was awarded to another party for meat for the Poor Asylum at 19 cents per lb.; for the Sanatorium and Sudbury Hospital at 20 cents per lb. respectively; (3) if the lowest tender as submitted by Mr. T. J. Murphy was not accepted, why not.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—I beg to table the reply.

2. MR. SCAMMELL asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the table a statement showing in detail as far as possible how the amount of $22,000.00 account S. S. Priestman dredging was expended as voted in Supplementary Supply 1924-25.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—In reply to Mr. Scammell I may say I will have the answer a little later on.

3. MR. WARREN asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay upon the table of the Houses a copy of all correspondence (either by telegram or letter) between the Government or any department thereof and any other parties on the subject of the exportation of herring to the Anderson Cold Storage Company at St. Pierre, and to ask if it is the intention of the Government to refuse a license for the exportation of herring to St. Pierre even if a bond is given by responsible parties that the herring will be cured and packed and will not be used for bait.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Speaker, this question was answered yesterday by the Hon. the Prime Minister with some comment but he failed to answer the last part of it. Now since I have had the honor to represent the District of Fortune, I have always discountenanced any attempts to interfere with the operations of the Bait Act and I am behind the Government in preventing anyone doing so. I am also against the giving of bait to foreign fishermen but I would ask the Government, during recess, to give us an assurance that they will not discontinue the export of herring to St. Pierre. That district, Fortune, has suffered from the enforcement of the Bait Act though it is a benefit to all other parts of the country, and as the Anderson Cold Storage Company have always acted up to the agreement of curing and packing the herring for use as food and not used it as a bait, I deprecate the idea of their attempting to evade the Act now. As long as the herring is not used for bait, the exportation of it to St. Pierre should not be discontinued.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Speaker, as to the matter of those unemployed, I understand that some 4000 have been registered at the Employment Bureau. Out of that total 2140 had got employment and 2098 were still idle when this information was furnished. I suggest that during recess the Bureau should advertise the names of those seeking work as men are looking for work and employers are looking for men and the latter lose a great deal of time in trying to find where they can get work. Many when they know the condition of the men would employ them but at present they do not know where the men are to be found. This Bureau can be made to furnish a way out of the difficulty and by advertising the names and class of work the men engage at, the employers will know how to find the man they want. This applies also as regards Corner Brook and other industrial centres and the money would not be wasted if used in advertising as it would prove of assistance to employers and those seeking employment alike. I do not know if the Bureau is under the control of the Hon. the Prime Minister but if he would look into this matter it would result in relieving many a case of destitution.

MR. SCAMMELL—I would ask the Hon. Colonial Secretary to whom the men to be employed on the Dock will have to apply to.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY —Captain Byrne is keeping the register of the men to be employed there.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Hon. the Prime Minister if anything further has been done about the Flour Mill.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member for St. Barbe, I may say that as far as I am concerned I think in connection with this milling proposition a big game of bluff is being played and that the capitalists to whom Mr. Palmer referred are not behind it at all. It is my personal opinion that it is a game of bluff. We did not undertake to put a duty on flour and Mr. Palmer knew it but now he says that because we did not put that duty on, he cannot go ahead with the mill. As a matter of fact he sent me the correspondence with the alleged capitalists

abroad, showing that he told them—which is not correct—that I would put the duty on to get the business going and they replied that there was no need of his taking further action at present. I do not think they have the capital at all, I told Mr. Palmer I thought that as soon as they decided to come here and erect the mill, we would put on a duty to protect them to the extent of 25 cents per barrel. At any rate the mill could not be built in much less than a year and by that time we will be in session again and if Mr. Palmer has the capitalists behind him and they are ready to come here to begin operations, we ought to hear from him in the meantime.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Hon. Mr. Sullivan what he had to say as to my supplying goods to the Government.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Mr. Speaker, I said in the course of my remarks that if anything I said was wrong I would apologise when we would meet again. The House met yesterday but I did not apologise as I had found my statement to be correct.

MR. HICKMAN—Will you read the statement.

(Hon. Mr. Sullivan reads statement.)

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 has voted the Supply required to enable the Government to defray the expenses of the Public Service. In the name of the House of Assembly I present the following Bills for your Excellency's Assent:

"An Act for 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, 1925, and the 30th day of June, 1926, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service."

"An Act Respecting Certain Retiring Allowances."

"An Act for Granting to His Majesty certain duties on Goods, Wares and Merchandise imported into this Colony and its Dependencies."

"An Act Respecting the Encouragement of Shipbuilding and Rebuilding."

"An Act Respecting a Tax on Certain Incomes."

"An Act to Amend Chapter 74 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Old Age Pensions.'"

"An Act Respecting a Tax on Goods imported into Newfoundland.

"An Act to Amend the Terra Nova Sulphite Company Act, 1920."

"An Act to Amend Chapter 52 of the Consolidated Statutes, (Third Series) entitled 'Of Egress from Churches, Theatres and other Buildings.'"

"An Act to Repeal 174 Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Passenger Accommodation on Board Steamers and Sailing Vessels.'"

"An Act entitled 'Of the Inspection of Ships.'"

"An Act Respecting the Records of Pure Bred Animals."

"An Act Relating to the Guarantee of Debentures of the Western Marine Railway, Limited."

"An Act to Amend the Industrial and Provident Societies Act, 1919."

"An Act Respecting the St. John's Street Railway."

"An Act to Confirm the Titles to certain Lands at Corner Brook."

"An Act to Amend Chapter 81 Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Education.'"

"An Act for the Confirmation of an Agreement between the Government and the Newfoundland Hotel Facilities, Limited."

"An Act to Amend Chapter 83 of the Consolidated Statutes 1916 (Third Series) and Acts in Amendment thereof."

"An Act Respecting the Avalon Telephone Company, Limited."

"An Act to Amend Chapter 4 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Legislative Disabilities and the Vacation of Seats in the House of Assembly."

His Excellency the Governor was then pleased to make the following Speech to both branches of the Legislature:

Mr. President and Honourable Gentlemen of the Legislative Council: Mr. Speaker and Gentlemen of the Honourable House of Assembly:

At the close of a busy and profitable Session, I am pleased to be able to relieve you of your Legislative duties, and more particularly so at a season when your private affairs urgently demand your attention. The summoning of the Legislature at an earlier date than usual has been clearly justified, so much so that it may be both expedient and convenient to convene you in future at an even earlier date.

The measure providing for the Redistribution of Seats in the House of Assembly is of supreme importance, and the unanimity with which it was considered attests to your conviction that it is not only fair in principle and correct in detail; but also is bound to have far reaching consequences.

Equal in importance is the enactment bestowing upon women of twenty five years and upwards the right to vote and be voted for, as representatives in the Assembly. The high standard of intelligence of the women of this Colony is adequate assurance that good will accrue to this endowment of equality.

The provision for the creation of a Highroads Commission, the enactment of the Motor Traffic Act, and the confirmation of the contract for the erection of a Hotel in St. John's are steps in a Tourist policy to capitalize the scenic and kindred attractions of this Colony, for the pleasure of the world at large, and for the profit of our people. If the prosperity of Newfoundland is to be increased it is essential that the means for easy and rapid transportation be provided.

In August last, at the close of the midsummer Session of this Assembly, I expressed the hope that our finances would shortly return to the normal. Progress in that respect has been slower than was hoped for. Debts and obligations inherited by my Government have had to be discharged, and the abnormal conditions of past years have proved exceedingly difficult to adjust. The old Customs Tariff required drastic reformation because the classification was antiquated and unscientific. Additional confusion was caused by taxation having been imposed by various amendments which have proved to be unsuitable to present conditions. A new classification has now been adopted based on the report of a Tariff Commission appointed by a preceding Government. Its operation will be carefully watched, and as the result of experience gained you will be invited to correct any anomalies that may be shown to exist.

Last year, as you will remember, my Government placed flour and gasolene on the free list, and you have now abolished the duties on beef, pork and kerosene oil, and re-

duced the sales tax by half. The Income Tax has also been repealed. Its incidence, although ostensibly paid on profits, was found to be harmful to trade and enterprise, and therefore injurious to fishermen, labourers, and other wage earners who depend on the free exploitation of capital for employment.

The Dry Dock in St. John's was shown on examination to require far more extensive repairs and alterations than had been anticipated, and on expert Canadian advice it has been decided to rebuild and extend it. The work will shortly be begun, but its completion and final equipment will be a matter of many months. Additional public works include the rerailing of the Southern end of the Railway from St. John's to Clarenville, the construction and reconditioning of certain important roads, and in addition the projected erection of the Hotel and a Flour Mill in St. John's.

The outlook for the steady employment of labour is further enhanced by the commencement at an early date of the manufacture of paper at the large Mills on the Humber, and by the increase in output at the Anglo Newfoundland Development Company's works at Grand Falls. It is hoped that the need for able bodied relief will disappear entirely. These various activities should result in the return to Newfoundland of many of her sons who have been impelled through the stringencies of recent years to seek employment far away from their native land.

By the Act for the Encouragement of Shipbuilding and Rebuilding, my Government has recognised the special needs of the fishermen. During the war years the fishing fleet fell into considerable disrepair; later the great cost of material and labour coupled with the poor prices obtained for fish in the seasons previous to last year, discouraged the fishermen to such an extent that many abandoned the industry. The promise that a bounty would be provided stimulated rebuilding last winter, and the measure fulfilling that promise has now become law. More vessels are about to prosecute the main industry of the Colony than have sailed for some time past. The safety of those who travel by sea has become immeasurably increased by your enactment for the annual survey of sealing steamers and all manner of passenger carrying vessels.

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

I thank you for the liberal supplies which you have granted. It has been, and will be the constant effort of my Government to reduce expenditure to the lowest possible point at which the efficiency of the Administration can be maintained.

Mr. President and Honourable Gentlemen of the Legislative Council:

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

I desire both to thank you for your labours, and to congratulate you upon the many important measures to which this Session has given birth. I can but wish you, in return, abundant success and prosperity in your personal affairs.

When we review the events which go to make up the history of Newfoundland for this year, we see before us the signs of reawakening prosperity, and we can but feel strengthened in our faith in the recuperative powers of the Empire's Oldest Colony.

After which the Honourable the President of the Legislative Council, by command of His Excellency the Governor said:

Gentlemen:

It is His Excellency the Governor's Will and Pleasure that this General Assembly be now prorogued until Thursday, the eigtheenth day of of June next, then and here to be holden, and this General Assembly stands prorogued accordingly.

INDEX

INDEX

INDEX

A

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Motion for, 7.
Report of Committee on, 27.

ASHBOURNE, MR.

On Address in Reply, 49, 59.
Firearms Bill, 204.
Highroads Bill, 263.
Women's Franchise Bill, 300.
Highway Traffic Bill, 333, 465.
Encouragement of Shipbuilding, 376, 481, 1033.
Dry Dock Resolutions, 432.
Survey of Foreign Going Vessels Act, 469.
Redistribution Bill, 557.
Supply, 613, 654, 700, 707, 737.
Newfoundland Hotel Facilities, 889, 1177.
Ways and Means, 946, 1097, 1177.
Income Tax Bill, 965.
Industrial and Provident Societies Act, 1151.
Inspection of Ships, 1202.
Avalon Telephone Co. Bill, 1255.

AGRICULTURE AND MINES, MINISTER OF

On Lobster Fishery Bill, 195.
Saw Mills Act, 221.
Crown Lands Act, 224.
Women's Franchise Bill, 321.
Motion to Adjourn, 659.
Supply, 662, 681, 684, 687, 690, 696, 1224.
Records of Pure Bred Animals Bill, 774, 813, 818.
Newfoundland Hotel Facilities, 870.
Ways and Means, 1191.
Of the Inspection of Ships, 123.

ADDITIONAL ESTIMATES, 1219.

B

BILLS INTRODUCED

"An Act to Amend the Loan Act 1924," 28.
"An Act Respecting the Sealfishery," 29.
"An Act Respecting the Lobster Fishery," 29.
"Of Light Dues," 29.
"An Act to Incorporate the Women's Patriotic Association," 29.
"An Act Relating to the Constitution of the Supreme Court," 29.
"An Act Respecting Companies," 29.
"Of Certain Fees and Charges by Stamps," 29.
"Of the Operation of Saw Mills," 29.
"Of Crown Lands, Timber, Mines and Minerals," 29.
"An Act to Amend the Revenue Act 1905," 58.
"An Act Respecting a Tax on Goods Imported into Newfoundland," 58.
"An Act Relating to Firearms," 58.
"Of the House of Assembly," 58.
"An Act to Provide for the Construction, Reconstruction and Maintenance of Highroads," 58.
"An Act to Regulate Travel on Highways, etc.," 58.
"An Act to Amend the Income Tax Act 1924," 233.
"An Act to Amend the War Pensions Act," 233.
"Of the Election of Members to the House of Assembly," 234.
"Of Egress from Churches, Theatres and other Public Buildings," 288.
"Of Banks and Banking," 325.
"An Act to Amend the Terra Nova Sulphite Company Oct. 1922," 325.
"An Act Respecting the Encouragement of Shipbuilding," 376.
"Of the Survey of Foreign Going and Labrador Vessels," 376.
"An Act to Amend Chap. 83 Consolidated Statutes and Acts in Amendment thereof," 376.
"Of Legislative Disabilities, etc," 392.
"An Act Respecting a Tax on Certain Incomes," 392.
"An Act Respecting the St. John's Dry Dock," 459.
"Of Old Age Pensions," 471.

"An Act Respecting the Records of Pure Bred Animals," 509.
"Newfoundland Hotel Facilities Act," 875.
"An Act Respecting the Avalon Telephone Co.," 934.
"Of the Inspection of Ships," 967.
"Of Passenger Accommodation on board Steamers and Vessels," 967.
"An Act for the Encouragement of Shipbuilding and Rebuilding," 1042.
"Western Marine Railway Bill," 1160.
"The Revenue Act," 1201.
"Retiring Allowance Bill," 1249.
"Public Service Bill," 1257.
"Street Railway Bill," 1259.
"Of Education," 1260.

BILLS, SECOND READING

"An Act respecting the Sealfishery," 79.
"An Act respecting the Lobster Fishery," 182.
"An Act to Incorporate the Women's Patriotic Trust Fund," 182.
"An Act relating to the Constitution of the Supreme Court," 183.
"An Act relating to Firearms," 187.
"Of Light Dues," 206.
"Of Companies," 206.
"Of Payment of Certain Fees and Charges by Stamps," 206.
"Of the Operations of Saw Mills," 206.
"Of Crown Lands, Mines and Minerals," 206.
"An Act to Provide for the Construction, etc., of Highroads," 231.
"An Act to Amend the War Pensions Act 1922," 287.
"Of the Election of Members of the House of Assembly," 306.
"An Act to Regulate Travel on Highways and the Speed, Operation and Load of Vehicles thereon," 336.
"Of Egress from Churches, Theatres and other Buildings," 336.
"An Act respecting a Tax on Certain Incomes," 342.
"Of Banks and Banking," 344.

"Terra Nova Sulphite Co. Bill," 344.
"An Act respecting the Encouragement of Shipbuilding," 467.
"Of the Survey of Foreign Going and Labrador Vessels," 469.
"An Act respecting the St. John's Dry Dock," 469.
"An Act to Amend Chapter 83 Consolidated Statutes, etc.," 508.
"An Act to Amend Terra Nova Sulphite Co. Act 1920," 508.
"Of Old Age Pensions," 774.
"An Act respecting the Records of Pure Bred Animals," 775.
"Of Legislative Disabilities and the Vacation of Seats in the House of Assembly," 820.
"An Act respecting a Tax on Goods Imported into Newfoundland," 877.
"An Act respecting a Tax on Certain Incomes," 882.
"An Act for the Confirmation of an Agreement between the Government of Newfoundland and the Newfoundland Hotel Facilities, Ltd.," 893.
"An Act respecting a Tax on Goods Imported into Newfoundland," 904.
"The Industrial and Provident Societies Act 1919," 967.
Avalon Telephone Co. Bill, 1155.
"Of the Inspection of Ships," 1155.
"Of Passenger Accommodation on board Steamers and Vessels," 1155.
Encouragement of Shipbuilding Bill, 1156.
"An Act to Confirm the Titles to Certain Lands at Corner Brook," 1156.
Western Marine Railway Bill, 1160.
Retiring Allowance Bill, 1249.
Revenue Bill, 1250.
Public Service Bill, 1257.
Street Railway Bill, 1260.
Of Education, 1260.

BILLS, THIRD READING

"An Act respecting the Sealfishery," 108.
"An Act to Incorporate the Women's Patriotic Trust Fund and for other purposes," 219.

"An Act relating to the Constitution of the Supreme Court," 219.
"Of Light Dues," 234.
"Of the Operation of Saw Mills," 234.
"Of Crown Lands, Mines and Minerals," 234.
"Of Payment of Certain Fees and Charges by Stamps," 234.
"An Act to Provide for the Construction, Reconstruction and Maintenance of Highroads," 290.
"An Act to Amend the War Pensions Act 1922," 309.
"An Act respecting the Lobster Fishery," 326.
"Of the Election of Members to the House of Assembly," 326.
"An Act relating to Firearms," 347.
"Of Egress from Churches, etc.," 347.
"Of Banks and Banking," 352.
"An Act to Regulate Travel on Highway and the Speed, Operations and load of vehicles thereon," 470.
"An Act for the Encouragement of Shipbuilding," 514.
"An Act relating to the St. John's Dry Dock," 514.
"Of the House of Assembly," 586.
"Of the Survey of Foreign Going and Labrador Vessels," 586.
"An Act to Amend the Terra Nova Sulphite Co. Act 1920," 586.
Judicature Amendment Act Bill, 823.
Old Age Pensions Bill, 823
Record of Pure Bred Animals Bill, 823.
"An Act for the Confirmation of an Agreement between the Government and the Newfoundland Hotel Facilities, Ltd.," 907.
"Of Legislative Disabilities and the Vacation of Seats in the House of Assembly," 972.
"An Act respecting a Tax on Goods Imported into Newfoundland," 972.
"An Act respecting a Tax on Certain Incomes," 973.
"The Industrial and Provident Societies Act 1919" amendment, 1151.
Western Marine Railway Bill, 1160.
"Of the Inspection of Ships," 1208.
"Of Passenger Accommodation on board Steamers and Sailing Vessels," 1208.

Retiring Allowance Bill, 1249.
Revenue Bill, 1250.
Avalon Telephone Co. Bill, 1255.
Public Service Bill, 1257.
Street Railway Bill, 1260.
"Of Education," 1260.
"Of Shipbuilding and Rebuilding," 1261.
Corner Brook Titles Bill, 1262.

BROWNE, MR. W. J.

On Address in Reply, 10.
Women's Franchise Bill, 301.
Dry Dock Resolutions, 444.
Highway Traffic Bill, 463, 464, 466, 467, 579.
Supply, 527.
Redistribution Bill, 555.
Legislative Disabilities Bill, 771.

BROWN, MR.

On Address in Reply, 43.
Lobster Fishery Bill, 201.
Highroads Bill, 266.
Encouragement of Shipbuilding, 375, 479.
Dry Dock Resolutions, 386, 439.
Dry Dock Bill, 493.
Redistribution Bill, 552, 558.
Terra Nova Sulphite Act, 1920, 564, 576.
Old Age Pension Bill, 812.
Ways and Means, 955, 1092.
Industrial and Provident Societies Act, 1919, 1151.

C.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE.

On Loan Act 1924 Amendment, 28.
Resolutions re Revenue Act, 55.
Seal Fishery Bill, 100.
Lobster Fishery Bill, 193.
Firearms Bill, 202.
Women's Patriotic Trust Fund, 206.
Supreme Court Bill, 206.
"Of Light Dues," 219.

"Of Payment of Certain Fees and Charges by Stamps," 219.
Crown Lands Act, 224.
Construction of Highroads Bill, 234, 263.
"An Act relating to Firearms," 327, 338.
"An Act to Amend the War Pensions Act 1922," 290.
"An Act respecting the Lobster Fishery," 309.
"Election of Members to the House of Assembly," 310.
"Egress from Churches, etc.," 340.
"Of Banks and Banking," 347.
"An Act to Regulate Travel, etc.," 352, 462.
"Supply, 388, 394, 514, 586, 613, 662, 693, 717, 761, 1219.
Ways and Means, 776, 823, 835, 907, 934, 973, 1082, 1116, 1138.
"Of the House of Assembly," 471, 536.
"An Act for the Encouragement of Shipbuilding," 476.
"An Act relating to the St. John's Dry Dock," 489.
"Of the Survey of Foreign Going and Labrador Vessels," 562.
Terra Nova Co. Sulphite Act, 563.
Judicature Amendment Act Bill, 808.
Old Age Pensions Bill, 811.
Pure Bred Animals Bill, 813.
Legislative Disabilities Bill, 830, 877, 960.
"An Act respecting a Tax on Certain Incomes," 896, 963.
Hotel Facilities Bill, 903.
"An Act respecting a Tax on Goods imported into Newfoundland," 966.
"The Industrial and Provident Societies Act, 1919," 1150.
Western Marine Railway Bill, 1160.
"Of the Inspection of Ships," 1202.
"Of Passenger Accommodation on board Steamers and Sailing Vessels," 1208.
Retiring Allowance Bill, 1249.
Revenue Bill, 1250.
Corner Brook Titles Bill, 1250, 1261.

Public Service Bill, 1257.
Street Railway Bill, 1260.
"Of Education," 1260.
"Of Shipbuilding and Rebuilding," 1261.

COLONIAL SECRETARY (HON. J. R. BENNETT)

On Highroads Bill, 227, 255, 281, 510, 512.
Unemployment in Hr. Grace, 253.
War Pensions Act Bill, 285, 290.
Women's Franchise Bill, 300.
Highway Traffic Bill, 327, 352, 363, 464, 578, 579.
Banks and Banking, 342.
Dry Dock Resolutions, 440.
Supply 518, 523, 528, 530, 591, 594, 682, 697, 763, 1223, 1245.
Redistribution Bill, 550, 765..
Legislative Disabilities Bill, 769, 832.
Newfoundland Hotel Facilities, 865, 889.
Income Tax Bill, 881, 900, 965.
Ways and Means, 977, 1008, 1166, 1167.
Avalon Telephone Co. Bill, 1153, 1154.
Council's Amendments to Disabilities Bill, 1215, 1263.

CAHILL, MR.

On Address in Reply, 7.

CRAMM, HON. MR.

Redistribution Bill, 537.
Income Tax Bill, 897, 901.

CASHIN, MR.

On Controller's Dept., 387.
Dry Dock Resolutions, 416.
Supply, 621, 764, 1220, 1232, 1236, 1243, 1247.
Old Age Pension Bill, 812.
Ways and Means, 958, 1017, 1018, 1019, 1047, 1061, 1083, 1085, 1101, 1124, 1144, 1162, 1169, 1188.
Council's Amendments to Disabilities Bill, 1218.

D

DIVISIONS.

On Revenue Act Amendment, 57.
Dry Dock Resolutions, 459.
Encouragement of Shipbuilding Bill, 488.
Dry Dock Bill, 506.
Redistribution Bill, 562.
Ways and Means, 1188, 1201.
Revenue Bill, 1249.

DUFF, MR.

On Lobster Fishery Bill, 201.
Firearms Bill, 204.
Highway Traffic Bill, 360.
Encouragement of Shipbuilding, 377.
Question of Privilege, 391.
Dry Dock Resolutions, 454.
Encouragement of Shipbuilding, 479.
Dry Dock Bill, 505.
Supply, 520, 640.
Redistribution Bill, 542.
Supply, 712.
Avalon Telephone Co. Bill, 904, 1152, 1252.
Ways and Means, 918, 997.
Western Marine Railway Bill, 1159.

FINANCE AND CUSTOMS, HON. THE MINISTER

On Amendment to Revenue Act, 55.
Light Dues Bill, 205.
Banks and Banking Bill, 342, 344.
Supply, 394, 407, 515, 658, 729, 736, 740, 749, 761, 762, 766.
Terra Nova Sulphite Co. Act 1920, 575.
Ways and Means, 776, 824, 916, 946, 975, 1125, 1162, 1166, 1194.
The Raising of the Loan, 1079.
Western Marine Railway, Ltd., 1158, 1160.
Council's Amendments to Disabilities Bill, 1218.
Additional Estimates, 1219, 1220, 1221.
Supplementary Supply, 1223, 1226, 1229, 1231, 1232, 1237.

G

GOVERNOR'S REPLY TO ADDRESS OF THANKS, 212.
GOVERNOR ASSENTS TO BILLS, 716.
GODDEN, MR.
On Highroads Bill, 249.
Highway Traffic Bill, 332.
Dry Dock Resolutions, 435.
Redistribution Bill, 542.
Terra Nova Sulphite Co. Act 1920, 577.
Supply, 683.
Legislative Disabilities Bill, 771, 819.
Ways and Means, 835, 984, 1175.
Newfoundland Hotel Facilities, 867, 891.
Income Tax Bill 880, 902.

GRIMES, MR.
On Highroads Bill, 267.
Women's Franchise Bill, 306, 319.
Dry Dock Resolutions, 447.
Encouragement of Shipbuilding, 487.
Dry Dock Bill, 492.
Supply, 528, 642, 701, 737, 738, 758.
Newfoundland Textile Co. Resolutions, 531.
Redistribution Bill, 559.
Terra Nova Sulphite Co. Act 1920, 577.
Newfoundland Hotel Facilities Ltd., 873, 888.
Income Tax Bill, 878.
Ways and Means, 935, 1139.
Avalon Telephone Co. Bill, 1155.

H

HICKMAN, MR.
On Address in Reply, 15,144.
Revenue Act Amendment, 55.
Sealfishery Bill, 101, 102.
Lobster Fishery Bill, 195.
Firearms Bill, 204.
Crown Lands Act, 224, 225, 227.
Highroads Bill, 279.

Lobster Fishery Bill, 310.
Women's Franchise Bill, 311, 314, 320, 389.
Highway Traffic Bill, 334, 354, 360, 363, 467.
Banks and Banking, 343.
Supply, 407, 514, 520, 588, 589, 591, 602, 647, 736, 757, 762, 1228, 1230, 1231, 1239, 1246.
Dry Dock Resolutions, 407, 415, 454.
Survey of Foreign Going Vessels, etc., 469.
Redistribution Bill, 471, 475, 536, 548.
Encouragement of Shipbuilding, 476, 483, 485, 1035, 1040.
Dry Dock Bill, 494, 502, 504.
Motion to Adjourn, 581.
Labrador Boundary Dispute, 608.
Old Age Pensions Bill, 774, 811.
Pure Bred Animals Bill, 815, 816.
Ways and Means, 823, 839, 999, 1008, 1010, 1014, 1046, 1170, 1193.
Newfoundland Hotel Facilities, 858, 882, 884.
A Tax on Certain Incomes Bill, 896, 898, 899.
The Raising of the Loan, 1077.
Western Marine Railway Bill, 1159.
Corner Brook Titles Bill, 1261.

HALFYARD, MR.

On Revenue Act Amendment, 56.
Address in Reply, 84.
Sealfishery Bill, 108.
Lobster Fishery Bill, 181.
Payment of Certain Fees and Charges by Stamps, 219.
Saw Mills Act, 220.
Highroads Bill, 234.
Motion to Adjourn, 261, 345.
Women's Franchise Bill, 303, 316, 389.
Encouragement of Shipbuilding, 374, 484, 1034, 1036.
Question of Privilege, 390.
Dry Dock Resolutions, 420, 428, 458.
Survey of Foreign Going Vessels, etc., 468.
Redistribution Bill, 475, 537, 549.
Dry Dock Bill, 489.

Supply, 519, 525, 526, 641, 655, 713, 714, 722, 741, 757, 761, 766, 767, 1221, 1226, 1227, 1235.
Terra Nova Sulphite Co. Act 1920, 574.
Legislative Disabilities Bill, 767, 818, 962.
Ways and Means, 846, 924, 1012, 1017, 1105, 1147, 1168, 1189.
Newfoundland Hotel Facilities, 868.
Income Tax Bill, 963.
Of the Inspection of Ships, 1202.
Council's Amendments to Disabilities Bill, 1216.

HIBBS, MR.

On Address in Reply, 61.
Saw Mills Act, 221.
Highroads Bill, 270.
Women's Franchise Bill, 305.
Highway Traffic Bill, 363, 365.
Dry Dock Resolutions, 442.
Encouragement of Shipbuilding, 481, 482.
Supply, 519, 528, 1222, 1225.
Redistribution Bill, 543.
Newfoundland Hotel Facilities, 870.
Legislative Disabilities Bill, 961.
Motion to Adjourn, 967.
Ways and Means, 974, 981, 983, 1169, 1200.

I

INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION, 290.

J

JUSTICE, MINISTER OF (HON. W. J. HIGGINS)

On Sealfishery Bill, 107.
Address in Reply, 118, 163.
Patriotic Trust Fund Bill, 182.
Constitution of Supreme Court Bill, 183.
"An Act respecting Companies," 183.
"An Act relating to Firearms," 186, 202.
Crown Lands Act, 225.
Highroads Bill, 254, 512.
Women's Franchise Bill, 295, 312.
Lobster Fishery Bill, 310.

Firearms Bill, 327.
Corner Brook Titles Bill, 1250, 1261.
Egress from Churches, etc. Bill, 336, 340.
Terra Nova Sulphite Co. Bill, 344, 508, 563, 568, 577.
Highway Traffic Bill, 364, 466.
Dry Dock Resolutions, 410.
Dry Dock Bill 498.
Judicature Act Amendment Bill, 507, 808.
Supply, 524, 525, 586, 590, 734, 763, 1223.
Encouragement of Shipbuilding and Rebuilding, 1037.
Redistribution Bill, 546, 547, 560.
Labrador Boundary Dispute, 608.
Legislative Disabilities Bill, 767, 819, 832, 877, 960, 961.
Old Age Pension Bill, 811.
Record of Pure Bred Animals Bill, 816.
Newfoundland Hotel Facilities, 863, 885.
Income Tax Bill, 903.
Ways and Means, 915, 960, 1060, 1138, 1169.
Industrial and Provident Societies Act, 1150.
"Of the Inspection of Ships,' 1205.
Council's Amendments to Disabilities Bill, 1213, 1218.

L

LAKE, MR.
On Women's Franchise Bill, 304.
Supply, 594, 595, 599, 620, 762.
Ways and Means, 1069.
The Inspection of Ships, 1205.

LONG, HON. MR.
On Supply, 695.

LIBRARY COMMITTEE APPOINTED, 533.

M

MARINE AND FISHERIES, MINISTER
On the Sealfishery Bill, 79, 101, 102, 103, 106.
The Lobster Fishery Bill, 79, 179, 193, 197, 201, 310.
Address in Reply, 98, 112.

Women's Franchise Bill, 302.
Encouragement of Shipbuilding, 370, 375, 476, 1034, 482, 1033, 477, 478, 480, 481.
Survey of Foreign Going Vessels, etc., 468.
Supply, 520, 624, 642, 645, 753, 1220, 1237.
Ways and Means, 923, 931, 1178.
Passenger Accommodation on board Steamers and Sailing Vessels Bill, 1158.
"Of the Inspection of Ships," 1202, 1204.

MOORE, MR.

On War Pensions Bill, 286.
Women's Franchise Bill, 301.
Highway Traffic Bill, 364.
Supply, 588.
Old Age Pension Bill, 812.
Ways and Means, 1085.

P

PETITIONS PRESENTED.

By Mr. Scammell, 26, 337.
Minister of Marine and Fisheries, 27, 81, 110, 369, 716, 823.
Colonial Secretary, 820.
Hon. Mr. Bradley, 27, 307, 308.
Minister of Justice, 54, 108, 169, 232, 325, 391, 582, 660, 693, 932.
Prime Minister, 603, 760, 833.
Mr. Halfyard, 81, 213, 308, 346, 349, 366, 603, 760, 806, 1032, 1136.
Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, 349, 470, 821.
Mr. Power, 82, 110, 287, 338, 509.
Mr. Brown, 324, 348, 533, 1075.
Minister of Agriculture and Mines, 108, 170, 191, 212, 231, 366, 821, 822.
Mr. Hickman, 660, 1075, 1136.
Mr. Chambers, 110, 261.
Minister of Finance, 307.
Hon. Mr. Sullivan, 129, 307, 338, 365, 660, 760, 1265.
Mr. Cahill, 216, 232, 350, 604, 717, 1076.
Mr. Cashin, 129, 820, 1267.

Mr. Lake, 215, 875, 1115.
Hon. Mr. Long, 169, 509, 603, 833.
Mr. Ashbourne, 190, 349, 369, 582, 932, 1209, 1256.
Mr. Grimes, 876, 932, 1137.
Mr. Sinnott, 191.
Hon. Mr. Cramm, 191, 212.
Mr. Browne, 213.
Mr. Duff, 806.
Mr. Moore, 214.
Mr. Puddester, 232.
Mr. Godden, 307, 533, 876.
Mr. Linegar, 324.
Mr. Warren, 347, 348, 806.
Mr. Hibbs, 368.
Capt. Randell, 807.
Minister of Public Works, 1209.

PRIME MINISTER, HON. THE.

On Address in Reply, 21, 53, 171.
Sealfishery Bill, 107.
Redistribution Bill, 207, 471, 472, 541, 543, 549, 558.
Highroads Bill, 269.
Women's Franchise Bill, 291, 312, 314, 320, 389.
Motion to Adjourn, 323, 336, 580, 968.
Banks and Banking, 342, 343.
Dry Dock Resolutions, 377, 385, 413, 426, 435, 451, 458.
Newfoundland Textile Co. Resolutions, 391, 531, 532.
Encouragement of Shipbuilding, 482, 484, 1041.
Dry Dock Bill, 493.
Supply, 514, 522, 722, 1235, 1241, 1248.
Terra Nova Sulphite Co. Act 1920, 573.
Old Age Pensions Bill, 773, 811, 813.
Legislative Disabilities Bill, 832.
Newfoundland Hotel Facilities, Ltd., 856, 883, 892.
Income Tax Bill, 879, 897, 899.
Avalon Telephone Co. Bill, 905, 1151, 1154, 1252, 1254.
Ways and Means, 919, 922, 1019, 1072, 1174.
Western Marine Railway Bill, 1159.

Council's Amendments to Disabilities Bill, 1217.
Street Railway Bill, 1257.
Education Bill, 1260.
West Coast Herring Fishery, 1264.

PUDDESTER, MR.

On Women's Franchise Bill, 303.
Council's Amendments to Legislative Disabilities Bill, 1263.

PUBLIC WORKS, MINISTER OF

On Highway Traffic Bill, 364.
Supply, 688, 691, 695, 702, 1221, 1247.
Avalon Telephone Co. Bill, 1253.

POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS, THE HON. MINISTER OF

On Women's Franchise Bill, 322.
Highway Traffic Bill, 362, 365.
Supply, 707, 714, 718.
Pure Bred Animals Bill, 817.
Ways and Means, 975, 982, 1008, 1010, 1014.

R

REPORTS OF COMMISSIONS.

Logging Enquiry, 28.

RULES OF HOUSE SUSPENDED, 1158.

RESOLUTIONS

On Revenue Act Amendment, 7.
Encouragement of Shipbuilding, 370.
The Dry Dock at St. John's, 377, 407.
Newfoundland Textile Co., Ltd., 391, 531.
Newfoundland Hotel Facilities, Ltd., 856.
Respecting a tax on goods imported into Nfld., 877.
Shipbuilding and Rebuilding, 1032.
Western Marine Railway, Ltd., 1158.
Street Railway, 1257.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Address in Reply, 27.
Select Committee on Textile Bill, 370.
Terra Nova Sulphite Act, 460.
Of the House of Assembly Bill, 461.
Newfoundland Hotel Facilities, Ltd., 852.
Avalon Telephone Co. Bill, 904, 1202.
Newfoundland Power and Paper Co. Bill, 1116.
Western Marine Railway, 1137.
Corner Brook Titles Bill, 1209.
St. John's Street Railway, 1256.

RANDELL, CAPTAIN

On Address in Reply, 73.
Sealfishery Bill, 102, 105.
Lobster Fishery Bill, 181.
Highroads Bill, 251, 259.
Dry Dock Resolutions, 417.
Encouragement of Shipbuilding, 477, 478, 1038, 1040.
Newfoundland Hotel Facilities, 867.
Ways and Means, 979.
Legislative Disabilities Bill, 963.

S

SULLIVAN, HON. MR.

On Motion to Adjourn, 187.
Highroads Bill, 255.
War Pensions Bill, 287.
Women's Franchise Bill, 305.
Dry Dock Resolutions, 379, 386, 414, 437.
Dry Dock Bill, 504.
Terra Nova Sulphite Co. Act 1920, 570.
Ways and Means, 1125.
Supply, 1244, 1246.

SELECT COMMITTEES

On Newfoundland Textile Mfg. Bill, 191.
Companies Bill, 206.
Terra Nova Sulphite Co. Bill, 344.
Newfoundland Light & Power Co. Bill, 760.

Newfoundland Power & Paper Co., Ltd. Bill, 760.
Newfoundland Hotel Facilities, Ltd., 833.
Western Marine Railway, 833.
Avalon Telephone Co. Bill, 1155.
Corner Brook Titles Act, 1156.

SUPPLEMENTARY SUPPLY, 1223.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE, OPENING, 3.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE, CLOSING, 1270.

SPEAKER, HON. THE

On Rules of the House, 834.
Question of Privilege, 1044.

SCAMMELL, MR.

On Address in Reply, 30.
Sealfishery Bill, 100, 101, 106, 107.
Lobster Fishery Bill, 177, 199.
Women's Franchise Bill, 313.
Highway Traffic Bill, 355.
Encouragement of Shipbuilding, 373, 480, 486.
Dry Dock Resolutions, 451.
Dry Dock Bill, 491.
Supply, 522, 527, 596, 679, 690, 691, 698, 700, 703, 1220, 1227.
Newfoundland Textile Co. Resolutions, 532.
Redistribution Bill, 553.
Terra Nova Sulphite Co. Act 1920, 572.
Motion to Adjourn, 581.
Newfoundland Hotel Facilities, 867, 884.
Ways and Means, 984, 1117, 1164, 1167, 1168, 1184.
Of the Inspection of Ships, 1203.
Council's Amendments to Disabilities Bill, 1215, 1262.
Avalon Telephone Co. Bill, 1254.

W

WARREN, MR.

On Address in Reply, 17, 112.
Revenue Act Amendment, 56.
Sealfishery Bill, 107.

Lobster Fishery Bill, 193, 194.
Firearms Bill, 203, 204, 339.
Saw Mills Act, 223.
Crown Lands Act, 227.
Women's Franchise Bill, 297.
Highway Traffic Bill, 335, 357, 361, 363, 462.
Question of Privilege, 337, 610, 1043.
Newfoundland Textile Co. Resolutions, 392, 531.
Dry Dock Resolutions, 431.
Redistribution Bill, 473.
Highroads Bill, 511, 513.
Supply, 514, 515, 519, 522, 523, 594, 595, 596, 685, 692, 693, 699, 794, 707, 736, 751, 1233.
Terra Nova Sulphite Act 1920 Bill, 569.
Labrador Boundary Dispute, 608.
Old Age Pensions Bill, 775.
Pure Bred Animals Bill, 817.
Legislative Disabilities Bill, 831.
Newfoundland Hotel Facilities, 860.
Income Tax Bill, 897.
Ways and Means, 907, 917, 922, 1180.
Council's Amendments to Disabilities Bill, 1213, 1262.