PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

HOUSE *of* ASSEMBLY

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

1926

The Evening Telegram, Ltd.
ST. JOHN'S, N.F.

Proceedings of the House of Assembly of Newfoundland

SESSION 1926

Begun and holden at St. John's in the said Island on Wednesday, the third day of March, Anno Domini, Nineteen hundred and Twenty-six, being in the Sixteenth 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, March 3rd, 1926.

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

At three of the clock a message from His Excellency, the Governor, was delivered by the 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 accuracy 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:

Since last we met there has been universal sorrow throughout our Empire at the death of Her late Majesty Queen Alexandra. The Queen Mother, by her exceptional qualities, her kindness of heart, and her untiring efforts for the alleviation of suffering, won the love and affection of all classes of the community both at Home and Overseas. The sincere sympathy of the people of Newfoundland went out to their Majesties the King and Queen, and to all the Members of the Royal Family.

The continued prosperity of the Colony since you were last in Session has been well maintained, and I congratulate you accordingly. Not since the Great War commenced have conditions generally been so satisfactory as they are at present, and have been during the last twelve months.

The Sealing and Codfishery industries in 1925 were more productive than in the previous year. Stimulated by the bounty for repairs a larger number of vessels engaged in codfishing on the Labrador, and the catch

obtained was above the average. Good prices were paid locally for fish, and although foreign market conditions are not now good, exporters will probably realize their stocks without material loss. Improvement in the cure is essential if the Colony is to maintain its position in foreign markets.

The development of the Colony's forest resources during the last twenty years, and the growth of the pulp industry, have changed and improved the conditions of a large section of the working classes. There is reason to hope for a further early expansion of this industry, as well as that of mining, with a proportionately increased demand for labourers.

The construction of the Hotel in St. John's, legislation in connection with which was enacted last year, has proceeded apace, and there is no reason to doubt that the Hotel will be ready for occupation at the opening of the approaching tourist season. During last Summer the Highroads Commission constructed and reconditioned a considerable mileage of important roads. The quality of the work done was excellent and the cost per mile was not excessive when fair allowance is made for the initial cost and local conditions.

The reconstruction, extension and improvement of the St. John's dry dock have proceeded rapidly, and the erection of a capacious fire-proof warehouse in connection therewith has been commenced recently. The utmost satisfaction is felt with the manner in which the work has been done, and with the results that have been obtained.

The re-railing of a portion of the railway between St. John's and Clarenville has materially improved the road-bed, has afforded increased comfort to passengers, and has facilitated traffic. Ordinary depreciation in rolling stock and road-bed has been more than met by increased ballasting and other improvements, and, as a whole, the standard of the railway has been heightened.

In the month of August last certain Members of the Imperial Parliamentary Association came to Newfoundland and were the guests of the Government. This was the first occasion that any such delegation had visited the Colony and the Legislature and the Public were gratified to have the opportunity of meeting them. The exchange of views between the Parliamentarians of this country and those from the United Kingdom were alike helpful and profitable, and it is anticipated that much good will result.

In October last the S. S. "Caribou" took up the conveyance of mails and passengers between Port aux Basques and North Sydney, and has proved to be a most suitable boat for the service. With a large up-to-date Hotel in St. John's, improved and extended roads, a smoother railway road-bed, and a new, commodious and well-equipped steamer to connect with the adjoining Dominion, the Colony is rapidly being made ready for the increased tourist traffic which is confidently hoped for and expected. In this connection it is pleasant to note that three large new passenger steamers will this year be plying to and from St. John's, and that an excellent steamship has been built for the trade between Montreal and Bay of Islands.

The award of the Pecuniary Claims Tribunal at Washington in November last, on claims by the United States of America arising out of the traffic in herring on the West Coast by American vessels, was in Newfoundland's favour. The principle on which the decision was based establishes the Colony's right to control traffic between its people and American vessels resorting to that Coast to procure herring cargoes. The final pleadings in the Labrador Boundary

case will be filed at the end of this month and it is proposed to have a date in October of this year set for the hearing in London by the Judicial Committee of His Majesty's Privy Council.

The geological surveys of the Colony which have been made in the past were carried out before the interior was opened up by the railway. It is not unreasonable to hope, and even to believe, that great mineral resources exist, and an effort ought to be made to discover them for development purposes. A proposal, therefore, will be laid before you for the employment of a competent and experienced geologist, with adequate provision for surveys.

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

The financial year 1924-25 resulted in a substantial surplus of ordinary Revenue over ordinary Expenditure, but the loss on the operations of the railway absorbed that surplus. Railway receipts did not equal those of the previous year owing chiefly to the decrease in the volume of freight, while railway expenditure during the year included the cost of improving the railway road-bed and rolling stock beyond the wear and tear of the year. The Revenue and Expenditure of the Colony for the expired portion of 1925-26 conform closely to the estimate. It is not expected that a substantial surplus will be achieved on the year's operations as demands for increased expenditure continually arise, some of them automatically by reason of long standing legislation, such, for instance, as the Teachers' Augmentation Fund. The estimates for 1926-27 will be placed before you in due course.

Mr. President and Honourable Gentlemen of the Legislative Council:
Mr. Speaker and Gentlemen of the Honourable House of Assembly:

The development of the industries of the Colony within recent years and the increasing number of our people engaged therein, make it desirable to provide the best possible protection to workmen and their dependents in case of accident. The amount of compensation to which workmen, in case of injury, and their dependents, in case of death, are entitled under the existing law is not sufficient. Your consideration of this matter is invited for such action as may seem to you best calculated to safeguard the interests of workmen and industries alike.

Although self-government in purely local affairs seems to be desirable and practicable in certain localities, either by single or associated settlements, the powers and responsibilities of Municipal Government ought to be sought by the electors of progressive areas rather than imposed upon them by authority. A measure was drafted last Session which was general in its terms as to the election and powers of Councils in incorporated areas, with provision for its adoption where suitable on the petition of electors and subject to the approval of the Governor-in-Council. That draft was deferred for more mature consideration and a Bill will be presented to you during the present Session.

The status of Civil Servants is undefined by law both as to their appointment and retirements. Salaries are seldom large enough to permit of saving for old age or infirmity, or for the protection of dependents, and, consequently, some officials have remained in office when their efficiency has ceased, while the death of others has reduced their dependents to want and entailed upon the Colony at times almost irresistible claims for gratuities. A Bill will therefore be introduced regulating superannuation or retiring allowances, and for other purposes.

The legal position of the railway and its operations; the method of collecting its revenue and disbursing its expenditure; the making of its contracts, and its responsibility for accidents are susceptible of improvement, and a tentative measure will be introduced not in order to make any drastic alteration in present conditions and practices, but to legalize the control and operation in the manner followed since the railway was taken over from the contractors.

When the Board of Liquor Control came into power in the early part of last year, the conditions it had to deal with were chaotic. Under its administration, however, smuggling and moonshining have decreased, and there has been a gratifying diminution of offences, many of which were the outcome of breaches of the Prohibition Act. The pecuniary results have exceeded the estimate. Conditions under the existing law have not, however, been free from objection, ascribable, in some degree, to the open practice of bad habits previously pursued with greater secrecy, and partly from the greater circulation of money through increased employment. It is confidently anticipated that there will be a continuous improvement in results. Some amendments in the Liquor Act, to facilitate its enforcement, seem desirable, and, incidentally, the fines for certain offences will be reduced, so as to make them more suitable for conditions here, but no radical change in methods will be proposed. A Bill for these purposes will be placed before you.

The statute permitting the landing and transhipment of spirituous liquors hampers the enforcement of the law in adjoining countries, and thus, possibly, tends to create international friction. Both good conscience and prudence alike suggest its repeal, and a Bill for that purpose will be introduced.

A new contract, subject to your confirmation, has been made between the Government and the Companies operating at Bell Island. Working conditions on the Island call for improvement. The creation of a market for ore within the British Empire is almost essential. The contract has been made, therefore, for a long term, and contains a provision as to export duty designed to give a preference to consumption within the Empire. The contract provides for improved housing conditions and limits the price of coal for household consumption both to workmen and others within the Colony. A safeguard is instituted against any reasonably avoidable closing of the mines at any time. I invite your serious consideration to the terms of this important contract.

Proposals will be laid before you for the better control of the harbour of St. John's by the institution of a Port Authority. The opening of the new Dry Dock, and the increase of shipping which it is anticipated will result, make such a measure necessary.

The agreement entered into by the Government with the Montreal Trust Company in relation to an issue of bonds for the Hotel now under construction in St. John's will be submitted to you for confirmation.

I invoke the Divine Blessings on your labours, and leave you to your deliberations with confidence that they will be inspired by the desire to serve your country well.

RESOLUTION OF SYMPATHY.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker: Since this House of Assembly last met the country has been deprived by death of the services of the Honourable J. D. Ryan. Mr. Ryan represented the very important district of Ferryland in this House from the year 1900 to 1904. For twenty-one years thereafter he was a member of the Legis-

lative Council and during the last five years of that period he presided with dignity and impartiality over the deliberations of that particular body.

Honoured alike by the Head of his Church and by the country of adoption, Mr. Ryan was one of these unassuming, genial souls, who we are proud to call nature's gentlemen and who whereever they go spread an influence for good and the influence towards better citizenship, which was inspired by the life and living amongst us here of Mr. Ryan for sixty years, would be incaluable. Still he never lost his love for his native land by having taken Newfoundland as his adopted country, and although his whole soul and heart was in the interest of the Colony. For twenty-five years Mr. Ryan held the honoured position of President of the Benevolent Irish Society and I do not think that there was a man in the whole country more suitable to occupy that office. Those who knew Mr. Ryan most intimately, I think, will join with me in saying that the word benevolence, as it is defined in the dictionary, describes the peculiar characteristics of the man.

I, therefore, Mr. Speaker, ask to move the following Resolution:

RESOLVED that this House desire to record the expression of its deep regret at the death of Honourable J. D. Ryan, late President of the Legislative Council and some time Member of this House.

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

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker: I take upon myself this afternoon the sad duty of seconding the Resolution of sympathy proposed by the Honourable the Prime Minister to the relatives of the late Hon. J. D. Ryan. A biography of his life has been given you, Sir, by the proposer and I am sure that there is not much that I can add to it. I have known Mr. Ryan for several years and I have known him always to be a good citizen; and I know that he was a devout worshipper of his religious faith and teachings and is a good example for all the members of this honourable House of Assembly. In the death of Mr. Ryan the Legislative Council has lost a good member and St. John's an exemplary citizen.

I understand that twenty-five years ago he occupied a seat in this Chamber, as a colleague of Sir Michael Cashin, representing the district of Ferryland, and prior to that he contested the district of St. John's East. He always took an active interest in the public life of the Colony.

I agree with the Honourable the Prime Minister in submitting the Resolution to the House and which I beg to second.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Speaker: So that this section of the House may be heard from, I desire to associate myself with what has been so eloquently and ably said by the Honourable the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker: I would like to associate myself also with the Motion before the Chair so ably proposed by the Prime Minister, especially in view of the fact that the late Mr. Ryan represented the district, which I have the honour to represent to-day, for four years. Mr. Ryan was known as a philanthropist in this community and he was always ever ready and foremost in the cause of education. He was a devout Roman Catholic and contributed generously to his Church, and I trust that Mr. Ryan has reaped the benefit of his good deeds in the other world.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, seconded by Mr. Hickman, and supported by Mr. Warren and Mr.

Cashin, the following Resolution was passed:

RESOLVED that this House desire to record the expression of its deep regret at the death of Honourable J. D. Ryan, late President of the Legislative Council and some time Member of this House.

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

MOTION FOR ADDRESS IN REPLY.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Speaker: I rise for the purpose of moving that a select committee be appointed to draft an address in reply to the gracious speech with which His Excellency has been pleased to open the present session of the Legislature, and in doing so ask the permission of the House to make a few observations upon certain matters referred to therein.

Before addressing myself thereto I would ask your permission, Sir, to refer back to the resolution of condolence just passed unanimously by the House on the motion of the Hon. Prime Minister. The Hon. J. D. Ryan, was, for many years, an outstanding figure in the public business and church life of Newfoundland. At first he was a member of this branch of the Legislature, graduating, if I may so put it, from this House to the higher and upper body. But whether in this House or the Upper House he always showed himself possessed of that marked dignity and respect which at all times become a public man. So much was this so that he was chosen among his brethren to preside over their deliberations. In business life he was highly successful and at all times the soul of honour. In his religious life he was a tower of strength to his Church and was signally honoured for his loyalty and devotion to the cause which he held most precious. We all deplore deeply the loss we have sustained in his death. Be it ours to emulate as far as in us lies the noble example that his life has left us.

In the death of Queen Alexandra the British Empire suffered a very severe loss. Since 1863 when, as the "Sea King's daughter from over the sea," she was welcomed to England and became the Princess of Wales, up to the time of her lamented death in November 1925, she held an honoured place in the affections of the people of our Great Empire. First from 1863 to 1901 as the Princess of Wales, and wife of our future King, then from 1901 to 1910 as the wife of our Sovereign, and as such our Queen, and 1910 to 1925 as the beloved Queen Mother. The latter title was spontaneously conferred upon her on the death of her illustrious husband, King Edward, because of the sincere love and devotion manifested by her to the people of the whole Empire, which Empire she had devotedly served for fifty years. During the debate on the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne which has occupied some weeks of the Canadian Federal Parliament now sitting, some remarkable tributes were paid to this good woman. Member after member with sincere and tender sorrow, paid his tribute of respect and esteem. May we in the Parliament of Newfoundland, the oldest Jewel in the Crown of Great Britain, be permitted to join with our Canadian brethren in paying a merited tribute of esteem and affection to the Memory of the great and good Queen Mother, and assure our beloved King and the Royal Family of our sincere sympathy in their great bereavement.

THE FISHING INDUSTRY

It is indeed gratifying to note, Sir, that the Sealing Industry and the Codfishery in 1925 were more productive than in the previous year.

To the Hon. Minister of Finance and

Customs I am indebted for some statistics relating to his Department, and among others I notice with pleasure that the Exports of Fishery products increased $2,175,405 during the last fiscal year over the year previous.

The exact figures are:

1923-24 .. .. ..

undertaking, as it should, the reflex influence will be felt throughout the whole country. And all that is required to have this object fully realized is efficient management, with ability to be able to enter into keen competition with Halifax, St. John and Quebec. This is most important —the very life of the new dock depends upon its application. Without doubt, Sir, the new dock is a splendid asset for Newfoundland.

The new steamer Caribou is another enterprise of the Government which deserves special mention as is also the rerailing of the railroad. These two enterprises are closely connected with the Highroads, and the new Hotel, which all taken together form the nucleus of the tourist policy undertaken by the Government. One is the complement of the other. Taken in order they run as follows:—The Caribou, the re-railing and equipping of the railway, the Hotel and the Highroad. This policy, I have little doubt, if pushed vigorously by the Government, the Publicity Bureau, and the several lines of ocean steamships will have its desired effect, viz., the bringing in of wealth by the influx of tourists who will make Newfoundland their home for two or perhaps three months of the summer season. In my humble opinion the pivotal point in this regard is the new Hotel which I am glad to see is being erected with such startling rapidity. Let me say again, as in the case of the Dock, if this Tourist policy prospers and becomes a wealth producing source for the revenue of the Government of Newfoundland, its reflex influence will be felt in every town and hamlet in the island. The people to whom we are looking to visit Newfoundland as tourists, are not the "boozing" Yankees, as I recently heard them termed, who come down here for a "spree," but the best people of the American Continent, both Canadians and Americans who will come here because of our country, because of our scenery, because of our historic associations, and because we can offer them health and happiness in our invigorating climate. Sir, what other countries have done in the tourist line we can do also. A story can be told of Victoria, B.C., and British Columbia as a whole if time permitted, as to the trade developed there in recent years, a story, I must confess when I heard it related, completely changed my viewpoint as regards the possibilities of this Tourist Traffic policy.

MATTERS FINANCIAL

The paragraph to which I wish to next draw attention is that dealing with the financial affairs of the Colony, and I trust I shall be pardoned if I explore them a little more fully than they are dealt with in the Speech from the Throne. It is announced here that a substantial surplus of revenue over expenditure was declared for the last fiscal year. Through the courtesy of the Hon. the Finance Minister I have been able to get some figures relating to the Current Account of the Colony for the year ending June 30th, 1925. The details of this account will be tabled and the House informed in due course. It will be remembered that on the operations of Current Account for the year before the Monroe Government took charge a deficit of $1,620,-000.00 was declared. In the first year of the present Government's office that large deficit was turned into a surplus of about $350,000.00. How did that remarkable change take place? Here are a few facts. Let us first take the revenue figures for the past two years.

COMPARATIVE REVENUE STATEMENT

	1923-24	1924-25	Increase
Customs Revenue	$6,603,000.00	$7,997,000.00	$1,394,000.00
Postal Telegraph	468,000.00	523,400.00	55,400.00
Crown Lands Revenue	98,000.00	159,000.00	61,000.00
Fees from Public Institutions	52,000.00	55,000.00	3,000.00
Death Duties	23,000.00	47,000.00	24,000.00
Cable Tax	56,000.00	96,000.00	40,000.00
			$1,577,400.00

All the above are increases.

The following are the decreases:

	1923-24	1924-25	Decrease
Liquor Revenue	$ 219,000.00	$ 177,000.00	$ 42,000.00
Income Tax	560,000.00	506,000.00	54,000.00
Miscellaneous	164,000.00	76,000.00	88,000.00
			$ 184,000.00
Total Net Increases			$1,400,000.00

To be precise the exact increase of Revenue for 1924-25 over 1923-24 is $1,381,519.37. If we add the deficit of 1923-24 of $1,620,468.36 to the surplus of 1924-25, viz.: $347,003.23 we have a total of $1,967,471.59 which is the exact amount that the Government improved the financial situation of the country during their first year of office. Of this amount we have only accounted for approximately $1,400,000.00 in increased revenue and where shall we find the balance of more than half million dollars? To discover the source of this balance we must turn to the Expenditure Account and there we find a record which is indeed creditable to the administrators of the government. Let me give you some approximate figures.

COMPARATIVE EXPENDITURE STATEMENT

	1923-24	1924-25	Decrease
Legislation	121,000.00	98,000.00	23,000.00
Civil Government	$ 476,000.00	$ 457,000.00	$ 19,000.00
Administration of Justice	537,000.00	458,000.00	79,000.00
Public Charities	1,173,000.00	1,060,000.00	113,000.00
Agriculture and Mines	77,000.00	52,000.00	25,000.00
Roads, Bridges and Ferries	236,000.00	225,000.00	11,000.00
Posts and Telegraphs	1,372,000.00	1,250,000.00	122,000.00
Customs Department	529,000.00	510,000.00	19,000.00
General Contingencies	110,000.00	90,000.00	20,000.00
Shipping	41,000.00		41,000.00
Elections	72,000.00	7,000.00	65,000.00
Audit Act, Sect. 33B	419,000.00	181,000.00	238,000.00
			$ 775,000.00

All the above are decreases:

The following are the increases:

	1923-24	1924-25	Increase
Interest on Public Debt	$3,016,000.00	$3,128,000.00	$ 112,000.00
Marine and Fisheries	295,000.00	317,000.00	22,000.00
Pensions—Civil, Military and Old Age	715,000.00	768,000.00	53,000.00
			$ 187,000.00

The above figures show a saving in Expenditure of approximately $600,000.00, but again to be precise, the expenditure figures for the year under review are:—1923-24, $10,022,137.45; 1924-25, $9,783,188.46, showing a saving of $585,952.22. In other words the Government during their first year of office increased their Revenue $1,400,000 and decreased their expenditure nearly $600,000.00, a truly remarkable feat, the accomplishment of which the Finance Minister, the Government and the Government party should indeed feel proud and for which the country will be deeply grateful.

Strict Business Methods

The question, Sir, will be asked where the increased revenue came from. Immediately I hear the answer "from the New Tariff"; but this is not so, or at least not to any great extent, because it was not until April that the new Tariff was put into force and only about two months of the fiscal year came under its application. One of the greatest and most productive sources, Sir, I take it was the confidence the public placed in the Monroe Government when it assumed power; a confidence which induced increased importations by the business public, and which in turn brought increased Customs Revenue. Increased prosperity was undoubtedly another substantial reason. I also notice among the items which go to make up the increase $75,000.00 in Royalties collected from Besco, an amount which had been outstanding for years, but through lack of courage or impotence on the part of the then Finance Ministers was not collected until the present Minister took charge. Then again I attribute a considerable part of the increase to the strict application to duty displayed by Sir John Crosbie, from the very moment he took office. This attention to duty on his part resulted in the collecting of very many thousands of dollars that were outstanding for lengthy periods, some instances for years. The advent of the present Government to power and the placing of a keen business mind in charge of the financial affairs of the country did not come a moment too soon. This country could not stand many more deficits such as those experienced in recent years, therefore it is with great pleasure we hail the year 1924-25 when the country's credit was again established on a firm foundation; and it will be the aim and object of the Government, I have no doubt, to so regulate the Income and Expenditure during their term of office that it will redound to the country's credit at home and abroad.

The Tariff Commission

Much criticism, Sir, has been aimed at the New Tariff enacted at the last session of this Legislature. This criticism was indulged in largely by the very men who appointed the Tariff Commission, whose production it was, and worst of all by some who were members of the Commission themselves and who by their signatures to the report should have taken full responsibility for their recom-

mendations. Instead they censured the Government for giving effect to their own recommendations. This Tariff may be high and bear heavy in some respects, but it must not be forgotten that this Government put certain commodities, used very largely by the masses, on the free list, such as Flour, Pork, Beef, Kero-Oil, Gasolene. And to what extent have the public benefited by these goods being placed on the free list?

Loss to Revenue on Flour	$11,321.00
Pork	38,852.00
Beef	40,717.00
Kero-Oil	59,509.00
Gasolene	54,485.00
Sales Tax on above	25,000.00
	$329,884.00

So you see the Revenue would be $330,000 better off and the masses the same amount the poorer if the Government had not placed these on the free list. This to a large extent counteracts the increases in the New Tariff.

The Country's Trade

Again I have to thank the Finance Minister for some very important statistics relating to the Colony's Trade during the past fiscal year. These statistics compared with those of the previous year give very interesting, and very important information. In 1923-24 the total Trade was $48,748,-753, but last year it mounted to $59,-994,860, an increase of $11,246,107.

The imports for last year amounted to $36,404,674, and for the year previous $27,677,1882, an increase of $8,-727,492. The Exports for last year amounted to $23,590,186 and for the year previous $21,071,571, an increase of $2,518,615. It is very gratifying to have this increase in Trade especially the increase of about two and one half million dollars in the Exports. It will be noticed that there is an excess of Imports over Exports for last year of approximately $13,000,000. A true barometer of a country's prosperity is considered to be the balance of trade either in its favour or against it. This large balance against us would be disquieting were it a normal year and it occurred in normal times. But it is accounted for by the large imports of machinery, equipment, etc., for the Mills at Corner Brook, and Grand Falls, the Dock and the New Hotel. Of our total imports last year of 36 million dollars nearly 16 million dollars worth of goods came in the country duty free. The year previous the free list amounted to 7½ millions. I would judge that in an ordinary average year the duty on free articles would amount to from five to seven million dollars. Last year was an abnormal one, inasmuch as heavy imports were made for the mills and other enterprises just mentioned and practically all came in duty free. But, Sir, I submit that the large free importations in an ordinary year give cause for some very serious consideration on the part of the financial authorities of our country. Can we afford to have such a free list, and I do not now refer to the free articles such as flour, etc. Are there not things and commodities on that free list that should not be there? Is there not here a source of revenue for the country that has not yet been tapped? I commend the careful consideration of this free list to our Finance Minister and through him to the Government. For a number of years past the balance of trade has been continually against the country. May we not express the hope that ere long we shall be back to the days when more money was brought in the country for exports than was sent out of the country to purchase the imports.

THE RAILWAY

It is a matter of great regret that the surplus has to go to liquidate a deficit incurred by the operations of the railway. There is great appre-

hension existing in the minds of most people as to whether or not this is a burden this country will have to bear indefinitely. We cannot do without this great utility. It is not the fault of the present Government that the railway has been turned from a private ownership to ownership by the public. Rather it is an inheritance which the Government assumed when they took office. It was the first thing they found on their doorstep. If blame there be for this additional burden it must be borne by a previous Government who purchased the railway for two million dollars rather than force the Contractors to live up to their obligations. On the other hand it is gratifying to learn that the road is in such good repair. The Maintenance of Way account is never treated as a liability but as a very valuable asset. If it is ever our lot to have the railway revert to private ownership, our greatest asset in that regard will be the amount of the maintenance account for the ten years previous to the reversion. The larger the account the greater the asset. It is a matter of great interest to me to learn that the railway last season had three steam shovels working, that 123,000 cubic yards of ballast were laid as against 43,000 in 1924, and that new ties to the number of 500,000 were put in as against 250,000 the previous year, and I trust that this good work will be continued next season and every season, and that the road will be kept in a state of thorough repair. One great trouble with the railway during the years 1920, 1921 and 1922, when such heavy losses were incurred was due to the fact that from 1909 to 1915 when the branches were under construction little or no attention was given to maintenance, and from 1915 to 1918, during the war period, a constant effort was being made to sell out and very little repair work was being undertaken while these negotiations were proceeding. Consequently in 1920 we had on our hands a dilapidated railway practically unfit and unsafe to travel over. Too much praise cannot be given the present Management of the Railway for the efficiency displayed in handling matters. Under inefficient management during the past two years the losses would have been much heavier. I have great faith in the capabilities of Mr. H. J. Russell, who came from the school house to the railroad office and I well remember the day he joined the staff. From the first he showed great interest in his work, and under the able tuition and guidance of Mr. F. Rioux he soon developed into a first class railroad operator. Ably seconding Mr. Russell is Mr. W. F. Joyce, who has even much longer experience than the Manager. His is a practical railroader's experience,—an engineer of no mean ability who knows every inch of the railway from St. John's to Port aux Basques together with the several branches. With Mr. Russell looking after the operation of the road and Mr. Joyce the maintenance of way, and attention to rolling stock, etc., this country can place every confidence in its Railway Management. Sir, I say that the Railway Commission can scrape Canada and the United States and bring down high salaried men to run the road, as was done before, if they so desire, but they will find in a very short period that men who have grown up with the road, such as Russell and Joyce will be the prime factors in running the road though the credit for doing it may be taken by the importations. All credit to Russell and Joyce and their officials for the splendid manner in which they have kept the road open during the past two months under such trying circumstances.

Civil Service Pensions

The pensioning of Civil Servants

has long been a source of worry to successive Governments. It has at different times been recorded that too soon after appointment has a pension been granted. It is a commendable action for the Government to have the courage to take up this matter and handle it. I have no doubt but the bill when introduced will commend itself to the House and the Country.

LIQUOR TRANSHIPMENT.

The bill permitting the landing and transhipping of liquor at St. John's for the purpose of export to our sister nation, the United States of America, has since its introduction in 1923 been regarded with much disfavour by many of our people. It looked too much like trying to break the laws of a sister state for sordid gain. I am sure the announcement of the repeal of this obnoxious measure will be greeted with much satisfaction.

THE BESCO CONTRACT

Another paragraph announces that after prolonged negotiations between the Government and its party and the B. E. S. Co. a contract relating to the operations of the mines at Bell Island has been consummated. During the past five years the operations have been somewhat of a nightmare to those interested, both Government and miners. One could not tell when a "shut down" was going to occur. It has been openly stated that when the old contract of 1921 was made, one of the parties at least, had no intention of abiding by its terms. Now a contract has been made, a hard and fast one, with penalties for its non-performance, and it is the intention of this Government during their term of office absolutely to insist that the Company live up to its agreements. The negotiations resulting in this contract were, as I said before, prolonged and every means that could be thought out for the benefit of the country in this regard were explored. No person in Newfoundland wishes to see the mines closed down. It may be thought that another Company could be induced to take the mines over and operate them, but this is easier said than done. We have experiences, not too rosy, staring us in the face at every turn we take in looking to mining development. No body of people legislating for the country's benefit was ever more sincere or more determined in trying to get the best contract possible for Bell Island than was the Monroe Government in the negotiations with Besco just concluded.

A BRIGHTER DAY

In reviewing the record of the Government for the past 18 months one finds that many new assets have been added to the country's capital account; a tight rein has been kept on the country's expenditure; a diligent application to duty has characterized the head of every department thereby engendering efficiency throughout the system, and if they will persevere throughout their term as they have done during the past when they had to undertake the difficult task of rescuing the Colony from almost a "Slough of Despond" then they will be thanked by a grateful country. As the Prime Minister, in whom this House, and also this country, has every confidence, stated during the first session of this Parliament, the Government will not be judged on one year's record or two years' or even three years', but on the record of their whole term. On that record they will stand or fail. What of the future of Newfoundland? Sir, I am no pessimist as far as the future of the country is concerned. I believe that given sane and judicious Government, there is a bright future ahead of her. We must steer clear of the pitfalls into which we came near stumbling during recent years. We must profit by the mistakes of

those years. We are passing through post-war years. We have yet to be very careful. May I commend to the House the words of that famous English Statesman, John Bright, who in 1851, speaking when England was coming out of a period of depression gave utterance to these memorable words:—"I am not afraid of the future. We have not as the chosen people of old had, the pillar of cloud by day and the pillar of fire by night to lead us through the wilderness of human passion and human error, but He who vouchsafed the cloud and the fire has not left us forsaken. We have a guide not less sure, a light not less clear; we have before us the great principles of Justice and Mercy which Christianity has brought us and the advantage of philosophy and experience. Let us trust their principles. Let us believe that they exist forever unchangeable in the Providence of God, and if we build our national policy upon them we may rest assured that we shall do all that lies in our power to promote that which is good and which patriotic men in all ages have panted for—the lasting happiness and prosperity of this great Nation." These words apply to Newfoundland to-day as much as they did to England in 1851. May we as Members of this House take heed to them.

To the Government, Sir, whose duty it is to guide the destinies of Newfoundland for the time being, I commend the words that Shakespeare put into the mouth of one of his characters, Wolsey, "Let all the ends you aim at be your Country's, your God's and Truth's."

Mr. Speaker I beg to move the resolution.

MR. BROWNE—Mr. Speaker: It is my great pleasure to rise here to-day and second the resolution which has just been proposed by the Honourable member who has just sat down. I feel sure, Sir, that it would scarcely be incorrect to say that he has covered everything that is in the speech from the Throne and that he has a wonderful command of statistics and of the country's trade, and he must have left with you a decided impression of the country's prosperity. It is almost to be regretted that his position as Chairman of Ways and Means prohibits him from devoting his great ability as a speaker to the various matters which come before the House.

As I had a similar honour of seconding the Motion for the appointment of a committee to draft a reply to the speech from the Throne last year, I wish to state that it is through the illness of the Honourable Member for St. George's that I do it this year, and I am sure that all regret that he is ill and trust that his illness is not serious. I wish to extend a welcome to the Honourable and gallant member for Placentia and St. Mary's, and trust that his sojourn in the Old Country has succeeded in restoring his health and that he returns to his duties with vigour and ardour.

From the speech of my hon. friend who has just proposed the motion, and in which can be seen his confidence in his country, it will be noticed that the wheels of industry are now moving as rapidly and as regularly as before the war. Speaking for my own constituency,—and I may add the country as a whole,—I believe that this is true. St. John's West has had a period of prosperity during the past twelve months which it has not had for a long time, and although at the moment perhaps one may be inclined to be a little pessimistic, I trust the depression is only momentary, and that the impetus given the country last year will carry us forward with renewed confidence and will result in continued prosperity.

During the latter part of the sum-

mer we had the pleasure of being visited by the members of the British Parliamentary delegation consisting of twelve members of the British House of Commons, under the chairmanship of Captain King. I am sure that they must have been somewhat disappointed on coming here, when they had heard so much about this country as a fishing country, to find that only one of their party succeeded in hooking a salmon and that he, even with the help of all the other members of the delegation and two guides was not able to land it. I am sure that the knowledge which they gained of this country and its affairs and the exchange of ideas which was available to them, will be of assistance to them in the discussion of imperial affairs in the British House of Commons, and will also be of no little value to us. I regard the British statesmen in a certain sense as being as representative of the people of this country as the members of this House. In all dealings with foreign powers and matters of foreign policy it is the British statesmen who speak the mind of the empire and therefore I regard the members of the British House of Commons as representative of the different parts of the British Empire and that what they do affects the whole Empire.

We hear too in this speech of how the pulp and paper industry on the Humber River was started last August when the button was pushed and the wheels of the enterprise began to move. The development of these last resources has been most useful to this country. We have already reached the position when the pulp and paper industry is scarcely less important to the country than the fishery and it has reached such a stage that it will be necessary for the Government of the Country to take some steps for the conservation of the timber of the country. I think that for example there should be some measures taken to prevent the exportation from the Colony of pulp wood and pitprops which could be manufactured in the Colony These products would then be much more valuable than they are when exported in the unmanufactured state.

I am glad to see that the Government is considering the introduction of an experienced geologist who will be of great assistance to the development of the mines and minerals resources that are lying dormant in this country. It will be a great encouragement to the prospectors and the investors who have had unfailing faith in the country's future.

Side by side with the industrial development of the country I must refer to the policy of the Government in connection with the tourist traffic. It must have been a surprise to some of the members from the outports to come to town and see how far the workmen have advanced with the construction of the new Hotel. It is a fine building and will be the first to greet the tourist's eye as he enters the Narrows. I am sure that this addition to the City's accommodation, combined with the fact that the street car system in St. John's has been put in excellent order during the past summer, will help to enhance the reputation of the country as a tourist resort.

Gratification will be felt at the immense improvement to the roads of the country which has been made. Now I am sure that honourable gentlemen of this House will give a great deal of attention to the matter of the high cost or the low cost of highroads during the coming session, but all things considered I think that the progress of the past year has been most satisfactory, although at the initial stages of the undertaking the cost of construction was rather great. I believe that every one will agree

that perhaps through inexperience at the outset of this great venture things were done that might have been done a little cheaper, but what has been done has been done well, and it is now a pleasure to ride on our country roads. One can now go to Placentia, to Whitbourne, to Hodgewater and Brigus over the most magnificent roads that we ever had. I am told that there is one stretch of road between Hodgewater and Brigus of twenty one miles, and the only thing wrong with it is that it is too good, but I trust that the time is coming when nothing will be too good for us.

The daily Press have already informed honourable members of the successful issue of the arbitration in connection with the N. W. Atlantic Fisheries dispute. But I would like to refer to the fact that the Labrador Boundary is at last to be definitely decided upon, and that the goose that has laid the golden egg for so many generations for the legal profession is about to be killed. Some of us may get some of the feathers.

A subject which has given me a great deal of thought, and which I am glad to see is being given consideration by the government is the question of workmen's compensation for injuries. This matter is a question of social legislation. The act that we have on the Statute Book to-day was passed in 1908 and we are not so far behind other countries in this respect. However, the amounts given in compensation are utterly inadequate. This country has made a great deal of progress during that time, and what surprises me is that we have had governments that claimed to represent the mass of the people more than any other government has done, and no change has been made to any extent in this matter of compensation. I feel sure that the Government can count on the support of all the members of this House to produce an act which will be original and serviceable, and which will be a lasting benefit to all those engaged in the industries of this country. Last year in the debate on the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne I made a reference to the establishment of municipalities. But, sir, everyone, will admit that last session was a very full one. It was too busy a one to consider a question of local government. That is going to be done this year, and I understand that instead of creating municipalities provision will be made by which they can apply for incorporation. I feel sure that a lot of good will come from the devolution of a lot of the work under the hands of the local authorities.

The Government has decided to introduce a bill to legalize the position of the Railway now under a commission. I am sure that the disingenious questions of the Hon. Member for Fortune at the last Session of the House were intended to produce legislation of this character, for he was Attorney-General at the time the Railway came into the hands of the people of this country and appointed a commission to operate it.

Another matter, sir, about which I presume to have a little knowledge is in connection with the Alcoholic Liquor Act. It was never intended that this Act was going to be a panacea for all the evils that this country was suffering from. But I think that we have discovered this, that the Act has abolished the hypocrisy and the deception that existed during the previous Act. It abolished moonshining to such an extent that it is now almost extinct; and it has also reduced smuggling, because there is no need for those practices now. And, although, sir, some of our daily papers and some of our principal members may think that we are exaggerating the claims of improvement, yet, sir,

my contention is that the conditions that exist in the country to-day are better than they have been since the abolition of the old time saloon. It might appear from the number of arrests for drunkenness, and from the sections of the act that make drunkenness punishable with imprisonment that the act was bad right through, but this is not so, and I feel sure that when this part of the act is remedied that we will be still more justified in pursuing this act. This liquor question is not a dry one, yet it is astonishing to find the heat its discussion produces. I trust that the attitude that the Hon. Members of the Opposition will take to this subject will be the same as the attitude which they adopt towards liquor itself, that is—a moderate one. I also trust this discussion will be conducted in the best spirit.

I think that all the other matters have been referred to by the Hon. Member for Bay de Verde. Therefore, in conclusion, I should just like to say that though the legislation for the present session is not as extensive as it was last session, yet there are some matters of very great importanec to which all Hon. Members will bring their good services. I trust also that we shall have a continuance of the cordial and amicable relations that have always existed between the members of this House. I have much pleasure in seconding the motion that a Commtitee be appointed to draft an address in reply to the gracious speech with which His Excellency opened this Session of the Legislature.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—It has been the custom in this House of Assembly for the Leader of the Opposition to congratulate the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, whether they deserve it or not. However I congratulate both the gentlemen, they did remarkably well. And I would say for the member, Mr. Puddester, that his speech will look well in the Morning News to-morrow. And I would venture to say that he had that uppermost in his mind when he wrote it to read here to-day. And also it was intended to circulate amongst his constituents in Bay de Verde District who were not here to hear it.

Now this Speech from the Throne as they call it, delivered by His Excellency the Governor, is a speech written by the Government and given to the Governor to read, and he has to read it. A lot of this speech is pure camouflage, written purely to deceive the lay man. The man who hears this thinks that there is a lot in it. He probably thinks that this country is going to get a lot of benefit from these things. But when it is read thoroughly and thrashed out, as it will be on the floors of this House, then you will see nothing of benefit in it.

I agree with the first part of the Speech from the Throne in preference to the death of the late Queen Alexandria, and in the last section but one I also concur. That is in regard to the proposition for the better control of the Harbor of St. John's. That is a thing that is very necessary. The rest, as I said before, is pure camouflage and it has to be well read and then it wlil be found that there is nothing in it. Now the Governor made reference to a great many things. Here is a reference to the Fishery. It states that improvement in the cure is essential if the colony is to maintain its position in the foreign markets. What help is that to the fishery? Why is there not some legislation to rectify this? Now everybody knows that improved cure is necessary. That has been said in this House many times. However the Government do not say that they are going to introduce any system for the

improvement of the cure. They simply say that it is necessary.

They also tell us "There is reasons to hope for an early expansion of timber industry as well as that of mining." You would imagine from that that they were going to begin great mining developments. But they do not tell us that they are going to spend any money to develop and improve the mineral resources. They simply hope that something will turn up. We all hope for developments, hoping does not give employment. Hope deferred maketh the heart sick. It is silly to fill up the speech from the Throne with such nonsense. Let us hear of practical development.

Now there is this great big tourist policy. This seems to be uppermost in the minds of the mover and the seconder of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. I think that every true Newfoundlander would like to see a large number of tourists come in here and leave their money here. It will distribute among our people, the cabman, the taxi-man, the photographer, the guide and many other classes, and the country will reap the benefit. We have a fine country and an excellent climate. This is a great place for tourists to come. But there is no development of the tourist policy yet that would justify the Governmnet in laying out two million dollars on roads. First thing is to get our tourists and let them use the roads that we have now. Then if the tourists come we can extend our roads to meet requirements of the visitors, but we cannot have a great tourist traffic here, because in the first place there is no accommodation for them. We have all heard of the fine hotel. But it has only 150 rooms, and if we have a tourist traffic worth while we will need more people than we have accommodation for. We have heard people speak of the tourist traffic of British Columbia, Quebec, and other Canadian Provinces. Some of the Hotels have facilities to meet the needs and have two thousand to three thousand rooms in them, and there are many. I was in a hotel only a few weeks ago which contained four thousand rooms, and when it is filled there are over seven thousand people in it including employees. I congratulate the Government on a sane tourist policy and I would say that we will do nothing to discourage anything of that kind. But I cannot believe in misleading our people that we are going to do something that will be of great benefit to the country when we know that what we have in mind is impossible of fulfilment.

The speech contains the following: "The cost of the road was not excessive when fair allowances made for the initial cost and local conditions." This is untrue and misleading, I venture to say that many miles of road that was made cost not less than $20,000 per mile. I have no figures at present to substantiate that, but it will be found that that is the case when we have all the figures when we are told all that has been done in that respect.

Great stress has been laid on the Dry Dock. They tell us what lovely dock we are going to have. So it is, a good dock is a splendid thing to have in Newfoundland, and it would be a good thing also if everybody had a gold watch; but if we had to go and borrow the money to pay for the gold watch it would be better to use the nickel one as long as it kept the correct time. Now we had a dock that one hundred thousand dollars would have put in condition and it would have done this country for the next twenty years; and the records show that during the last forty years only four steamers came into the port of St. John's that could not go on the dock that we had. If that is the excuse for the Government borrowing

another two million dollars and putting an additional burden on the shoulders of the people of this country I cannot see any reason for it.

They also mention the S. S. Caribou. I should have thought that would be one thing that the Government would leave out altogether. I did not think that they would bring up the subject of the Caribou if the reports we hear of the conditions of the ship have any foundation in fact. We all know the fittting and furniture are cheap stuff, not at all equal to what is put in a British built ship, and the ship herself is not strong; besides she was built in a foreign dock-yard, when thousands of British subjects in England who fought in the war and kept us from the enemy were walking the streets out of employment.

The mover of the Address in Reply made a statement here this afternoon while it might be correct in one way, it was misleading in another. He made the statement that the Government had made only $177,000.00 off the sale of liquors. Now he may be correct in this way, that the Government had made $177,000.00 in the liquor sales department.

Now that is just where it is misleading to the laymen. I want to point out that the Government in addition to profit on sales made large sums on the duty on the liquor, which went into the Department of Customs. You can import the whiskey in bond which the Government is selling here for one dollar a bottle, and they are selling it over the counter here for four dollar and fifty cents per bottle. Rum that costs about twenty to fifty cents a gallon in Demerara is bought here, diluted with forty per cent. of water, and then sold over the counter for one dollar and fifty cents and two dollars per bottle.

I don't say that the mover meant to give us the wrong figures, but he gave us the wrong impression. You wanted to convey to us the impression that the Government which you are a member of was not making much off liquors. I want to tell him that they are making a lot off the liquor, but if they are making only $177,000 off the sale of liquor it would be better to give it up and the people that spend their money on the liquor spend it on groceries, food and clothing. The Government are making a lot more off the liquor, and in a few days when the figures are laid on the table of this House we will see just how much they are making. I venture to say that the drink bill in this country is $1,250,000. I go further and say that it is nearer one million and a half dollars, and it would be far better to take it all and throw it into the sea, because it would not then wrcek the bodies of those who are consuming it. I refer now to the habitual drunkard.

They tell us that they are going to make a change in the Liquor Act. The ordinary man in the street might think that the change is going to be in regard to the bottle a day. The change is going to be in reference to the fines for certain offences. According to the act as it stands at present any man convicted three times has got to go to jail. I suppose they are going to change this so that he won't have to go to jail. I say it should be changed.

Reference has been made in the Speech from the Throne to a contract that has been made with the companies operating in Bell Island. The working conditions on the Island call for improvement. The contract I see is a long one; I hope that it is a good one, because if it is a long contract, for twenty or fifty years it cannot be changed and we will have to put up with it.

"The creation of a market for ore within the British Empire is almost essential."

We know that it is essential, but for all that there is nothing in the Speech from the Throne to tell us that the Government is going to make any special effort to increase the market for the ore. Most of the ore that came out of the mines recently has been sent to Germany. Germany was the only market that has blasting furnaces to utilise the ore and facilities for discharging the ore to obtain ocean freight rates. The Government tells us how necessary a market is, but they do not tell us how they are going to find a market to increase the output on Bell Island.

Reference has been made here in regard to legislation for a new hotel. I don't know what the legislation is. The Government brought down a bill into this House last year in which they undertook to guarantee the bonds but not the interest on the bonds as well. If there is some more legislation necessary I suppose that we shall hear about it in a few days.

Again I congratulate the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, but I do not agree with everything that they have said, and I hope in the course of the next few days to take up some of their points and show them where they are wrong.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Speaker: As the elected representative of the independent party I need hardly make any apologies for addressing the House this afternoon. But in view of the fact that I take the position that I represent the man who does not show any partizanship towards politics, who neither supports the Government nor the Opposition—I may be allowed to say a few things this afternoon. And first of all I would suggest to you that if the members on this side of the House are to intelligently discuss this Speech from the Throne, then it would be well to have copies of the speech distributed long before they are. We on this side have had only a few minutes to study this speech at all. We heard it read in the Upper House, and when we came down here we heard it read again, and for some reason or other we are not permitted to read it ourselves until you, sir, have finished reading it from the chair.

For those whom I represent in this House here I associate myself with what is contained in the Speech from the Throne with regard to the loss entailed by the death of the late Queen Alexandria. And I am very much surprised that this House has not been called upon to pass a vote of condolence—as was done in the British House of Parliament on this occasion.

Next, sir, I don't consider it a duty but a pleasure to congratulate the mover and seconder of this motion. The mover of the motion gave us a speech that we do not often hear on an occasion of this sort, and I was rather at a loss to find out whether he was anticipating the Minister of Finance with his budget or whether he was afraid that we on this side of the House had not sufficient pep to keep the debate going for the next ten days, and therefore he thought that he would be a little provocative so as to work us up on this side to answer him next week. And I want to say that I am going to send him back as good as he gave. His speech was certainly rather provocative, and most of his references to the actions of a previous Government call for, (as far as I am concerned, and I think that I may speak for those associated with me in a previous Government), not only refutation but some caustic comments. I will have many things to say in reference to the decreased expenditure later on when the motion for the adoption of the report comes before the House. All will then have an opportunity of expressing

their opinions and of criticizing a great deal of what has been said here this afternoon. I don't intend to say anything about the increased revenue, but I do take exception to what has been said about the decreased expenditure. Because it is common knowledge that when this Government came into power they adopted the estimate of the Warren Government of the year before. Therefore if the expenditure is decreased the country has to thank the previous government and those associated with me at that time.

My Hon. friend, the member for St. John's West, referred to the goose that laid the golden egg, the Labrador boundary, and he made a statement that the goose was going to be killed, and that there would be no more golden eggs coming from that goose. I am not sure that the goose is going to be killed just yet. It is quite possible that the Labrador boundary question may not be settled, and therefore I want to relieve the feelings of those future members of the Bar perhaps by telling them not to believe all that Mr. Browne said this afternoon. Possibly in ten or fifteen years from now those who are law students to-day may still continue to get some of the golden eggs that come from that goose. I do not intend to go into detail about it now, but I think the Attorney General could tell us that there is a possibility of the Privy Council not deciding the case.

Now, sir, I don't want to take the time of the House this afternoon to any length and as a matter of fact the speech itself is so verbose that it would take a considerable time to read it. I say that there is more verbosity in it than anything else, and I agree with the Leader of the Opposition in that respect. But generally speaking the man in the street looks to the Speech from the Throne as outlining some things that the Government intends to do or at all events containing something in which he is interested. There are a great many things agitating the mind of the man in the street to-day and they may be summed up shortly by saying that there should be no increase in taxation.

He wants to see that there shall be no increase in taxation and that there shall be no increase in the cost of living. As a matter of fact he would like to see a decrease in taxation and a decrease in the cost of living. He will scan the Speech from the Throne and start in to guess whether there is going to be any increases or decreases concerning his living conditions. We have listened this afternoon to the honourable member for Bay de Verde referring to the decrease in expenditure. Our expenditure is practically in three different parts. First of all we have to pay the interest on our public debt. We have to find the money to pay that anyhow. After that we have to find a large amount for Education. That expenditure and the expenditure on our public debt are laid down by Statute and we cannot get away from them. But we also have another expenditure, which is the ordinary expenditure on Civil Government, and it is there, I think, that some reduction can be made. Those who were associated with me in the Government previous to the present one often discussed the possibility of reducing the cost of Civil Government in this Colony. I was convinced then, and I am convinced now, that any Government as a Government cannot undertake it; but the present Government ought to do what other Governments in the British Empire did. A few years ago in England the Government found that they had to reduce the Income Tax rate. To cut down the expenditure of Civil Government the Geddes Commission was formed to see what reduction could be made. Sir

Eric Geddes was an independent outside man who was entrusted with the necessary powers. As a result of his investigation the expenditure on Civil Government was cut down considerably and one shilling per pound was taken off the Income Tax. In the year 1923 India was on the verge of bankruptcy. She had done everything she could in order to meet the requirements of the service, but even then those in charge of the Government were unable to formulate any scheme tending to overcome the difficulty that confronted them, and, accordingly Lord Inchcape was appointed to conduct an investigation similar to that conducted by Sir Eric Geddes with a view to seeing what reduction could be made in the service. In consequence of that investigation India is on her feet to-day. I merely cite these instances to show how effectively an outside independent man, when called in, can do the work.

Now neither the Monroe Government nor any other Government in this country can reduce the expenditure on Civil Government with any degree of success. The work cannot be done satisfactorily by any man who is mixed up in politics; but I do think that if an outsider was brought in to do the cutting that he would perform the job alright.

Another thing that the man on the street is agitated about is the railway. When I heard His Excellency the Governor reading the Speech from the Throne in the Legislative Council this afternoon I was at a loss to know as to why he mentioned the railway at all. What on earth has the railway got to do with this House. Millions were spent on the railway and this House had scarcely a word to say about it. The seconder of the motion for the Address in Reply (Mr. Browne) referred in his speech to some questions I asked last session with regard to the operations and control of the railway. Ever since the railway was taken over by the Government it has been illegally and unconstitutionally run. I am glad to see, therefore, that, according to the Governor's speech, the Government proposes to legalize the control and operation of the railroad, and so that this House will have some say respecting the expenditure of money in that branch of the Government service, because this House should have full control over all expenditure in connection with the railway, the same as is done in Canada.

One of the things that I intended to speak about at the last session of the House and which is engaging the attention of the man on the street in St. John's to-day is certain public utilities, which have been given certain rights and privileges. Within recent years the Telephone Company were given a franchise and the right to use the streets which belong to the Municipality of St. John's. The Electric Light Company, the Gas Company and the Tramways Company for many years had similar franchises and similar rights and exercised them. Now the man on the street has paid for the streets that are used by those Companies, which are Public Utility Companies, and, as such, are supposed to supply the people with adequate and safe services and at reasonable figures. While I do not say that they are not doing that at present, I do say that there should be somebody to see that they carry out their contracts. We give them the rights and franchises to operate, but, when it comes to their being compelled to carry out their sides of the contracts, it is a matter of "What is everybody's business is nobody's business." Take the telephone service, for instance. If a man refuses to pay his bill on the grounds that he could not use the telephone in an emergency case, the next thing John Citizen finds that his

'phone is cut out and he has nobody to appeal to at the present time. The same applies to the Electric Company. If my electric light bill is not paid within a certain time, no matter what the excuse, the lights are cut out, as the Company has the law in its own hands. Lately we have seen the Street Car service considerably improved. In fact it is an asset to the town. Now the position is that the Street Railway Company have so increased their trade by an improved service that they are not able to take care of the traffic that they themselves created. In every other country but this one there is a Public Utilities Commission and until there is one in this country we will never get the service we are entitled to. The street railway to-day is the poor man's motor car and a man driving in a street car to and from his meals now would imagine almost that he is in a subway in New York; and by reason of the fact that those care are driven through our streets, which are maintained and upkept out of the moneys of the workingmen, the Government should see that the Company who own and operate these cars carry out their part of the agreement.

Reference is also made in the Speech from the Throne to the industrial development of the country, and anybody who has been following the trend of events recently cannot help noticing that there is a bad feeling growing in this country over the lack of protection to workmen and their dependents in case of accident, and, I learn, with satisfaction that the Government is going to deal with the Workmen's Compensation Act, particularly as it applies to Bell Island. In pursuing that policy I think that the Government are taking a wise course. The signs of the times all over the world show that there is a tendency to-day for labour to look after itself, and unless labour is handled and treated with the respect that labour demands, you will find, Mr. Speaker, that there is going to be trouble. Hence I say that the Government are taking a wise course in attending to the wants and requirements of the miners on Bell Island and so amending the Workmen's Compensation Act as to satisfy those who may be looked upon as the labouring portion of the community. In this little country of ours we cannot afford to have any strikes or revolutions or anything of that sort; and I would like to advise all within sound of my voice now that the labourer has to receive a fair share for his toil, and the labourer has also to realise that capital has to receive its fair share too.

It was only this afternoon that I came across a clipping from a certain paper, and, in concluding what I have to say, I cannot do better than quote it. It reads as follows:

" 'Tis Industry that shows the way to peace,
And bids men thrive in Harmony of Toil,
Each taking up the task that fits him best,
And proudly conscious that he fills a place
Which, left unfilled, would mar the symmetry,
And leave the aimed-at figure incomplete!
With men thus ruled, there dwells prosperity."

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker: As a leader of one of the Independent parties and having last year stepped from the chorus part of the performance into that of playing into a minor role, I purpose to again take a slight part in the annual drama that is produced here every year.

It has been customary in the past for various leaders and speakers to extend hearty congratulations to the Mover and Seconder of the Motion for the appointment of a Committee to draft an Address in Reply. I do not

feel inclined altogether to extend to them my hearty congratulations; but, on the contrary, I feel like extending to them my deepest sympathy for being in the position to have to try to the best of their abilities to bolster up the cause of a class legislation Government, which has been in power in this country just long enough to show that it is considerably more extravagant than previous administrations. We have heard from Mr. Puddester what one would think was a supplementary Budget. He spoke very fast and it was difficult to follow his figures, but, no doubt, the "Daily News" to-morrow morning will have it all. However, as the debate goes on I feel that I will be able to convince this House and this country that the expenditure by the present Government for the past twelve months has considerably increased instead of being reduced and that the extra revenue that has been said to be got has been derived through class legislation. I do not propose to spend any time this evening in dilating on the actions of the Government or to make any serious commentary on the Speech from the Throne, because in my opinion the Speech from the Throne should set forth—but it did not —to the country what the Government's policy is for the next twelve months. There is nothing in the Speech telling what the Government is going to do; but what the Government has done. I do not intend to be personal; but I would like to ask the Prime Minister and the present members of his Party when they intend to start and carry out the promises that they made to the people of this country in the Spring of 1924. There is nothing in the Speech from the Throne concerning the future of the fisheries of this country; but we are told instead that the Government has entered into a contract with the Companies at Bell Island. Now, if we are to believe what we are told the contract is not all what it should be, and, no doubt, when the matter comes up for debate in this House members, —no matter where they are sitting— who are directly or indirectly interested with the miners on Bell Island, will assert themselves. Party feelings or political affiliations should not be brought into this matter. It is too serious a question. I know that there are members in the present Government to-day who are not in favor of a lot of clauses in that contract. We are told in the Speech from the Throne that the Government have entered into a contract and we are told amongst other things that the contract is a fair one; but there is no mention in it at all about wages for the miners. The Speech from the Throne says: "The contract provides for improved housing conditions, and limits the price of coal for household consumption both to workmen and others within the Colony. A safeguard is instituted against any reasonably avoidable closing of the mines at any time." But it does not say anything regarding wages for the workingmen on Bell Island.

Now, for the information of this House and this country generally I feel that the Companies operating the iron mines are attempting to "put one over" on the people of this country. Therefore, I say that this class of legislation when brought in here should receive the earnest consideration and serious attention from the members of the Government, Opposition and Independent benches.

In concluding my remarks and before taking my seat I wish to say that when the debate begins next week I propose to deal as thoroughly as I can with the Government's management of affairs from the time of their election down to the present day, and I feel that after I have finished that Mr. Puddester will be con-

vinced that both expenditure and taxation has increased instead of decreased during the Monroe Government's tenure of office and that the people of this country to-day are worse off than they were in the year 1924.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Speaker: The time is getting short this afternoon and I am sure that some of the ladies present are getting tired, and it is not my intention to further delay the House with the few remarks that I propose to make. We have, I hope, a considerably busy session before us and when all those matters that have been brought up this afternoon will be fully threshed out.

To-day we find that we have three parties in opposition to the Government, and I see by the papers that the principal Opposition are going to take off their coats in good shape and give us all we want. Perhaps we are able to get off our coats and retaliate; but this afternoon we are only shedding our overcoats and not settling down to actual business yet.

TRADE SHOULD SUGGEST

I would like to comment for a few moments on a few remarks made by the honourable leader of the Opposition and at the same time congratulate Mr. Puddester and Mr. Browne, who certainly did themselves credit by the excellent speeches they made. Now in dealing with that paragraph in the Speech from the Throne which states in effect that improvement in the cure of codfish is essential if the Colony is to maintain its position in foreign markets, the Leader of the Opposition inferentially said that it was the business of the Government to find out what that cure should be. I take the position that it is the duty of the trade to recommend to the Government what should be done in connection with the cure of codfish. A Government is not supposed to know and deal with any particular faults of the cure of fish. That is a matter for the Board of Trade or some other body interested in the trade who could recommend and suggest to the Government what could and should be done. We have had Government interference in the past with our codfishery industry and I do not think the Colony benefitted by it. The Leader of the Opposition also referred to other industries in his speech. We cannot say very much until we are sure of things. We are looking forward to and hoping to see large outlays of expenditures on the industries mentioned in the Speech from the Throne. For instance, we are expecting the Gander proposition may start up, although at the present time there is nothing definite in the matter. We also have a fairly good assurance from the principal of the Grand Falls Company, who is now in London, stating that if his investigations prove correct that the Company intends to expend two million of dollars within the next two years. That expenditure will go towards the building of a new paper machine, the building of another stock room and the improvement of the present plant generally, and altogether should afford a considerable amount of employment for our people. The same Company has a great interest in large deposits of silver and lead at Red Indian Lake. Work on those deposits is only yet in the experimental stage, but, for purposes of development, the Company purposes spending a half million dollars there.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT EXPECTED.

We have also an intimation from another party that the development of a large aluminum deposit will probably take place in Bay D'Espoir on the South West Coast, and if that comes off, as we hope it will, it will mean an expenditure of about forty million dollars—a proposition larger than

Corner Brook itself. These are some of the industries that we have hope for; also there is a small company about to use the waters of Carbonear for the purpose of the refining of things in connection with the fisheries. All those industries that I have referred to cannot be gone ahead with at once, but they make the outlook bright for the future.

When operations ceased on the Humber practically five thousand men were let loose and if we had no Dry Dock, no Highroads, and no new Hotel being built, we would have found it very difficult to cope with a serious unemployment situation. These local expenditures are all of value to the country, and the Government was able to leave the people in fairly good circumstances this Winter when it is considered that we got no calls to any great extent for relief.

We are endeavouring to the best of our ability to carry out what was contained in my Manifesto and which we started in to carry out; but I am going to tell the House that I have now a very different idea of reducing taxation than what I had when I came in power first, because there is not a week in the month, or a day in the week, or an hour in the day that somebody is not coming to the Government with a proposition for the expenditure of Government money. It is only out of the revenue of the country that we can get the money at all, and I know that most of the propositions put before us are worth while and are needed.

TWO MILLIONS FOR OLD DEBTS.

You say that we cannot borrow any more money. You say that we have borrowed six and a half millions. But we used two millions of that to pay the back debts contracted by our predecessors in office. That only left four and a half millions, and what have we got for it. We have the dock for one and a half millions. A splendid dock no matter what the Leader of the Opposition may say about it—a dock that has double the capacity of the one we had before, and which will be invaluable to the port. We have the "Caribou" for a half a million dollars, and I am surprised to hear the Leader of the Opposition refer to the "Caribou" to-day, and say that certain rumours are going around the street in connection with her. Surely it is the business of the Leader of the Opposition to make sure that what he is saying is correct. I believe that for the half million dollars we have in the "Caribou" the best steamer that was ever put in the water in this country or any other country. We spent a million dollars on high roads during the past year. I am going to say that it is quite possible that some of the money was spent extravagantly. In the early part of the spring men came along with the desire to be put to work and they were put to work, and perhaps there was a little overlapping. But this is a thing that will not happen again. And as long as we have good roads that will not average more than seven thousand dollars a mile. I think that the money will have proved fairly remunerative. I remember the member for Trinity referring last year to the fact that we had spent a great deal of money in Bonavista district before the General Election. It was only twenty or thirty thousand dollars but he made a great deal of fuss about it, but I said that we had got value for it. I want to take that back again. We did not get value for it. I travelled over the roads and I said that they were splendid and that the twenty thousand dollars were spent well. But after the first shower the roads were gone again. And that is what has been happening in this country for years. The roads have not been properly built. We have started building roads that will be a

credit to the country. We will do a little at a time, and we will have something to look at for our money. It has been said that we are running the railway illegally. We know it. But surely the Government of which Mr. Warren was the head, put that machinery into being, and when we took that concern over we had to run it illegally at first, but we are doing the best we can to put that right.

RAILWAY COMMISSION TO CONTINUE.

There has been a suggestion made in the papers of the Opposition that we were going to make Mr. Sullivan the Minister of Railways and so create a new department. We have not done that because we do not want to create an extra salary to be paid in the Government service. We have, fortunately, got four men, I don't know that they get very much thanks for it, who go up there once a week and work for the afternoon on railway matters, and they do it without pay. A former Government paid three thousand dollars for this work. Mr. Halfyard, I think was a member of that Commission and he said that he had received one thousand dollars for it, and he said that he would have taken three thousand if it had been offered him. But we are doing it for nothing. And I think that it is being done fairly well. We found that there were two or three men whom we thought were paid too high salaries, and for what we did in these cases we did not get credit even from the papers supporting this side of the House. Two or three were getting salaries of six and seven thousand dollars. When the other day, very unfortunately, the General Freight Agent died, we just moved up the next man, and now the office has one man where it had two before. When the man in charge of the machine shop left the other day we moved up the next man, and in this way we are, I say Mr. Speaker, doing everything that can be done to cut down expenditure. You want to be a Prime Minister or an Executive Minister to recognise just how difficult it is to do this. There may be a man or two too many in a Government Department. Possibly there is. But what can the Government do? The Government cannot throw anybody into the street. The Opposition papers said the other day that there was going to be a cut in the salaries in the Civil Service. But of course we must not reduce anything. But we must decrease taxation, the only way that we can get the money to pay salaries. Then there is the claim that the departments of the Government are not well run. The departments of the Government are better run than they have been for years. There has been a great deal of criticism of Mr. Russell in the Board of Works. People said that he was spending money freely and giving patronage to his friends, and that we were losing a lot of money for the Colony. I, as the Prime Minister, went to investigate, and I persuaded the Board to call for tenders for the supplies for the Board of Works. And they advertised for tenders for supplies for the next twelve months, and Mr. Harris, the Deputy Minister of Public Works, took these tenders and spent three days and nights, and now taking these invoices he estimates that the prices for goods in November and December were lower than those quoted in January for shipment during the next twelve months. And I think that that is a feather in Mr. Russell's cap. It is an indication that attention is being paid to the department. The Department of Marine and Fisheries has been doing its work. They have found that the lighthouses are in a wrecked condition. And money has to be spent

to keep them in repair. We cannot let them fall down. Everybody knows what interest Mr. Walsh is taking in the work of his department, and the efforts that he is making to have vegetables produced in this country, improved. It is not only the improvement of the vegetables produced that has to be looked to, but it is also the storing of them here. We have to have a store here. The man down on the West Coast is not concerned very much about how the potatoes are grown in Salvage, but he is concerned about the manner of transport. It is easier to get the potatoes by steamer from Halifax than to have them come in peacemeal from the Outports, as they are required. We want a big storage house here in St. John's and we want a lot of other things at the same time. We want a Poor House; that has been talked of since Lord Morris' day. But you can't take it out of current revenue and it has got to be capital expenditure, and I say that the country has got to borrow more money. I believe that we have got to borrow more money as long as the money borrowed is spent properly.

MAKING A SOUND AND SOLID RAILWAY.

What have we done with the railway? We have spent a million dollars on re-railing, and another half million for rolling stock in connection therewith. We got fifty new flat cars and fifty new box cars, two sleepers and a diner, all costing money. What are we going to do now? Are we going to lie down and let the rest of the railway rot? If some of the people in this House saw the number of broken rails that came off the Bishop's Falls section I think that they would be almost afraid to travel over the line. We have got to re-rail a certain portion of the line again. It will cost three million dollars to finish re-railing the railway and put it in condition. What did we get when we came into office? We found that the railway was not much more than a bunch of junk. That is all I can call it. It was down to the last sleeper. The dock was absolutely bad and we have had to face the situation and see what could be done. And have we faith in the country? Are we going to carry on? Are we going to let the railway go to ruin and say that is all we can do about it? I say no. We have faith in this country. I say that the country has resources and it only wants the right men to run it. And for that reason we are going to go ahead and give her a chance. We are only here because we thought that the last government was horrible. At least I am here because I thought that we could improve things, and I think that we have improved matters. And I think that if a former Government had spent its sixteen million dollars that it borrowed as well as we spent the four million dollars that we borrowed, we would be in a better position than we are in to-day. They built two roads leading from nowhere to nowhere and that is all they have to show for it. I give them every credit for having to live in a hard time. I give them credit that the country was in desperate circumstances and that they had a very difficult road to travel during the past few years that they were in office, but they could have done some good works with money that they spent instead of something bad. We are here, Mr. Speaker, as the Government, and we shall do our best, and I am not afraid when the end of our term in office is up, that we will have established in the minds of the public at large the fact that we are not the worst Government that ever had charge of affairs.

On motion of Mr. Puddester, seconded by Mr. W. J. Browne, it was ordered that an Address of Thanks be presented to His Excellency the Gov-

ernor, 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.

The Committee to consist of Mr. Puddester, Mr. Browne, Mr. Sinnott, Mr. Hibbs, Mr. Randell.

Hon. the Colonial Secretary tabled Estimated Revenue St. John's Municipal Council—1926.

Mr. Scammell gave notice of question.

Mr. Grimes gave notice of question.

Mr. Cashin gave notice of question.

Mr. Ashbourne gave notice of question.

Mr. Hibbs gave notice of question.

Mr. Brown gave notice of question.

Mr. Randell gave notice of question.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Speaker, in rising to move the adjournment of the House I was going to suggest that the House adjourn until to-morrow at three o'clock. But I have a note here from the Leader of the Opposition asking that we adjourn the House as we did last year until Monday. And we have pleasure in acceding to the request of the Opposition in this matter. If I cannot congratulate the members on the other side of the House on the interest taken in getting the sessional work begun, I can congratulate them on being ready with the large number of questions which they have given notice of, and they are making sure that somebody will be busy getting ready the answers between now and Monday. In accordance with the wish of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House adjourn until Monday afternoon, at three of the clock.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until Monday afternoon next, 8th inst., at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, March 8th, 1926.

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

Mr. Speaker read Reply of Thanks from Mrs. James D. Ryan for the Resolution of Condolence passed by the House.

Petitions were presented by:

Mr. Brown from Springdale, re road.

Mr. Cashin from Renews, re dredging.

Mr. W. J. Browne from Petty Harbour, re mail service.

Mr. Ashbourne from Cobbs Arm, re fishing rules.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Speaker: On behalf of the Select Committee appointed to draft the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne with which His Excellency the Governor was pleased to open the present session of the Legislature, I beg to present the Report which reads 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 Branches of the Legislature.

(Sgd.) J. C. PUDDESTER.
W. J. BROWNE,
E. F. SINNOTT,
I. R. RANDELL.

Assembly Room, March 8th, 1926.

MR. GODDEN—Mr. Speaker: On the motion for the adoption of the report of the Select Committee I would like to say first of all that the first paragraph in the Speech from the Throne is in accord with my own sentiments. The late lamented Queen Alexandra was widely known and generally beloved throughout the British Empire

for her charitable efforts and was the greatest Queen, in that respect perhaps, the world has ever known.

The rest of His Excellency's Speech does not give cause for much encouragement. The second paragraph tells of the continued prosperity the country has had since last session of the House. Prosperity is not general in Newfoundland, I am sorry to say, and if there was prosperity in some sections of the community, there were setbacks in many others. We must remember that whatever extra success business people met with was on account of the money, belonging to the taxpayers of Newfoundland, that the Government expended on the Dry Dock, new Hotel and Highroads. That money was borrowed money and has to be paid back with heavy interest, so that the prosperity talked of in the Speech from the Throne is not a lasting prosperity; but a false prosperity.

The next paragraph in the Speech says that the Sealing and Codfishery industries in 1925 were unusually successful, etc. I believe that the catch of codfish last year was very large; but where anyone gets the idea that exporters will probably realise on their stocks of fish without any material loss in the face of adverse conditions in the foreign markets I am at a loss to know, as the present outlook in the foreign markets is anything but optimistic. I quite agree that an improvement in the cure of our fish is essential so that our product can maintain its position in the foreign markets, and the best way that can be done is by proper standardization.

Further on in the Speech from the Throne reference is made to the development of our inland resources, particularly to our forest resources. That reminds me that in reading the "Royal Gazette" from time to time one notices requests being made by people not belonging to this country for huge timber areas and water powers. I think, Sir, that those in authority should take particular care that people outside Newfoundland, unless they are convinced that such outsiders are particularly interested in developing our resources, should not be given advantage over Newfoundlanders in having given to them unlimited timber areas and water powers. I know some of those people that are asking for permits over thousands of square miles of property are only asking for them for the purpose of exploiting them for their own personal and pecuniary advantage.

Now with regard to the construction of the new Hotel in St. John's, I, for one, hope that the project will be a success. As the present Government has guaranteed the interest on the bonds, however, I think that it would be just as well to have some one to watch matters fearing something unwieldy may happen and that we may be left with a white elephant in our hands.

With regard to the Highroads Commission. Apparently good work was done last year, but I think I will be agreed with when I say that it takes a Newfoundland winter to test whether good roads were made or not. If they stand the test this winter then we may have something to congratulate the Commission on. I have my doubts, though, if the Highroads Commission kept within the bounds of the expenditure they set out to do, namely, a half million dollars. I am afraid they went beyond that limit very considerably, and I must say that it would be far better, if the monies that have been spent and will be spent in that direction, were expended on the repairing and building of local and main lines in the different outport districts, and, if possible, link up one district with another. In any event, I suppose the Highroads

Commission will carry on. While on this point I would like to put up a plea to that Commission on behalf of the South Side of Trinity Bay, particularly between Winterton and Lead Cove, where the people are without coastal facilities and are up against other disadvantages in getting goods and supplies to and from the settlements. There is a local road there now and people living in different places on the South Side of the Bay are very anxious to have that road improved and made navigable, and I hope and trust that the Highroads Commission will do their best and assist these people by giving them a good road this year.

I fail to see why reference to last year's visit of the Imperial Parliamentarians is contained in the Speech from the Throne. They were fine fellows and I dare say that they enjoyed their visit here; but I cannot see what material advantage it was to the Colony by their visit.

Coming next to that paragraph dealing with the Dry Dock, I still contend as I did last year that the Dock could have been repaired and brought to its original capacity, with a few minor improvements at a cost of not more than a quarter of a million dollars. It is also very questionable as to whether it has been done in so satisfactory a manner as stated—that is to be seen later.

Mention is made of the re-railing of the railway. I think it is a pity that the Government saddled itself with the railway, although that is not the work of the present Government; it would be far better to have passed it to private hands who I believe could make it a paying venture. It is a difficult matter to make a railway pay and particularly if saddled with Government interference. I believe the management, and I refer particularly to Mr. Russell, is as good as can be obtained, but under Government control it will be difficult to make it pay. Under existing conditions I should be interested in a statement showing profits and losses.

MR. HIGGINS—"Do you think that might interest possible purchasers?"

MR. GODDEN—I think it might. No matter how bad the situation might be I believe the Railway could be run on a profitable basis.

His Excellency's Speech speaks of the "Caribou" as being a huge success. I have not seen the steamer, but the consensus of opinion seems to be among people who have travelled by her that she is not built to last long. One man asked me what she cost, and when I told him $500,000.00 he replied "That is a half million too much."

I notice that part of His Excellency's Speech is about the success of the Pecuniary Claims Hearing at Washington. No doubt our legal friends know best who got most out of that matter.

Regarding the paragraph dealing with finance for the years 1924-1925, appearing to show a credit balance, this is misleading. If I make a profit on flour and lose that profit on pork, there is no profit, and this state of affairs applies here. You have no surplus. And now, Mr. Speaker, I understand that a further loan has been suggested. I should like to point out that we are a Colony of only a quarter million of people, and I think it would be far better for us to cry halt on any expenditures except those of a strictly necessary nature, certainly not such things as highways or re-railing the railway. Regarding the railway I think we ought to spend just what is necessary to keep it going and let whoever takes it over make the most of it. The more we borrow the more taxation we have to endure, and it is time to consider carrying on without further taxation. I am sorry to see nothing regarding reduction

of taxes. I understood last year when the new tariff was introduced that the increases might be only for a year, and I quite expected to see some relief coming about this time, and I hope the Minister of Finance will give us something of this sort before the session ends. He stated that he wanted $600,000 more last year, but the result of the new tariff has been to collect three times the $600,000, as I predicted. I agree that it is desirable that there be some sort of protection for workers and the working classes and hope something can be arranged to that end. With regard to the reference to the Civil Service status, I think it is also desirable that something be done to the end that appointments no longer be given to parties with nothing more to recommend them than party affiliations. Persons advanced in life are given appointments, and two or three years afterwards are pensioned—this should stop.

The country will note with interest the forthcoming changes in the Liquor Act. I do not understand why it is wise to prohibit the landing and exportation of Liquors. This provides employment to longshoremen and others and revenue to the country, which I am sure is welcome to the Finance Minister. Why we should bother about aiding in the enforcement of the laws of countries who do not aid us I do not quite understand.

It is interesting to note that the contract to be made with Besco by the Government is to be for a long term. Experience shows that we must be very, very careful in making this sort of contract. It it can be shown that it is for the benefit of the country and to its advantage it is alright, and it is up to us to see that this advantage occurs.

The Speech ends by expressing confidence that our deliberations will be inspired by a desire to serve our country; I hope that it will not be left entirely to the Opposition to pick out all the flaws and errors in the Bills that will come before us, but that the gentlemen on the other side will help. (They don't do everything right.) Let us criticise together as amicably as possible. Thus our deliberations could be truly for the benefit of the country in which we live. As I stated before, the Speech from the Throne can hardly be called encouraging. I should like to see expenses reduced to that irreducible minimum mentioned by the Minister of Finance in his Budget Speech last year; but if we go on spending as we have been that minimum will never be attained. It would be interesting to find something in the Governor's Speech referring to a bounty for fishermen on their fish, and a bounty for miners; also some suggestion regarding reduction of taxes. It is difficult to see how our taxes can be made less—if we spend we must obtain. At present what we can't get from our people we borrow anyhow, and so saddle our people further with an extra burden of debt. While I was away I was interested in the talk of Canadian farmers on cooperation on farm products and their marketing, such as wheat and grain. Already this talk has had effect on some markets, and produced marked improvement in farming areas—why could not also cooperation of this sort be effected here? This cooperation is very necessary if we are to market our fish successfully. Some of those who did catch fish last year made some money, but unfortunately everybody did not get a good catch. Then again often those who bought found that the price in other markets was less than that paid by them here.

I have now come to the end of the Speech and think I have covered all that is in it. I have only just arrived

in town, and did not hear the Speech from the Throne, merely obtaining the newspaper copy. I trust that we shall hear of some other measures than those taken up in the Speech from the Throne, before the end of the Session which will be of benefit to our people.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Speaker, I propose to offer some observations on the Speech from the Throne. In conformity with Parliamentary practice and institutions we have this Speech which presents the same undesirable conditions each year. It is my personal opinion that this Address in Reply really ought to be presented at the end rather than the beginning of the Session. We are now called in, and at the opening of the Session supposed to thank His Excellency the Governor, officially. It would, I think, be much better if such a debate as this be left until later. But we must bow to parliamentary practice. The Speech from the Throne is supposed to contain an outline of Government policy; I have very grave doubt as to the Government's having any policy. I mentioned the parable of the fig tree bearing no fruit, last year, and I am forced to say the same this year. What we have listened to in the Speech from the Throne is nothing more than a re-hash of what has been said before. The Press, or one section of the Press has told us that on the opening the Prime Minister spoke in a happy frame of mind and was in a fighting mood. I want to say that I have been here in this House, for a short while, it is true, but I have never yet seen the outlook so black. I do not believe the Prime Minister was happy, even if he did show a happy front. He might, it is true, have been happy because he has all his party still about him, but certainly not as to what the future holds, for admitting he was happy, he certainly is not looking to the future in any happy frame of mind.

Now Mr. Speaker, this document is a very long one, and it may possibly be that in taking it line for line a great deal of time may be spent in debating it. It opens with an expression of regret at the universal sorrow over the death of Her Late Majesty Queen Alexandra. That is correct. There were no doubt expressions of sorrow from all parts of the Empire when the news was flashed around the world that the late Queen had passed away. And of course we of the Opposition can have no disagreement with the sentiments embodied in the special clause in reference to this fact. No doubt the late Queen was a very remarkable woman and worthy of the love and the esteem of all her subjects. She has been styled "The sea King's daughter from over the seas," and she has been loved not only by those who have been associated with her in the old country, but because she was a woman possessing the admirable qualities referred to here.

The Speech from the Throne has referred to the continued prosperity of the Colony. "The continued prosperity of the Colony since you were last in session has been well maintained and I congratulate you accordingly."

These words were put in to His Excellency's mouth by His Excellency's Ministers. Sir, I cannot find that this continued prosperity has been maintained. It is a prosperity based on borrowing money, but as Mr. Hickman observed here at the last session we could all have a gold watch if we had to borrow the money for it, but then we forget that the day will come when we will have to pay for it. The astonishing aspect is, that the Prime Minister has expressed the opinion that we shall have to go on borrowing money. Now I ask any man within the sound of my voice this afternoon where we can expect to get off if we have to take serious

consideration of such expressions of the Prime Minister. If this country has got to go on borrowing money I can well understand the jubilation in the Government ranks because of the fact that next year they will have their three new steamers kept busy taking people out of this country. Now the duty of the Government in this country instead of embarrassing and clogging the wheels of progress is to assist this country on the way to success and prosperity. They are certainly not going that way when they can see no other avenue but that of continuing to borrow money.

It is a frightful statement, a statement that will spread throughout the country that the Government can see no other way out of their difficulties except to continue to borrow money. I wonder if the Government has taken the trouble seriously to find the way out of the difficulty, and to devise any schemes that would obviate in any way the necessity of borrowing money. This country cannot afford to borrow more money. This Government stands charged with neglect because they seriously undertook to transact the affairs of this country, and to correct the mistakes and errors committed by its predecessors. It seriously undertook to evolve a new condition of things, and having seriously undertaken this it now not only stands charged with not knowing what it was talking about when it criticized the actions of its predecessors, but it is also charged with the delinquency of knowing now less themselves. In the Manifesto of the Prime Minister previous to the election of 1924 we were told that we were going to have a general clean up in the affairs of the public, and that this country was henceforth going to be an entirely different place to live in. Expenditure of public money was going to be reduced. When this Government came into power it ought to have begun to redeem those promises to the country, to undertake to carry out it's policy. What proof is there that this Government has made any honest attempt to put this policy into effect. What proof is there that this Government has any policy. I say that it has absolutely none, and no proof can be shown to contradict the statements I am making.

The continued prosperity of this country is not the continued prosperity the people want. Let us pursue this statement further. The Speech from the Throne goes on to refer to the Sealing and Codfishery industries. The Sealing and Codfishery industries in 1925, you state, were more productive than in the previous year. But if the Government wanted to make any serious estimate of the condition of those industries, I think they ought to have gone back further and not taken the most successful year in the history of the fishery, to gauge where we stand.

According to the estimates last year the country was flooded with an army of men going up and down throughout the length and breadth of the country, here, there and everywhere gathering statistics to give an estimate regarding the catch of the codfisheries. The Government seems to have got a bee in it's bonnet for statistics. We have been flooded with statistics of all sorts which the average man finds it difficult to penetrate. Mr. Puddester handed out a considerable number of statistics on Wednesday afternoon, which I feel sure the Honorable gentleman himself could not possibly have understood.

It also strikes me that there may be some truth in the report that the Member for Bay de Verde is hankering after the job of Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Be that as it may, he certainly has done the Minister of Finance and Customs a great service in starting out to prepare figures

which it will be necessary for the Minister of Financ eand Customs to have in his Budget.

The estimates and the figures tell us that the shore fishery for 1925 was seventy thousand less than the previous year. I think that the total catch for the season just concluded, that is for 1925, has been estimated. I think that it is somewhere in the vicinity of one million two hundred thousand dollars. That is the total catch of the whole fishery taken all together. Now Mr. Speaker I do not see anything in these figures of one million two hundred and fifty thousand quintals last year to show that we are having any increased prosperity in this direction. The government should not take any additional credit to itself because of the fact that the Government brought in a bill here by giving a bounty for the repair of vessels and a great deal of prosperity was due to that. I say that that is a ridiculous position to assume. The giving of a bounty for the repair of vessels has helped the fishermen in a smaller way, but it certainly could not have influenced the prosperity of the fisheries as a whole. That is not the kind of bounty that the fishermen of this country were expecting, the kind of bounty that the fishermen of this country were expecting was a bounty paid on fish. That is what the fishermen have been looking for, and that is what they are looking for to-day.

What kind of a situation had we down north last year with regard to the fisheries? From the very start the fishermen were beset by uncertainty and doubt. In the first place he was uncertain as to where he was going to get supplies, as he cannot give any assurance that he is going to get any fish. And then there is the uncertainty when he returns, as he does not know what price he is going to get for his fish or whether the price that he may get is going to repay him. And then add to that the uncertainty of being able to cure the fish at all.

This Speech from the Throne contains a reference to the problem of the cure of fish. There are many men in the ranks of the Government who know something about the fisheries, who have experience in the fisheries. If these men were engaged a little bit more on the problems of the fishing industry and a little bit less on the building of roads they would be doing a lot more to justify the existence of the Government. The fishermen of the North to-day or the fishermen anywhere for that matter are not concerned with hotels. They are not concerned as to whether the hotel is going to have 150 or 200 rooms. They are concerned about going to the fishery and they don't want to continue at the fishery and have to contend with difficulties and obstacles and adverse conditions at every angle. We found that last year one great problem that confronted the fisherman was the difficulty of getting the fish cured, and the position to-day is that the fisherman has to pay double what he had to pay a few years ago to have his fish properly cured. Now if the Government is serious and wants to do something to encourage the cure of fish why does not this Government do something to assist this great industry and to shift from the shoulders of the fishermen some of the burdens that they have got to carry in order to get their fish made.

We are told that to-day the great problem is to apply a better grade of fish. The markets that we have lost are lost because of the inferior cure of our fish. Newfoundland is declining to-day and we will soon forget that this is a fishing country. This country is going under because the main support of the majority of the people of

Newfoundland, the fishing industry, is not being given the assistance that it should be by those who are in the position to aid it. The very thing that the country depends upon is being constantly ignored.

The Prime Minister has told us that he does not consider it his duty to interfere in a matter of this kind. He tells us that it is the duty of the trade to make any recommendation that may be thought necessary to benefit the industry. We know that the Prime Minister is a very conservative man, but I would like to tell the Prime Minister that this is a matter where he has to take into consideration not only the trade of the country but also the mass of the people of the country as well. I daresay that if Mr. Baldwin had consulted his own views only he would never have subsidised the coal industry. But the peculiar circumstances of the industry left no other course open to him but to bow to the necessities of the situation. I say to the Prime Minister to-day in the same way that if his own business opinion does not lead him into considering that Government interference in this matter is right it is his duty at least to the country and to the industry to give more consideration to this than has been given to it hitherto. Now there is something that the Government should have done if they could not have given a bonus on fish. They might have tried to interest themselves more in the cure of fish. The matter of the cost of the cure is a serious one, and the cure must be superior if we are to hold our own. But this is the very point that we are neglecting. We think that because we have got fine roads and hotels that now we can afford to rest on our oars and let the staple industry of the country take care of itself. We have timber areas that may be a source of wealth to us to-day, but there may come a day when we may have nothing here but bare rock. There may come a day when there would not be a tree to run an industry of that sort. And in that contingency is Newfoundland going to remain as we always were—a fishing industry?

At the present time the government is able to find money for every scheme except to help along the fisheries. And therefore I cannot believe the Government is serious when it says that it has the interests of the mass of the people at heart. Now only to-day I was reading a circular issued by some firms dealing in fish, and I read that the fishermen might be required to use mineral salt. Complaint has been made that the fish has been going bad on the other side, and the blame has been laid to the marine salt. And the firms say that unless the mineral salt is used they will not be able to get a market for the fish. But if the mineral salt is used it is going to cost the fisherman more money. Figuring this out at eighteen hogsheads to a hundred quintals it would figure out at a cost of 25 or 30 cents more a quintal to catch fish. I want to tell everyone that the fishermen of this country are not going to view that with any great amount of composure. If ever the Government is going to do anything to encourage the fisheries now is the time. In view of the present situation, step in and do something.

Mr. Godden referred to the need for cooperation among the exporters. I am afraid that if we wait for a move for cooperation to come from the exporters we will have to wait for a very long day. But I certainly think that if this move came from the Government, if some sort of pressure was brought to bear and the exporters were brought to realise the duty they owe to the country they would get together. Many business men have signified and given expression of their views that the ex-

porters ought to get together and co-operate. But these men are holding back because others are holding back. Whereas if a move were made by the Government to bring those men together much might be accomplished. That would be one step to take. If they failed it would only be a step and the country would feel that they had done their best in that connection, while that step might lead to great progress in the fisheries. But the duty of the Government is to do more than they are doing for the fisheries. I regret therefore that I cannot hold up the Government to the public as paragons of virtue in this respect because they are constantly neglecting this matter in connection with their policy.

We are fast losing our position as a fishing country to-day and unless something is done to really help the industry it will disappear eventually. And I say to the Prime Minister that if he is anxious to help the fishermen that he should place on the free list such articles of supplies as constitute a necessary part of the fishermen's outfit. There are some things to-day from which duty is being collected that could very well be placed on the free list and go a long way to encourage the fishermen of this country. Go to any group of fishermen to-day, I mean sincere, honest fishermen who are remaining at the fishery and desirous of seeing the fisheries helped out. Ask them what they think is the first thing that ought to be done and they will tell you that taxation ought to be removed. To-day we have duties on molasses, lines and twines, etc. Why cannot the duties on those articles be removed. If the fisherman has got to pay more for his salt and he finds that it is going to cost him from twenty-five to thirty cents more to cure his fish he certainly will be expecting a removal of these duties.

It was amusing to read in Mr. Pudester's speech that his Government had put certain things back on the free list. And he went on to give certain figures to show that the fishermen had benefited as a result. That was amusing indeed from Mr. Puddester, and I wondered when I heard him reading it whether he did not think that he was pulling our leg. It was the predecessor of the present Government that put these things on the free list, and the present Government put them back on the duty list because they said that we did not take them off legally. Now if you are sincere in helping the great mass of the toilers of this country and if you find the country in such a prosperous condition you cannot do much better than by removing the present duties that remain. And I tell you that there will be no let up until those duties are removed. We want those duties removed and we want to see this Government concerning themselves with these problems of the fishermen.

Now sir I am going to say right here that if there is reason to hope for a further expansion of the paper industries I trust that when that expansion takes place that the Government now in power will see to it that the Newfoundlanders will get a better deal than they have got in the expansions that have taken place recently. This country does not want another Humber bungle on the Gander. I care not what array of figures or names may be produced to show the benefit that those industries have been to the country, the fact remains that in the minds of the average man there is a settled and determined opinion that the Newfoundlanders have not got a square deal. The Prime Minister said in his manifesto of 1924 that one of his duties would be to see that the Newfoundlanders would get a square deal up in the Humber. It would not have been

much out of its way if the Government had made it its business to look into the conditions up there. This they have not done and they have done nothing to lead us to believe that they are a bit more sincere to-day.

Now as to this Humber mortgage business. I consider that this is a very serious and very drastic move on the part of the Government. If they relegated our second mortgage up there to a third class condition in order to pay for bungling and squandering I say, as I have said before, that it was the duty of this Legislature to have gone into the matter fully before it becomes law. Time was, and not far distant, when we heard a lot of loud talk and bitter denunciations about the outrages and scandals of Government by Minute-of-Council.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —It is law now and it was made law under the contract made by the previous administration.

MR. SCAMMELL—I might add in that connection that when contracts of this nature are being submitted to this House again that we will permit no such thing to be done under the contract.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —What was done by the present administration was done, under the contract, and was passed previously.

MR. SCAMMELL—The Minister of Justice speaks clearly, and it is his intention to be clear, because he would not be Minister of Justice, if he was not a lawyer. I must take his word for it that it was done under the contract; but despite all the Minister says we have got to find out before we are finished if that second mortgage could be relegated up there, and our workingmen, who were so outrageously discriminated against in that Humber area, will not be satisfied until we do find out. I hope and trust that when the Gander industry starts—if it ever does start—that the same wholesale discrimination will not be practised against Newfoundlanders. Ten million of dollars was guaranteed by the Newfoundland Government in order to develop the Humber and give our people employment a few years ago; but, if some people, who are sitting in Government benches in this House this evening, had been listened to by the people of this country at that time, there would be no Humber industry to-day and no ten millions of dollars would have been spent. Yet, notwithstanding the spending of that ten millions of dollars our own Newfoundland people are being frightfully treated in connection with labour in the Humber industry.

With regard to the construction of the new Hotel in St. John's legislation for which was passed at last session, the people of Newfoundland have to pay the interest on the bonds, if this project turns out to be a white elephant, that is, when it ceases paying —if it ever does pay. The crowd who got their money into it are bound to get the interest on their investments, as they are guaranteed it by law and will squeeze the taxpayers to get it.

During last Summer the Government spent probably one million dollars in reconditioning roads around Conception Bay and elsewhere and in building new roads at an enormous cost; but the fisher folk of the country, who were up to their knees in muck and mire and who have to pay the interest on what this road policy is going to cost, asked for work at home near their own doors and could not get it. In spite of this the Government to-day parades their road building policy as a great accomplishment. The Government last year did not consider it right and proper to give road work to fishermen near their own homes because they contended that would be a form of relief and would inter-

fere with their road policy. We spent money in that way to relieve unemployment. The present Government calls it a part of their road policy, although I heard a member of the Government, in another place, call this money that was spent in road building last year relief for the workless and he considered the money was well spent. Now what are we to believe? Is the present Government's road policy, a policy of progress, or is it relief? A previous administration was berated soundly for their connection with the building of roads and no later than a few days ago in this House by the present Prime Minister, who termed the Deer Lake-Bonne Bay road as having been built from "nowhere to nowhere." I would like for the Prime Minister to address a public meeting at Deer Lake or Bonne Bay and tell the people that. If he did, I am sure he would go from "somewhere to nowhere." The man does not know what he is talking about. That road has been a great blessing for the people in that section of the country. It has been the means of easy access to the Humber Valley and the Bishop Company, and other contractors have been able to use their tractors on it in connection with their timber operations. The Prime Minister talks sheer nonsense when he refers to that work as he did. I am not in a position to challenge the value of the Badger Road; but Bonne Bay, where you have a community of three thousand people, cannot be regarded as nowhere, surely; and you cannot regard the road, ending where one of the biggest industries in the Island is being carried on, nowhere.

Now I would like to know of what interest to the outport people that I represent is "the reconstruction, extension and improvement of the Dry Dock and the erection of a capacious warehouse, etc." My constituents are interested in fishing and they know that while this Hotel, Dry Dock and Highroads business are going on they cannot expect anything being done by the Government for the fishery. The Leader of the Opposition made the statement here a few days ago that there were only four ships that came into this port that could not be docked here. If that is so I do not see the necessity of going to the enormous expense of building a new dock. It was pointed out from this side of the House that the old dock could be repaired and rebuilt out of wood for three hundred thousand dollars and would serve the purpose of this country just as well as the tremendously expensive dock that the Government is now building, and which is going to cost over one million dollars. The Opposition warned the Government last year and advised them to go slow and repair the old dock and put it in condition to stand for the next twenty years at a cost of three hundred thousand dollars. They refused to listen to advice, and, therefore, cannot be justified before the country as being sincere. Able pleas were put up to them from members on this side of the House, particularly by experienced men like Captain Randell, but they persisted in pursuing their reckless policy.

Regarding the S. S. Caribou, I shall leave that subject to other members on this side of the House who are better able to deal with it than I am. As to the Pecuniary Claims Tribunal, we are left in the position that we need not be in to have them cleared up. We got some claims paid us and we have to pay some claims. Probably the biggest claims have yet to be paid by us and I will leave it to my friends on the other side of the House to guess what those claims are.

There is another paragraph in the Speech from the Throne which foreshadows the amending of the Workmen's Compensation Act. We cannot

say anything on that until we see what the Bill is like. Another paragraph says that "self-government is very desirable." Yes, it is very desirable and the self-government under the Local Affairs Act that was in effect when this Government took office was very desirable too. There were sections of the Island running their own affairs up to the time this Government came into power and saw fit to revert to the old system of appointing Road Boards on Executive authority as a progressive piece of legislation. The Local Affairs Act may not appeal to some constituencies; but speaking for the northern constituencies I can say that people took a great deal more interest in their own affairs and conducted their own affairs with more satisfaction. If the Prime Minister had stuck to this system the money that was spent on his last election—money spent on his friends or his nominees—would not have been as badly spent as it was. This paragraph in the Speech also foreshadows some legislation which looks like the creation of Municipalities, presumably for the outports, and we on this side of the House will watch this legislation very carefully, as it requires close study.

I notice also in the Speech from the Throne that the legal position of the railway and its operations is going to be defined and dealt with this session. I am very much inclined to think that provision is going to be made to make the railway and its operations secure for whoever is going to take the railway off the Government's hands. In fact it would not surprise some of us to hear that the contract has already been entered into and will be brought before the House for our consideration.

The Speech from the Throne winds up as follows: "I invoke the Divine blessing on your labours, and leave you to your deliberations with confidence that they will be inspired by the desire to serve your country well." That seems an absolute farce and gross hypocrisy when a certain settled and definite policy is supposed to be laid down here. As far as I can see the Government is concerning themselves with everything except the fishery, instead of forgetting about hotels, docks, highroads and everything else except the life blood of the Colony—the fishery.

We have nothing in our possession now regarding the financial position of the country, from which we are asked to discuss the various public matters alluded to. The Government is concerned about everybody and everything, but the fishermen. I would not give a snap of my finger for any Government any longer unless they came in here and tried to do something to improve the fishery. Even if it is almost at the eleventh hour the Prime Minister and colleagues could get together and formulate some policy for the betterment of the fishery and the fishermen.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few observations on the subject now before the Chair. After perusing the Speech from the Throne I have no hesitation whatever in placing the same construction upon it as the last speaker, because it is absolutely devoid of even a constructive suggestion. Before criticising the speech in general, however, I want to say that we all have shared that universal sorrow that was felt through the entire British Empire over the death of the late beloved Queen Alexandra. I am sure that no people in the whole Commonwealth of Nations regretted her demise more so than did the people of Newfoundland. Queen Alexandra left the impress of a great life upon her devoted people, a life that had been faithfully devoted to the welfare of the nation.

I must congratulate the mover and

seconder of the motion for the Address in Reply. They played the part of loyal party men on opening day. It must be admitted that they made the best of a very bad case. This can especially be said of the mover, Mr. Puddester, who qualified as a finance minister in bringing in quite a budget. Of course, the Government realizes the weakness of their case, and that was why they prepared a lot of figures and selected Mr. Puddester to get them off here, and no doubt the Minister of Finance and Customs rendered him considerable assistance in preparing those figures. The idea behind this unusual procedure was to show to the country that all the criticism levelled against the Government the past twelve months was not justified. In this Mr. Puddester has failed. As I go along I propose to show that a great deal of Mr. Puddester's figures are not critically correct.

My hon. friend, Mr. Browne, who seconded the motion, was a little more modest. In his usual fluent style he also endeavoured to cover the weak spots, but displayed a commendable caution. This is his second year performing this duty and experience has taught him, no doubt, that it is easier and more convenient to make promises than to perform them.

Mr. Speaker, I notice that in the second paragraph of the Speech from the Throne it is stated that "the continued prosperity of the Colony since last session has been maintained" and the Governor is supposed to say "I congratulate you accordingly."

Well, Sir, since there is such univercal condemnation of the Government, and the policy which it has adopted during the past year and a half, it must be a consolation to the Government members to at least, be abl,e to congratulate themselves.

The Speech goes on to say "that not since the great war commenced have conditions, generally, been so satisfactory as they are at present, and had been during the last twelve months."

I am obliged to place one of two possible constructions upon that statement. One is, that the Government is deliberately trying to conceal the true conditions of affairs in this country by shouting prosperity when there is none, or if that is not a true interpretation, then perhaps the members of the Government have persuaded themselves that what is merely an inflated and fictitious means of coping with our economic problems, by the expenditure of borrowed monies, is a real and permanent panacea for the serious problems that confront this country. If the latter is true, well then, the future of Newfoundland is even more hopeless under the present Administration than anyone imagined, for one must know and appreciate one's problem before you can hope to cope successfully with them.

Seal Fishery

We are then told that "the Seal Fishery and Cod Fishery in 1925 were more productive than the previous year. Stimulated by the bounty for repairs a larger number of vessels were engaged in codfishing on the Labrador, and the catch obtained was above the average." What a lucky thing these few old vessels were repaired last Spring.

The Government apparently derives a great deal of comfort from the fact that the sealfishery and codfishery were more productive in 1925 than in 1924, and as this paragraph deals with the two very important industries, I cannot pass them without giving expression to a few thoughts on matters which I should have no intention of giving, more than a passing reference thereto.

Take the sealfishery, what serious minded person who has given this one very important industry any consider-

ation at all, but must arrive at the very alarming conclusion that the sealfishery of Newfoundland is rapidly declining, and in a couple of decades more, if the situation is not grappled with our sealfishery will become but one of the memories of a glorious past.

When it is said that the sealfishery of 1925 exceeded that of 1924 the statement, as far as the catch is concerned, is incorrect; the fact is in 1925 one hundred and twenty-seven thousand eight hundred and eighty two (127,882) seals were brought in, while in 1924 129,561 seals were landed—a difference of 1,679 seals in favour of 1924. The 1925 seals were, however, heavier than that of 1925, which fact together with a little higher price brought the sealing voyage of 1925 to—$269, 467.38 against $241,126.68 for 1925 making a difference of $28,340.70 in favour of 1925.

But, Sir, any Government who shows evidence of elation over this almost insignificent fluctuation, and is quite satisfied to have this country take "pot luck" with regard to the future of so important an industry, is, in my opinion, absolutely hopeless.

Hundrde Years Record

Permit me, Sir, to refer to the sealfishery at certain periods down through the last century, for the purpose of trying to awaken this House to a realization, that the sealfishery as prosecuted to-day is but a small remnant—I might almost term it but an echo of the great Spring hunt of the years gone; and it appears a sad commentary indeed upon the enterprise of the commercial elements of this country, to permit an industry to be practically abandoned which in the past, has formed the proudest and most interesting pages in the annals of Newfoundland fishing history.

I will not detain the House with annual figures, during the long period referred to, but will merely state the amounts of the sealing voyage at intervals from 1805 to 1925, a period of 120 years.

In 1805 the Newfoundland sealfishery produced 81,888 seals.

In 1810 the catch had increased to 118,080 seals and four years later it had reached 156,000.

In 1825—one hundred years ago last Spring, 295,352 seals were brought in, which figures when placed side by side with last year's catch shows a difference of 167,670 seals in favour of the sealfishery of 100 years ago.

In 1830 the voyage had increased to 558,043 seals, and the following year (1831) witnessed the greatest catch in the history of the sealfishery in Newfoundland when 686,836 seals were brought in by the fleet of sturdy sealing vessels of that day.

The catch of last year represented less than one fifth of this great voyage.

In 1840 another splendid catch of 631,385 seals were brought in, and the years of 1843 and 1844 the catches were 651,370 and 685,530 respectively.

The next best catch was in 1848, when 521,604 seals were secured, and in 1858, ten years later, the catch was 507,624; this was the last time in the history of the sealfishery that the five hundred thousand mark was reached.

In 1863, which date marks the advent of steamers in the prosecution of our sealfishery, the catch was 287,151; ten years later in 1873 another good voyage of 449,727 seals were brought in.

The next greatest catch was 1892 when the catch amounted to 390,174.

In 1904 seals brought in amounted to 243,639, while ten years later in 1914, when all the great steel fleet were prosecuting the seal fishery the catch was 233,719; 104,000 more than was brought in in 1924, ten years later.

Mr. Speaker: Students of the sealfishery tell us that despite the recent small and fast decreasing catches

there are more seals brought in per man that engages in the sealfishery to-day, than was brought in by those who prosecuted the industry from fifty to a hundred years ago.

Personally, I am not an expert on sealing matters, but an expert is not required to discover that one of the greatest earning resources of our people is fast passing out of existence, and if something is not done to revive interest in the sealing voyage, then, it will soon be but a memory, and surely this does not reflect much credit, either upon the trade of Newfoundland or the Government of the country, whose duty it is to stimulate every possible means of exploiting for the benefit of our people—the resources which nature has placed at our disposal.

It is the opinion of the most expert sealers that seals are still plentiful, though more scattered than in former years, and the thought is sometimes impressed upon one—if we learn anything from the history of the past—that the seal fishery may not have been prosecuted more successfully by steam, than it was by the sailing vessel of long ago.

Mr. Speaker, I have on my desk a discription of the migration and peculiarities of seals, extracted from a book by Commander George Robinson, R.N., published about 30 years ago, and I would crave the indulgence of the House while I read it.

It may form an interesting record in the Hansard.

Reads report.

January: The Newfoundland seals are fishing on the Eastern Coast of Green Bank and St. Pierre bank, southern.

The one and two year old seals, "bedlamers," remain on the southern banks feeding during the months of January, February and March and some springs part of April, as they do not congregate with the breeding seals during welping time. It is not until the breeding seals leave their young (the first week in April) that they mix with them again and swarm north for their summer quarters.

February: The old breeding seals that were feeding on the Banks make their way North West about the 20th for the welping ice, leaving the bedlamers behind. During an average season the seals mount the ice from 30 to 40 miles eastward of Battle Hr. of Belle Isle, occasionally they mount in the vicinity of Cape Gulf, and in harder weather from 20 to 30 miles off Cape Bauld. When once the seals are on the ice they are at the mercy of the winds and tides. If easterly winds prevail during the last week of February the seals will be found near Quirpon or in White Bay. It often occurs that with easterly winds Belle Isle splits the main body of seals so that a portion of them go through the Straits, it has a prior claim on ice splitting for 15 or 20 miles N. E. of the island; the stream divides and the western ice is drawn into the Straits.

March: Seeing that the seals welp about the first of March (or as the old sealing masters say the 28th of February is the seals' birthday) in the vicinity of Belle Isle about the middle of March they are usually from 20 to 50 miles N. E. or East of the Funk Islands, and by the end of March they are from 100 to 200 miles South East of Cape Bonavista.

April: About the first week the old seals leave their young to do for themselves and they take to the waters, and both old and young go south, where they again join up with the one and two year old seals (bedlamers) about the middle of the month, when all proceed north west together. About the end of April the seals are as far North as Cape Charles, where they abandon the ice, then in to Baffin Bay.

May, June, July, August: Summer months the seals are up about Cumberland Sound until about the 20th September, they are then driven out to the South East by the ice forming in Baffin Bay.

October: They move away to the S. S. West after passing the ice off Cape Walsingham, because they invariably precede the ice flowing down the Labrador Coast. About the end of October the seals are in the vicinity of Cape Mugford. From Cape Walsingham to Belle Isle is 840 miles.

November: The seals are coming Southward and about the middle of the month they are passing in the neighbourhood of Battle Harbour, in fact they could be in this vicinity up to the middle of December; it is all according to the season whether mild or cold.

December: They pass Belle Isle, Cape Freels, and then to the South East to the Green Bank, where they fish all along the edge of the Green Bank.

Codfishery

Mr. Speaker: I notice that the Herring fishery has not received even passing mention in the Speech. Evidently the Government are not inclined to congratulate themselves upon even an imaginary increase in the herring fishery, as in the case of the sealfishery, of which I have just spoken.

We have watched this fishery practically pass out of existence, until today it represents but a very small item in the industrial life of the country. This is a field in which a little energy could be profitably displayed otherwise another "Goose that laid the golden egg" in former years will be destroyed ,feathers and all.

If I be permitted, Sir, I would direct the attention of this House to some records of the codfishery, which, while it does not show a corresponding decline to that of the sealfishery at least reveals a lamentable lack of progress and initiative, with regard to the catch as well as to its cure and marketing. The present high cost of producing fish makes the industry unprofitable and unattractive.

In attempting to discuss the backwardness of Newfoundland in this great practical field of industrial possibility one feels the hopelessness of any forward step being taken under existing conditions. Speaking in this Chamber a few days ago the Prime Minister stated that "a Government is not supposed to know and deal with any particular faults of the cure of fish. That is a matter for the Board of Trade or some other body interested in the Trade, who could recommend and suggest to the Government what could and should be done." I repeat, sir, that if that statement of the Prime Minister represents, as I feel sure it does, the attitude of the present Government, in connection with the curing, standardizing and sensible marketing of our codfish, then there is little hope indeed for improvement while the gentlemen opposite remain in office.

The Hon. the Prime Minister intimates that he is satisfied to leave the fate of Newfoundland to the tender mercies of those very enterprising and progressive gentlemen who comprise the Board of Trade. I am not attempting to cast any reflection upon the social standing and qualifications of the men who form that Board.

They are, I understand, very fine companions with whom to spend a social hour and to discuss anything from the local gossip of the street to the latest political rumor in the city. But, sir, if the Prime Minister waits until a broad, feasible, practical and courageous policy, such as Newland requires at the present time, is formulated and fathered by those gentlemen, then I fear a great many moons will come and go before the

greatest problem confronting Newfoundland to-day will be solved.

My purpose in referring to this important subject is to add my voice to that of many others who have sounded a note of warning and endeavoured by every means in their power to revive the flagging interest in the stable industry of the colony.

Our earliest authentic records show that 120 years ago, the exports of the Nfld. codfishery amounted to 644,277 qtls. Ten years later the million mark had been reached and the catch of 1815, 110 years ago, was 1,086,266 qtls.

In 1856, 70 years ago, the voyage tle less than one million qtls., and it was not until 1841 that the million mark was again exceeded by 9,725 qtls.

In 1874 the largest catch on record exceeded that of last year by 18,324, as the catch of that year was 1,268,-324.

In 18874 the largest catch on record up to that date was brought in, and 1,595,827 quintals were exported.

From 1874 to 1904, a period of 30 years, the annual catch averaged 1,248,737 quintals.

The average catch during the years 1910 to 1925 was somewhat better, being 1,404,552 quintals. If the cost of outfitting were reduced, and the catch marketed at anything like its maximum value both the producers and the trade would profit enormously.

Before I leave this subject, Mr. Speaker, I would say to the Prime Minister get busy and take the responsibility for a policy of standardization and regulation of exports. Don't wait for the Board of Trade to act independently, encourage them to act; appoint a commission consisting of the trade and government, and include the Leader of the Opposition, and be big enough to secure the advice of Sir William Coaker, Sir Michael Cashin and others, who are the greatest students of our needs in the marketing of fishery produce in Newfoundland.

You may build highroads or lowroads, and you may erect hotels and build costly steamers, all of which may, and I sincerely hope, will, bring some returns, but let our sheet anchor slip and we will soon drift on the breakers of economic destruction.

Forest Resources

The next paragraph in the Speech from the Throne deals with our forest resources and says that "its growth during the last twenty years has improved, and changed the condition of a large section of our working classes." This is true, Sir. As a result of the policy of the Liberal Party of a quarter of a century ago, the paper industry at Grand Falls was made possible, and it was fortunate that the Tory opposition of that day were in a minority, as only seven sat on this side of the House to protest against the policy of Sir Robert Bond's Government in putting through, which they claimed was bartering away the people's rights to a foreign corporation. This stands as one of the many achievements of Liberalism in Newfoundland.

The exports of our paper and pulp industry have now surpassed the total value of our fishery products, having now reached the value of $12,600,000.-00; that looks quite a development on paper, but are we not constrained to ask ourselves what proportion of that huge sum goes into the pockets of the labouring class of Newfoundland who are the producers of that wealth.

The development of our forest resources benefits Newfoundland only in so far as they afford a comfortable living to the thousands of families whose bread-winners are engaged in the production of this wealth.

A controversy over the matter of foreign help being permitted to usurp positions which rightly belong to the people of this country, has been waged

in the newspapers recently, and an effort is being made by the Government organs to show there is no discrimination being practiced in this respect at Corner Brook.

Mr. Speaker: It is useless to deny that practically every executive office which carries with it the right to employ or dismiss men is being held by persons other than Newfoundlanders. And, Sir, while personally I consider that a man's nationality should not bar him from securing a position in Newfoundland or any other land, still I do object, and I think it is the duty of every representative of the people in this Chamber, to object to our most important inland industry being exploited for the benefit of strangers when the very object of the late Liberal Government, guaranteeing bonds to the value of $10,000,000.00 was to create a Newfoundland industry, that would solve in some degree, at least, the serious problem of unemployment with which the late Government was obliged to cope during the entire period of its administration.

What has the Hon. member for Burin, Mr. Lake, to say about this? He is the Government representative on the Board of Directors of the N. P. & P. Company, and as such it is his duty to protect the interests of Newfoundlanders first. Has he made any report and if so what has he to say regarding the outrageous discrimination that has been allowed to go on unchallenged.

MR. LAKE—I'll give my report.

MR. HIBBS—I hope so, and I give you credit for being a pretty good type of Newfoundlander and we expect you to do your duty by the people whom you represent.

MR. LAKE—I don't want to do any knocking.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Speaker, the Hon. gentleman intimates that someone is knocking this enterprise. I wonder does he realize what he is saying. Knocking indeed. I have, Sir, a very vivid recollection of the time when the real knocking was being done, and it was not from gentlemen occupying seats on this side of the House. The people who did the knocking are with the Hon. gentleman on that side of the House.

The same party knocked everything from the Grand Falls enterprise to the Humber industry. They knocked in this House, in their party newspapers, on the street corners and in fact they did everything within their power to embarrass the Liberal Party in the fight for industrial construction.

The late government created industries that brought revenues for the present government to squander. It's up to the Monroe Government to help put the Gander into operation, and the members on this side of the House will help them. That is a principle of our industrial policy.

New Hotel

The Speech refers to the construction of the new hotel in St. John's, and the constructing and reconditioning of roads by the Highroads Commission.

To the former I offer no criticism and would like to avail of this opportunity to extend my warmest congratulations to the promoters of the enterprise, Hon. Mr. Blandford and Mr. B. B. Stafford. I regard this hotel as a memorial to the untiring efforts of these gentlemen and a demonstration of what can be accomplished, even in backward Newfoundland, by the application of hard work and perseverance in the promotion of a unique undertaking. I might, however, remind the Prime Minister and other hon. gentlemen of the Government that it would have been much more business-like and creditable to themselves if they had taken the whole House into their confidence at the last session when the Bill guaranteeing a sinking fund of $450,000,

at the rate of $13,500.00 a year was passed, and instead of quibbling in the matter, as they did on that occasion, to have frankly told us that an undertaking had been given whereby interest at 6 per cent. had also been guaranteed to bond holders whose money had been put into this hotel.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—We did not know ourselves.

MR. HIBBS—No. You thought you were putting something over on somebody. You imagined the bond purchasers were an easy crowd. I told you last session I was very skeptical about this agreement. Now I presume you are obliged to guarantee the interest. I shall reserve further comment on this subject until it comes before the House for discussion.

High Roads Commission

Mr. Speaker, now for a word or two with reference to the activities of the High Roads Commission. With a great flare up and blowing of party trumpets, an act was brought in here last year and passed, which characteristic of the present administration, promised to revolutionize the road question in Newfoundland. There seemed to be no doubt about the absolute perfection of the Act itself, which, though not original, was a kind of made to order, hand sewed piece of Legislation of Canadian manufacture, and considering that the country is fast becoming Canadianized the whole scheme was supposed to be adaptable and applicable to local conditions.

The execution of this marvellous programme, required of course, the services of experts to show the people of the country how roads and bridges should be built, quickly, efficiently and with wise economy.

The application of the Master mind and the touch of the Master Hand was the only essential factor needed, and the Government made appointments accordingly and in order to avoid the slightest friction that might possibly interfere with the smooth running of this machine, the Government in their impartial wisdom decided that all superintendents, foremen, and where ever possible, even the working-men, should be of one political persuasion, and strange to say their choice fell on supporters of their own administration. The programme provided that two million dollars be placed at the disposal of the commission.

From a pretty close observation of the commission's activities I estimate that about 130 miles of road have been given attention, a small percentage of these roads were newly built, others rebuilt and widened, and considerable attention has been given to the repairing of other sections that were already in pretty good condition. Some concrete bridges were also built and I understand from the Prime Minister's remarks that about $1,000,000.00 has been expended. $1,000,000.00 spent on say 130 miles of road including bridges, would average over $$7,500.00 per mile.

When one considers that many of these roads required not more than $1,000 to $1,500 per mile to put on a good gravel surface such as was done, it will be interesting to discover just what was expended per mile on the roads that were widened and rebuilt and those that were newly made. Assuming that the following programme outlined by Hon. Mr. Morine last year is to be carried out, and about 800 miles of road is to be built or rebuilt, a sum of at least $6,000,000.00 will be required to complete the Government Highroads policy.

The proposed roads to be built by the Highroads Commission as outlined by Mr. Morine March 12th, 1925, are

as follows:—	Miles
Port aux Basques to Corner Brook	142
Stephenville Crossing to Port aux Basques	40
Corner Brook to Deer Lake	32
Deer Lake to Bonne Bay Rd.	2
Deer Lake to Head White Bay	37
Head White Bay to S. W. Arm, Green Bay	34
S. W. Arm, Green Bay to Little Bay	8
Springdale to Hall's Bay Road	15
Hall's Bay Road to Badger	35
Badger to Grand Falls	19
Grand Falls to Botwood	32
Total Miles from Botwood to Port aux Basques	396
Dark Cove to S. W. Arm, T.B.	2½
Dark Cove to Gambo	4
Clarenville to Peninsula between Bonavista and Trinity	104
AVALON PENINSULA	
St. John's to Placentia	88
St. John's to Trepassey	96
Trepassey to St. Joseph's, Salmonier	30
ROADS TO BE BUILT IN 1925	
Between Port aux Basques and Bay of Islands	50
Little Bay to Botwood	20
North Side, B.B.	25
Trinity Peninsula	20
Between Holyrood and Colinet	20
Between Fermeuse and Trepassey	20
SUMMARY	
Proposed roads from Botwood to Port aux Basques	396
Gambo to Wesleyville	45
Clarenville on Peninsula between Bonavista and Trinity	104
St. John's to Placentia	88
St. John's to Trepassey	96
Trepassey to St. Joseph's, Salmonier	30
Other roads referred to will at least aggregate	41
Total	800

At the present rate of expenditure, to complete this programme will cost this country not less than six million dollars, ($6,000,000.00).

Cost of Canadian Roads

For the purpose of comparison I submit the following costs of new gravel highway and road construction with Federal aid in all provinces of Canada.

Province	Widths sub-grades feet	Cost per mile
Alberta	20	$4,410
British Columbia	20–24	5,713
Manitoba	18	3,575
New Brunswick	24	5,754
Nova Scotia	16–24	5,515
Prince Edward Isld.	20	5,250
Quebec	24	6,646
Saskatchewan	18	3,515

An average of a little over $5,000.00 per mile for new roads.

The laborer's pay on roads throughout Canada average $3.75 per day. The Newfoundland laborer receives $2.50 per day or 50 p.c. less than the average Canadian, and considering the abundance of good gravel and road material available here, our roads should not cost more than $4,000.00 per mile. This fact has been demonstrated by the late Road Commission.

Roads were widened and rebuilt, such for instance as the road from Lance Cove to Holyrood, and put in first class condition for $2,000.00 per mile. Considering this fact, sir, is there any justification or excuse for the present Commission expending $8,000.00 on similar roads. The Newfoundland Road Commission built a first class new motor road at a cost of $3,500.00 per mile, and in view of this what explanation can be given by the present Highroads Commission for expending $10,000.00 to $12,000.00 on the same kind of road. Mr. Joseph Dawe supervised work on the latter road and Mr. Reuben Butler on the former, but these men could not get a job with the present commission. Surely the men in charge of the work must be either absolutely incapable or their object must have been to get

rid of that $2,000,000.00 as quickly as possible. Anyhow they managed to "clean up" $1,000,000.00 or half the loan in the short space of four or five months and comparatively little has been accomplished for the huge sum.

By personal observation I can vouch that $3,740.00 were spent on putting a gravel top on a quarter of a mile of road in the vicinity of Kelligrews.

This figures out at about $$15,000.00 per mile, and, sir, I can command no vocabulary sufficiently strong to condemn this unparalleled waste.

I would like the honorable gentlemen to remember that those Canadian figures relate to new roads. The present Highroads Commission have spent in some cases over $8,000.00 or more than double that amount, in merely putting a gravel surface on an already well-built road. I claim, sir, that Newfoundland can never solve her road problem under such management.

If you had taken our advice last session and earmarked one million of this loan for improvement of the fisheries there might have been value realized.

I have no hesitation in saying that if the Minister of Public Works, who is responsible to the people of this country and responsible to this House, were allowed to function as his office and had charge of this work, so that contracts could be given to competent men, much better value would be obtained. The work under contract could be inspected by Mr. Hall the Government Engineer, or Mr. Cochius, who is a good man for the job and who, I feel, is greatly interested in making a success of the work, even now, were he given a free hand. How much tourist traffic will be required to pay even the interest upon capital expenditure at the present rate. More, I fear, than you can hope to get for many years to come, and you have to reckon on a large annual expenditure on the upkeep of these roads.

Mr. Speaker, I can imagine hon. gentlemen on the Government side or perhaps the Government newspapers saying that when a member of the late Government I advocated the building of good roads. That is true, sir. It is also true that I published Road Boosters in an effort to awaken public interest. But I have always realized our limitations, beyond which I felt it would be dangerous, nay, even madness, to venture.

In order to make my position clear and to show that my present attitude is consistent, I propose, with your permission, sir, to read an article from the 1924 Road Booster, which sets forth my own idea of how monies should be raised for road building in this country, and at the same time placed no increased tax upon the fishermen and labouring class throughout Newfoundland.

Following is the article:

How Are We to Finance Our Road Problem?

"Around the above query revolves the question of road building in this country. In another article we have endeavoured to show the absolutely inadequate amount voted for road work, and comparing same with any Province of Canada from Prince Edward Island to British Columbia, the futility of attempting to improve the old badly built roads, to say nothing of the extending new ones, is glaringly apparent. We realise that the financial condition of the country does not at present permit us to operate a very extensive programme of road building, but, before we can hope to do anything, we must first realise that there is a necessity.. Until such time as our public men become alive to the loss that this country is annually sustaining by shutting its doors to a source of revenue that all other countries of the world are fostering and

encouraging, then we can never hope to have even a beginning.

A broader vision is necessary, a concentration of thought and ideas along those lines have to be cultivated before there can be any hope of getting out of the old rut. First of all we must have a road policy. Such a policy must contain specific and definite plans. The old haphazard way of spending money must disappear. Let our allocations be great or small there must be a programme.

If the Newfoundland Road Commission is to continue to function, or its services to be availed of, then an effort must be made to raise funds. If the exchequer can't afford it, and candidly we don't think it can at the present time, then other methods should be adopted to finance the project. The one thing the country can't afford at the present time, is indifference and consequent inactivity.

If we are to be content to plod along in the same old aimless manner without any direction or policy, and imagine that it is only when we have a surplus to spare that money shall be voted for road work, then our case, as far as the development of a tourist trade is concerned, is an absolutely hopeless one.

When the people of Newfoundland realise that monies properly spent on roads is not wasted, but invested at a high rate of interest, and that the object aimed at is the exploitation of the resources of the country, which will largely supplemant, if not equal, the revenues at present derived from the fishing industry, then a public interest will be awakened that will result in achieving for Newfoundland all that is aimed for in the production of this booklet.

Right Method of Financing

By way of solving our financial problem at the present moment, we would suggest that the Government raise, or authorise the Road Commission to raise a loan of say Two hundred and fifty thousand dollars ($250,000.00) on fifteen or twenty year bonds. The revenue at present derived from motor taxes, which may reasonably be expected to pay the interest as well as form a sinking fund to take care of such a loan. We make this suggestion in the confident belief of its feasibility, and would commend it to the consideration of the Government.

Two hundred and fifty thousand dollars at 5 per cent. interest would exhaust about half of the present annual motor tax and Government grant the balance could be funded to take care of the bonds at say, fifteen or twenty years.

Taking into account the natural increase in the number of vehicles, and corresponding increase in taxes, together with the accumulative interest from the sinking fund, the suggestion is perfectly sound and safe from the financial point of view, and solves the matter of ways and means for at least two or three years. By that time we can reasonably hope, if the proper encouragement is in other respects given, to see the beginning of a revenue from tourist trade which should be estimated as in Canada, and earmarked for the further extension of the good roads movement.

As a precedent for this, I might quote from correspondence received from various Provinces of Canada on this subject. Mr. Shaw, Provincial Engineer of Prince Edward Island, says, that "in order to finance the "expenditure on roads, the Province "set aside the Automobile tax to pro- "vide a sinking fund, which would "take care of bonds sold for the pur- "pose, and it would apparently be "able to do this. The Automobile Tax "Receipts reached about $50,000.00 in "1923."

Mr. McNamee, Chairman of the Provincial Highway Board of Nova Scotia

speaking of the financing of their road problems states, "the monies received from motor vehicle taxes is "ear-marked to pay interest and sinking fund by capital expenditures, and "up to this time we have sufficient "returns from this source to meet the "interest and sinking fund on all borrowings on account of roads."

Mr. Hill, Provincial Road Engineer of New Brunswick, has the following to say: "The $400,000.00 voted for "permanent road construction is provided, by funding the Automobile "foes, that is, such funds as are collected on license fees from Automobile owners are placed aside and used "only for the purpose of providing "interest and sinking fund on 20 year "bonds, the proceeds of which are "used to build a fairly durable type of "road."

Is it not well for us to take a leaf from the book of our Canadian cousins in connection with their progressiveness in this very important matter"

I may say that later on I suggested to the Warren Government which was then in power that a half million dollars may be raised in this way and that the taxes on motor-cars be left as they were in order that the interest may be taken care of.

I go further and say this, that if the work done last summer is a sample of what the Commission is capable of doing, I have no hesitation in stating that the late Road Commission would build as many miles of road for $500,000 as these people would build for the two million.

Before I leave this subject I would ask the Government to stop this mad policy of waste and extravagance.

To go over the road last summer one was literally tripping over so-called superintendents and bosses. There was a small army of those chaps everywhere one went. There were superintendents, ordinary foremen, pit bosses, dump bosses, timekeepers, and God knows how many others pulling down salaries.

Why, sir, it was almost impossible for men to work without running the risk of killing some of them with a pick, so numerous were they, and you call this economy.

Public Finance

Mr. Speaker: It will be noticed that the Speech does not anticipate a substantial surplus in spite of the high Tariff.

What is true of the individuals, Sir, is also true of Governments, the more money they get the more they spend.

And here I would remind the Prime Minister that he issued a Manifesto in the Spring of 1924, and I would like to ask him if he ever consults that famous document in order that no mistake be made in the carrying out of the high sounding principles enunciated therein.

By their deeds you shall know them, not by their profession and promises.

With your permission, Sir, I would refer to one or two paragraphs of that Manifesto for the purpose of comparison between the Honourable the Prime Minister's promises when he was trying to get into office, and his practices since he got into saddle.

Under the heading of Public Finances Mr. Monroe says:—

"The condition of public finances is very bad. I fear that it is worse than is generally known. Public expenditure must be drastically reduced. The Customs Tariff requires re-arrangement, with a view especially to encourage the prosecution of the fisheries. The cost of the public service must be reduced, and efficiently increased. It would be worse than useless—it would be deceptive for me to enter into details in this connection; for only a Government in office, filled with reforming zeal and energy, could wisely decide the directions in which reform should be undertaken. I promise that, if given power, I shall

cause a careful investigation to be made into the way in which improvement can best be made in the financial methods of the country, and I shall enforce a policy of wise economy and retrenchment."

I would respectfully ask the Prime Minister to enlighten this House as to what time he intends to begin. If the Government has practiced a policy of wise economy and retrenchment then they have been so secretive about it as to render it unobservable to anybody but themselves. As a matter of fact there has been no attempt to retrench, on the contrary, the officials in the Civil Service have been increased, and the cost of the machinery of government has kept pace with increased taxation, which policy is in direct contravention to the promises which the Prime Minister made in his manifesto.

The Prime Minister says his mind has undergone a change in regard to expenditure. Of course it has changed. He is now the head of the most ex travagant government in the history of the country.

The wave of resentment that have swept throughout this country against the actions of the present administration is the best evidence that the people feel that they have been grossly deceived, and are now but awaiting an opportunity to dismiss from office their deceivers.

The Prime Minister apparently can see nothing wrong in the raising of loans so long as they are properly expended, but the history of our national debt suggested that it is time to call halt.

The following table shows how our public debt has grown since 1900:

Year	Public Debt
1901	$17,378,000
1902	19,644,000
1903	19,833,000
1904	20,037,000
1907	22,043,000
1909	22,371,000
1911	23,187,000
1913	29,470,000
1915	31,489,000
1918	34,489,000
1919	42,000,000
1921	49,033,000
1922	55,030,000
1923	60,456,000
1926	66,956,000

From $17,378,000 to $66,956,000 in 25 years is a dismaying increase.

In 1901 the interest paid on the public debt amounted to a total of $680,000—not much more than half a million dollars. It is now $3,600,000.

The increase in the interest paid on the public debt is shown in the following table:

Year	Interest on Debt
1901	$ 680,000
1902	674,414
1903	753,755
1904	801,066
1907	874,395
1911	933,115
1913	1,105,000
1918	1,951,000
1923	2,850,000
1926	3,600,000

The expenditure of the Government in 1900 was the comparatively small sum of $1,920,157. This year it is $9,353,000.

The Hon. the Prime Minisetr assailed the Leader of the Liberal Administration because he had to borrow money. Now he has changed his mind and stated in the House on opening day that he saw "nothing wrong about borrowing so long as the money was properly borrowed and properly spent."

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Did I say properly borrowed?

MR. HIBBS—That is precisely what you did say. I took your words down.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Perhaps so.

MR. HIBBS—The House will re-

member a movement that sprang into being, ostensibly in Bonavista Bay, but really in St. John's, known as the United Fishermen. Certain elements did really unite for a brief period and during that time held various meetings in the city.

The first in the Grenfell Hall, on November 6th, 1922, where those gentlemen in a patriotic effort to save their country, as they claimed, passed sundry resolutions demanding reduced taxation. It may be observed, sir, that Mr. Morine adorned the stage on that occasion, purely by accident of course. And, Mr. Speaker, the report of this meeting says that Mr. Morine was induced to speak to that meeting. It's surprising how he overcame his usual modesty. Mr. Morine told the meeting that if he were in charge of the Government he would reduce taxation by $2,000,000.

On Nov. 16th, 1922, another meeting was held in the C. L. B. Armoury and there the present Prime Minister, Hon. Mr. Monroe, made a speech. The meeting was held under the convenient auspices of the United Fishermen's Association, Capt. Jesse Winsor acted as Chairman and Mr. Monroe was accompanied by Mr. Morine. The latter gentleman was of course, only there as legal adviser, so the report said. He wasn't interested in mere party politics. Oh no.

Mr. Monroe was called upon to make a speech, which he obligingly did, and listen while I read it. The Morning News with the following glaring headlines describes the meeting. It may have been written by Mr. Puddester.

(Big public meeting endorses resolutions for reduced taxation; fishermen are determined that existing wrongs must be remedied; over 2,000 people stand for more than three hours and attentively listen to speakers from city and outports; proposes first resolution.)

PROPOSES FIRST RESOLUTION

"Mr. Monroe, who is the principal of the Monroe Export Company, and one of our most widely known merchants, was given a hearty reception. He said he was not present as a politician, or a public speaker, but at the request of his many friends in Bonavista Bay who had called upon him, he had consented to address this important meeting. Only yesterday his wife had told him that she would like to shake the hand of Peter Roberts whose address she had read in the morning paper, because Peter Roberts had spoken the feelings of the whole community. He had the greatest sympathy and friendship for their cause, and for the rights of the bone and sinew. It was not wise that we should kill the goose that lays the golden egg, but it was necessary that the producer still be permitted to produce.

If he were in charge of affairs in this Colony to-day he would advocate that we be given the status of a Crown Colony. We should ask ourselves whether we are fit for responsible government. We were like a mouse with the trappings of an elephant:—with the weight and cost of Government, it is impossible for a small community to carry. Public opinion, however, has been backward for the last twenty years, and has been conspicuous by its absence. It was a great satisfaction, therefore, to see that Demos had awakened in Bonavista Bay at any rate, but we should not be content until the awakening had spread throughout the whole country. Last April, the Board of Trade called a meeting, and sent resolutions to the Government on the matter of excessive taxation. At that meeting it was predicted that if a fisherman got a full load of fish, under existing conditions he would be barely able to make both ends meet. That prediction was correct, as all are aware. The Board of Trade as a com-

mittee went to the Government and asked that taxation be reduced. They, however, did very little except reduce the export tax on fish from 30 cents to 10 cents per quintal. A reduction on kerosene, and a few minor alterations, were all that resulted, and it did not affect things very much. The merchants felt the fishery was not a paying proposition or a good commercial undertaking. The fishermen were given supplies, the crews took the chances, and the merchants took a little more risk when they fitted them out. The Government were not able to do anything for them.

MR. BROWNE—Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. There is a rule which says an Hon. Member shall not read his speech.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Speaker, I am not reading my own speech, I am reading Mr. Monroe's, and a splendid speech it is.

HIS HON. THE SPEAKER: There is something in what Mr. Browne has said.

MR. HIBBS—I feel, sir, I have a perfect right to quote a reference made by a public man when not speaking in this chamber, and I take it for granted that I have your permission to continue. Mr. Monroe in that famous speech went on to say:

"After the Board of Trade meeting he, Mr. Monroe, received a letter from Mr. Morine, in which he pointed out that it was the custom to estimate the revenue one year ahead, so as to regulate expenditure according to revenue.

Mr. Morine told him that if he were the Finance Minister, he would adopt a different course and he pointed a way out of the difficulty, by reducing taxation, and cutting down expenditure, and while it may be necessary to borrow the first year, to make up a deficit, it would be far better than borrowing to give it away in pauper relief. What, said Mr. Monroe, are we going to do? This distressing taxation which we are now carrying is the main question. Go to the Government and if they cannot see their way to reduce taxation, then politely tell them to take a back seat and get someone else to come in who will do something. Regarding the codfish situation, Mr. Monroe was of the opinion that no fish Trust could handle it better than the merchants. They were now taking fish at a nominal price, at least his firm was, and if they can get any more for it the fishermen would get the benefit. Owing to competition amongst various sellers, Labrador fish in Spain was only worth 28 shillings, and at this price it was impossible to pay more than $4.00 for it. The market is, however, improving, due to this competition being eliminated to an extent and by other arrangements, showing a more hopeful outlook, and the fishermen will of course benefit, but it is not known how long this will last. The outlook for shore fish is not by any means satisfactory. Brazil, due to exchange conditions, has entirely collapsed. In case, however, exchange improves, the merchants at least will do the same with shore as Labrador and pay the advanced price. The interests of the merchants and the interests of the fishermen were as one and the merchants would like to see the fishermen get the best prices for their catch. With a small price, the fisherman's property is valueless and the merchant's property also loses its value. It was the duty, therefore, of every merchant to be associated with this movement, and he had much pleasure in proposing the following resolution:—

"WHEREAS the expenditure of the Colony, by the Government, upon curfent account, and for unproductive works, is very much greater than the ordinary revenue, leading to borrowing large sums, and a rapidly growing

charge for interest on the public debt.

"AND WHEREAS much of this expenditure is wasteful and unnecessary, and much of it is for useless offices and extravagant salaries, and no permanent reduction in taxation can be made without permanent reduction in expenditure is also made;

"RESOLVED: That this meeting demands the abolition of all public offices which are not essential to public welfare, the dismissal of all unnecessary officials, the reduction of all extravagant salaries, and a scale of expenditure brought down to the amount which the Colony can meet by erasonable taxation."

Now Mr. Speaker, Mr. Monroe is in the saddle, and what has he done? He has changed his mind, he tells us, and has clapped on an additional 15 per cent. tax. I wonder what he would do if resolutions were passed demanding that he would redeem, at least, some of the promises with which he deceived the people in 1924. But this is the difference between Mr. Monroe outside trying to get in and Mr. Monroe inside trying to hold on to office. Before dispensing with the subject I might say that Mr. Gosling also made a speech at that meeting and he said:—

MR. SPEAKER—Might I be permitted to advise the honourable member that he is out of order.

MR. HIBBS—I bow to your ruling, sir, but may I be permitted to say that in the opinion of Mr. Gosling the late Government was doing its best.

MR. SPEAKER—It does not matter what the opinion of Mr. Gosling was. It is out of order.

MR. HIBBS—Another gentleman named Mr. Morine also spoke and I suppose that I have to ask your permission to quote his speech. It was not made in the upper chamber.

MR. SPEAKER—That does not matter. It is out of order.

MR. HIBBS—I must accept your ruling. Mr. Speaker, the hopeless part of this whole situation is that the Prime Minister of to-day, in spite of all his sins, is not in the least repentant. He has borrowed moneys which were unnecessary. He has increased taxation which was a public crime. He has increased the public service and consequently increased expenditure. He has violated every principle laid down in his Manifesto of 1924, and he has not shown the courtesy to apologise for his misrepresentation of other people.

Workmen's Compensation Act

The members sitting on this side of the House gladly welcome the Government's announcement, that they propose to introduce legislation dealing with the matter of compensation to workers injured in industry, or to their dependents in case of death.

I assume that it is the intention of the Government to repeal the present Workmen's Compensation Act and replace it with a real Act.

I shall be greatly dissappointed if that is not their intention.

MINISTER OF JUSTICE—It will be the most far-reaching legislation for years.

The Workmen's Compensation Act is in reality an Employers' Liability Act, such as was in force in American States, Canadian Provinces and European Countries many years ago. In those countries the old Employers' Act was repealed long ago and replaced by Workmen's Compensation Acts. That is what needs to be done in Newfoundland.

This so-called Workmen's Compensation Act that is now on our Statute Books is an Act which places upon the shoulders of the employers in certain industrial establishments, the liability to pay a certain stated amount to employees when injured, or their dependents in case of death. The liability is on the shoulders of the employer. What is more important,

the liability is borne directly by him. That is to say, when there is an injury or death under the Act the employer has to pay the Compensation directly out of his own funds to the worker of the dependent.

That is unsound for two principle reasons: it comes hard on small employers to pay out the sum of $1,500, although that sum is really inadequate in case of death; and, second, there is no real guarantee that the worker or the dependent will receive it.

You can't squeeze blood out of a turnip. Again, the burden of enforcement of this Act rests directly upon the shoulders of the injured worker or the dependent of the killed worker. There is no enforcement machinery for this Act. It is up to the worker or his dependents. Law cases have taken place in this connection. It is obviously unfair to the worker or his dependents to embroil them in litigation in such cases. When the issue is a simple one between the worker and his employer, the worker is not in a strong position to collect. He cannot afford to fight his employer. Consequently, many injured workers in Newfoundland never receive the Compensation allowed them under the Act. There are also thousands of workers who do not know anything of the existence of the Act.

For these reasons, among others, the present Act needs to be abolished and replaced by one that will more nearly meet the needs of the situation.

There is another important reason why the present Act should be repealed. Under this Act, there are only two classifications of Compensation: 1, for death; and, 2 for injury. The Act contains no sub-division of injuries. If a man is injured for a period of more than two weeks, no matter what the nature of the injury, he becomes entitled to compensation at the rate of a certain proportion of his regular wage. But there is nothing in the Act about loss of limbs, and special compensation therefor.

Some companies in Newfoundland do pay for loss of limbs. Others pay no more than the disability amount for injury—so much of the regular wage.

Obviously, there should be a provision providing for loss of limbs, and, what is just as bad to the worker, loss of use of limbs.

The new Act ought to scale out a man's body. For the loss of a finger, so much. For the loss of a hand, so much. For the loss of an arm, so much. For the loss of a leg, so much. And for an eye, or any organ or limb of the body, or loss of use thereof.

How ought this compensation be arranged?

In the first place, the Act should contain no stated amounts. The modern method in Workmen's Compensation Acts is to state it in weeks. For the loss, let us say, of an arm, a worker receives a total sum of money equal to so many weeks' pay at his regular rate of wages. Then, when the limb is lost, or the use of the limb, or organ, the worker applies for compensation, and the award is made according to the Act—so many weeks' pay in a lump sum, according to the importance of the limb or organ to the worker in his work and in his private life.

Again, it is necessary to take the direct liability off the employer—for his own sake, and for the sake of the worker. For that reason there should be a system of insurance, under which the employer could insure his risk, under the Act, with a State insurance fund. Each employer, under a proper Compensation Act, would be required to pay small premiums into a Compensation Fund for each worker employed. The premiums would not be all equal. The amount of the premium would vary according to the degree of

hazard and danger of the employment.

The employers would pay a regular small premium per worker into the State Compensation Fund. The workers, when entitled to compensation, instead of having to face and fight their employers, would then repair to the State Fund and receive there compensation therefrom. They would not deal with their employers at all. They would not be examined by their employers' doctors. Nor would they have to deal with private insurance companies who are primarily interested, as a rule, in beating down the applicant for compensation, doing so in the general interests of the company funds.

There should also be a clause in the new act providing that the board would make its award within, say, two weeks of the date on which the application was received. This would guard against unnecessary red tape. Another danger against which to guard is that of legalism. With all respect to our lawyer friends it seems clear that in this kind of business lawyers should be strictly barred. Let the Fund be administrated by intelligent, sympathetic men.

In this connection I may say that the Workmen's Compensation Board of Ontario, in the past ten years, handled some 460,000 cases of industrial accident and death, and awarded the stupendous sum of $45,000,000 to injured workers and their dependents, and not a lawyer was hired, not a court case was heard, not a yard of red tape was employed.

MINISTER OF JUSTICE—You may not have heard of them being hired, but they were employed just the same. Lawyers are a necessary evil.

MR. HIBBS—There is another important point which should be remembered when this Act is drawn up. Care should be exercised to deprive the administrators of the fund of too much power of private judgment or discretion. As far as possible the Act should provide for everything, so that a worker may never be open to discrimination or the whims or caprices of the individuals administering the Act.

May I, before dropping this subject, —and I may say that I drop it only temporarily; I shall take it up when the legislation comes before the House —may I urge upon the Government the advisability of providing some scheme of insurance for seamen and fishermen? This should not be included in the Workmen's Compensation Act, but in separate Acts. Norway and other continental countries of Europe, as well as Australia and New Zealand, etc., have their special seamen's bills and fishermen's insurance acts.

MINISTER OF JUSTICE—The difficulties would be in the assessments and premiums.

MR. HIBBS——I dare say, but it is a matter that can be got over.

However, I do not wish to be understood as advocating separate sets of enforcement machinery for those additional acts. The Workmen's Compensation Board should be able to administrate such special acts.

Before leaving this subject, let me say that in cases of industrial death, the dependents of the killed workers ought not to be paid any lump sums, as now. The proper way is to pay the widow so much a week for life, or up until the time when she remarries, if she does remarry and so much additional for each child during the minority of those children.

While we are on the subject of social insurance, may I say how glad I was to learn from the Speech that the Government has decided to accept the suggestions made by the Daily Globe to formulate a system of pensions insurance for civil servants.

MINISTER OF JUSTICE—We took

your suggestion not to cut civil servants' salaries.

MR. HIBBS—I am glad of that also, but you may reduce the number. This is a very good move, but to make it wholly commendable must be in line with simliar legislation of other countries. A scheme similar to the Compensation fund should be started. There are two possibilities before the Government in this respect: (1) to pay the whole premium themselves for each civil servant; and (2) to pay part of it and have each civil servant pay the balance. The unthinkable method is to place the whole burden upon the civil servant himself. The ideal method would be to have the Government pay the whole amount. But there are arguments in favor of having the civil servant contribute toward it. It will help to inculcate the habit of thrift and precaution. I shall have more to say on this subject when the legislation is introduced.

Geological Survey.

I am glad to know that an experienced geologist is to be attached to the Department of Agriculture and Mines. I give the Minister credit for this movement. He has shown himself to be alive to the needs of the hour and I think his work since taking charge of that department has been commendable. We will have to offer him the same portfolio in our new government.

Mr. Speaker, the next paragraph in the speech says: "When the Board of Liquor Control came into power in the early part of last year the conditions it had to deal with were chaotic." This may be construed to mean that the flow of booze was too scant and irregular, and the Board immediately opened the taps, so to speak, and permitted a regular flow of liquors of all conceivable qualities to flow throughout the country, especially the city of St. John's.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—No money coming in and all going out.

MR. HIBBS—That's why you commercialized the traffic. Mr. Puddester essayed the courageous task of trying to apologise for the Government's booze policy on opening day and stated that only $176,000.00 were collected for liquor last year. He, however, afterwards admitted to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that the figures given did not include the duty.

I challenge Mr. Puddester to substantiate the figures which he gave as representing anything near the amount which has been taken in by the three liquor stores for sales over the counter. My honorable friend, Mr. Puddester, would almost appear to be a little partial to the Government, if we are to judge by some of those comparative figures which he gave us on opening day. They say that "figures never lie," but people who handle the truth carelessly can figure. And, while I would not for a moment place Mr. Puddester in that class, I am wondering whether his figures relating to the consumption of booze were as misleading as those referring to the cost of elections in Newfoundland for the years 1923-24 and 1924-25.

MR. PUDDESTER—I have been challenged, and will take up the challenge. Here is a statement of the current account of the Government of Newfoundland, including Customs Revenue, Liquor, etc., signed by the Auditor General.

MR. HIBBS—During what period?

MR. PUDDESTER—1924-1925. If you will permit me, Mr. Speaker to interrupt, as I wasn't finished, this statement is for the period from the 1st of July, 1924, to the 30th of June, 1925, covering five months of the Mifflin administration, and compared with the year from June 1st, 1923, to June 30th, 192, totalled $177,0000, as against $219,000 for the previous year. These are the records of sales signed by the Auditor General.

MR. HIBBS—They are to say the least not very convincing. The explanation is that only five months of the Liquor Control Board regime is covered. The figures given by Mr. Puddester included but five months of the Mifflin bottle a day regime; it will be a different story when a full year's statement is given. The figures given by Mr. Puddester are somewhat misleading.

MR. PUDDESTER—I rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to state that my remarks were deliberately misleading?

MR. HIBBS—I do not go as far as that, but they are inclined to mislead the average person.

THE SPEAKER—I shall have to ask the hon. gentleman to make his remarks plainer.

MR. HIBBS—I merely stated that the figures as given first were misleading, without further explanation.

THE SPEAKER—You should make it quite clear as to whether you are making an accusation against Mr. Puddester.

MR. HIBBS—Of course not.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Puddester told the House that elections for 1923-24 cost $72.000.00, and the Monroe administration by their policy of economy reduced that expenditure to the normal sum of $7.000.00 for the years 1924-25. He might have been a little more explanatory and stated that the general election of members all over Newfoundland in the spring of 1924 cost $72,000.00, and that the bye-election in Harbor Grace and Bonavista in the fall of 1924 cost $7,000.00, and he might have added to that $40,000.00 spent by the present Government on account of these bye-elections, over $28,000.00 of which was spent to help elect the Prime Minister and Captain Windsor in Bonavista Bay, a huge sum, from which, according to the Prime Minister's statement on opening day, the country received absolutely no returns.

PRIME MINISTER—Then why are you anxious for more bye-elections?

MR. HIBBS—In answering the Hon. Prime Minister I may say that a member of his Government told me that the money which the Government would throw out to get votes in a bye-election in St. John's East was good reason for not holding the election. He thought you would flood the districts with monies to influence votes.

HON. PRIME MINISTER — Do I understand you to say that I said that?

MR. HIBBS—Oh, no, you wouldn't commit yourself so far as that.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE — This is the mysterious man that has been telling them so many things.

MR. HIBBS—There are more mysterious men in your party than you are aware of. You don't know all that's going on. There is another aspect of the booze business I should like to draw attention to, and it is that this business is carried on in a most shamefully illegal manner. I feel sure, sir, in saying that if a private business firm carried on its business in the same way they would be put in jail. We have an act to protect our people against profiteering, and what would happen if any firm sold for $1.50 an article which cost at their store 15c.

MR. BROWNE—How would they get so cheap a duty?

MR. HIBBS—Let us assume that they are on the free list. The Government is notorious for putting certain goods on the free list.

MINISTER OF JUSTICE—The idea of the high price is to prevent drinking.

MR. HIBBS—And has your scheme been successful?

MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Oh, pretty much so.

MR. HIBBS—I make the statement

here that there is a $1,000,000 profiteering business being carried on against the people of Newfoundland. The cost of Demarara Rum is not more than 80c. per gallon landed in the bond stores. With the addition of water nine bottles of rum, I understand, is made from one gallon. This stuff is sold for $1.50, $2.00 and $2.50 per bottle, a profit both illegal and outrageous.

Mr. Speaker, referring again to the Government's liquor policy, I would like to point out that in addition to the demoralizing effect which this liquor traffic is having upon the country, the whole business is conducted by most outrageous and illegal methods.

The Government has monopolized this trade and is carrying on a profiteering business against the unfortunate consumers. We have on our Statute Book a law to protect our people known as an "'Act to Check Profiteering," and I would like to know what would happen to any private business firm or corporation that would import goods into this country and sell to our people an article at $1.50 to $2.50 which cost landed in the store not more than 10c. to 20c. If the Government intends to remain in the liquor business, then they should give their patrons some value for the money which they take from them. It is the duty of the Government to suppress and prevent profiteering, instead of that, they are the only notorious sinners—in this respect—that we have in Newfoundland.

You will observe, sir, that the Government is very solicitous for the welfare of the people of the United States, and has undertaken to assist that great republic in making its citizens sober by forbidding the landing and transhipment of any spirituous liquors through any port in this country. If they displayed a little of this spirit towards our own people, it would be much more commendable.

The Besco Contract.

Mr. Speaker, we are told that the Government has drawn up a contract with the British Empire Steel Corporation for the operation of the Bell Island mines. I understand that the contract has been sent to Montreal for Mr. Wolvin's signature. We shall be in a better position to discuss this contract when it comes before the House.

Meanwhile there are one or two things I would like to say regarding it. First, as to wage increases for the Bell Island workers. It is inconceivable that a contract be signed with Besco, giving them big concessions, unless concessions are likewise given the workers. The two so-called concessions mentioned in the Speech from the Throne are not concessions at all. First it is stated that there is a provision to regulate prices of coal on the Island. This is a joke. The workers ever since mining was commenced on Bell Island have got their coal at "workmen's prices,"—that is to say, at cost. Nothing has arisen to make it necessary to have anything about coal prices in the new contract. Is this a cheap trick on the part of the Government to make it appear as if they were giving to the workers, or getting for them, a concession?

Then there is a statement that something will be done about housing on the Island. We shall be in a better position to discuss that point when we see the contract. But I want to say that what the workers on Bell Island are interested in is not housing, but wages. What would be the use of giving them better houses if their pay is too small to maintain properly their present houses? It is as well to die in a shack as to die in a castle, if die one must.

Let me emphasize this point, Mr.

Speaker, it is wages that interest the workers, not alone coal or housing. Give them a wage increase. They need it, and they are entitled to it. They are shamefully underpaid. They perform the hardest labor in Newfoundland, or, for that matter, any country in the world. Their work day is a 10-hour day, as against the 8-hour day in the coal mines of Nova Scotia. Iron mining is much more laborious than coal mining. Yet you have men working 10 hours a day underground on Bell Island and getting considerably less per day than men doing coal mine work in Nova Scotia in an 8-hour day.

I very much fear that the Government, for what reason I do not profess to know, has signed a very one-sided contract with Besco, and has failed altogether to win concessions for the workers there. Hence their ridiculous effort to make it appear as if they had got concessions.

Outport Municipalities.

Another paragraph in the speech refers to Outport Municipalities. This will, I suppose, empower communities to form themselves into Municipalities. I should like to point out, however, that we already have some form of municipal government for the outports. The Local Affairs Act, passed June 5th, 1915, gave outport settlements the right to manage their own affairs, and not only spend their own monies on roads, wharves, bridges, etc., but to manage the general affairs of the community in which they were elected. This was carried out strictly during the Morris administration, and also during the Liberal Government's regime, but since the present Government entered office the act has been openly violated for purely political purposes.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE — The act was never properly carried out. Except perhaps the last, there never was a legal election.

MR. HIBBS—There may have been some little technical illegality, but to all intents and purposes Boards were properly elected by the poeple and should have been recognized. The real reason for the attitude of the Government is that when the Government came into power they found in some instances men on the Boards who were politically opposed to them, and they were superceded by political friends, the Government claiming they were not legally elected.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE — The position of the Government is that under the act they are not able to carry on elections legally; they could not be carried on or directed.

MR. HIBBS—Could not the act have been amended, as you have amended other acts.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE — Oh, yes, I suppose so.

MR. HIBBS—The Government has been in power now for three sessions and it has made no attempt to carry out the law as laid down in the act.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE — There was never any satisfaction on Bell Island. You have two Boards there where you should have only one.

MR. HIBBS—Too many politicians, perhaps, but we have to give the Council on Bell Island credit for having functioned. I know from experience—they often favored me with a visit, as well as the Minister of Justice. No doubt Bell Island Council is somewhat different from the average outport Board.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE — There should have been only one municipality there.

MR. HIBBS—Yes, and I am glad to see that the Government is repenting of its ways and giving the people of the outports rights which hitherto have not been recognized.

Before I sit down I should like to refer to a remark made by the Prime

Minister yesterday after I sat down. He thought there was too much time taken up in speaking. We have a traditional right of free speech in this democratic age, and this ought to be recognized in the people's House if anywhere, but the Prime Minister says he would curtail speeches to half an hour.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—I gave that only as my opinoin.

MR. HIBBS—It is well known that the Prime Minister changes his opinion. He told us so with regard to taxation, and I think he had better do so in this case. He thought it the easiest thing in the world to run the Government of Newfoundland—he now sees things as they really are. Let me furnish a little advice: make some attempt to carry out some of your promises in your Manifesto. Mr. Morine stated that he could reduce expenditure by $2,000,000 if he were Finance Minister. Mr. Monroe should place him there at once. He is the man for the job.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—I rise to a point of order. There was a ruling given here yesterday that hon. members should not refer to any person outside of this House.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Speaker, if that be so then we shall have very little to say here in future. However, sir, I have made the statement and I hope the Prime Minister will make the change in the interests of the country. He has said that the machinery of government is like the "trappings of an elephant on the back of a mouse," which is true. An esteemed citizen stated to-day that "the present Government is using a hundred pound sledge hammer to crack a hazel nut when it could be done with your teeth." In conclusion, I say to the Government, if you want to restore yourselves to public confidence, then play the game by the people who sent you here. I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your courtesy and forbearance during the course of my rather extended remarks.

Mr. Cashin gave notice of questions.

Mr. Warren gave notice of questions.

Mr. Grimes gave notice of questions.

Mr. Hibbs gave notice of questions.

Mr. Brown gave notice of questions.

Mr. Ashbourne gave notice of questions.

Hon. the Leader of the Opposition gave notice of questions.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

(1) MR. SCAMMELL asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the Table of the House a statement answering the following questions:—(a) How much of the Gambo-Wesleyville Road has passed the Government Engineer's Survey as completed; (b) How much remains to be completed; (c) What is the total cost to date of such work as has been done on this Highway; (d) To lay on the Table of the House a detailed statement showing all expenditure in connection with this road to date.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—In reply I may inform the Hon. Member that my department has nothing to do with the construction of that road.

MR. SCAMMELL—To what Department does it refer.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—I hardly know. It may belong to the Colonial Secretary's Department.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—I may say in reference to this matter that, as the House will appreciate, I intimated at the last session that those roads came under no special Department and therefore, the Government Engineer was made responsible to the Governor in Council. I also intimated that the High Roads Commission were making a report of their progress during the past year and this report would

contain the information that you are seeking. I saw Mr. Hall this morning and he told me that he would have this report ready inside of a week and I would appreciate it very much if the members would refrain from asking questions concerning that matter until this report is completed.

(2) MR. SCAMMELL asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the Table of the House a statement of expenditure and Revenue on Railway operating account for the years 1924 and 1925 respectively.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I beg to table the information.

Questions Nos. 3, 4 and 5 were deferred.

(6) MR. GRIMES asked Hon. the Minister of Justice: (a) To lay on the Table of the House a statement of the number of persons summoned for breach of the Prohibition law during 1922 and 1923, a classified list of the charges made and the number of convictions obtained; (b) A statement of the number of persons summoned during 1924 and 1925 for breach of the present Liquor Act, with a classified list of the charges made and the number of convictions obtained; (c) A statement of the number of persons concerned in these breaches, and the number of times the same person was charged for breach of the Act.

(7) MR. GRIMES asked Hon. the Minister of Justice how many Police were stationed in St. John's during the years 1922, 1923, 1924, 1925 respectively.

(8) MR. GRIMES asked Hon. the Minister of Justice to lay on the Table of the House: (a) A statement of the number of arrests made for drunkenness by the police in St. John's and the Outports for the year 1925 according to occupation; also the number arrested in the Outports and their occupation; (b) How many of those arrested were males and their ages; (c) State separately according to sex and occupation how many had to serve terms of imprisonment and the length of the term; (d) State separately and according to occupation, sex and age the number arrested for the first, second, third or more offence.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —I beg to table the answers to questions No. 6, No.7 and No. 8.

(9) MR. CASHIN asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the Table of the House a copy of the Contract entered into between the Messrs. W. I. Bishop Company, Limited, and the Newfoundland Government in connection with the construction of the new public building at Corner Brook.

THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—I beg to table the information.

Nos. 10 and 11 deferred.

(12) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the Table of the House the following information: The total earnings of the Railway from July 1st, 1925, to December 31st, 1925, as well as expenditure for the operation during the same period.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I beg to table the information.

(13) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the Table of the House the following information: A detailed statement showing the total amount spent for re-railing Clarenville division, this amount to include cost of rails, labor, etc.: the number of tons of old rails which were sold; amount per ton received for same; if tenders were asked for the purpose of these rails; and what was the total amount realized as the result of the sale of these old rails.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I beg to table the information.

(14) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the

Colonial Secretary to lay on the Table of the House the following information: Report, if any, submitted by the Government Director of the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company, Limited, to the Government; what amount the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company, Limited, is capitalized at; how much of the amount is paid up; what is the total expenditure for construction purposes in connection with this project up to the present time.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker: In reply I may say that Mr. Lake, who represents the Government as director of the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company, has just arrived in the city, and he informs me that he was unable to reach Corner Brook owing to the conditions of the railroad, but he is sending in his report and we will have it within a week, when I will be very glad to table it.

(15) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the Table of the House the original contract entered into between the Messrs. W. I. Bishop Company, Limited, and the Newfoundland Government for the construction of the new sheds at the Dock.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, for the information of the Hon. Member I may say that an agreement has been entered into to build the freight sheds on a basis of cost, plus.

(16) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the Table of the House the following information: The Gross Earnings of the Railway for the Fiscal Year ending June 30th, 1925, as well as the expenditure for the same period.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I beg to table the information.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker, with your permission I would like to draw the attention of the Prime Minister to the last question. He did not tell us on what percentage basis the sheds are being built.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I will give you that information tomorrow.

MR. CASHIN—While I am on my feet now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I would appreciate very much if I could get that information.

Question No. 17 deferred.

(18) MR. ASHBOURNE asked Hon. the Minister of Justice when a Magistrate for Twillingate will be appointed and why this vacancy has not been filled before this date.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE Mr. Speaker: In reply to the Hon. Member I am hoping that that appointment will be made any day. I just want to repeat what I said personally to the Hon. Member, and that is that we will endeavour to get the best possible person to fill this position, to the satisfaction of the people of the district.

(19) MR. ASHBOURNE asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the Table of the House the following information: What agreement was entered into between the Government and Hon. W. J. Ellis, or between the W. I. Bishop Company on behalf of the Government and Hon. W. J. Ellis, for the use of stone quarry on South Side owned by Hon. W. J. Ellis; what was the amount paid Mr. Ellis for the use of such quarry; if Mr. Lee recommended any other suitable place that would be more beneficial than Mr. Ellis's; and if so, why wasn't his recommendation accepted.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I beg to table the information.

(20) MR. BROWN asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the Table of the House a statement of all moneys paid by his Department to Capt. Jesse Winsor and Capt. S. R. Winsor since July 1st,

1924, to date, and to show what these amounts were paid for.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—On behalf of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I beg to table the information.

(21) MR. BROWN asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing the earnings of the S.S. "Malakoff" for the seasons 1923, 1924 and 1925 respectively.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I beg to table the information.

(22) MR. HIBBS—(1) Asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the Table of the House a statement giving the names of all Fishery Inspectors engaged under his Department during the year 1925; (2) To state the District or Section of District in which such Inspectors operated; (3) To state the nature of the duties assigned to Inspectors, and to table a copy of their reports; (4) To state the salary paid to each individual Inspector.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—On behalf of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I beg to table the information.

(25) MR. HIBBS asked Hon. the Prime Minister if the Government is in possession of any authoritative information regarding the promotion of the proposed Pulp and Paper industry on the Gander Valley, and if so, to Table all such information.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, in reply I may say that I have no information on that matter at all.

(26) MR. HIBBS asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the Table of the House the following information: (a) What time was Capt. Tavernor dismissed from the Railway Service; (b) What pay he was receiving at the time of his dismissal; (c) How long he was laid off; (d) When was he re-instated; (e) If he was paid for the time that he was laid off; and if so why?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker in reply to question 26 I may say that Capt. Tavernor has not being dismissed at any time.

(27) MR. RANDELL asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing the total expenditure incurred by sending the S. S. Prospero, and also the S. S. Sagona, to the sealfishery during the season of 1925; also the total loss to the Colony in respect to the outfitting of these ships; also to show the nett earnings of each ship for the season mentioned.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I beg to table the information.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Speaker: I wish to address myself to the Colonial Secretary in reference to the answers to these questions particularly in regard to expenditure. It would be just as well to apprise Mr. Hall of the nature of these questions so that the information that we are seeking may be in the report.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—In reply to the hon. member I may say that I pointed out to Mr. Hall the other morning the questions on the order paper, and I told him that I wanted the answers as full as possible. I ask the indulgence of the House until this report is tabled, and then I will be glad to furnish any additional information.

Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to move the House into Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions respecting the Taxation and immunity from Taxation of State enterprises.

Hon. the Minister of Justice gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill to amend Section 4 of Cap. 1 Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) en-

titled "Of the Promulgation and Construction of Statutes."

Hon. the Minister of Posts gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill "An Act to amend the Act 11, George V, 35, of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Postal and Telegraph Services."

Hon. the Minister of Posts gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill "An Act further to Amend Chapter 35 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Postal and Telegraph Services.' "

Hon. the Minister of Finance tabled the following documents:

Statement of Customs Revenue collected in the Colony during the year ended 30th June, 1925.

Statement of the Imports and Exports of the Colony for the year ended 30th June, 1925.

A Comparative Statement of Goods, Wares, Merchandise imported into the Colony during the years ended 30th June, 1924, and 30th June, 1925, showing increases and decreases for the year 1924-25.

A Comparative Statement of Revenue received at each Outport for the years 1923-24 and 1924-25.

A Comparative Statement of Light Dues, showing collections at each Outport for the years 1923-24 and 1924-25.

A Return of the Bank Fishery for the year 1925.

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 30th, June 1925.

An Abstract of Shipping for the year ended 31st December, 1925.

The Minister of Agriculture tabled the Reports of his Department 1924-25.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the adjournment of this House until to-morrow afternoon at three of the clock, but first I would like to make a remark in connection with these questions being asked. There are some ridiculous questions being asked which I think that the Government should not be called upon to respond to, and if I am not out of order, Mr. Speaker, might I suggest that the questions be submitted to the chair before being asked, so that they might be passed by you as the correct questions to be answered. The Hon. Member for St. Barbe has asked a question concerning the railway and if we were to gather all the information, we would never get out of the House.

MR. SCAMMELL—Pardon me, Mr. Speaker, but I do not agree with the position taken by the Prime Minister, that members are obliged to submit their questions to you. As regards the member for St. Barbe asking for information concerning the railway; the member is entitled to that information and that member is going to get it.

MR. SPEAKER—The Speaker has the right to censor questions and to disallow any that may be irregular.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, March 9th, 1926.

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

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

Balance Sheet of Treasury Accounts for the year ended June 30th, 1925.

Statement of Public Debt to June 30th, 1925.

Statement of the Current Account of the Government of Newfoundland for the year ended 30th June, 1925.

Mr. Cashin gave notice of question.

Mr. Grimes gave notice of question.

Mr. Ashbourne gave notice of question.

Mr. Randell gave notice of question.

Mr. Brown gave notice of question.

Mr. Warren gave notice of question.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Sec. 4 of Cap. 1 Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Promulgation and Construction of Statutes' 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 Posts the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 11, George V., Cap. 37, entitled "An Act further to amend Chapter 35 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of the Postal and Telegraph Services" 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 Posts the Bill entitled "An Act further to Amend Chapter 35 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Postal and Telegraph Services' was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Speaker, at this juncture I should like to refer to my statement of the opening day regarding distribution of the Speech from the Throne, and also point out that Bills are not distributed until the second reading. These Bills should be distributed immediately on the first reading, as members have no time to study the principles of the Bills. I have taken the trouble to look into the matter, and find that in other places bills are always so distributed. In the Canadian House, the leader of the Opposition often asks "Please explain," and often short explanations as to the nature of the Bill are given. Here the second reading comes immediately. There is nothing in the rules of the House which prevents Bills being distributed, and there is nothing to hinder such being done. I suggest immediate distribution of all Bills on their first reading—we do not want to be here until Summer, and after introduction and first reading the bills are the property of the House and should be printed and distributed.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, with your permission I should like a word or two. I quite agree with the suggestion of the hon. member for Fortune; the rules of the House do not prevent it. What I was thinking was that there might be an intermission of a day between the time the Bill was posted and debate on it on the second reading. It happens that to-day all bills have been printed. Regarding the motion of the Minister of Finance, that was printed by error in bill form, and had to be reprinted as resolutions. There is no reason why bills should not be distributed as suggested. Practice in other countries does provide for this, and it ought to prevail here.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Speaker, with your indulgence, I may say that I only spoke as I did because it was the first opportunity I had of doing so.

HIS HONOR THE SPEAKER—On this matter reference was made yesterday afternoon to the manner in

which questions have been asked in this Assembly, and I think it is timely that certain general propositions be stated for the information and guidance of honourable members in framing questions; the more so as this is the beginning of the session and it may obviate difficulty and contribute to a more satisfactory state of affairs in relating to the asking of questions during the remainder of the session. Under the rules of the House questions may be put to Ministers of the Crown relating to any Bill, motion or other public matter connected with the business of the House in which such members may be concerned.

In putting any such question no argument or opinion may be offered nor any facts stated except so far as may be necessary to explain such question.

In answering any such question a member may not debate the matter to which the same refers.

But the form and nature of such questions and their phraseology are confined within well known limits. For example the main purpose of a question is to seek and not to supply information to the House. The question should not contain statements of facts unless they are necessary to make the question intelligible and such statements can be authenticated. The question should not contain argument or expressions of opinion or inferences or imputations. A question should not contain controversial or ironical expressions. A question should not refer to a debate or answers to questions during the current session. An expression of opinion or the solution of an abstract legal case or of a hypothetical proposition cannot be sought in a question directed to a Minister of the Crown. It is not in order to ask in a question whether certain statements in a newspaper are correct or not; but attention may be drawn to such statements in a newspaper, provided that the member who asks the question makes himself responsible for their accuracy.

No question can be asked which reflects upon the character or conduct of a member, or which implies charges of personal character, and no question should be asked which tends to prejudice a pending trial. Questions should be simply and severely accurate in their allegations."

The custom of this House has been in the past to give notice of questions directed to Ministers of the Crown by reading those questions aloud. I submit for the consideration of the Assembly the question whether time might not be saved if notice of the proposed questions might not be given by a mere deposit of the questions with the Clerk of the House, instead of reading them aloud on the day of notice as at present. The Clerk, if in doubt as to their regularity, might refer them to the Speaker, and they of course would appear on the following day's paper and be answered in the usual way. The Speaker has the right to censor such questions and veto those which may be irregular. I think it is desirable subject to the pleasure of the House that in future questions should be presented in duplicate to the Clerk at the table, the Clerk retaining one copy and forwarding the other to the Speaker for his consideration. Last evening I went over various questions which were asked by certain Honourable Members at that sitting. In some cases I altered and corrected certain questions; in other cases I had to disallow questions which had not fulfilled these requirements. I have already intimated this to the Hon. Members who asked those questions. There was one particular question asked by the Honorable Member for Ferryland and di-

rected to the Honorable Colonial Secretary asking that the correspondence between His Excellency the Governor and a certain party, and between His Excellency the Governor and the Secretary of State for the Colonies be laid upon the table of the House. As that concerns a matter of procedure, I deem it advisable to specifically refer to it, and to say that in my opinion information of that character should not be sought in that fashion from a Minister of the Crown.

In order to obtain that information it would be necessary to move that an Address be presented to His Excellency praying that His Excellency transmit for the information of the House the correspondence in question. The Address may be moved for upon notice of motion in the usual way.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether I am in order or not, but speaking upon the statement made in the House, I take it that you have made a ruling, and if it is necessary to bring me within the rules of the House I move that your ruling may not be sustained. You have very accurately, Sir, quoted the authorities on the point of how Notices of Questions should be given. They are rather abstract and I suppose do not concern Members on the Government side of the House, as they do not ask questions and are only worried by the questions asked them. Consequently, the people effected by this ruling are the Opposition and Independent Members. In other words this discussion so far as this House is concerned is entirely a matter that interests those who do not belong to the Government of the day. I may say, Sir, that you were good enough to intimate to me privately that you were to make such a rule, and I may say also that the Leader of the Opposition also consulted me privately in regard to it, and I presumed that you were going to make this pronouncement. Nobody in this House can find fault with the general principle you have laid down respecting the asking of questions. I have no hesitation in saying that some questions asked here were outside the Rules of the House; but I must also say that if they are framed in different phraseology they will effect and attain the same object.

Now, Sir, there is only one statement that I would like to ask you for a further ruling on. You stated that any Member of this House who cites a quotation from a paper has got to make himself personally responsible for the accuracy. I would like to ask if you meant that the member made himself personally responsible for the accuracy of the facts in the statement or the accuracy of the fact of publication. You said, Sir, that time would be saved by Members not reading their Notices of Questions. That may be alright in the British House of Commons where they have an Order Paper daily consisting of three or four hundred questions, and where they have to save time in many other ways such as "Closures," guillotine &c.; but in this House I see no reason for preventing Members from reading to this House the Notices of Questions they propose to ask. The average number of questions daily on the Order Paper here is three or four, although at the beginning of this Session there were between twenty and thirty, and perhaps Members might be a little less prolix in their remarks and read out their questions.

It has been the practice in this House since this Institution was founded in 1832, and again since the days of Responsible Government in 1854, for Members to give Notices of Questions and read them openly, so that not only the Ministers interest-

ed in answering them should have due notice of them, but so that other members of the House might have their attention drawn to the points raised by the question. Besides, very often strangers—and I do not wish to suggest that strangers are present—are interested in the questions asked, and not infrequently people come here as strangers one day to hear the questions asked and come back here again the next day as strangers to hear the questions answered. I do not think that any good can be served by handing in to the Clerk at the table questions to be asked, the Speaker calling the number of the question and the Minister to whom the question is directed saying "I beg to table the answer." I do not think that we need go on to that sort of thing because there is not a soul in the country will know what the question and answer is about, if they do not read something about it in the ordinary papers. I think that we should follow the example of the Prime Minister, who is credited with putting all his cards on the table and face up at that; and have all questions and their answers placed on the table, so that everybody can see them, and face up at that.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker: I rise for the purpose of asking you if what you have submitted to the House is your positive ruling, if it is I think that your ruling should not be sustained. The honorable member for Fortune Bay has outlined many reasons why it should not be sustained, and there are others. I suppose since the time of the granting of Responsible Government in this country there has never been such a ruling given in this House of Assembly. Questions have always been asked in the usual way and I do not see why there should be a departure from that way now. Unless a question is read, how can a member on any side of the House know what it is about? You also referred to questions in which correspondence was asked for between the Colonial office and His Excellency the Governor in reference to any particular subject. There is a particular case in point and in which the correspondence should be tabled in the House and for which correspondence I had intended to ask, and that is respecting what took place between His Excellency the Governor and the Colonial office relative to St. John's East district some time ago. As Leader of the Opposition, I had some private correspondence on the subject with His Excellency and with the Colonial office. A short time after the correspondence took place two daily newspapers in St. John's came out and published the whole correspondence. I made an effort to find out where the papers got this private correspondence, and I have an intimation from His Excellency the Governor that the correspondence came to the Colonial Secretary's office and that the Colonial Secretary was responsible for having it published. Well, if private correspondence like that can be made public, I do not see why this House is not entitled to all the correspondence that takes place between His Excellency the Governor and the Colonial office on any subject which concerns the policy of this country, and for that reason as well as others, Sir, I think your ruling is not what it should be.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker: In this discussion, which was brought by that question which emanated from me, I should like to have something to say. True it was not framed by any member of the legal fraternity; I, as an ordinary layman, framed it and in doing so took it for granted that it did not contain any imputation against any Minister of the Crown. I thought I put a straight question and

was desirous of getting a straight answer to it, with the result that this discussion takes place this afternoon. In bowing to your ruling that the question should have been framed in a different manner, I shall have some of the wording altered and shall again ask the question to-morrow afternoon. With regard to your suggestion that questions should not be read by any members of the House, I regret to say that I am not in accord with your idea. This method of shortening time by private members passing along questions to the Clerk of the House may be alright in the House of Commons in London or Ottawa where three or four hundred questions are asked daily, but I think the old rule established in this Legislature since the days of Responsible Government should be carried out here, as I feel that it is only right and proper that private members as well as interested strangers who come in here should have an opportunity to hear the questions that are asked and the answers. I thank you sincerely, Sir, for putting me on the right road in connection with the framing of that question, but I feel that upon reconsideration, you will agree with previous speakers and myself in relation to the method of asking questions here.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Speaker: I would like to associate myself with the remarks of previous speakers in this discussion in relation to questions asked by private members. I would like to say that the House should consider itself quite elevated for the lession read them by you on the nicety of language they are to use in asking questions. We have lost nothing; probably learned a great deal, and I trust, Sir, that your own nicety of language, ruling and explanation will be strictly adhered to, not only by members of this Parliament, but by those who come after us.

On the question as to the right or advisability of members to read out their questions when giving notice of such, I endorse what previous speakers have said in relation thereto, no matter how wearisome a question might seem to be, or however much a Minister of the Crown may not like to hear it read. I feel that all members of Parliament have free and untrammelled rights to ask questions in the public interest, and the least we should expect is that we should be given the right to stand up here as men and read out the questions asked, as not only Ministers of the Crown themselves are interested, but private members and strangers as well, like to hear the information sought and the answers received.

In again thanking you, Sir, for your ruling, I still hold that it is better for a man to be able to stand up here freely, fearlessly and openly and ask and read his questions, because I believe in the old truism that and ask and read his questions, becomes accepted with the force of law."

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER Mr. Speaker: Before you pronounce on the remarks made by certain speakers on the other side of the House, I would like to put myself right on the matter. As it was I who raised this matter relative to questions of the previous sitting by intimating that there was a doubt in my mind as to how a question should be asked, more particularly with regard to the question asked by the honorable member for St. Barbe, wherein every bar of soap and every towel purchased and used by the railroad for the past twelve months would have to be accounted for and which question would occupy a couple of months to answer. That particular question struck me as being ridiculous and I approached the Speaker on the matter. So far as the reading

out of questions is concerned so that the people may know what is asked and before a Minister may reply, I would say that I, personally, have not the slightest objection to having them read, nor do I think any member on this side of the House would object to them either, as far as I know, and I think that the proposition in that respect came from the Speaker to save the time of the House. I merely want to make myself clear in this discussion, as I never made any endeavour to quash in any way the requirements of the Opposition in that respect.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Speaker, the motion that I made that your ruling be not sustained I propose to withdraw. The two points arising in the discussion since I made the motion have been referred to by the Leader of the Opposition and the member for St. Barbe. I take it that the Leader of the Opposition understands that with regard to this correspondence between His Excellency the Governor and anybody else it is only a method of application respecting the question. Instead of giving notice of question he simply gives notice of motion and the members of the House on either side can vote how they like. At all events, it is just the same in effect as the ordinary notice of question. With regard to the question asked by the hon. member for St. Barbe and referred to by the Prime Minister, I desire to say that this House would stand by the Prime Minister, if he had come and said that he could not answer it, as it would probably take two or three months to prepare. The motion that I made respecting your ruling, Sir, I again ask leave to withdraw.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker: I trust that this matter which is now the subject of much discussion before the House will clear up any misunderstandings that may be in the minds of any members of the House with regard to what should and what should not be done as to the asking of questions.

I agree with the Speaker that the matter and the phraseology of questions should have been considered not only by this House, but also by some of the parliaments of the past, and I trust that we shall now benefit by the Speaker bringing this matter to the attention of the House as he has done this afternoon. If we are going to restrict in any way the privileges before they are submitted to the House, perhaps he and the members of this House might be misunderstood and misrepresented. Perhaps the majority of the members of this House may say "What is the necessity of wasting so much time as long as the question is put on the Order Paper, and the member gets the reply he is looking for?" But you can't get clear of public opinion, and I believe that, if the suggestion of the Speaker, although he may be honest and sincere is acted upon, it will be misunderstood and misrepresented.

We are obliged to the Hon. Member for Fortune for proposing this question to the House in the way he did, so that we could all have an opportunity of speaking to it. There are two questions which have occupied the members of this House since I had to speak here, and I think, perhaps previous to my coming here. If you look up the Hansard of 1913 or 1914, you will see there that when Judge Kent was Leader of the Opposition, he asked that the Internal Economy Committee take up this question of having the replies to questions published in the Hansard, as he thought it would be a benefit to the public if the replies were published. Now we find if we take up the Hansard for the last two or three sessions, that some questions

are answered if it suits the Government, if the reply is favourable to the powers that be. If the reply would be regarded as unfavourable, it is not published. I think that we should make a ruling on this, and that we should be sustained by the whole House, and that all replies to questions should be published in the Hansard. I know that, at that time, the Prime Minister was Sir Edward Morris, now Lord Morris. He took the matter very favorably, and said that it would receive the greatest consideration, and that he would take the matter up with the Internal Economy Committee. Since then, some of the replies to questions were published, and some were not. I respectfully draw the attention of the present Prime Minister to this question of having replies published. It was a source of controversy from year to year and session to session. I would suggest that this question of making any change in the procedure of the House with regard to these questions be not pressed at this time because both sides of the House do not want, at the beginning of the session, to cause any unpleasantness and have the newspapers misrepresenting the actions of the Government in this matter. It would be better to go the same old way.

Mr. Warren gave notice of question.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Mr. Speaker, I may say for the hon. member's information that, as far as I know, that man has been paid nothing to date.

MR. WARREN—That is not the answer to my question, Mr. Speaker; that is only half the answer. I asked if he was getting anything from the fines that has been imposed.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Mr. Speaker, he does, Sir, but he has not been paid anything yet.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Speaker, I know that very well.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Mr. Speaker, well, if the hon. member knows that, why is he asking me that question?

MR. WARREN—Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that I am not asking that question for my own benefit. I am asking that for the benefit of those who are interested in that matter.

NOTICE OF QUESTION.

(1) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries: (a) The total number of schooners that prosecuted the Labrador fishery during the year 1924; (b) the total number of schooners that prosecuted the Labrador fishery during the year 1925; (c) the total number of vessels fishing on the Grand Banks, owned and operated in Newfoundland during the year 1924; and (d) the total number of vessels fishing on the Grand Banks owned and operated in Newfoundland during the year 1925.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member I would just like to say that in 1924 there were 474 Labrador schooners employed, and in 1925, 497; in 1924, thirty-six bankers, and in 1925, forty-one.

Question No. 2 deferred.

(3) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister, as Chairman of the Railway Commission, to lay on the Table of the House the following information: (a) What amount of Marine Insurance is carried on each steamer owned and operated by the Newfoundland Government Railway; (b) the rate and amount of premium payable on account of each steamer; (c) the name of the agent in Newfoundland who secured the business; (d) if tenders were asked for this business, to lay them on the Table of the House; and (e) if no tenders were asked for, why not? (f)

To table the policies covering amount on each boat.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that it is impossible, when we get the Order Paper at twelve o'clock, to have an answer to a question at three o'clock, and I think the members of the Opposition will bear with me in that matter and at least give us forty-eight hours to prepare the answers to the questions.

MR. CASHIN—With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that, while I agree with what the Prime Minister has said in regard to the difficulty of preparing answers to questions in short time, yet I would ask on behalf of the members on this side of the House, who are here to debate matters in the interest of their country, that a special effort would be made to get the questions here as quickly as possible, and if it should take some time to get that information, I think that the debate should be postponed until the said information is forthcoming.

Question No. 4 deferred.

Question No. 5 deferred.

(6) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the Table of the House the following information: The amount paid the Hon. A. B. Morine on account of services rendered in connection with the Pecuniary Claims case at Washington.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Mr. Speaker, for the information of the hon. member I may say that the amount paid to the Hon. A. B. Morine on account of services rendered in connection with Pecuniary Claims case at Washington is $2,500.

(7) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the Table of the House the following information: The amount paid to Mr. C. E. Hunt on account of services rendered in connection with the Pecuniary Claims case at Washington.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Mr. Speaker, for the information of the hon. member I may say that no payment has been made by this House to Mr. C. E. Hunt in connection with the Pecuniary Claims case.

(8) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the Table of the House the folllowing information: The amount paid to the Hon. A. B. Morine for services drafting the new Liquor Bill; if no amount has ben paid him, has Mr. Morine submitted a bill, and if so for what amount?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Mr. Speaker, for the information of the hon. member I may say that Mr. Morine has been paid $1,000 for services rendered in the drafting of the new Liquor Bill.

(9)MR. CASHIN—asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the Table of the House the following information: The amount paid to the Hon. A. B. Morine for services drafting the Re-Disttribution Bill; if no amount has been paid him, has Mr. Morine submitted a bill, and if so for what amount?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Mr. Speaker, for the information of the hon. member I may say that the amount paid to Mr. A. B. Morine for services rendered in drafting the Re-Distribution Bill was $2,000.

(10) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the Table of the House the folllowing information: The amount paid to the Hon. A. B. Morine for services drafting the Roads and Highways Bill; if no amount has been paid him, has Mr. Morine submitted a bill, and if so for what amount

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Mr. Speaker, for the in-

formation of the hon. member I may say that the amount paid to the Hon. A. B. Morine for services rendered in drafting the Roads and Highways Bill was $250.

Question No. 11 deferred.

Question No. 12 deferred.

(13) MR. GRIMES asked Hon. the Prime Minister if the Labor Bureau is still in operation; if so, give the names of all persons attached to the Bureau and the salaries paid and the nature of the work they have to do; also if it is the intention of the Government to continue the Bureau and the reasons for doing so; if not, the reasons for discontinuing the Bureau.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I may say in answer to the hon. member that that Bureau has been done away with and there is no one being paid in connection with that at the present time.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Hon. the Prime Minister what were his reasons for discontinuing this Bureau?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the hon. member that my reasons for discontinuing this are the same as the reason for discontinuing anything that is no longer of service.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Prime Minister if he means by that that there are none out of employment to-day?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, of course I did not mean that; but it is not necessary to keep an employment bureau to get employment for a man or two.

(14) MR. GRIMES asked the Minister of Agriculture and Mines to lay on the Table of the House copies of all correspondence that passed between his Department and the firms or individuals from whom the machinery was purchased for the breaking of limestone.

HON. THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES—Mr. Speaker, I beg to table the information for the benefit of the hon. gentleman.

Question No. 15 deferred.

Question No. 16 deferred.

(17) MR. HIBBS asked the Minister of Public Works to state when the last election of Road Boards under the Local Affairs Act, 1915, took place, and if there are any Road Boards elected, are they operating in Newfoundland to-day; and if not, why not?

HON. THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay the information on the Table of the House.

Question No. 18 deferred.

(19) MR. BROWN asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing all amounts paid by the Marine and Fisheries Department to officials of that Department and others on behalf of the Department for travelling expenses since July 1st, 1924, to date, and also to show what amount was paid the Minister of Marine and Fisheries as travelling expenses on account of his trip to Quebec this winter.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay that information on the Table of the House.

Question 20 deferred.

(21) MR. SCAMMELL asked Hon. the Colonial Secretary the total cost to the Colony of Newfoundland's share in the Wembley Exhibition for the seasons of 1924 and 1925 respectively; and to ask how many Newfoundlanders were employed at the Newfoundland Pavillion in each of these seasons and what they were paid; also to ask who the Mr. E. C. Robinson employed there is, and what arrangements were made with him and what he was paid; and further to ask if any enuiries were received for Newfoundland codfish by those in charge there, and to what fish ex-

porting firms these enquiries were transmitted; and to ask if there were any such enquiries why they were not made public in the interest of the whole of the exporting firms of the Colony.

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

(22) MR. SCAMMELL asked the Minister of Public Works to table a statement showing who paid Motor Car Taxes and Licenses in the Outports, and to show if there were any who have not paid, to state who they are and why they have not paid.

HON. THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Speaker, I wish to say as I said yesterday in connection with other questions that my department has nothing to do with motor car taxes and licenses in outports. That is a matter for the Highroads Commission.

Question No. 23 deferred.

Question No. 24 deferred.

(25) MR. SCAMMELL asked the Hon. Prime Minister to lay on the Table of the House a list of all purchases made by the Railway Commission from January 1st, 1925, to December 31st, 1925, and to show the prices paid in each case and parties from whom purchases were made.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — Mr. Speaker, I think that we will have it, if the hon. member insists on it, this day twelve months. I would like to suggest that if there is any information, that is, any particular information, we will be glad to give it to him, but questions of this sort are absurd. Why, you would have to take on another set of clerks to prepare that information.

(26) MR. ASHBOURNE asked the Prime Minister to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing why the administration of the Highroads Commission was transferred from the Department of Public Works to the Colonial Secretary's Department.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, in response to Mr. Ashbourne's question, may I lay on the Table of the House a statement showing why the Highroads Commission was transferred from the Department of Public Works to the Colonial Secretary's Department. May I also say that the administration of the Highroads Commission was not transferred. There was a special Act introduced here last year in connection with the Highways Commission and the Highroads Commission was inaugurated under that Act.

Question No. 27 prepared.

Question No. 28 deferred.

Question No. 29 deferred.

(30) MR. HICKMAN asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the Table of the House all correspondence in reference to the last loan raised by the Government; the correspondence to include the original tenders received; copy of advertisements by which the loan was advertised; the name of all publications in which the advertisement appeared asking for tenders for the loan.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Mr. Speaker, for the information of the hon. member I may say that there was no such thing as advertising for this loan. None whatever. The Bank of Montreal, the New York Syndicate and another company gave us tenders for this loan. The tender was submitted to me by each individual agent of those companies here, and after consulting with the Prime Minister I decided to accept the tender from the Bank of Montreal. I have much pleasure in passing this information over to the hon. member and I would like to ask the hon. member not to lose these as they will be wanted back in the Department.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, in moving the adjournment of the House, I do not wish to make any suggestion as to the limiting of speeches of members of the Opposition, but I do contend that speeches should not be longer than is necessary. I noticed last year and again at this session a strong desire to discuss matters in connection with Bills which are not yet before the House. Such matters are first discussed on the Motion for the Address in Reply and again discussed all over again when the Bills come up. It would save time if members, who have any comments or criticisms to make on the Bell Island agreement or any other Acts, would reserve what they have to say until the legislation is brought down. In that connection I would call the attention of the House to the fact that last year the Hansard cost this Colony nearly ten thousand dollars, and still Mr. Halfyard suggests this afternoon that all questions and answers should appear in Hansard. They were published in Hansard last year and at an enormous expense, and I suggested to the Internal Economy Commission to have it cut out, as I thought the money could be more profitably spent on old age pensions or something of the kind. Apparently we should have some kind of record and our idea is to cut down the Hansard, although we have to keep verbatim reports of speeches. For that reason I would suggest—and I wish the suggestion would come from the Opposition side—that no member speak longer than half an hour on one subject. There is no subject but can be dealt with in a half an hour, notwithstanding that certain Opposition members spoke for four hours last year. I merely mention that we do not propose, as suggested by Mr. Halfyard, to publish questions and answers in the Hansard. Personally, I look upon the Hansard as a sort of "burying ground" for debates in this House.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, March 10th, 1926.

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

Petitions were presented by

Mr. Ashbourne from Burton's Arm re road.

Mr. Speaker read the following communication from His Excellency the Governor:

The Governor has the honour to communicate to the Honourable House of Assembly the appointment of the Commissioners of Internal Economy of the Legislature in accordance with the provisions of Section 4, Cap. VII., Consolidated Statutes (Third Series), as set forth in the accompanying certified copy of Minute of the Honourable the Executive Council approved by the Governor on the 8th inst.

(Sgd.) W. L. ALLARDYCE,
Governor.

Government House,
St. John's, Nfld.,
10 March, 1926.

March 6tht, 1926.—Under the provisions of Section 4, Cap. 7, Consolidated Statutes, it was ordered that the following gentlemen shall be the Commission of Internal Economy of the Legislature, namely:

The President Legislative Council.
Hon. A. B. Morine, K.C.
Hon. 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.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the answer to Question No. 5 of Order Paper March 9th, asked by the hon. member for Ferryland. I would also like to say in this connection that I am tabling the memorial of the United States and the answer of Great Britain, which includes Newfoundland's case. I also table the report of the counsel for the Colony, which was sent to the Government. I think this report would well repay members for any time they might spend in the reading of it. I would like to ask the hon. member to leave the information with the Clerk of the House when he has studied it.

Mr. Cashin gave notice of question.

Mr. Scammell gave notice of question.

Mr. Ashbourne gave notice of question.

Mr. Halfyard gave notice of question.

Mr. Hickman gave notice of question.

Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs tabled the Report of the Auditor General and the Report under Section 33 (B).

Mr. Cashin gave notice that he would on to-morrow move that an address be presented to His Excellency the Governor by this House, praying that His Excellency may be graciously pleased to transmit to this House, for its information, the correspondence between His Excellency and Mr. J. A. W. W. McNeily, Barrister-at-Law, in relation to the law firm of Higgins, Hunt and Emerson, of which the Minister of Justice, Hon. W. J. Higgins, is a member, acting for firms and individuals in contractural relationship with the Government, together with the correspondence between His Excellency and the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and all other correspondence or documents in connection therewith.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—I beg leave to table the reply to the question asked by the hon. member for Ferryland on the Order Paper of March 9th.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I think that I have answered all the questions asked me to date with the exception of one, and I would like to call attention to this question regarding new appointments in the departments of the civil service. New appointments in the cviil service do not necessarily mean new jobs.

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 the Taxation and Immunity from Taxation of State Enterprises.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—I would like to explain to the House that these resolutions are in connection with the taxation on state enterprises. As far as I know it does not affect us very much. I will read it for the information of the House.

(Reads.)

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —I think that a word of explanation might be in order. Perhaps the member for Fortune Bay knows more about this matter than anyone else, because he was the Attorney General and Prime Minister at the time, and was present at the Imperial Conference. As the Minister of Finance has said, it is simply legislation that has been passed by the Imperial Parliament and the self-governing colonies. It provides that state enterprises of certain nature be taxed,—those engaged in trade; for example, if the Canadian Government Merchant Marine operates a line here, they will be liable to the taxation of the coun-

try as well as any other private company. But in London the Canada House is not in trade, and under this it would not be liable to taxation. It simply provides that state enterprises will be liable to taxation as well as private enterprises when they engage in trade. This is in similar form to what has been adopted elsewhere.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Speaker, what the Minister of Justice says is true. I was at the Economic Conference when these resolutions were introduced, and I think that they have been adopted by all the other self-governing dominions in the British Empire. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance if he knows if there are any Government enterprises in this country that willl come under this Act.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—I do not know of any.

MR. WARREN—I understand that we have a cable tax in this country. There is a cable landed in this country that has since been taken over by the British Government, and I thought that it would have to pay taxation as well as anyone else. But when I was Prime Minister I found that this cable company had ceased to pay taxes, and I discovered that the cable had been taken over by the British Government, and they refused to pay the taxes. They claimed that the Crown was not subject to taxation. When I was in London, I think that the amount of the arrears was about $90,000.00. I paid a visit to the Deputy Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, or whatever the gentleman is called in London, and I asked him if he did not think that the British Government should pay taxes as well as any other private company doing cable business in Newfoundland, such as the Commercial or the Western Union Telegraph Companies; but he said that the Government was not bound to pay taxes, and he refused to pay.

(Reads last section of the Resolutions.)

I would like to ask the Minister of Finance if he knows if the British Government has paid any cable taxes?

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—To the best of my knowledge all the cable taxes have been paid. There has not been any report to me of any that have not been paid.

MR. WARREN—I thought that the Minister of Finance would know about that. As a matter of fact I told the gentleman I met in London that we would introduce legislation that would make them pay the cable taxes.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—I will let the hon. member know to-morrow.

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 a Bill be introduced to give effect to the same.

On motion this Report was received and adopted and the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the Taxation and Immunity from Taxation of State Enterprises" 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. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Public Works to lay on the Table of the House the following information: All Tenders which were submitted by various business concerns in the city the past autumn for coal to be supplied to the several Government Institutions, these Tenders to include prices submitted for American Household Coal; also table reports on both American and Sydney coal by Mr. Forbes, the Boiler Inspector; and, if the lowest figure was not accepted, why not?

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—

This answer is being prepared.

MR. CASHIN—I would like to ask if we will really get this information next day. This ought to be definite; we may not get the answer until next week.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—We are very busy at the Department just now preparing answers, etc., and will give all information as soon as possible.

MR. SPEAKER—I think the answer is satisfactory.

MR. CASHIN—I may say that the Prime Minister usually gives us his answers in a day, but others do not. I am not pressing this thing unduly, but we ought to have answers to our questions, which are on economic questions.

(2) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the Table of the House the folllowing information : (a) What amount has been paid to the Hon. W. J. Higgins since 1924 as retainer for services reference the Labrador Boundary; (b) what amount has been paid to the Hon. W. J. Higgins for expenses, etc., in connection with his trip to England in the autumn of 1925 with reference to the Labrador Boundary; (c) what amount has been paid to the Hon. W. S. Monroe, Hon. Sir P. T. McGrath, Hon. J. R. Bennett and Hon. W. J. Higgins in connection with expenditures on their trip to Canada in 1924 with reference to the Labrador Boundary.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—I may say that no amounts have been paid these gentlemen.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —I may say for the benefit of the hon. member that I am giving an answer to question No. 10 which gives all information regarding the Labrador Boundary.

MR. CASHIN—But that is not an answer to my question.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —No, but it gives the information which perhaps the hon. member wishes to get.

(3) MR CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the Table of the House the following information: What coal was purchased by the Railway Department during the last part of 1925 from Sydney for railway purposes and what price was paid for same; also the amount of coal supplied the Railway by the firm represented by Hon. M. S. Sullivan; if this firm carried out their full contract; if not, why not. Also state if any action has been taken by the Railway for loss, if any, on account of having to purchase from Sydney because of non-performance of their contract by the firm represented by Mr. Sullivan; if no action has been taken, why not.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I shall table the information asked for to-morrow.

(4) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in his capacity as Chairman of the Railway Commission, to lay on the Table of the House the following information: All reports submitted by the various engineers on the steamship service and on the railway service, in connection with the quality of American coal and English coal, respectively, purchased last year by the Railway Commission.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I shall table the information to-morrow.

(5) MR. CASHIN asked the Hon. the Colonial Secretary if the Hon. M. S. Sullivan is still in receipt of a pension from the Board of Pension Commissioners for Newfoundland, and if so, why?

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—In answer to the question I may say that Hon. Mr. Sullivan is not in receipt of a pension from the Board of Pension Commissioners, nor has he ever been so. The Colonel has received a pension from the Imperial

authorities in connection with his work with the Foresters. This is paid by the Imperial authorities through the Pensions Board here.

(6) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the Table of the House the following information: What amount was paid the Hon. M. S. Sullivan for services and expenses in connection with the construction of S. S. Caribou.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I have no information further than that tabled in answer to a question last year.

MR. CASHIN—I got no information last year. I merely ask for information now.

HON. THE SPEAKER—This information was tabled last year and would be a matter of record.

MR. WARREN—And if that information is not on record?

HON. THE SPEAKER—The question may be asked again.

(7) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the Table of the House the following information: (a) Mow many special Patrol Boats were stationed around the Island during the summer of 1925, giving the names, by whom owned; (b) if owned by the Government, amounts paid for same and from whom purchased; and (c) if hired from private individuals, the amount paid per day or month for hire.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the information asked for.

(8) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the Table of the House the following information: (a) The number of tons of stone, either crushed or rubble, used in the construction of the Dock and taken from the quarry owned by the Hon. W. J. Ellis; (b) a rough estimate of the number of tons of stone or rubble required for the construction of the Dock and Sheds; (c) whether the machinery erected on the property owned by the Hon. W. J. Ellis and used for the purpose of crushing stone on his quarry is to be removed after the construction of the Dock and Sheds are finished.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I beg leave to table the information asked for.

MR. CASHIN—Why I asked the last part of that question was because I noticed no clause in the contract which would permit the Government to take any machinery off Mr. Bishop's property.

(9) MR. GRIMES asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the Table of the House copies of tenders for supplies from May 1925 to date to the Government institutions under control of his Department and names of all firms or individuals whose tenders were accepted.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—I beg to say that this information is being prepared.

(10) MR. ASHBOURNE asked Hon. the Minister of Justice to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing all amounts paid on account of the Labrador Boundary Dispute since June 1st, 1924.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —I beg leave to table the information asked for.

(11) MR. ASHBOURNE asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the Table of the House a copy of the Agreement made between the Government and Messrs. Murray and Crawford in reference to the S. S. Prospero and S. S. Sagona sealing voyage of 1925.

HON. THE PRIME MININSTER — This information is being prepared and should be ready to-morrow.

(12) MR. RANDELL asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to lay on the Table of the House a copy of the Agreement between the

Government and the Marine Agencies in reference to the use of the Government wharf adjoining the premises of the Marine Agencies, and the abridging of the cove between.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, this is a half-holiday and I could not get this information from the Marine and Fisheries Department to-day. I guarantee, however, to have all information asked for from that Department with in 48 hours of a question. I could not get it to-day.

(13) MR. SCAMMELL asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, if any amounts were paid by the Fisheries Department to schooner owners fishing on Canadian Labrador waters during last season on account of fishing licenses, and state what such amounts were, and to whom, and on whose behalf they were paid.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I am sorry that I cannot give the amount. When Captain Winsor went down on the Canadian Labrador last year he found that the fees for traps had been doubled, and many men there unable to pay them. He arranged to advance amounts for those unable to pay, and collected from the schooner owners when they came on to St. John's. There was nothing whatever lost on this. While on my feet I may say that Captain Winsor has arranged that our vessels will be allowed to fish on the Canadian Labrador under the same conditions as Canadian fishermen. They raised the point that we were being charged the same as other fishermen outside Quebec, etc., but as there were really no others on the coast this did not apply. Our fishermen are not to carry guns and are not to interfere with birds' eggs. The Canadians are particularly anxious to preserve bird life. I do not know that our fishermen do interfere with it, but they are blamed with doing so, hence the stipulation.

MR. SCAMMELL—We appreciate the commendable promptituude of Hon. the Prime Minister in giving the information afforded. I should appreciate it if the Prime Minister would give us a list of the schooners carrying out that arrangement.

(14) MR. SCAMMELL asked the Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing all expenditure by the Fisheries Department since July 1st, 1924, to date, on account of Light Houses, for Paint, Kerosene Oil and new Lighting arrangements, and also the amount spent for replacements of the equipment and repairs to Light Houses.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — This is a Marine and Fisheries Department matter. I shall have the information to-morrow.

(15) MR. SCAMMELL asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the Table of the House a list of all allocations made through his Department to the District of St. Barbe from July 1st, 1924, to date.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS— That information is being prepared and will be tabled to-morrow.

(16) MR. SCAMMELL asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to lay on the Table of the House a statement of all allocations made by the Fisheries Department to the District of St. Barbe from July 1st, 1924, to date.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — That is also a Marine and Fisheries matter, and the same answer applies.

(17) MR. BROWN asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the Table of the House a copy of freight rates between St. John's and the different outports by Government coastal boats direct; also by rail and boat for different classes of merchandise.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER —

That is being prepared and will be ready to-morrow.

(18) MR. BROWN asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing the amount of public moneys sent to Grand Falls since July 1st, 1924, and to whom sent, and if returns of same has been sent in, and to table same.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—That information will be ready to-morrow.

(19) MR. BROWN asked Hon. the Colonial Secretary to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing the amount of money spent on able-bodied relief for each Electoral District in the Island since July 1st, 1924, to December 31st, 1925, and to state names of persons who received same.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I should like to draw the attention of the hon. gentleman to that question. While the part as to amounts is being prepared I cannot hope to answer the part as to the names of persons who received relief. I think you can appreciate that difficulty.

MR. SCAMMELL—I may say that was not the intention of the member asking the question.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY — Then that is alright.

MR. SCAMMELL—Can we get amounts spent in each electoral district, and by each Relieving Officer?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I think I might get that.

(20) MR. WARREN asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs if Mr. J. H. Dee is paid any portion of the fines imposed in any case in which he is prosecutor or acts for the prosecutor; if so, to lay upon the Table a statement of all amounts paid him during the period from July 1st, 1925, to date, showing from what cases they were derived.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—I beg to table amounts paid Mr. Dee.

MR. WARREN—We have no answer to the first part of that question.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—I take it you want to know if Dee gets part of the fines collected. Yes, he does, but that is not new with us, it was done before, and he was getting these amounts before.

MR. SCAMMELL—On the Order Paper of March 8th I asked the Minister of Public Works a question, which he advised came under the Colonial Secretary's Department, and which the Colonial Secretary advsied would be contained in a report. Are we to understand that we are to ask no questions in this regard?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—If you wait until the report is tabled you will find all this information covered in that report. This morning Mr. Hall told me we should probably have the information shortly.

MR. CASHIN—I have received no reply to question No. 14 on Order Paper of March 8th. Perhaps Mr. Lake can answer this.

MR. LAKE—The answer is in course of preparation. I am waiting on a mail from Corner Brook.

HON. THE SPEAKER—This is out of order, gentlemen. The hon. member cannot address a question to Mr. Lake in this manner.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—I would like to inform Mr. Hibbs, who asked a question on the first day, that this is being prepared and I ought to have it to-morrow.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, I purpose making a few remarks on the Speech from the Throne. It will be readily admitted that there is very little left to be said after the very exhaustive speech made by the member for Fogo. I congratulate him upon his effort, the pains he took, the time he devoted in its preparation and for

the very informative address that he delivered yesterday and to-day. It is the prerogative of members of this House to talk and it is just as well for any member of this House, no matter on what side he sits, to make up his mind that he will have to exercise a little patience. They say that Frenchmen are the most courteous people in the world and that they can listen to persons talking all kinds of nonsense with an apparent interest as if the remarks were entertaining and informative; so I would advise members of the Government this afternoon to console themselves and be happy whether they are entertained or not. I do not think that anything I shall say will cause any ill-feeling, because we are not here for the first time. I am sure that we can all bear honest criticism, and, if in the course of my remarks I should say anything that would appear to be of a critical nature, I trust that it will be accepted in the spirit in which it is said by the members of this House.

The Speech from the Throne refers to the death of the late Queen Alexandra. We, as members of the great British Empire, feel sorry over the death of any member of the Royal family, but we are particularly sorry over the death of a person of such high character and standing as the Queen Mother.

Some members of the House were disappointed because the Legislature did not meet earlier in the year, particularly the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. He regretted very much that the House did not open in January so that he would have an opportunity of attending the session and dealing with matters concerning his department. From the remarks made by the Prime Minister and his associates last year we were all more or less disappointed that the House did not open earlier. There may be good and sufficient reasons why it did not, nevertheless an effort should have been made for the Legislature to begin its session in January or February when it would be more suitable for outport members to attend their Legislative duties.

Of course this, after all, is only another instance of failure to carry out good intentions and good resolutions, as the Government is finding, as time passes, that it is practically impossible for them to put into practice all they thought they would be able to do before they became administrators of the affairs of this country. I was sorry I was not present at the opening of the session to hear the Speech from the Throne as well as the speeches made by the mover and seconder of the motion for the Address in Reply, Messrs. Puddester and Browne, respectively, and I had to content myself with reading their speeches in the newspapers. I congratulate these two gentlemen on the material supplied and I propose to refer to one or two remarks made by the mover, who thanked the Finance Minister for giving him the statistics showing that there was an increase of imports over exports for last year of approximately thirteen million dollars. If we are to take exports as a criterion or an exact barometer of the country's business, we may be millions of dollars astray, because we can only take the codfish entries as they are presented at the Custom House and find out what the total amount is. Our exports, which consist principally of fish and fish products, it is impossible to determine with any degree of accuracy the value. The only way we can get the correct amount of the exports of our products is from the accounts sales, and it is difficult to get that because a cargo of fish worth, say, $100,000, may leave here in a ship and after it reaches its destination, perhaps, only $25,000 may be realized on that cargo. The pro-

poser of the motion for the Address in Reply also said "without doubt the Act passed last session creating a bounty for schooner repairs stimulated activity in the Labrador fishery and it responsible to some extent for the increased catch on that coast."

Now I would like to know what an Act passed last April in this House had to do with the fiscal year ending June 30th, 1925; but if the honorable member for Bay de Verde had stated that without doubt the pronouncement made by the Prime Minister when he sought his election in Bonavista Bay to the effect that a bounty would be paid on fish stimulated activity for the Labrador fishery it would be nearer the truth, because I understand men went to the fishery expecting to get a bounty on their fish, as they were told, and they were sadly disappointed.

The bounty for schooner repairs might have also stimulated activity last summer; but even if you had no bounty on schooner repairs last year men would have gone to the Labrador just the same, because the preceding year's voyage gave them remunerative returns, and all those who could get supplies were anxious to go to the fishery. Anything that this Legislature did in regard to the encouragement of schooner building only had an effect on this country; but look at what other countries are doing and the successful operations that are going on in connection with the Lunenburg fleet. According to the Halifax Herald, 18 new fishing schooners were launched during the past year, 14 of which have joined the Lunenburg fleet; 9 were in course of construction at the earliest possible date.

The Speech from the Throne says "Not since the Great War commenced have conditions generally been so satisfactory as they are at present, and have been during the last twelve months." An unthinking person may be inclined to accept that statement without question, but the thinking person would ask what constructive policy of the Government brought about these satisfactory conditions, that is, a policy that provided remunerative employment after the constructive work had finished. I do not think that it can be seriously contended that anything has been done by the present Government that may be regarded as a source of employment for years to come, and that is the most unfortunate part of it.

It is true that conditions recently were better than they were for years past, but every member of this House must seriously consider what will happen to this country industrially, economically and financially after those works that were undertaken last year are completed—these temporary labor giving works, one cannot call them industries. Take the construction of the new hotel. That gave employment for the time being. After that hotel is built what returns will the people get? Take the Dry Dock, which is going to cost a million and a half of dollars by the time the freight sheds and other paraphernalia are thrown in. That will not make the earning power of the people any better.

The Government says that the Dry Dock is one of the best assets of the country. It is a public utility and it is necessary to have a dock for the country to dock its own vessels as well as ships from outside. A dock is something on a parallel with a planter who has to build a dock or landing place to enable him to carry on the fishery, and if it is washed away one year he has got to build a new one the next year. Now it is all very nice for us to have a great and expensive dock, but the question is, can we afford it?

A number of people who are working on the dock say that it could

have been rebuilt to meet the requirements of this country and take on 99½ per cent. of the ships that arrive in this port from outside and to last for the next forty years at a cost between three and four hundred thousand dollars; whereas the present new dock will cost between one and one and a quarter million dollars.

Can we congratulate ourselves then on such a condition, a condition which may appear to be one of prosperity when we find that we have to borrow the money, upon which we will have to pay hundreds of thousands of dollars annually for all time to provide ourselves with such a public utility; and are the Government justified in designating it one of the best assets of the country? I question the wisdom of the Government in doing what they have done. We all deplored the fact that we had to have the dock rebuilt and had to borrow the money to have the work done, but from a financial standpoint it puts us in a worse position than before.

Mr. Speaker, the same argument applies to the re-railing of the railway. The re-railing cost in the neighbourhood of $900,000, and it gave employment. The railway is put in better condition and transportation due to an improved roadbed is greatly improved. The railway is the same as the dock, a liability, a public utility, that we have got to borrow money to keep going.

The next thing that I am going to refer to is the work on the roads. That gave employment, thousands of men earned a certain amount of money, much or little. Some men last year made excellent wages, but what will these men do next year? The same facilities will not be afforded them for employment. There are men from Colinet and men from Whitbourne who were working on the Whitbourne and Colinet road.

Suppose it should be completed with the expenditure of a few more thousand dollars, then what will the men in these localities do next year? The same thing applies with regard to the road around Conception Bay to a greater or less extent. It gave employment last year and released the Government from a very unpleasant situation. If they did not have these avenues of employment there would have been just the same conditions as obtained with the Government that preceded them.

I refer now to the Conception Bay districts, and as to what these people will do after this source of employment is cut out. You have a few men from Conception Bay who could get employment on Bell Island. Those who have got accustomed to that work, although I am told that it is the worst kind of slavery that one can imagine, especially iron ore mining. Still people are accustomed to it, and they would go there when they would not go in the woods, but that will only supply employment for a comparatively few people.

Now, then, considering the sources of employment last year outside the fisheries, which enabled the people to buy dutiable goods, and therefore gave increased revenue to the Government. What will these people do next year, with no work on dock, hotel, railway and high roads in Conception Bay.

As I said before, there is nothing constructive, nothing permanent in this policy. As has been remarked by some honourable member not in this House in speaking in a chamber adjoining, "It is non-recurrent employment"; that is the way he described it. They get the work done, take the money, and then, in some cases, they create a liability instead of an asset. I think, Sir, that it was said by some other speaker, "The dry dock is a splendid asset; the Caribou is a

splendid asset, and there is another enterprise, the re-railing of the railroad, that deserves special attention. These two are closely connected with the highroads and the new hotel, and altogether they form the nucleus of the tourist policy."

I don't know why these undertakings last year which gave employment to the people of this country were worthy of special mention. Unless it was to deplore the fact, that the Government had to borrow millions of dollars to provide, or continue public utilities for transportation purposes, liabilities that unfortunately the country has to meet. We must have the dock and the railway, but there is one thing we need not have, and that is the spending of so much money on the high roads, but the Government, through the Prime Minister, has intimated that it would be better to spend it in this way than on the rock sheds. We did not think that the conditions of things was such that we have to spend money in this way; but if this Government is honest enough to say that they did those things to relieve the unemployment, alright.

The roads to Badger and Bonne Bay were built to relieve the unemployed, but we are led to believe that this country is in a better condition today than when these roads were built. We were told this Government did not need to borrow money to relieve the unemployed. It was spending money that would bring untold wealth to future generations in this country, as we would have an increased number of people coming down here to see what Newfoundland was like.

I disagreed with the tourist policy last year, from the place where I am now speaking, and I disagree with it now, that is, the policy as outlined by the Government. Practically one million dollars has been spent on the high roads, and Mr. Hibbs, the honourable member for Fogo, said that he thought that about 135 miles of road have been rebuilt and re-conditioned, that would be an average of about $7,500 a mile. This is a luxury that we cannot afford. Why cannot we afford it? In the first place, as all honourable members know, there are hundreds of miles of road over which people have to travel in the different communities where they have to live and work, and try to supplement the earnings of the fisheries by what they can get from the soil and the agricultural products; these roads are impassable; they connect up communities of three or four thousand people, more or less. If the Government intended to do something to help the people of the country, why not begin to build roads where people live? The reason why the Squires Government went up country to build roads in 1922 was because the conditions then were the worst in the history of this country, when we had people coming up to the Bar of the House and the environments of this House of Assembly were packed with people from the city and outport districts, clamouring for employment. The money that was spent last year would be quite alright if we could afford it; the building of a road from Trinity Bay to Placentia Bay gave a lot of employment and helped a lot of people last year. But after the road was built what great facilities were afforded the people, or how did it increase the earning power of the people who live at both ends of that road. It is alright for the men from St. John's who can afford to take a ride from here to Colinet. But will it increase the earning power of the people who have to get down to the pick and shovel work. Will it increase the earning power of the producer?

I do not think that it will. It will increase the pleasure of the joy riders and some few people who may

have to do business with people in these harbours and bays. But outside of that it is money wasted. And if we are correctly informed, I think that it is a most extravagant way of building roads that the Government has adopted. Why it was said here yesterday by the honourable the member for Fogo that in Canada, where they had a virgin forest and no road at all, they built the road at an average of $4,000 a mile. Here we are building roads at a cost of over $7,000. I say it is pure madness. It is a costly blunder. The roads are too wide. Half as wide would have answered the purpose as well. Why make roads twenty-four feet wide when twelve would do.

Trinity district, I understand, profited to the extent of the road work that was performed from Whitbourne to Colinet. Outside of that there was nothing done in Trinity district last year with the exception of the half mile or quarter of a mile of road between Shoal Harbour and Clarenville. The Highroads Commission undertook to build a piece of road there, but I do not know what it cost. I know it is not completed yet. When we get the report of the High Road Commission I hope we will get full particulars.

But, Mr. Speaker, the Government not only did not spend any money in Trinity District, they took between $4,000 and $5,0000 of our grant and gave it to the High Roads Commission to help build this road from Clarenville to Shoal Harbour. Perhaps Trinity District is singular in this respect. I don't suppose that any other district in the country had a part of its money taken and given to the High Roads Commission to help perform any part of their road work. There were places in the district which required bridges to be built, roads to be made passable so that people could get from one place to the other. And these places had to remain in the same condition. The bridges fell down and the people had to wade the rivers and the horses and the cows had to swim across, and our money that we had set aside to get those roads repaired and those bridges rebuilt was taken out of our hands and given over to the Road Commission. Well, I don't think that there is anything right about it. It has been said that there was one million dollars spent on the roads last year. Well, then, if they had left that four thousand dollars to the credit of Trinity District it would not have made such a wonderful difference. Poor old Trinity, what has it done to come into such disfavor?

The Prime Minister has stated that he has a different opinion now from what he had previous to his becoming the head of the Government, with regard to taxation and expenditure. That is where the Prime Minister has made a great mistake. His opinion might have changed but his resolution should not have changed with regard to what should have been done in the matter of expenditure. He should not have allowed his opinion to influence his actions.

The Monroe Government started with a clean sheet with regard to the administration of the affairs of this country, and the people of this country had faith in the Government because they thought that they were beginning a clean sheet. That is patent to everybody. Clean up and keep clean was the order of the day. But they can't say the same to-day. Is it clean with regard to the policy that it has been pursuing in this country? Is it clean in regard to what it has done in the interests of the people of this country?

What makes this Government so unpopular? Is it newspaper propaganda? This Government would be just as unpopular if there were no opposition newspapers. The reason

is because the people of this country expected something that they did not get from the Monroe Government. They expected a reduction of expenditure, They expected a reduction of taxation. They did expect that some effort would be put forward by the Prime Minister and his Government to encourage the prosecution of the fisheries and to make the returns of the fisheries more remunerative to the fishermen and the merchants. But in many of the actions of that Government and in many of the things that have been done by that Government they are sadly disappointed, whether it is expressed or not. As I said before, the Government began with a clean sheet and have besmirched it with a lavish waste of public monies, that brands them as the greatest crowd of incompetents and political hypocrites that have ever handled the affairs of this country.

Mr. Speaker, this Government has not hesitated to embark on any kind of expenditure. If the result of that expenditure foreshadowed great benefits to the country in the way of creating industries that would give employment in the future we would all be in favor of the policies of the Government and we would all shout their praises. But up to the present the present Government can not point to one action of theirs which has created an industry which will be of any benefit to the people of this country. We hear of the new hotel that is being built and of this tourist policy. That reminds me of the statements that were made by those who were in favor of the building of the Branch Railways. Representations were made to the Government at that time that these railways would be a great benefit to the people of this country, just as now we hear of the great boon that this tourist policy is going to be to Newfoundland.

But what do we find? We do not approve of the building of these Branch Railways at the present day. They are liabilities almost unbearable. The people of the present day have a different way of living now and the means of transportation that we had before the Branch Railways were built are gone to-day, and the railways have become a costly necessity. Here we have those high roads costing $7,000 a mile, and expect people to come in here from the States and Canada and bring their motor cars.

It is purely visionary, and the chances of any returns to the country are not a fractional part as good as that which obtained in connection with the building of Branch Railways. We are aping the doings of larger countries in which $1,000,000 is the same as $1,000 to us, and where the possibilities with regard to tourist traffic are one thousand times greater. Anyone coming here from the States with a motor car has to put it on a steamer to get it across to Port aux Basques, and then only to find that there is no roads to get any distance from Port aux Basques. How much money will it take before it is possible to drive across country in a motor car?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —We do not intend to build such a road. We hope to make money from the motorists using roads around St. John's and in other parts of Newfoundland more than from tourist motorists.

MR. HALFYARD—But we were told last year when the Bill appointing a High Roads Commission was being debated, that tourists would be coming to St. John's from the States and Canada, who would bring their cars. Now you say you hope to make money from our own motorists using roads around St. John's. But how is this tourist policy going to increase the earning power of our people, or give greater revenue unless people

from outside come here and spend money they bring with them. But the point to be done was to increase the earning power of the people of the country. We can't go on borrowing money for always. I am just trying to remind you and to remind ourselves of the conditions that obtain. We cannot deceive ourselves that the conditions here at present are good, and I am trying to find out what the Government is doing to make things better. Any Government can pass a loan bill and raise money and give it to contractors to build a hotel and a dock, etc., etc., but if it ends there what is going to happen. I wish we could go on borrowing money for always, but as business men know, you can only keep a business going as long as your credit lasts, and after our credit is stopped what is going to happen to us? And then, again, the policy of the Government and their method of spending money is all contrary to their pre-election promises. I had thought that confidence would be restored in the minds of the electorate of this country, but as a result of the actions of the Government the people will lose all interest in public matters and will hesitate to take any politician seriously. The worst feature about this Government is that they have two or three men with big opinions of themselves, and they are obsessed with the idea that after they have gained certain powers and are put in certain positions they must do something big, and it is not good to sit down and collect taxes and not do something. They must do something big, build a big hotel or spend a few million dollars on a tourist policy.

You may think I am pessimistic and too conservative, but I am only expressing an opinion that we have arrived at a time when we should try if possible to conserve what assets we have and content ourselves with no further borrowing of money or creating of liabilities. That idea obtains in Great Britain, and in the United States and Canada. What are they trying to do but to reduce expenditure and taxation. As a very insignificant part of the world we generally copy what is being done in other countries. You can take the pronouncements of the leading statesmen in Great Britain and Canada, and the unanimous opinion expressed by the leaders in Church and State is that there must be a reduction in expenditure and taxation. England has reduced her expenditure from two billion to eight hundred million. The United States has made large reductions in taxation. General Dawes is making a budget reducing taxation enormously, and reductions are going on now. The leading men in Canada are all stressing the point of reduction of expenditure and taxation. Now there was only one attempt made at a reduction in expenditure since 1923, and that attempt was made by the Warren administration. When the Monroe Government assumed power a very short time elapsed between their election and the opening of the Legislature, and they accepted the estimates prepared by the Warren Government, and these showed a reduction of approximately three quarters of a million dollars. These estimates were accepted by Sir John Crosbie and put into force. They had to make the reduction whether they liked it or not. But last year there was no reduction but rather an increase of $438,173.24. You all know what happened when the new tariff was tabled, the whole country was dismayed and dissatisfied. Why did you have to increase taxation? You increased it to make two ends meet. The most suicidal policy of any Government, who expected the people to keep them where they were, was to increase the tariff, repeal the income tax and reduce the Bank tax, and increase expenditure. With the increased ex-

penditure of almost half a million dollars, taxes had to be increased. Money to meet the increased expenditure had to be obtained from some source. It is going on from bad to worse. Next year we won't get a cent from the income tax. What is facing the Government I regret is that we will be met with a deficit of almost three quarters of a million dollars on the railway. I don't know what the intention of the Finance Minister is, or that of the Government, but certainly we will have to find extra revenue, and I suggest that the income tax be put on again, and if the banks can afford it put that tax on again, and put a tax on the gasoline used in motor cars. In every province in Canada except one there is a tax on gasoline, and the money received from this tax is earmarked for roads. Don't tax the fishermen, we all know that they are taxed enough, but why shouldn't users of motor cars be taxed? Certainly if a man can afford to run a car he can afford to pay a tax on his gasoline that would go to keep the roads repaired. I said that we required revenue to meet the deficit on the railway (from the fiscal year July 1 to the end of November, 1925, there was a deficit of $358,509.84). But last year you will remember by reference to the Budget Speech introduced by Sir John Crosbie that on Dec. 31st, 1924, there was a profit on operative account of $152,137.68. But we are now told that at the end of the fiscal year ending June 30th, 1925, there was a deficit or loss of $358,509.84. The profit of $152,137.68 at the end of Dec., during the six months from Jan. 12th to June 30th, had been turned into a loss of $358,509.84. Therefore the actual loss for six months was the real loss for the year, plus the profit. On Dec. 31, 1924, viz: $510,647.52. For the fiscal year 1925-1926, instead of a profit on Dec. 31st, 1925, there is a deficit on Nov. 30th of $132,138.63. We therefore conclude that if the losses for the six months from Jan. 1st to June 30th, 1926, are no greater than for the corresponding six months of 1925, the deficit at June 30th, 1926, will be $642,786.15.

The Minister of Finance thinks my calculations are all astray. I fear they are only too true. Anyhow, logically, they are absolutely correct, and I challenge the Minister of Justice and the Finance Minister to prove otherwise.

The deficit on June 30 was $358,509.84. There was $510,647.52 lost during the last six months of the fiscal year 1924-25, and the loss this year will be greater than last year because the operating conditions are very much worse. Last year you had the steamers and the dock, and that gave a little money, but this year the losses will be enormous. If the losses will be the same as the last six months of 1925, the loss at the end of June, 1926, will be $642,786.15. There is no pleasure for me in saying this. But you know that what I am saying is too true. Not because the Minister of Justice questions my figures is there any doubt about it. He knows that what I say is true. The Speech from the Throne shows it. It states the surplus was wiped out by the losses on the railway.

The Finance Minister in his speech last year congratulated the Railway Commission on the excellent showing for the six months ending Dec. 31st. The statement given then was misleading and I pointed it out to the Minister at the time. Of course it was written to convey to the reader the idea that through the efforts and wisdom of the Commission railway deficits would be turned into profits. The Commission as constituted is purely political, and it is said it would be just as well for four or five schoolboys to be named as a commission. They could go up to see the manager once a week and take up two or three hours of his valuable time which

could be used to better advantage in the performance of his important work. If the Commission take advantage of the position to interfere with the management of the railway for political or selfish purposes, for themselves or their political supporters, it would be much better to have a commission like that of 1923-24. I do not say that the Commission is doing things of this nature, but people are inclined to believe that is what is being done. Speaking of the Commission of 1923-24, that was one thing that we did not do. Politics were cut out. And we supported the manager in his attempt to run the railway on purely business lines, and we succeeded.

Another thing that the Government led us to believe was that when this Legislature voted the estimates for expenditure for the fiscal year that there would be no expenditure by the Executive Government. No Minute of Council expenditure. And the Minister of Finance was very pronounced about it. And he deplored the fact that the salaries of the civil servants were not shown in the estimates, and he hoped that there would be a saving of expenditure by having all salaries voted in the estimates. What do we find? I just have the report of the Auditor General under section 33B of the Audit Act for the period Dec. 31, 1925. It contradicts everything that the Minister of Finance said about the salaries for the civil service. The same system is going on. There it is in black and white. Cannot be contradicted. Expenditure by Minute of Council. The Auditor General had to bring in a report against it, as his duty it is, complaining about the actions of the Government. It amounts to over $400,000.00, made up principally in increases in salaries, bonuses and new appointments.

I think that we were told that this country was prosperous. We were told this at the first session by the hon. member for Burin, Mr. Lake, in his speech in moving the Address in Reply, he said there would be no more able-bodied relief. Everything is grand since Mr. Monroe became the head of the Government. No able-bodied pauper relief! These are the figures from the Public Charities: Feb. 3, $10,000.00; Feb. 10, $20,000.00; March 2, $20,000.00; April 15, $20,000.00; May 12, $20,000.00; June 2, $20,000.00; July 2, $20,000.00; August 4, $20,000.00; Oct. 2, $20,000.00. Still we are told that able-bodied pauper relief was a thing of the past. In the Department of Marine and Fisheries since the House of Assembly closed last year we have money spent for storms in Placentia and St. Mary's. And you had to take the four thousand dollars belonging to the district of Trinity to build bridges for the people and cattle to travel over and give it to the High Roads Commission to build a road.

Under storm damages for Placentia and St. Mary's you have spent twenty-one hundred dollars. Twenty-five hundred for the same reason in Bonavista. It would be interesting to find out where the money was spent.

I find in practically every department increases in expenditure by Minute of Council altogether contrary to what we were told by the Finance Minister. More extended remarks will be made to the Auditor General's Report when we are considering Ways and Means or the Estimates for 1926-27.

The Speech from the Throne is disappointing and saddening. I hope that somebody will come to our rescue or that something will turn up to save Newfoundland from bankruptcy, because we are borrowing continually and I am afraid we shall default in our payments. It is most unfortunate that the Government has pursued a policy which necessitates the raising of another loan. The Prime Minister

stated in his speech that the Dry Dock would cost a million and a half dollars; the Caribou a half million; the High Roads one million; the Railway one and a half millions. Anyhow, the whole loan, according to the statement of the Prime Minister, is gone and the Government must be getting a temporary loan from the Bank of Montreal to enable them to carry on and meet their overdrafts. Now, are we going to pursue the same mad policy of spending one million dollars on highroads again next year, and can we afford to stand for it? I regret to say that the years of the Squires administration were lean years—years of trial, depression, poverty and desolation. There is no word or phrase in the English language strong enough to describe the deplorable conditions that were made apparent to those who had to handle the affairs of Government at that time. People had no money to buy goods. As soon as the people did get a little money they started to buy new clothing and there were increased importations, and, consequently, increased revenue; but the unfortunate part of it all is that the people got to pay through the neck now under the new tariff of the present Government. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to speak any longer on the motion for the Address in Reply, but I would move the adjournment of the debate, as there are a couple of things on the Order Paper.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, in moving the adjournment of the House I would like to intimate that there is some very good sealing news in this afternoon. The steamers Beothic, Eagle and Sagona struck a small patch of seals this morning. The aeroplane went up at 1 p.m. and came down since and reports having flown over a patch of seals eight miles long and four miles wide. All the ships are within twenty miles of the patch.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, March 11th, 1926.

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

Petitions were presented by

Mr. Brown from Brighton re steam service.

Mr. Warren from Anderson's Cove re steam service.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker, I would like permission to ask the Prime Minister if any correspondence has taken place between the Government and those interested in bringing in the disabled steamship Kentucky.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — There has not been any that I know of, except that a message was sent from the Railway Department to know whether the S. S. Kyle could go out for salvage under arrangement of getting half of what the Silvia was getting. This permission was given, but it was arranged that the Sable Island go out on other terms.

MR. HICKMAN—I had heard that the Government was offered $5,000 to send the Kyle and refused to go except on special terms. It appears to me to be the business of the Government to send the Kyle out. The Kentucky is in a terribly damaged condition and close to the Narrows. There are a great many valuable lives on board in very grave danger. This ship may meet the same fate as the Regulus, Capt. Taylor, which was on this coast at sunset and at dawn the following morning had disappeared with all on board, and nothing has been seen of steamer or crew since. If the gale which is now raging on our coast was blowing from the south instead of the northeast, I am very sorry to say there is every probability that the S. S. Kentucky, with all

her crew, would now be at the bottom of the ocean. It is the recognised thing that in cases such as this a Government ship should proceed to the rescue of a ship in distress. The Government should have sent out the Kyle without any arrangement for salvage and let the matter of salvage be setled afterwards, by arbitration if necessary. If this report which is around is correct, namely, that the Government was offered $5,000 to send the assistance of the Kyle, and instead stated terms which, I think, were 60 per cent. of the salvage, then it is very serious, and certainly not right.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—In reply to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, I beg to say that the rumor of which he speaks is just about as reliable as that other rumor in connection with the Caribou and her suggested unseaworthiness. There was no question of saving lives. The Silvia has been alongside the Kentucky for days, and the Sable Island has now also gone out.

HON THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—I would like to call the attention of the Leader of the Opposition to the fact that the Terra Nova was sent out by Bowring Brothers and that also while the Caribou was proceeding west a message was sent from it to the captain of the Kentucky offering any assistance that might be required, and he replied that he would not require any assistance. I think I may say that if the Caribou's offer of assistance had been accepted, the Kentucky would be in the harbor to-day. Such rumors about the Government's refusing to give assistance for the saving of lives, ninety-nine per cent. are absolutely untrue.

MR. HICKMAN—I beg to move adjournment of this House in order that this matter be immediately debated.

HIS HONOR THE SPEAKER—Adjournment of the House is an expedient that can be adopted only in case of a matter of great public importance, and must be supported by ten members. I do not know whether any purpose can be gained by further dilating on this subject, and the motion will have to be supported by ten members after the House has been first satisfied that the matter is one of urgent importance. I think this matter should be settled in the regular way, by giving notice of question to be asked, and not by adjournment of the House, which is an extraordinary expedient.

MR. HICKMAN—I think a matter of the saving of human lives is most certainly one of public importance.

HIS HONOR THE SPEAKER—The matter cannot be brought up in this way.

MR. WARREN—It is apparent that the Leader of the Opposition is out of order at present, as the Rules of the House show.

(Reads from Rules of the House.)

HIS HONOR THE SPEAKER—I think I have made it very clear that at this juncture the question cannot be further discussed. In the first place it will have to be established that the matter is one of public import. It may be later brought up by substantive motion. It is then a matter for the House, if it should choose, to waive Notice of Motion. At present it is most certainly not in order.

Mr. Brown gave notice of question.

Mr. Cashin gave notice of question.

Mr. Warren gave notice of question.

Mr. Hickman gave notice of question.

Mr. Godden gave notice of question.

Mr. Scammell gave notice of question.

Mr. Hibbs gave notice of question.

NOTICE OF MOTION.

MR. CASHIN—To move that an Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor by this House praying that His Excellency may be graciously pleased to transmit to this House

for its information the correspondence between His Excellency and Mr. J. A. W. W. McNeily, Barrister-at-Law, in relation to the Law Firm of Higgins, Hunt and Emerson, of which the Minister of Justice, Hon. W. J. Higgins, is a member, acting for firms and individuals in contractual relationship with the Government, together with the correspondence between His Excellency and the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and all other correspondence or documents in connection therewith.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker, in making this motion I would like the House to understand that this motion was made by me on account of the question which was ruled out of order by you a few days ago, and as you advised me the right course to take, I have adopted that course to-day, and in doing so, I want it distinctly understood by members on both sides of the House that there is no ulterior motive in my mind. I am doing this merely on principle, and I feel sure that the information, if transmitted by His Excellency the Governor to this House, will prove to the country that we are attempting in some way to carry out reforms in connection with the public service of Newfoundland. I do not think that it would be in order for me to cite instances in connection with this matter and I will leave this motion to the House now so that members can decide for themselves and for the country as to whether this information, which is now in possession of His Excellency the Governor, is in the interest of the poeple of Newfoundland and should be tabled here. Mr. Speaker, I have very great pleasure in making this motion.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Speaker, I have the greatest pleasure in rising to second that motion. If the House will be gracious enough to accept a request from me to support the same, I trust I shall have an opportunity, when the correspondence is tabled, to have it demonstrated why I am pleased that the honourable member should have moved this address.

On motion of Mr. Cashin, seconded by Hon. the Minister of Justice, the following Address was passed and ordered to be transmitted to His Excellency the Governor:

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 Assembly, humbly request that Your Excellency will be pleased to transmit, for the information of this House, the correspondence between Your Excellency and Mr. J. A. W. W. McNeily, Barrister-at-Law, in relation to the Law Firm of Higgins, Hunt and Emerson, of which the Minister of Justice, Hon. W. J. Higgins, is a member, acting for firms and individuals in contractual relationship with the Government, together with the correspondence between Your Excellency and the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and all other correspondence or documents in connection therewith.

(Sgd.) CYRIL JAMES FOX.

NOTICE OF QUESTION.

(1) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the Table of the House Minute Book kept by the Railway Commission for all meetings held up to the present time since July 1924.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I beg to table the Minute Book of the Railway Commission. It is open to the scrutiny of the House and I would ask that it be not taken out of the House.

(2) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the Table

of the House the following information: (1) If any tenders were asked for the supply of the boilers to be installed on S. S. Prospero and S. S. Portia; (2) if no tenders were asked for, why not; (3) from whom have the boilers for S. S. Prospero and S. S. Portia been purchased; (4) what was price paid, and (5) what was the estimated cost for the installation of each boiler.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I beg to table the information.

(3) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Justice to lay on the Table of the House the following information: What amount was authorized and paid from his Department to various lawyers for legal work done during the past eighteen months, giving the names of the lawyers, names of cases on which they were engaged, and amounts charged in connection with each case.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —The answer to that question is in course of preparation and will be tabled within a few days.

(4) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the Table of the House the following information: (a) How many officials were dismissed or suspended from the Department of Customs during the years 1924, 1925; (b) the reason for their dismissal; (c) the number that have since been reinstated; (d) if salaries were paid in full to all those that were reinstated for the time that they were suspended; (e) if some of them have not been reinstated, why not; (f) give the names of the officials in question.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—I beg to table the information.

(5) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the Table of the House the following information: (a) How many new employees have been taken on in the Customs Department during the year; (b) give their names, occupations and the salaries paid to each.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—The answer to that question has been already tabled.

(6) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Finance to lay on the Table of the House the following information: A list of the Wines and Liquors seized by him personally or by his command when he visited Corner Brook in the autumn of 1924; were these goods sent to the Department of the Controller, and what was the value of the goods.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—The answer will be available to-morrow.

(7) MR. CASHIN asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the Table of the House the following information: (1) How many meetings were held by the Board of Works since July 1924; (2) if regular meetings were not called, why not; (3) to lay on the Table of the House Minute Books if any that was kept, giving the Minutes of the meetings; (4) why did Messrs. Morine and Mitchell resign; (5) were their resignations in writing? If so, table same.

Deferred.

(8) MR. CASHIN asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the Table of the House the following information: (1) How many pianos were purchased from June the 1st, 1924, to date, for any of the Public Institutions; (2) from whom were the pianos purchased; (3) what price was paid for same; (4) were tenders asked for same, and if not, why not; (5) were any old pianos given in part payment; (6) what amount was allowed for each; (7) did the Board of Works sanction the purchase or were instruments purchased by any individual member without sanction of the full Board.

Deferred.

(9) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to

lay on the Table of the House the following information: (1) Did the Department of Finance and Customs on or about July 1924 make a claim against the London, New York and Paris Association of Fashion for any amount in connection with frauds against the Customs alleged to be committed by that firm? If so, give full particulars, including amount of original claim; (2) was there a compromise afterwards effected? If so, give amount of same and full particulars of same; if in writing, produce copy of same; also on what authority was said compromise effected; (3) who paid the compromise? Was it paid in cash or by cheque? If by cheque, please produce copy of same, if available. Who signed the cheque? (4) Who were the solicitors for London, New York and Paris Association of Fashion in connection with this matter?

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—I beg to table the information.

(10) MR. GODDEN asked the Minister of Public Works to table a report showing the total amounts of money sent from his Department to the District of Trinity for the year ending December 31st, 1925, stating the sum sent to each town or settlement; stating also the names of the parties to whom each allocation was made.

Deferred.

(11) MR. GODDEN asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to table a report showing the total amounts of money sent from his Department to the District of Trinity for the year ending December 31st, 1925, stating the sum sent to each town or settlement; stating also the names of the parties to whom each allocation was made.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I would ask to have this or any other matter affecting the Fisheries Department stand over for a day.

(12) MR. GODDEN asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing the total number of cases or packages of Spirituous Liquors landed at the Port of St. John's for transhipment since January 1st to December 31st, 1925, showing the amount of revenue received by his Department on such shipment.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—I beg to table the information.

(13) MR. SCAMMELL asked Hon the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing the names of all Mail Couriers at present employed in the District of St. Barbe, the route covered by each Courier and amount per week per trip (as the case may be) in each case.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—The answer to that question is in course of preparation.

(14) MR. ASHBOURNE asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing (a) the number of schooners and the bounty paid on them built since January 1st, 1924; (b) the number of schooners and the bounty paid on them rebuilt since November 1st, 1924.

Deferred.

(15) MR. ASHBOURNE asked Hon. the Colonial Secretary to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing the list of payments made by the Internal Economy Committee since July 1st, 1924, and to whom these payments were made.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—I may say that the accounts of the Internal Economy Committee are not kept in my office, but to facilitate matters I got in touch with Mr. Keating, Deputy Minister of Finance, who keeps the accounts and who in-

forms me that he is preparing a full statement of the work done for the past year and the information will be tabled within the next few days. The same answer, I presume, will be accepted by the Leader of the Opposition to question No. 17.

(16) MR. HALFYARD asked the Minister of Agriculture and Mines to lay on the Table of the House copy of the reports of accidents to their workers returned by the Bell Island mining companies for the years 1924, 1925 and 1926, to date, as required under the Mines Regulations Act.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—The information asked for will be available to-morrow.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

MR. DUFF— Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a few observations on the Speech from the Throne. I heartily congratulate the member for Bay de Verde and the member for St. John's West, the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply. They did not go to the extreme of telling us that everything was rosy, but they told us that the country was in a state of prosperity. Well, I cannot see where the prosperity is and I fear the Government cannot see it either. We are living in peculiar times in this country, and I am sure each and every member of the House knows that the country is not prosperous and not likely to be under present conditions. I feel that when the Finance Minister brings down his Budget it will be found that the country is going in debt head over heels. The Prime Minister said in his speech a few days ago that we had to keep on borrowing money, and still we are told that "complete prosperity is being maintained". We are also told in the Speech from the Throne that the codfishery was more productive last year than the previous one and that it was stimulated by the bounty paid on repairs to schooners. I might say that I received a letter this morning from the district the Minister of Finance once represented. The writer says that the recent loss on fish has taken the vim out of most of our fishermen around there and that there were no prospects of any work there at the present time. In the early season, I admit, fairly remunerative prices were paid for fish, but lately very poor prices were paid. The merchants to-day are not going to get back those prices that they paid for fish and the chances are that next year there will be a curtailment in supplying for the fishery, and, if that is so, the country cannot succeed, because, after all, this is a fishing country and the fishery has been the mainstay of this country. The development of our forest resources is all very well, but that is only an auxiliary to our staple industry. We are told in the Speech from the Throne that everybody in the country is happy. Well, I know one party to-day who has his full Labrador voyage for last season unsold. He could not sell it even on consignment. The building of the Dry Dock and new Hotel may be giving employment now, and they may look nice on picture postcards, but as permanent assets and paying propositions they amount to nothing to this country. We are told that the Hotel and the Highroads is going to bring foreign money into this country; but what are these projects going to do and what is the Government going to do for the outport men in this country. The Highroads Commission did work last year on roads at a very excessive cost, and even the Government will admit that the Commission did not do their best with the building and repairing of roads. Why build roads between St. John's and Argentia for tourists and have people living in the country suffering through it. As an example of the waste and extravagance that was practised in the building of the Argentia road, an official

who worked there told me that there was felt used on that line sufficiently to cover the road from one end to the other. I was driving between Whitbourne and Clarke's Beach while the road work in that section was in progress and I saw at every mile or two houses built that must have cost a great deal of money. When the cost of road making performed by the Motor Association is considered and compared with the cost of the work done by the Highroads Commission, I think that the Government should never have taken the work out of the Department to which it belonged. First of all the members of that Commission were not all suitable for the work, and how could they be expected to know what to do or what not to do. Mr. Cochius might have had some experience as a landscape gardener, but surely a dry goods man in St. John's does not know anything about road building. Have we not got men in this country capable of building roads if given the chance? Newfoundlanders in other countries have succeeded in all walks of life, yet we must send to Holland or elsewhere to get men to build roads for us. The whole thing in my opinion is ridiculous. I do not expect the Government to agree with me in what I am saying, but I do expect them to get to work and do something towards retrenchment, which they have been promising to do and which we have seen such little evidence of up to the present time.

Then again the High Roads Commission had to be appointed to do the work that the Minister of Public Works should do. The Hon. Speaker read in the Speech that all matters with regard to the Liquor Act were being run very satisfactorily. Well, as regards this Board of Liquor Control, this is another item where much money might have been saved. We are evidently copying the Quebec Act, and I might say, in this regard, that there is not much that the Government has not copied. They had on their Board of Liquor Act three Commissioners, same as we have here. The only difference is that, where they appointed only one man, we appointed three men with very large salaries to do the work that one man should have done. That is one of the many extravagant things done by the Government in this country. The intention to retrench, expressed by the Government when they first came into power, does not seem to bear fruit. As regards the bottle a day business, it does not seem to give any satisfaction. At the same time I will admit that this is a very difficult matter to solve. However, I believe there is even a better way than that. A bottle a day effects very much the working man of St. John's, although it does not affect the man in Carbonear to any great extent. I suppose that if the people of St. John's are satisfied, I should be; but this Act has been thrust on the people of the city, and I am surprised that the people here allow their working man to get so great a part of the liquor that costs so much money.

I am very glad to say that the Government has done something with regard to the landing of liquors from neighbouring countries, but if the Government could make some arrangements with other countries to take their fishery products, they would be killing two birds with one stone.

Some mention has been made of those gentlemen who were here visiting the country last summer. I am sure we were all very pleased to see these gentlemen in the country. At the same time, when we know that the country has to pay for it, it puts another aspect on the matter altogether. I wonder if these gentlemen would be anxious to come out to this country, to come down here, even if we paid their expenses, take in the different scenery and everything else that this country has to offer them.

In one instance, at least, he did not seem to like it very well.

Sometimes I feel that this country cannot afford to ask gentlemen from countries such as those to come here, and pay them for so doing, unless they get more from them than they get from most people. At the same time I must allow that they are very fine men.

As regards the exports of the fishery products which the mover mentioned as having increased $2,125,000, I presume that is taking in all the exports of the country, because a part of that $2,000,000, as he very well knows, would have been made anyway. But that is the only way that the Finance Minister has of getting at these figures, and surely everyone knows that the fishery exports have not increased to that extent. I had very great pleasure in hearing the honourable member for Bay de Verde speaking of Nos. 1, 2 and 3 qualities of fish. I would like to ask what he should do with Nos. 1, 2 and 3 prices for fish. The fishery problem is a very big one, and one that I was hoping that this business Government would have tackled. It has been a disgusting business for a long time. The people that have kept at it have gone to the wall. From time immemorial it has been this way; they get a few successful years, and they are buoyed up with the hope that it is going to continue next year. Then, a bad season comes and down they fall. So it will go on. The men along Water Street to-day are feeling in a bad way on account of the conditions of the market. I quite realize and I am quite in sympathy with the Prime Minister on the stand that he has taken in regard to this matter. This is a matter for the business men of this country to make a suggestion to remove this difficulty. It should be so, but the business men of this country are very scarce to-day, and the Premier does not seem to realize that the country has no business men, and for that reason things should be done on a more business like basis. I say it is the business of the Government to take up the matter. It is too serious to see our country going down. There will come a day very soon when the Norwegians will come in here and take our fisheries, all because of the Methods of our exporters. They are sending fish across to-day as fast as they can send it, although the markets are fully stocked, just because they want to get in their fish first. I am convinced there is a way out of this difficulty. Attempts have been made before by politicians, but they did not succeed, for the simple reason that the time was not opportune. This was just after the war, unfortunately at a very wrong time; but to-day is an opportune time, and certainly it is the business of this Government to take cognizance of the affairs of the people of this country and try to get them out of their difficulties. Why should our fish be worth sixty shillings in September and worth only thirty in December of the same year? As it is to-day our fishermen cannot afford to catch fish. Five dollars a quintal for Labrador fish would not pay them, unless they got a very big catch.

It is the High Roads and the Hotel and the Dock that is engaging the attention of this Government, although they have to borrow money for those enterprises. I say, Mr. Speaker, that the fisheries should be looked after, and that it should be the business of the Government to take some steps to protect the fishermen as well as the merchants, for the merchants need protection. Some of these days men from Sweden will be controlling all the fish business of this country; and perhaps, after all is said and done, it may be better that way than it is at the present time. We have Spaniards coming over here and

buying our fish, but we don't require very expensive stores for that.

They come and they go, and they pay little or nothing into the finances of this country. There is one matter, in talking of the fisheries, that I would like to call the attention of the House to, and that is in connection with the storm that took place on the Labrador coast the 24th of December last. The only people interested in that were the people of Conception Bay, as they were the only people who go down there and settle on that coast. Now, I may say that the Minister of Marine, this winter, did all he could to get information as regards the damage done by the storm of December 24th. It is pretty difficult, I admit, to obtain any information in the month of January as regards a storm on Labrador. The matter with a lot of the people down there to-day is this. I know, for instance, men down there in Conception Bay who have three or four traps and two or three motor boats, everything pertaining to the fisheries, the accumulation of a lifetime by themselves and their families before them. To-day they don't own a stick or a stone, and they are waiting for information from the Government that does not come.

I would like to ask the Honourable the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, whom I am sure will do all in his power to get information next spring. There were some men sent down there this year, but some of the places were not visited, although there were other places that could not be got to. I would like the House to take cognizance of this fact and in the early spring to get information that is badly needed by the fishermen of this country. The fisheries are the mainstay of this country. We have been told by the Finance Minister that the increase in revenue over last year was over one million dollars. I was wondering what the increase in the revenue would be if all the duties on the goods were paid. I know that St. John's people are a law-abiding people and pay their duties. Go along north and you will find things pretty much the same. But there are large sections of this country where the duties are not paid. So it comes to this that the northern districts have to pay for the others. As we have a large number of revenue officials on our northern bays I would suggest that some of those be moved further along the coast so that they could watch the other parts of the country.

Now while we are on the subject of expenditure I would like to tell the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs that there are three clerks on the Carbonear train and these three clerks only work two days a week. That work was done by one clerk in former days. Well, why have three? There is no work for three, nevertheless they are there. The same thing applies to the mail letter department.

I am also surprised to note that in the Speech from the Throne there was nothing said about the agricultural policy of the Government. I am sure that the Minister of Agriculture has shown commendable interest in the agriculture of this country and why, then, is there nothing done to boost the agriculture of this country a little bit. I was speaking to one of the members of his department some time ago and he showed me some pictures of the model farms of Ottawa. One picture showed three horses pulling a mass of machinery and another showed them binding, reaping and all the rest of it. But of course the people around our shores who have to go out and dig with an Irish spade cannot see just where these pictures are going to benefit this country. At the same time I think that the Minister of Agriculture was trying to do his best in sending over these men to study the

methods of our neighbouring dominion. But there is something more to be done. We are importing foodstuffs to the value of half a million dollars, most of which we should grow in our own country. I would suggest that that matter be taken up by the Department to give some encouragement to the people of this country to grow those products that we are importing at the present time. Now there is one thing that we have to give the Government credit for, and that is the Redistribution Bill that was brought in here last year. By that Bill we will hav eforty members in this House instead of thirty-six. This Bill was brought in so that we would have one man districts instead of three. At the same time there are still three districts that still have two men. There is not much sign of retrenchment in that act. I was hoping myself that the expenditure would have been cut in two.

The remark was made last year "Who put the hum in the Humber." But things were expected from the Humber that did not materialise, and the question is to-day "Who took the hum out of the Humber." I was told the other day about a man in Deer Lake who left his own home place and went up to the Humber and made his home there. To-day he is living in poverty because he can't get any work there, while men, foreigners, not Newfoundlanders at all, are imported from the outside to do the work. I will admit that there is certain work that we must get men in from the outside to do, work that requires experts; but the same complaint is made in other branches where only ordinary labor is required.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make some reference to the Caribou. This boat was made in Holland and it was a very poor job and a very costly job. In the first place the Caribou has got to be cleaned—every room in it—after the trip, because the water goes right through it. The upholstering and the wood work is a cheap job. It is not at all like the Bruce or the Prospero, and the Government would have done much better if they had placed their order with the same company as put these boats here. I say it was poor policy on the part of this Government to pass the British people, who were associated with us in the Great War, and where there are so many people out of employment, to pass those by and to get the people of Holland to build that ship.

I notice that the Government is going to bring in a Municipalities Act. I am glad of that, because at the present time I don't know any more about the affairs of Carbonear than the man in St. Barbe. I would also like to see the people of that town manage their own affairs.

I am glad to see that a new contract is to be entered into with the British Empire Steel Company in reference to the conditions on Bell Island. That is a matter that concerns this country very closely. Our men have been working there and receiving very small pay. I was speaking to a medical man last year and he told me that he did not understand why the men had not broken down. In some cases their cartilage was out of place through hard work. Some men lifted twenty-two tons of that ore a day for $2.50 a day. Mr. Speaker, I am not a labour candidate, neither am I a unionist, but I certainly think that the people of Bell Island are not receiving their just rights. Some of these people came over here last year and complained of the housing conditions on the Island, and I am sure that they had great reason. I hope that when the Government looks into this matter that they will make a change for the better.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that these few remarks of mine may not be taken

amiss. I am sincere in what I say. My idea is that this country should benefit by our services. We should try to make this country a better place to live in. We cannot do that without reducing the tariff so that the fisherman can fish and at the same time build up some hope for the future. Just at the present time there is no hope for the people of this country. I hope for one thing, that when the Finance Minister brings in his Budget that we will see there a decrease in taxation.

CAPTAIN RANDELL—Mr. Speaker, I have a few remarks to make on that document known as the Speech from the Throne. With relation to the first paragraph, regarding the late Queen Mother, her Gracious Majesty Queen Alexandra, without doubt we all concur. She was known for her exceptional qualities of kindliness and her efforts for the poor, not only within but without the Empire. She was truly a worthy successor to our much loved and gracious Queen Victoria.

I should like to congratulate the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, especially the honorable member for Bay de Verde, who gave us an array of figures and facts. I say facts advisedly, because I presume they were without mistake.

I also noted with interest the statements in the Speech from the Throne regarding the affairs of the country. I suppose these may be considered as a resume of last year's events, also of what the Government is intending to do for the ensuing year. From these remarks the inference may be drawn that there is prosperity, but Mr. Speaker, when we speak of prosperity we speak in relative terms. Some may consider this country prosperous, the same conditions may be considered by others as disastrous. I cannot endorse the reference to our prosperity. The country has at times had to borrow, especially in such times as during the Great War; but it is necessary in my opinion that this country learn to struggle along without it—there is no reason for it. I am not in accord with it, and firmly believe we ought to get along without further borrowing. We have no right to borrow. A country or a business has only a right to borrow with a hope of paying back almost at once or in the near future, and from all signs we shall not be able to do so for many years—not in my time, I am afraid.

Regarding the success of the sealing and codfishing fleets last year, it is true that these were in some degree successful, but I question as to whether shippers of codfish have been as successful as the previous year, and the returns for 1925 are not likely to exceed those for 1924. Of course the codfish is not all marketed as yet, but everyone will agree that the outlook is anything but a pleasant one. I think the Government will do well in providing some means to regulate sales and shipments and marketing, so that no particular market will be glutted at any time. There was an attempt in this direction some years ago, and the idea was alright; it might have been done differently, for exporters in some cases lost through them, but some gained through these regulations; and I think the Government of the day would do well to regulate shipments anyway. I presume prices will always be regulated by the law of demand and supply, but not shipment or cure. I think our people ought to be forced to take particular pains re curing and marketing their produce. In Norway and Iceland much greater pains are taken to produce good fish than here, and in shipments to market they have done more than we ever did to treat their fish as an article of food. I refer to Norway and Iceland.

Referring to the development of the

Colony's resources, no doubt there has been considerable development, but there has also been considerable depletion in our resources, and the Government would do well to remember this—not only through fire, but cutting has been done on a large scale without any attempt at conservation —our forests are being cut out. I shall defer further remarks on this subject until later, when there will likely be some discussion of local industries. I will also defer remarks on the paragraph referring to the construction of the Hotel. I presume this will come up in debate later.

Concerning the extension and improvement of the Dry Dock, I should like to say a few words. No doubt we have a splendid Dock, as far as that is concerned, and I think a good job has been done. I think it a pity that there will be added cost where the Freight Sheds and other buildings are concerned, and that this was not stipulated in the original contract. When a man goes to have a house or ship built he sees that the extras will not be too large. I think there ought not to have been any sub-contracts with regard to the buildings to be erected. I think, as I said, the job is a good one as far as that goec but that the expenditure was unnecessary. I do not think our shipping warrants such large expenditure. I believe if from $100,000 to $200,000 had been properly spent the old Dock would have been in as good a condition as would take care of any repairs we are likely to get, that is, practically in the same position with regard to outside work and repairs. I have been quoted as saying that this port should be the repair shop of the Atlantic. I made reference to North Atlantic shipping. Of course the shipping in the Tropic or south of the Equator would not affect us.

We are really spending money for something that doesn't exist. The portion of North Atlantic shipping coming to this port is so small that it is not worth considering, and the portion of that amount requiring repairs is too small to count. The success of a dry dock depends considerably on local shipping requiring repairs, painting, etc. Most of our ships are so small that they could go on the small existing docks, except perhaps the Government shipping. The spending of $100,000 to $200,000 would have served the purpose for 20 years, so I am not in accord with this expenditure. It is similar to that of the Roads and Highways.

We have all seen the expenditure on the highroads and been told of its results. If we had the money to spare I say it is alright, but this expenditure is speculative and visionary, and I believe it is not sensible. We have spent $1,000,000 on the Railway. No doubt this was well intended, but it has not been properly spent. I have gone over the road from here to Clarenville since the re-railing and have seen rotten sleepers left in the road bed, and anyone who sees rotten sleepers in a new job knows that the job is not well done; and what is the sense of doing a job and not having it well done. We had wooden bridges in this country that lasted 8 or 10 years, then a new bridge was needed; in another ten years another was built. I am very glad to see that the Government or the Board of Works has now the sense to build bridges of concrete. That is the proper and lasting way to do it, but to re-rail the road from here to Clarenville and put in rotten sleepers is a crime. I know of an instance where after the first train passed over the new work the spikes drew out and the rails were lying loose. That is what happened, and there are a lot of people in the country who know it as well as I do. I believe the Dock is a good job. I believe we have a Dock that is there for always.

My policy, Mr. Speaker, is not to

detain the House with camouflage or hyperbole, but to give credit where credit is due. There has been some reference made to the Caribou. I have heard other members speak on this subject, and unless a member has something new to say it is only a rehash of what has been said. I do want to say, however, that I have been over this boat, and I think she is a shoddy job. I heard the Prime Minister laud her on the opening day. I looked her over when she came to port and believe that her hull is alright; probably there is nothing wrong with it, but I must say that her internal fittings and woodwork could have been better, and I think in that respect she is a cheap job. Another thing, I understand from information given to this House last year that she cost £89,675, or approximately $440,000. It cost about $20,000 to bring her from Holland to this country. One begins to wonder what happened to the balance, as it seems to me the Prime Minister said the ship cost half a million. How is that?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I said she was worth half a million.

CAPT. RANDELL—If she is worth half a million that is more than when she was built, and I have yet to see, in the absence of exceptional circumstances or abnormal times, such as during the war, a ship improve with use or a ship built for less than half a million sell for that sum. I think he would have great difficulty in selling her for that sum. In the first place, when a person wants to buy or build a ship, it is for some particular purpose, and, if buying, there is not one chance in a hundred that he can strike the ship he needs without considerable alteration; and he would certainly build her to-day, that is a ship of that size, for less than half a million. I think, further, that it was a mistake to have the ship built in Holland. Continental shipbuilders have not the reputation of British shipbuilders, who are reputed to be the best in the world. Now I believe Mr. Sullivan made the statement that he asked eighteen or twenty builders to tender; but there are about 160 shipyards in Great Britain and 45 on the Clyde, surely he does not think 18 or 20 enough to approach regarding such a ship?

So I say Mr. Speaker that I do not consider that the ship, taken all in all, is a good job. She is not in the same class as the Lintrose or the Bruce. She has not got the power of the Lintrose by one thousand horsepower. Maybe this is not known to many in this country, but it is true. She has not got the power of the Bruce by five hundred horsepower. And if there is one thing that is needed in running a service between Port aux Basques and North Sydney it is power. With regard to the interior machinery arrangemnts of the ship, I have nothing to say. Only that I believe that the woodwork and the fittings could have been better done. I have heard stories about the machinrey, but I am not in a position to speak about that. But the fact remains that the ship is not the equal in power, and also she is not the equal with regard to interior arrangements of the Bruce or the Lintrose. I believe that it was a great mistake to have the ship built in Holland. It is said that there was a considerable amount of money saved by having her built there. But one begins to wonder if there was a saving really effected if when the ship is delivered you have to start in and make repairs, and one is inclined to think that the order should have been placed somewhere else. Now then there is one other thing which the Hon. Member for Placentia and St. Mary's who is more closely in touch with this matter, perhaps more so than anybody else, said, and that is that many of the British shipowners were placing orders on the continent.

and that ships were being built in the shipyards of Holland and Germany, while the British shipyards were idle. I would like to have a few words to say about that, Sir, before I finish. The Furness Withy people had four ships built on the continent, placed about the time when the Caribou was being built. And it seems, sir, that they must not have been very well pleased with the ships that they had built on the continent because at the beginning of February this year they placed orders for three new ships on the Clyde. Therefore it looks as if some of the British shipowners are somewhat dissatisfied with the work that is done on the continent, and I really think, Sir, that this boat should have been built on the Clyde or in some of the British shipyards. I understand that there was a delay of three months in the delivery because of a strike that was on in Holland, but I do not think that would have been the case if the ship had been built on the Clyde.

I note also that it is the intention of the Government to lay before the House proposals for the control of the Harbour of St. John's, by the institution of a port authority. I think that is a thing that is badly needed. We had in the past in St. John's, which is a small port, nobody that we could look to when something was being done wrong or if somebody was taking up too much or more than their share of the Harbour. Nobody of authority who could say what could be done or should be done. We have a lot of shipping coming and leaving our port during the run of a year, and while the Government is doing this I should like to call their attention also to the matter of port charges in St. John's, and this not only in St. John's but apparently all around the country. I think that I am correct in saying that a few years ago, that there was a ship headed for St. John's short of coal. Eventually she could not make St. John's and put into Bay Bulls. There was a local firm that had a steamer load of coal also due at St. John's. The coal steamer went to Bay Bulls and bunkered the ship that was short of bunker. The people that owned the coal had to pay the Customs the duty on the coal as if they had come into St. John's, although as far as I know there is nothing on the Statute Book that would make them legally liable to pay this duty. Another thing, sir; a ship coming into our port the last day of the year has to pay all the taxes for the year in which she comes in, if it is a day or a week before the end of the year. She has to pay the full taxes, port and light dues, water taxes, and every thing for the year. But if that ship goes out on the second day of January she has to pay the whole thing again for the next year. That kind of treatment is not such as would induce strangers to make for St. John's for repairs and use our docks for their ships. I am not quite sure that this is correct, but I think that it is so. A ship put into St. Anthony, damaged and in distress, had to pay the full dues as if she had come into St. John's, although it has been understood that a ship in distress putting into an outport, has not to pay port charges or harbour dues. I know of one big firm that has ships on all the oceans of the world that has issued orders to their masters to avoid St. John's except when it is necessary to save life. Cripple along to some other port for repairs. A ship of two thousand tons can go into Barbados, wait for orders and sail again at cost of fifteen or twenty dollars, but it costs a ship of that size between two or three hundred dollars anyway to come into St. John's. That kind of thing is not such as will encourage owners to have their ships make for St. John's as a port of call. I think that it would be well if the

Government were to take these things into consideration when they are placing the law on the Statute books in reference to the Port Authority.

I just want to say before I take my seat that I hope and trust that the policy outlined by the Government will be followed out and the Government will do what is right for the benefit of all our people when they take into consideration the passing of laws in reference to the undertakings which they propose to take in hand.

There are one or two other subjects that I would like to refer to, but there has been some suggested ruling about long speeches in this House, and I will defer my remarks and perhaps an opportunity will present itself so that I can make them at another time. And when that opportunity comes I will avail of it.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Speaker, I have been giving a few moments breathing space, and since it does not seem that even one of the Hon. members on the other side of the House has any remarks to pass on the Speech from the Throne, I beg to crave the indulgence of the House while I make a few remarks on the Speech from the Throne, and regarding the other speeches which have been delivered in this Assembly since the opening day.

A feeling of sorrow swept over Newfoundland when we received the news of the death of her Late Majesty, the Queen Mother, and at the time Newfoundland joined with the other Dominions in the expression of sincere sorrow with the Royal Family on its sad bereavement.

By the precedent of this House, Mr. Speaker, it has been the custom to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the motion that a committee to draft the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne should be appointed; and this afternoon I have great pleasure in congratulating Mr. Puddester, the Hon. Member for Bay de Verde, who moved the address, and also Mr. Browne, the seconder of the Motion. Of those who were present on the opening day there were no doubt many who must have thought that the member for Bay de Verde realized when he was handed the Speech from the Throne that in this empty document there was little to talk about. It must have appeared to him to have been of very little concern, because he gave us on that day what I should call a resume or precise of a budget speech. Perhaps the Hon. member thought that it would be a good time to tell the House the conditions under which the Colony was struggling.

Mr. Puddester in his speech says that the standardization of fish may have to come in the fish business. The inference that one was likely to draw from the Speech from the Throne was that the large number of schooners prosecuting the fishery this year was because of the bonus offered by the Government for the rebuilding of ships. I think that any ordinary layman of Newfoundland is likely to recognise that it was not because of the bonus offered for the repairing of ships but it might have been that the fishermen thought that the Prime Minister was going to carry out his promises and pay a bonus on fish. Continuing, the Speech from the Throne, said that "good prices were paid locally for fish, and although the condition of the foreign markets was not good it is expected that exporters will probably realize on their stocks without material loss. I feel sure that it was not the Prime Minister who wrote that Speech from the Throne. It must have been somebody not ocnversant with the fish markets as they are to-day. We feel that the losses on fish in the markets at the present time are going to be enormous. That they will be a serious deterent in the out fitting next season is almost certain, and we must realize that the

time is opportune for the placing of the fish business on a better basis. We, of the Opposition, are at a loss to understand why the Prime Minister does not tackle this business of the exportation of codfish which is one of the vitally essential branches of the industry of this country. Surely the people of Newfoundland when they elected Mr. Monroe as the Prime Minister of this country felt that his knowledge of the fishery, and as a fish exporter, would come in good stead in order that he might do something to place the fishing industry of the country on a sound and substantial basis. Reference is made here to the improvement in the cure. But that is not the only thing. What we want also is an improvement in the marketing conditions. We want improvement in marketing, in despatching, and also in the regulating of the amount of fish leaving Newfoundland going to the various markets. These are matters which the Government should take up and deal with without delay.

Reference has been made this afternoon by the Hon. member for Carbonear, Mr. Duff, in regard to shipments of parcels of fish to markets that are already congested. It might be better perhaps to hold the fish. But we must understand that the fish if it is held here cannot be sold here, and that it must go to the foreign markets for consumption. Every man who has fish is entitled to sell because if he holds his fish in Newfoundland he knows that the fish on the other side will go into consumption and his will not go into consumption. Fish is a perishable article and a fish holder cannot be expected to refrain from shipping unless we had some co-operative society or association so that the man who keeps his fish back is reinbursed or can participate in the profits already in the markets. It seems to me that we cannot expect a merchant to keep back his fish to-day. He cannot do it for self-preservation. He cannot keep back and see other fish go into consumption and see that he is helping the other man and cutting his own throat financially as it were. Therefore I submit that the marketing of codfish should receive attention, and it would pay the Government, in my opinion, to give a great deal of attention to such an important matter, as it is the most important and principal industry of this country. I think that perhaps it would be a good thing if all the fish were pooled. I think of course that it would have to be universal to have any effect, and I presume that those who were operating the pool would ascertain the conditions of the markets and only send over shipments as required. If at the end of the year there was a certain amount of fish remaining over then it could be disposed of without any great loss, and chances are without any loss at all, and nothing like the Newfoundland exporters are going to be called upon to meet this year. Instead of waiting for somebody to take the matter up and make the recommendations to the Government, I consider Mr. Speaker, that it is the duty of the Newfoundland Government to go into this matter themselves and not place the responsibility on others. The codfishery is our greatest industry. There is no industry that will give like returns, and I defy any member in this House to say that there is any other industry in Newfoundland in which a man, on the whole, could get better returns then from the codfishery. I would like to point out to the Hon. members of this House that the codfishery is not local, it is universal. Money brought into this country realised through the exportation of fish goes through the whole country. We are first and always a fishing people, and therefore I do not ask the pardon of the Hon. Members of this House if I should take up the time of

the House in properly discussing such an important branch of our industries.

Reference has been made to the sealing industry, and I take it, Sir, that it is recognized that the codfishery is not the only fishing industry that we have. The sealing industry is one that is of tantamount importance to us. We were all very pleased the other day when the Prime Minister made the statement that the aeroplane had located a patch of seals and I hope that this year our sealing steamers will do well. I hope that they will come in with bumper catches. I also hope and trust that some of the lands men who were not able to get in the sealing steamers will also do well. Everybody cannot get to the ice in the steamers. But in Twillingate, Fogo and Bonavista Bays there are large numbers of men and I would not be surprised to have a telegram to the effect that the seals had been sighted at Twillingate, and I hope Mr. Speaker that this will be a Green Bay sealing spring again. The indications at the present moment are very bright for that. As far as I can judge from the location of the patch it should be about sixty miles north of the Funks and with the wind as it is today, N.E., I think that the seals will be rafting in on the ice filling up Green Bay, and if this is the case it will be a great thing for the landsmen. I notice in this afternoon's paper some reference is made to the effect that the date for killing seals is March 13th. I take it that seals cannot be killed this year until after the thirteenth. Sunday is the fourteenth, so that they will not be able to begin killing until daylight on Monday morning. I have no doubt Capt. Winsor had a point when he brought in that bill last year, but the date will be the same this year, and so bring it to the 15th. We all know that the young seals, particularly the harps, do not leave the ice until about the twentieth or the twenty-second, and I hope and trust that when they begin to kill on the fifteenth the seals will be in very good order, and when they come in they will bring in as good a voyage per ship as was ever brought in, of good heavy seals.

The sealing industry as well as the codfishery needs all the attention that Honorable Members of the Government and of this side of the House can give it. We are a fishing country, and we cannot afford to lose sight of that fact, and whatever may be given in the interests of the fishery will bring ample returns. We can build highroads, a new dock and a new hotel, hope for the success of the Tourist Policy, but any money spent on the fisheries, and so far as I can see, very little attention has been given to them, will constitute the best investment that Newfoundlanders can possibly make. The Honourable Member for Bay de Verde, Mr. Puddester, when bringing in his resume of financial conditions of the Colony, in order to impress the Members then present, and the public at large, of financial conditions made certain statements. We were told that we were in a more prosperous condition. I notice that during the past year our debt has not been decreased. We do not owe any less than the previous year. I would like for the day to come when we could pay off some of our obligations, and the time for borrowing would cease, when we would realize that it must cease for our own salvation. As long as we have those debts interest has to be paid. We hoped then when the Prime Minister took office that we had seen an end to borrowing. When the $6,000,000 loan was raised, we hoped that that would be the end of borrowing. Now we see that the Prime Minister has changed his views. The platform on which the Prime Minister stood for election should not differ from the platform on which he stands to-day. The trust given to

him by the electorate at that time should be upheld by him to-day, and he should not depart from his pledges made to the country, no matter what his views now may be, and irrespective of the doings of other Governments. The past is passed and no one can bring it back, but we should learn from it, in order that by experience we may govern our conduct for the welfare of Newfoundland. Taxation wants to be reduced. Today I am afraid we are living on inflation, that our borrowings have carried us over the year, and that we have a mere semblance and a feeling of a prosperous condition. Time will tell if this indeed is a true prosperity. It is the duty of every man in this House to stand here to play the game, in the interests of the public at large. One wonders whether or not the Prime Minister might have become entangled in the net of politics; whether politics is not of the nature of a venomous serpent, or a leech that is drawing out the life's blood of the country. If so the quicker our way of government and policy are changed the better. Our aim and object should be to do our level best for the mass of the people, and I submit that the mass of the people consists of the fishermen and workmen of Newfoundland. Men of industry can oftentimes make their weight felt. Capitalists can do likewise, for money talks, but we have to look after the rights of those whose voice is but weak and feeble. It is of the utmost importance that great attention and deep consideration be given to the problems of the codfishery. In my opinion it was because Mr. Monroe was an exporter and a business man that the reins of government were placed in his hands, and that instead of waiting for the trade to make suggestions as to the best means of assisting the codfishery that it should be realised that the country looks to him to take some step in order that the bad conditions prevailing in foreign markets be bettered, and that instead of waiting for the trade to make suggestions as to the best means of assisting the codfishery that it should be realised that the country looks to him to take some step in order that the bad conditions prevailing in foreign markets be bettered and that from the losses which have been borne a lesson be learned and experience be utilised to prevent any such occurring again. I am sorry that the information I asked yesterday is not yet in my possession in regard to the building of and bounties on schooners, because I wish to show that the cause of the stimulus and secret of the increased catch may not have been because of this bounty but because of their hope that a bounty might be paid on fish. We are told this year that mineral salt may be required for the curing of fish. Complaints have been made that fish exported last year showed signs of "red," and to-day I think it would be a good plan on the part of the Government to spend a little money to ascertain something regarding the cause of fish turning red. The Canadian Government has made investigations of this kind, and chemists have worked on this subject, and, I believe, have prepared a treatise on it. I think the Government should be paying more attention to the matter, and if it is found that mineral salt is necessary for proper curing, then that fact should be broadcasted over the Colony. It is our duty to interest ourselves in matters of this kind for the benefit of the fishery.

This year, unfortunately, larger losses are likely to be sustained by fish exporters. Fish in St. John's almost goes begging sale, and we are just two or three months away from the beginning of another year's fishery. I claim that something will need to be done to show the country that some stimulation will be given

to outfitting this year; in order that the hopes of those who have to take upon themselves some responsibility for outfitting will not be shattered. I think it is time for the Government to make some pronouncement on their fishery policy. I regret to take up the time of the House speaking so long upon the fishery, but I feel that I do not need to ask pardon, for it is the most important branch of our industries. But as this House met for the despatch of business that is awaiting it, I wish the honourable members to understand that I am not here to delay them, that I am not here to make an impression, or to deliver any wondrous oration. But I submit that the members elected here hold a trust which they are bound to keep with the people who sent them here, and the fact, that the fisheries are not receiving the consideration that they warrant, lies very near my heart.

Take the financial position of the country. We are asked to believe that conditions are bright. To my mind, instead of that rosy hue which they would seem to indicate, to-day they are not much brighter than they have been for some years past. As far as I can see we cannot expect next year that fish will be $8 or $8.50 a quintal. We know that money will not be spent on re-building the dock; we know that money will not be spent on the hotel; we know that the Government will not have to re-rail the railroad from St. John's to Clarenville, and, therefore, we ask ourselves what we are going to do to cope with the unemployment which is likely to occur during the coming year.

The member for St. John's West, Mr. Browne, states in his speech that the last twelve months were ones of prosperity for his constituents, and which he confidently expected to continue. We wish that would continue to obtain over the whole Island; but we know and the people in the outports to-day realise that St. John's got most of the benefit of a large share of the public expenditures that went on and is going on now, and that the outports get what is left.

To-day we find that in the Oporto market British stocks are 71,540 quintals, consumption 4,460; Norwegian stocks 17,310, consumption 1890, and we realise that the foreign markets are blocked with fish. We realise also that the Government will have to step in and lead the way because everybody, after all, looks to the Government to find a way out, and rightly so, for if the Government falls down on the job who is to take it up?

The Dry Dock, we are told by the Government, is a credit to the Colony. I feel sure that it must have taken a great deal of the Colony's credit to build it. Last year members on this side of the House pointed out to the Government the advisability of having a thorough investigation of the condition of the dry dock before such a huge expenditure was incurred there. When votes for large expenditures, such as the dry dock, are rushed through this House in such short time and without such mature consideration as they warrant, then we can only hope that the greatest good will be got out of those expenditures. I think that honorable members will realise that if $250,000 had been spent on the dry dock that it would have made it quite suitable for the needs of this Colony. I understand that when the dock was taken to pieces that it was not in such disrepair as some people thought it was and on account of that I think that the Government were ill-advised in spending such a large sum of money on the re-building of the dock.

Regarding the finances of the country, in my opinion, retrenchment is what the people want—the cutting down with a pruning knife or with an axe, if necessary, of the expenditure;

and, until we get a Government in this country prepared to use the surgeon's knife in order to cut out the disease of squandermania we will continue to be in a hopeless mess. I submit that it might not be a popular Government to do that, but surely if a Government is honest and sincere and not wrapped up in playing the game of politics, and if a Government is prepared to take its chances, by doing what is right, irrespective of the fact whether the electors next time will vote them in office or not, then I think they have done their duty. If we, as Newfoundlanders, are going to live here, and if Newfoundland for generations to come is going to be the Newfoundland we want it, now is the time to begin—not by quibbling or losing time over past Governments, or not by talking about the misdeeds or actions of others—to do and administer the Colony's work with an eye single to to that purpose for the Colony's good. We find that the expenditure was a little less this year than the revenue. That means to say that we are living on our earnings, and I take it then that this is a most opportune time this year, if we are living within our income, to cut down our estimates of expenditure and retrench generally. The people of the country demand today that economy should be enforced in the public service. Personally, I intend to scrutinize most carefully this year the estimates as they come before this House, and shall do my very best severely to criticise them, because I realize that we are bound to reduce taxation in every possible way that we can in order that those who are not fortunate enough to be drawing big incomes and not fortunate enough to be able to live in luxury that they should not be boycotted or put out of existence.

This afternoon in looking over the Auditor General's Report, under Section 33 B of the Audit Act, I notice that $12,000 was the cost of the Parliamentary Delegates expenses. There is nothing said about this $12,000 in the Speech from the Throne which says:

"In the month of August last certain Members of the Imperial Parliamentary Association came to Newfoundland and were the guests of the Government. This was the first occasion that any such delegation had visited the Colony and the Legislature and the Public were gratified to have the opportunity of meeting them. The exchange of views between the Parliamentarians of this country and those from the United Kingdom were alike helpful and profitable, and it is anticipated that much good will result."

I hope and trust that we shall get back that $12,000 with 5 p.c. interest! A few days ago a question was asked in this House with regard to the amount of moneys paid for the drafting of certain bills, and for the settlement of the Pecuniary Claims Tribunal. $2,000 I think was paid for the Redistribution Bill and $1,000 for the Liquor Bill. Yesterday a statement of the awards and expenses on the Labrador Boundary was tabled, and I see that the Minister of Justice got a cheque for $2,500 as retainer. To my mind, if we are to pay the Minister of Justice, our own Attorney General, $2,500 as a retaining fee, what are we coming to? I know that the Labrador Boundary is a big question, and I would not for a moment advocate that we should be stinted in our expenditures in order that our claim might not be pushed to a successful issue; but it seems to me that these large sums of money paid for legal fees need some reducing, and I would suggest that the Prime Minister and other Members of the Executive Government should realize that the working people of this Colony are the people that have to bear the heavy burden of taxation, and in

the main these people are the fishermen of the country whose incomes average about a few hundred dollars a year each.

We are told, sir, that there is a contract to be made and laid before us in this House with regard to the Besco Company. I did not intend to speak on that until the matter was brought up before this House. All I want to say is that I hope that this contract will be in the interest of the man and that their interests will be well safeguarded. The Besco people only have to look after their own interests, but we have got to look after both interests, and the interests of the people of this colony particularly.

I have a few other remarks, Mr. Speaker, to make. I notice that the hour is drawing near for closing, but before I sit down this afternoon, and I promise that I will not keep the House any undue length on to-morrow, I would just like to say that I notice that there is nothing in the Speech from the Throne about the herring fisheries. We had hoped great things for the fisheries when this Government took charge. I think that if I was asked to give some suggestion as regards what we should do for the fisheries one would be, Sir, that we should encourage the herring fisheries, by giving a bonus on every barrel of split herring caught. Another one would be, Sir, that we increase the bounty on shipbuilding. I give these two suggestions in good faith, and if some member would only take this up with the executive government and have the matter submitted to the House I think that it would meet with our approval.

We are glad to see that the Government has seen fit to repeal the act regarding the landing of liquor in this country. I am very glad to see it. I am very glad to hear of it. And I hope and trust that through the repealing of this act the Government will not hesitate to take up the matter of the duty on codfish entering into the United States. I hope that something will be done in that regard perhaps to our benefit. I hope and trust, too, Sir, that before this session closes that the House will see fit to reimpose the income tax and the bank tax. I submit, Sir, that those who have incomes and can afford it should be taxed. I am one who would be in favour of that.

The re-railing of the railroad as far as Clarenville has been accomplished, and from a remark made by the Prime Minister on opening day it is evident that further re-railing was essential. The chief thing that we should look for in the re-railing of the road is safety, and not to have more pullman coaches or passenger coaches or to spend more money on capital account. The chief thing is safety, and for that reason I would point that out to the Government.

I am very sorry to see in the Speech from the Throne that there was no reference made to agriculture. I am in receipt of a communication from the Minister of Agriculture, with regard to the marketing of eel grass. I am sure that this House having heard the excellent address of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines last year on the question of agriculture, is surprised to-day that there is no mention of it in the Speech from the Throne. There is no program outlined in the Speech from the Throne as regards a distinct policy in order to foster and encourage agriculture.

To-day, Sir, we trust that the Prime Minister and the members of his Government will see to it that all sections of the country get a just and rightful share of the expenditures which they propose. We are told that a million dollars have been expended on the high roads policy. We are at present not aware in what sections of this country this money has been spent, but as far as I am

concerned I believe that a large portion has been spent in the Avalon Peninsula. To-day, I believe, Sir, that the whole of Newfoundland is crying for economy, and for retrenchment, and I believe that when it is put up to the people of Newfoundland; when the call goes forth to sacrifice they will be willing to meet it. But this will not be acceptable if certain sections of the country are deprived of certain rights and given to others. It will be acceptable as long as the people are convinced that the Government intends to cut down all round, and not depriving one section of the people of a right that they are giving to another. I would not advocate, Mr. Speaker, the giving of privileges to one particular section and denying them to another. I believe that to-day if the Government is sincere and wants to retrench, that it will have the people of Newfoundland with them, if it is prepared to administer the trust reposed in them for the Colony's true welfare.

As there are some other items on the order paper, Mr. Speaker, I would move that the debate on the Address in Reply be adjourned.

Debate adjourned.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works if he has the answers to my questions yet.

HON. THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay on the table of the House the answer to question 8. For the information of the Hon. Member, I may say that the other questions are being prepared.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, March 12th, 1926.

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

Petitions were presented by

Hon. Mr. Long from Little Bay re bridge.

Hon. Mr. Long from Burin re bait supply.

Mr. Brown gave notice of question.

Mr. Grimes gave notice of question.

Mr. Cashin gave notice of question.

Mr. Hibbs gave notice of question.

Mr. Ashbourne gave notice of question.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—I would like to explain to Mr. Grimes that my Department had nothing to do with the contract for installing heating in the Court House.

MR. GRIMES—May I ask what Department had to do with it?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—It was the Colonial Secretary's Department.

MR. GRIMES—May I ask that the Colonial Secretary's Department furnish that information.

(1) MR. BROWN asked Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs to lay on the table of the House copies of all correspondence relative to the appointment of one Lloyd Young, as Mail Courier between Springdale and Pilley's Island; to ask if any objections were raised to his appointment; if so, by whom, and to table any correspondence relative to these objections.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—The answer is in course of preparation. I hope to have it later in the afternoon.

(2) MR. BROWN asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the Table of the House a full list of persons in receipt of Old Age Pensions in the District of Twillingate and to name their place of residence.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—I beg to table the information, and would request that in future requests of this kind

for a list of Old Age Pensions in a district, give the names of the particular places concerning which the information is required, as otherwise it is necessary to make a very detailed list.

(3) MR. BROWN asked Hon. the Minister of Justice if the Police Officers who did duty on the S. S. Herbert Green at the time of her seizure last year received any extra or special remuneration for their services.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Owing to the fact that the Inspector General is out of town, I regret to say that I cannot give the information today. I will table it as soon as possible.

(4) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing: (1) The total amount of Revenue received from all sources from January 1st, 1925, to December 31st, 1925.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—I beg to table the information.

(5) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Colonial Secretary to lay on the Table of the House the following information: The total amount paid the Daily News for printing supplies and advertising during the year 1925.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—That amount is $155.50.

(6) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the Table of the House the following information: The total amount paid the Daily News for printing supplies and advertising during the year 1925.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—The total amount is $1.50, to pay for acknowledgment of conscience money, and I beg to table the information requested by Mr. Cashin on March 11th.

(7) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs to lay on the Table of the House the following information: The total amount paid the Daily News for printing supplies and advertising during the year 1925.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—I will table the information later in the afternoon.

(8) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Colonial Secretary to lay on the Table of the House the following information: What printing firm printed the Journal of the House for 1925, giving the total amount paid for such work.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—I beg to table the information.

(9) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the Table of the House the following information: (a) The number of trips made by the private car Terra Nova since August 1924 to date; (b) The names of the parties who availed of the use of the car on each trip; (c) The total amount charged for supplies for each trip; and (d) If trips made by private individuals on this private car was paid for by themselves.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The information is being prepared.

(10) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the Table of the House the following information: The total amount paid the Daily News for printing supplies and advertising during the year 1925; this amount to include any payments by the Railway.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The information with regard to the Railway is being prepared. Nothing was paid to the Daily News from my Department.

(11) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines to lay on the Table of the House the following information: The total amount paid the Daily News for printing supplies and advertising during the year 1925.

HON. MINISTER OF AGRICUL-

TURE & MINES—I beg to table the information.

(12) MR. CASHIN asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the Table of the House the following information: The total amount paid the Daily News for printing supplies and advertising during the year 1925.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—The answer is being prepared.

(13) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Education to lay on the Table of the House the following information: The total amount paid the Daily News for printing supplies and advertising during the year 1925.

HON. THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION—The information has been tabled.

(14) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Justice to lay on the Table of the House the following information: The total amount paid the Daily News for printing supplies and advertising during the year 1925.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —$133.00.

(15) MR. WARREN asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to Table a list of all local agents or principals from or through whom the Board of Liquor Control has purchased any Ales, Wines and Spirituous Liquors from June 1st, 1924, to date.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—I beg to table the information.

(16) MR. HICKMAN asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to lay upon the Table of the House a statement of gross receipts of sales of Wines, Beers and Liquors for 1925.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—I beg to say that the obtaining of this information at the present time would only delay the report of the Liquor Control Board. That report will be ready in a week or ten days, and will contain all the information required.

(17) MR. GODDEN asked Hon. the Prime Minister what consideration has been given to the Petition from the residents of Heart's Content presented on March 10th last year, asking for a Public Building at that place.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—No consideration has been given to the petition. It has not come to the attention of the Government at all.

(18) MR. SCAMMELL asked Hon. the Prime Minister if there has been any correspondence recently between the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Capt. Winsor) and the Executive Council on the question of the S. S. Senef being permitted to prosecute the seal fishery this Spring, and if so, to lay copies of such correspondence on the Table of the House and to ask if the Executive has considered the matter and what action has been decided on in connection therewith.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—There has been no correspondence and no action has been decided upon, therefore, there is nothing to table.

(19) MR. SCAMMELL asked Hon. the Colonial Secretary to lay on the Table a statement showing the total amount expended as able bodied pauper relief in the District of St. Barbe for the year 1924-25 and for the period June 30th, 1925, to December 31st, 1925; and further, to show the amount expended by each Relieving Officer in the District on this account for each of the above mentioned periods.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—I hope to be able to table the answer to this question on Monday, as it involves a lot of information which is not yet quite prepared.

(20) MR. HIBBS asked the Minister of Public Works to Table an itemized account of moneys spent on Western Bay Marsh during 1925; (2) A statement of the moneys spent

on Northern Bay Bridge during the same period.

(21) MR. HIBBS asked Hon. the Colonial Secretary to Table information showing how many natives of Newfoundland are employed by the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company as managers, assistant managers, superintendents, secretaries, foremen, accountants, office workers and as assistants thereto; also how many non-Newfoundlanders are so employed.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—I am glad to be given this opportunity to explain to the Honourable Member and to the House the situation with regard to employment at Corner Brook, and the operations of the Newfoundland Power and Paper Co. Ltd., generally. The matter has been giving a great deal of concern to the Colony, as to the treatment Newfoundlanders are getting, and yesterday I procured from Mr. Lake a statement as to the number of Newfoundlanders and outsiders employed at Corner Brook. The following are the particulars:—

Woodworkers ..	129	Newfoundlanders	
Pulp-Mill	86	"	92%
Paper-Mill	186	"	78%
Wood's Dept. ..	529	"	93%
Town	111	"	97%
Hotel..	22	"	82%
Monthly Wage..			65%

This is the official report from the Government Director of the Newfoundland Power and Paper Co. Operations. In this connection I would like to inform the House that the American Consul has been making representations to the Government for the last six or eight months in regard to the admission into the country of a certain class of people that is forbidden entry into the United States and Canada, namely, Lithuanians. Small batches of these people have been coming in here, and the Consul feared that this might be connected with an attempt to smuggle them into the United States. For that reason the United States Government is anxious to put a stop to their entry here. This did not appear very serious at first, but we lately received information that two hundred of them had made application in Liverpool for passage here on the White Star Line in Canada and on the Furness Withy Steamship Line direct. These Companies refused to accept them, because they feared that there might be difficulty in having them landed here, for they knew they certainly would not be accepted at Halifax or other Canadian ports. The matter was considered of such importance that the White Star Line sent a representative here to make inquiries, and an assurance was given us that they would not take them from Liverpool. As our Immigration Laws stand, we may not have power to refuse to let them land, but the Government have decided to introduce an amendment to the Immigration Laws to dispose of this difficulty. We knew these people were coming here for lumber work on the Humber or Grand Falls, and we wrote and asked the Newfoundland Power and Paper Co., and the A. N. D. Co. if they would decline to employ them. This seemed an effective way to check them, as they were seeking employment in these place only. I have with me the letter which I received in reply from Mr. Stadler, General Manager of the Nfld. P. & P. Co., which is of particular interest and importance, because it shows the attitude of the Company with regard to the employment of Newfoundlanders, and displays their policy in that respect in an excellent light.

Mr. Stadlier's letter read.

I think that we can then rest assured that our people are being fairly treated on the Humber. As it happened when the Mills opened at Grand Falls there was for a time a

large proportion of workers who were not Newfoundlanders, but now these have to a great extent been supplanted by Newfoundlanders, and I have no doubt that we shall see the same at Corner Brook.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—I beg to table the answer to Mr. Cashin's question of Thursday, March 11th.

MR. CASHIN—May I ask for the other answers the Minister of Public Works is preparing for me. They were promised me to-day. I asked one question three or four days ago and the information could be obtained in ten or fifteen minutes.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—I will do my best to have those answers on Monday. Quite a lot of trouble is entailed in answering those questions, and they will be tabled just as soon as they are ready.

MR. HIBBS—May I ask if the information given by the Colonial Secretary to me was intended to be complete; does not contain the information I required.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—It takes some time to obtain that information, and what I have given you was what I obtained from Mr. Lake. I will endeavour to secure the further exact information.

(22) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing: What amount was paid by the Postal Department to the Newfoundland Governmnet Railway for Subsidies during the year 1925, and to date, giving in detail for which services these subsidies were paid.

Address In Reply

MR. ASHBOURNE—I do not wish to burden this House, but I have a few more observations to make on the Address in Reply and Speech from the Throne. It is perhaps too much to expect that the Government on seeing its own shadow in the sun should descant upon its own deformity. Therefore, it is the duty of the Opposition to point out the failings of the Government. The Prime Minister expressed the hope that speeches be cut down to half an hour. Members on this side of the House and I myself have been disappointed that the House was not called together earlier than it was. The speech of His Excellency at the close of the Legislature last year expressed the hope that the House would be called earlier, and some outport members particularly were greatly disappointed that it was not called earlier this year.

I submit that, judging from the speech with which His Excellency closed the House last year, we were confidently expecting that this year we would be called together much earlier than last year. I believe, if one took the time to look up the Speech from the Throne that was delivered last year, one would find that some reference was made in it to the advisability of opening the session this year at an even earlier date. Therefore, I submit that, while we want the business of this House conducted with the greatest despatch, yet in matters of public moment and concern, we should not be confined to, say, half an hour for debates. I would suggest to the Hon. Prime Minister that, if our deliberations cannot be conducted in the afternoon, we have a few night sessions, so that we can get through them.

Yesterday I stressed the Fisheries being the most important industry in the Island, and the one industry which could help Newfoundland and the country in general; I submit, sir, that it has not received the consideration that it warrants, and that to-day, up to the present time at least, the fishery, our principal industry, has been relegated rather to a second or third place, instead of occupying the place in the country which it should. It may appear to some of us, sir, that

we are, perhaps, a little too conservative. There is a tendency to get in the rut, and I hope, sir, that when the time comes, we shall look out new avenues for marketing our codfish, and that we shall explore any means which we can think of in order that our chief industry can be put on a more profitable basis for the country. We feel that the confidence in the fishery, to some extent at least, has been broken, and we hope that the Government will in some way, restore that confidence before this session of the legislature is closed.

The chief hope of the fisheries in Newfoundland is a reduction in the tariff as regards the articles which are used chiefly in the fisheries. When other countries are subsidising their fisheries, surely we cannot hope to compete with them without fostering our fisheries as well.

I have, sir, in my pocket a letter which our firm received from one of the largest salt fish firms in New York. It was written last December. It goes on to say, in part:

> "We acknowledge receipt of your communication, and thank you for your offering of split herring, but we are now buying our split herring in Norway at a considerably lower price than we could get in Newfoundland."

And, sir, I submit, that, when other countries are subsidising their fisheries, and when we have to compete against France and Norway in the marketing of our produce, we cannot hope to get these markets until we are in a position to offer them fish at an equal or lower price. It stands to reason that these countries are not going to pay us more for their fish than the price which they have to pay in other countries; and in countries where they are subsidising the fisheries, naturally they can sell their fish much more cheaply, and hence, sir, I think that we should look into this question and boost our fisheries all we can.

MR. BROWNE—Are they subsidizing the fishery in Norway?

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Speaker, I cannot say. I am trying to get information in that regard, but I have not yet that information to hand. I understand, that in France, they are still subsidizing the fisheries, but as regards Norway, I do not know. But, sir, I believe that to-day Newfoundland needs to keep a good eye on Norway, and to see that it does not wrestle from us our markets that we have at the present time.

Another thing which, I believe, the Government should take cognizance of is the treaty which has been effected between Canada and the West Indies, and we should realize that that treaty may have a great influence on our markets in the near future. That is an important question to my mind.

The other matters mentioned in the Speech from the Throne: one of them is, The Workingmen's Compensation Act. It seems apparent to us all that this Act needs revision. I have often wondered, sir, whether or not we can get in this country some sort of insurance with regard to unemployment. I believe that in England there is some sort of insurance in this regard. Probably some member on this side of the House, or on the other side of the House, may be able to inform me with regard to that.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, for the information of the honourable member I would like to say that the great advantage in England is that a substantial proportion of the insurance is paid for by the employers. The trouble here is that the number of employers is limited. I would be glad to discuss this at any time with the honourable member, as I have a pretty good knowledge of the subject.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Speaker, I am very thankful to the Hon. Minister of Justice for his information, but it just occurred to me as to whether it might be feasible for the Government to evolve some plan with regard to this matter. We know that in Newfoundland to-day, if there is no employment for the people, if there is no means of earning a livelihood, that the people cannot starve. They must be fed, or some other work must be provided by the Government, to enable them to earn their livelihood or at any rate to eke out an existence, and that occurred to me, and so I would like to submit it to the honourable members opposite for their consideration as well.

It seems to me that if we have to feed those people, and to find employment for them in public works and works of that nature, it might be possible that, during the time when a man is working and during fruitful years, some sort of insurance scheme might be evolved whereby something might be done in times when employment is not so readily availed of. However, as regards this Compensation Act, that will be a matter for debate when it comes up before the House.

The hon. member for Bay de Verde, in his opening speech, referred to the large quantity of goods coming in to the country under the free list, and I hope and trust that the honourable Minister of Finance and Customs will see whether or not some articles on this free list cannot be taxed.

With regard to the appointment and procuring of a geologist for the services of the people of Newfoundland, it is a good idea. I think, myself, however, that a mineralogist, a man who specializes more in minerals than in geology, would be a more practical man, and his services would be more profitable to us.

We hope and trust that the Government are seeing to it that the Gander proposition will become a "fait accompli." We need all these industries if we can get them, and I hope and trust that before the spring comes, or at any rate, during the summer, we will have heard that the work is going ahead on the Gander.

With regard to the other matters spoken of in the Speech from the Throne, some of them I spoke on yesterday; one or two others remain to be mentioned. I do not, however, intend to take up much of the time of this House in debating them. We understand that the Government, today, in regard to the High Roads Policy, has spent about $1,000,000. We believe that a large portion of this money has been spent in the Avalon Peninsula, instead of, perhaps, spreading out the expenditure over all the Island, and, as a party remarked to me, the roads in some places seem as though they were almost sandpapered. Such a large expenditure of money on high roads is, in my opinion, not well spent. Half a million dollars spent on the fishery would have brought in far greater returns. However, the present Government has to answer to the people for that.

Now, with regard to the railway; it seems advisable that some legal act be introduced in this House in order that its operation, disbursement and connections might be carried on in a strictly legal fashion, and in that regard, I would urge upon the Government that Mr. Russell, who is the General Manager of the railway, be given full charge; that the railway be kept clear of politics; that this railway, which is after all a public utility, and which the country must keep up: that it be not overburdened because it is a public institution. And I would just like to urge on the Government that in trying to reduce the deficit on the railway, they use every means in their

power to prevent it from being a dumping ground, or in any way being impaired by politics.

With regard to the other items in the Speech from the Throne, the burning question is that the Government to-day should take stock. They should see where they stand. They should see that the fisheries are not regarded with indifference. There is perhaps a tendency on the part of Governments to seek the franchise of the electorate in order that the plums of office might be got. But I submit, Sir, that the Government to-day should do everything in its power to rescue Newfoundland from the "slough of despond" it seems to have fallen into.

With regards to the dock and the hotel and the expenditure on the high ways, in my opinion they are slight straws to depend upon. To-day, I believe, that the Government would be well advised to go in and do something for the fisheries as regards giving a bounty for fish or in some other way help to boost that important industry. With regard to the Municipalities Act. That is a good idea and I hope that it will be availed of by the chief towns in the outports. These towns will be able, perhaps, to elect mayors and aldermen or whatever is required. I did hope that last session this act would have been introduced into this House. In fact when the question of the High-roads Act came up, I asked the Prime Minister whether this Bill would be introduced; I understood from him that it was to have been brought up last year. On account of that and believing that Twillingate would be one of the first towns to apply for incorporation I did not then go into the Highroads Bill as I should have done if I had known that the matter would not have been brought up last session. The reason I was interested was in regard to the collection and disposition of the taxes on motor cars. Further mention will be made by me of this matter when the Bill comes up before this House during the session. However in taking my seat I would urge upon the Government the necessity of doing something tangible to encourage the fisheries. Before sitting down I would say that, in my opinion, we have come to the most opportune time for voicing our sentiments and of showing by some practical effort that we are bringing aid to the fisheries. I consider, Sir, that to-day is the time that this opportunity should be availed of.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak to the Address in Reply, I cannot say that I can follow the most of the previous speakers who said that they congratulated the mover of the resolution. My feeling is one of pity for the Hon. Member in that he had to spend so much time in order to make a case for the Government. There is no doubt that it required a good deal of time to show as best he could what has been accomplished by the Government during the past twelve months or two years. One cannot but admire him for the industry that he displayed in getting together the figures and the facts that he presented to us on Opening Day. But when it comes down to an examination of these figures they don't tell us anything. They tell a very different story entirely and I don't think that anyone who would take the trouble to examine that speech could say that he made a very good case of it.

He has said that during the past year in connection with the Board of Liquor Control that the revenue was less than the previous year. It was shown by the report of the Customs that the net revenue for liquors in 1921 was in the neighbourhood of $255,590, and for 1923 to 1924 the amount was $219,243. That is according to his own figures. That would leave a balance of about $55,000

over and above the previous year. When according to his own statement which he gave us it was about $45,000 less. Now that puts an entirely different complexion on the matter altogether.

Now in this House the statement was made by the Prime Minister during the discussion of the Liquor Act, that there would be less liquor drank under this act and that there would not be the same wholesale violation of the law as had been going on in previous years. The Customs returns give a different story and it would be very interesting to read the figures in connection with that. For 1924 there were 507 arrests for drunkenness and 784 for 1925. And that after the Prime Minister had particularly stressed that there would not be the same violation of the law. He said that there would be no occasion for it, when people could get a bottle a day. But the breaches of the liquor act went from 30 for 1921 to 177 for 1925. That gives a different complexion altogether as to the wisdom of that law being established. Certainly events have not verified what the Prime Minister said when he presented that Bill.

Now with regard to the quantities of liquor drank, we find that in 1923 64,000 gallons of beers, wines and liquors were consumed. In 1924-1925 it was 84,000. That was a difference of twenty thousand gallons. Now what I particularly want to direct attention of this House is this. Everybody knows that the liquor popularly used in this country, particularly by the poorer class of people is rum. For 1923 and 1924 the total amount imported for consumption was 38,830 gallons, according to the Customs returns. For 1924-1925 it was 51,115 gallons. Now if all that was put up in bottles we would find that it represents for 1924 a consumption of 350,000 bottles of rum alone. That is without counting whiskey, gin, brandy, champagne and port wine. If we were to total up all those we would have a consumption for that year of probably 550,000 bottles. Is that not all the proof that you want. If there was so much less imported for the three or four years previous to the introduction of this act than there has been for the past three or four years is not that conclusive evidence that from 1923 on, when the liquor act was put in force, that everybody was given a greater opportunity of getting liquor than in the previous years.

Here is the unfairness about the Government which claims to have the interest of the working classes at heart. You said that the Liquor Act would be alright and that there would be no class distinction or discrimination about it, as existed with the Prohibition Act. Now if you are interested in the poor as well as the rich why do you put a tax upon rum, which is used principally by the poorer classes, to the extent of 325 per cent; whilst the liquors used by the well-to-do are taxed as follows: 75 per cent. on brandy; 60 per cent. on whiskey and on champagne and other liquors in the same proportion. In other words, the rum that costs the Government 90 cents a gallon, or 15 cents per bottle, is sold to the working man for $1.50 a bottle.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—I beg to disagree with the hon. member on that point.

MR. GRIMES—I am basing my calculations upon the duty that has to be paid on these liquors, and in order to clear up any dispute on that point I shall quote from the Customs returns of the present Government for the year 1924-1925 a couple of items to prove my argument and to show how the poorer classes are grossly discriminated against. There were 2,486 gallons of gin imported, valued at $10,129.00 and bought at $4 a gallon. The duty on that was $3.60 per gallon, representing 90 per cent.

tax. There were 6,229 gallons of whiskey imported, valued at $43,000.00 and bought at $7 per gallon. The duty on that whiskey was $4.10 a gallon, representing 60 per cent. tax. But the strongest point is when we come to total up what all this liquor cost the people. It represents in the neighbourhood of one million dollars spent on liquor in this country for that year. But it will be even greater for the year 1925-1926 because the new liquor act was in force for only a part of the year 1924-1925. Still when you take one million dollars away from the expenditures upon the necessities of life it does not give the same returns to the country nor it does not provide for the same number of happy homes in the community as if it was spent on the necessities of life. What is the condition of trade in St. John's at the present time? Notwithstanding that last year was a very good year for trade all over the country, I never heard of such general dissatisfaction with the trade in the city as exists at present. Practically every grocer will tell you that they never saw business so dull as they found it during the past few months. I have asked them what they attribute it to and the answer I got in all cases was that people generally were spending more money on liquor than they were spending for food. It is only natural to expect that, if one million dollars is going to be spent on drink in a year, it is going to interfere with the general business of the town, and, I submit, that when the Government brings in their proposed Bill to amend the present liquor law that they take into consideration these facts and figures that I have prsecnted here this afternoon. I am not speaking now as a prohibitionist, but as a person who saw the conditions as they prevailed in this town,—conditions which are worse than they were a year ago. I do not intend to discuss the Liquor Act by referring to the figures brought before the House by the member for Bay de Verde (Mr. Puddester). I have no doubt he meant them well, enough to contradict the figures as shown by the Customs returns. There are some other matters in connection with the Address in Reply that I would like to allude to. The Government was given credit by Mr. Puddester for having expenditure $775,000.000 less for the year 1924-25 than it was the year previous. Yes, but it must be borne in mind that when the Warren administration went out of power it had prepared Estimates for the House showing a similar reduction in expenditure when that Government was defeated in the Spring of 1923. Those reductions in expenditures, however, actually started under the Squires administration when a reduction of $700,000.00 was made, then the Warren administration came with virtually a similar cut and you have simply followed up what previous Governments have done in that respect. Hence, I say that you have done nothing more than what was already provided for by the outgoing Warren Government so far as the reduction in expenditure is concerned. It was stated by the member for Bay de Verde that the expenditure for the election of 1923-24 was $72,000.00 and only $7,000.00 for 1924-25. The amount for 1923-24 covered a general election; whereas the amount for 1924-25 only covered a bye-election, so that any Government that came into office would have made that saving of $65,000.00.

I notice that there have been increased charges of Interest to the extent of $123,000.00, in spite of the fact that the Leader of the Government and his Party behind him went to the country on the cry of reduction of taxation and reduction of expenditure, and this increase in Interest was brought about by a borrowing policy on the part of the pre-

sent Government, which strongly condemned previous Governments for meddling with. Reduction of taxation is one of the most important questions confronting the country to-day and has been for several years back. The present Prime Minister emphasized in his Board of Trade speeches for two or three years the necessity there was for suggesting to the Government and the bringing of pressure to bear for the purpose of having reduction of taxation brought about. And, if you look at the Manifesto of the present Colonial Secretary when he led a Party in 1923, you will find that he pointed out in very strong terms that taxation was crushing the industries of the country, and he suggested various remedies whereby reductions could be brought about. What do we find? We find that the same men have and are acting directly opposite to their promises.

All over the country the Government have been preaching reduction of taxation; but the greatest chance in the history of any government is the chance of the present of reducing taxation; but instead of that they entered upon a tariff which is to bear heaviest upon people who cannot make both ends meet. A convention has been suggested between the merchants, the representative and the Government. This is a good plan if carried out properly. We have been talking for years as to what is to be done with the fishery; but the subject had to be dealt with in a practical and proper manner.

Reference has been made to the fishery to-day. That was a very important part of the Government's election plank. They promised in order to help the fishery to pay a bonus on fish. Not only would there be a bonus on fish, but there would be a reduction in the duties upon fishing supplies to assist that industry. Neither one or the other has been carried out by the Government up to the present time. There has only been a suggstion thrown out in the Speech from the Throne that there must be a better cure of fish. Everybody knows that that would help the situation, but I do not think that even the Prime Minister will agree that that would be sufficient to improve the condition of the markets.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I would be glad to hear of a remedy.

MR. GRIMES—I will tell you what you said yourself and what other members of the Government said. You said that it was necessary to have better marketing conditions and that the Government that came into power should see that something was done along that line. You also suggested that another way would be to have a convention take place in the fall of the year of the merchants and the fishermen in St. John's. Now you have been two years in office and you have not made any attempt to have any convention of the people interested to improve the conditions of the marketing of the fish. I was hoping to see that carried out. I was hoping to see a move made by the Government and see the merchants and the fishermen of the outports and St. John's and the representatives come together and discuss properly the situation. That is the only way in which you are going to get something tangible that will assist you in order to improve the conditions, existing in the country to-day. But we did not see it carried out. It was just the same as all the other catch cries that go around from year to year in order to get votes. Many promises are made, but when the time comes for the carrying out, when you got the opportunity, you failed to do it.

I said before we are talking here from day to day about what is to be done to the fishery. Suggestions are made by different parties when they go to the country as to what they are

going to do and they never do anything. The Prime Minister makes the Governor say in the Speech from the Throne that the only thing that the Government could do was to wait for suggestions from the trade. Well now I submit that that is a poor policy. It is a very weak policy, to wait for suggestions from the trade. In Norway, Canada, England, you have the governments of these countries calling together the representatives of industry in order to consider means to improve the industry. The Labour Government called the representatives of the fishing industry of Birmingham and Aberdeen and the other places interested in the industry. They did not solve the whole of the question because they were turned out of power before they got the chance. But there was something attempted and they helped the situation a great deal. You can see it done in Canada. There is a fishery policy there. There are certain regulations with regard to the cure. All the packages have to be made a certain way and labelled according to the class of product they contain and the inspectors go down on the wharves and examine the packages. They make them open them up and see what they contain, and if they do not suit the inspectors they certainly will not be allowed to be shipped and they make the owner of the fish take the packages and have them labelled properly. If we had something like that in this country there would be a greater faith in the markets as to the quality of the Newfoundland fish than there is to-day. The Hon. Mr. Long is the manager of a long established firm that has a good record in the fish markets, because they always saw that the fish that they exported was up to the standard. Not every firm has the same reputation in the fish markets as has the old firm of Hodge, and I suppose that the successor, the Newfoundland Labrador Export Company, is conducting its business in the same way. It goes to show what can be done in other established markets. It all goes to show the necessity of having some scheme laid down in order to have things go right. And when that is done, Sir, I am pretty certain that Newfoundland fish will run much higher in the estimation of purchasers than it has at the present time. And when that is done, Sir, you will gain the co-operation of the fishermen themselves. The fishermen who sell the fish want to get the value of their labour, and in order to get the value of their labour they want to see everybody treated fairly and squarely. When they see one man, under this tal-qual system, with an inferior quality of fish, get the same as they get with a better class they are bound to be dissatisfied with it, and the consequence is that they have not the stimulus necessary to make the fish as it ought to be to maintain its reputation which it ought to have in the markets of the world. My Hon. friend, Mr. Ashbourne, stated that there is no attention being paid by the Government to the herring fishery, and it would seem that in a country where we have such large quantities of herring in Placentia Bay and Green Bay and on the West Coast that we ought to have a greater trade in herring than we have to-day. In Canada there is something like five millions of dollars derived from the exportation of herring, and if the Canadians are able to export five millions of dollars worth of herring from that country what is wrong with Newfoundland with all the herring around her shores. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that that is something that ought to be investigated. There should be somebody appointed to find out why it is that the herring fishery to-day is not prosecuted on a larger scale than it is. If Canada exported five millions of dollars worth and New-

foundland only about half a million there is something radically wrong in connection with the herring industry. We have been talking about encouraging industries by means of bonuses. Well, that is a question which requires very careful consideration. It is alright to pay a bonus on fish and herring if it is an inducement to get more people engaged in the industries, thereby giving more employment that will help to build up the trade of the country. If it can be shown that bonuses will assist in that way, then I say, provide out of your income sufficient to encourage the industry and reach that happy condition.

Reference has been made to the railway in the speech and it is a peculiar attitude that is assumed by the members of the Government on the railway. We have the mover of the address in reply commending the management of the railway for the very efficient manner in which it has been conducted. And we had the Minister of Finance and Customs when in Halifax saying that he did not believe in Government ownership of the railway. There is something very contradictory in this. If the Railway is managed in a satisfactory way, then what do you want to sell it for. What is to be concluded from this? There is one thing sure and that is that when the railway was under the control of a private company the conditions were worse. Since the Government took control the system has been much improved. If there is something wrong with the railway, then I say there must be something wrong with the management, because nobody wants to get clear of a thing that is working properly.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—But not profitably.

MR. GRIMES—In answer to the Prime Minister. Suppose you hand over the operation of the road to some private concern. You have got to pay subsidies. You have to provide the money for any improvement that may have to be made on the railway. You have to pay increased freight charges, and increased passenger charges, and I cannot see anything to suggest that conditions can be improved by handing the railway over to somebody else, if they cannot manage it any better than we are doing it at the present time. Is it that the Government has not told us the truth. If they have told us the truth, then I say, forget talking about handing over the railway to private control if it means experiencing the same conditions as we have had in past years. The Colonial Secretary said this afternoon that there was no interference on the part of the Government. He said that they were not suggesting to the Management that it should put in any friend of any politician. If it is being conducted on a proper business basis what more do you want. What more do you want if it is going on in a business way? I think that before we go to talk about these things we should be told facts.

In the matter of Civil Service Pensions I think that it is high time that something was done in this connection. There is no doubt about it that there is some reform needed along these lines. It is true that there are many persons getting a pension who have only been in the service two or three years. They come into the service that length of time and think that some member will come along and suggest to the head of the Department that he will put them on the pension list and give their place to some other supporter of his in his place, and the time has now come when something should be done to remedy the condition of affairs. We are a little country with a small population. We have heavy burdens upon us. More burdens are put upon us

by each succeeding Government and if things continue in this way they will soon bear too heavily upon those engaged in the various industries of the country, and trying to earn their livelihood. And one of the means of reduction of expenditure by the present Government is by cutting down the number of officials. There is no doubt that some places would get on better with fewer officials than they have now and have had for a number of years. There are three or perhaps four magistrates in districts where one would very well do. We have several Custom House Officers where one would very well do. But I do not suggest that these men should be put out of their jobs, but what I do say is that when a vacancy occurs, the same thing should be done in every department in the Government as the Prime Minister said was done at the Railway on the opening day.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Every one of the new districts under the new distribution plan, is calling out for a magistrate for itself.

MR. GRIMES—I think that you should be strong enough to say that if we do not see the need for these appointments we will not make the recommendations. As I said before, I think that the time has come when the remedy should be made. There should be no person on the pension list who is not fifteen or twenty years in the service.

Now in connection with the Besco Contract, I presume that when this contract is laid before the House in a few days that we will get the reasons why nothing was said about it in the Speech from the Throne as to the men's getting a living wage over there. I do not say that the Government has not done its best. We will find out that when the contract is presented. But I cannot understand why there is not an announcement of increase of wages for the miners which was being looked forward to. If that is not so, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that the Government should have considered signing the contract until they find out that they have got all the facts and if the Company can pay a living wage. I am inclined to agree with the statement that if any company cannot pay a living wage to its employees, it has no business to exist.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Then, you would say to shut down Bell Island?

MR. GRIMES—I would rather consult the miners on that.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—They do not want it closed down. We know their answer.

MR. GRIMES—I think that the position of the company ought to be investigated, to find out as to what profits they are making with their Bell Island operations. In Canada they appointed a Royal Commission in order to find out what the Besco was doing at Sydney. They were able to find out the conditions of things and what was to be done from the findings, and while it was not altogether satisfactory to the miners it gave them some concessions which the company was not ready to grant until the commission made these findings and made the company disclose its rate of profits. And I think that if the Government has not got the facts in connection with the company's profits it ought to have them before the discussion of the contract when it comes before the House.

There is another matter that I would like to refer to, Mr. Speaker, and that is the absence of reference to the re-introduction of the income tax. Members may have their own individual views on that matter, but I consider that we ought to distribute taxation according to ability to pay. I am not suggesting that the income tax should be re-introduced in the

form in which it was last on the Statute Book, but re-introduced with some modifications, such as the exemption amount raised, but certain it is that taxation should be levied according to one's ability to pay. It is the only fair way of levying taxation. Every other British dominion recognises that. Britain herself being the first to set the example. Talk about patriotism. What is it if it does not mean being true to the institutions of the Empire to which we belong. That is one way of showing by practical demonstration the relation between one class and the other. We should conduct the affairs of Government in such a manner that the greater burden should fall upon those able to pay, and the lesser burden on the shoulders of those not so well able to bear the load. There is no reason why we should not be able to collect from two hundred and fifty thousand and three hundred thousand dollars a year from this source from the people in the country able to pay the income tax. In Canada, and in every province of Canada there is an income tax bill. In the little province of P. E. I. there are between six and seven hundred people who pay the income tax. In the Province of British Columbia you find that there are six or seven thousand people paying the income tax. The Province of Nova Scotia gets a million dollars a year from the income tax. The same thing applies to New Brunswick. The same thing applies to every dominion in the British Empire. Britain showed us the example. We have been going back on it. Talk about patriotism! At any rate, Mr. Speaker, I suppose we will have the opportunity to demonstrate what we are going to do along these lines before the session closes and when the time comes around we will be better able to discuss the taxation that will be made by the Government for the coming year.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—I move the adjournment of the debate. There are several things on the order paper, and we would like to get out of the House early.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—If the gentlemen would like to get out of the House early, there is nothing remaining over for this evening. If it is the desire of the Opposition to adjourn I have no objection to moving it. I move that the remaining order of the day stand deferred.

HON. THE MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Independent Party has asked for an answer to a question, and I have promised to give it to-day, and since my word is my bond, I would like your permission to table it now. It is in connection with railway subsidies paid by my department. It is unnecessary to read it.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—I would also like to table the answer to Question 23 of the Order Paper of March 9, asked by Mr. Scammell. I am sure members will appreciate the trouble it is to get these answers ready. Pages and pages of it. I don't know how many I have here.

MR. ASHBOURNE—I would like to ask if these bills here mentioned on the Order Paper are ready for distrbiution. I think that it would be well to have them to go over during the week end.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—They will be ready for distribution on Monday.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I move that the House do adjourn until to-morrow, Monday afternoon at three o'clock.

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 Monday afternoon next, 15th inst., at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, March 15th, 1926.

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

THE HONOURABLE THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, before the regular order of the day is proceeded with, I would ask your permission to make a few remarks in respect to the charges that have been made against the Government on refusing to assist seamen in distress. In this connection, the Leader of the Opposition asked some questions the other day, inferring statements against the Government, and that was followed up by an article in the Daily Globe of Friday last, and which reads as follows:

(Reads article)

This paper does not even do the Government the common justice of publishing the remarks made on that occasion, but it shows distinctively how it tried to make political capital out of this little incident. Yesterday afternoon the Captains and crews of the steamers Kentucky and Silvia, the Colonial Secretary, the Finance Minister, and myself, Mr. Bowring, Mr. Outerbridge, Captain Stewart, and the Mayor of the town were invited to a social gathering by His Excellency the Governor at the Government House. His Excellency made a brief address, congratulating the members of both crews on the excellent seamanship they had displayed in bringing those vessels to port. Mr. Wolfe, on behalf of the underwriters, and the Captain of the French steamer Kentucky, responded very nicely, and thanked the Governor for what had been done; and, when they had finished, Captain Mitchell of the Silvia, came forward to tell us the entire story. As he continued, Captain Mitchell said "I am going to hit, and I am going to hit hard." He proceeded by stating that the Government had refused to render assistance by sending the S.S. Kyle to the aid of the distressed mariners, and he wound up by congratulating Mr. Bowring on what he had done.

I think it is necessary that I should give a little further information, because it is loudly whispered and openly charged that the Government have not done their duty in this respect. I asked Mr. Russell, Manager of the Railway, to give me a full report of this matter, and I am in receipt of his report, which reads as follows:

(Reads report)

I claim that there is nothing in that correspondence to show that, at any time, there was the slightest suggestion or intimation to the Government that the lives of the crew of the S. S. Kentucky were at stake. If there was any cause for alarm, surely it should have been known when the S. S. Caribou was ready to leave here; and if, as Sir John Crosbie stated here the other day, the Caribou had been asked to go to the assistance of the Kentucky, and when weather conditions were favourable, the Kentucky would have been docked here a week ago. Furthermore, at the time, assistance could also have been rendered, if asked for, by the Furness liner Newfoundland, which was then fifty miles from the Kentucky on her way from England. The Captain of the Newfoundland told the Colonial Secretary that he could have had the Kentucky in this port on last Saturday week, but was informed the Kentucky was going to wait for the Silvia.

I contend that it is absolutely unfair and unjust, on the part of the Opposition, to try and use this particular incident to gain political

kudos and try to embarrass the Government, because that is what has, and what is being done. Captain Mitchell certainly availed of a very extraordinary occasion to make a charge against the Government, and I claim here now that there has not been the slightest blame, all things considered, that can be laid against the Government for neglect in any way whatever in that seafaring episode. Everything, that was possible for us to do, was done under the circumstances. The Leader of the Opposition may criticize the Government for exorbitant charges, from the commercial aspect of the matter; but I want to emphasize to-day that he cannot charge us with inhumanity in this respect.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to unnecessarily delay the House this afternoon on that particular piont, as I am prepared to table all the correspondence that took place with the Captain of the Silvia and Mr. Eric Bowring. It is not stated in any message that the lives of the Kentucky's crew were at risk. If they were at risk, why did Captain Mitchell not say so? If the bulk heads had given way the Kentucky was not in such jeopardy that she would likely go down like a stone, it would have appeared an easy matter for Captain Mitchell to arrange to take off the Captain and crew of the Kentucky, and if the Government steamers were wanted by Capt. Mitchell for life saving he must admit they were wanted to do what he was incapable of doing himself. However, that point I am not going to argue because Captain Mitchell may be able to give some reasons for his statement. The point I take exception to is the charge made by Captain Mitchell, the Leader of the Opposition, and the Daily Globe for refusing to assist seamen in distress. Captain Mitchell's message via Cape Spear reads as follows:

(Reads message)

Now, I would like to know if there is anything in that message to show that men's lives were at stake, or whether it was a similar case to that of the ill-fated S.S. Regulus, as pointed out by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, I place all this correspondence on the table of the House this afternoon in the hope that the Leader of the Opposition, after due consideration of it, will withdraw the charges he made against us.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker: As the Prime Minister has directed his remarks to me as Leader of the Opposition, I desire to make a short reply, because, after I have read this correspondence, I purpose referring to this matter again: also as I intend to speak upon the Address in Reply. Notwithstanding any reason that the Prime Minister gave to the contrary, I think that his conscience must have been very much agitated. He takes exceptions to the charges that he alleges I made, that the Government did not send out the S.S. Kyle to aid the S.S. Kentucky, but the correspondence that he has just read bears out everything that I said. I stated before and I repeat now that a Government steamer should have gone to the assistance of the "Kentucky" in the first instance and the matter of salvage could have been settled later by arbitration, as is usually done in such cases. The Government had every right to send out the S. S. Kyle to the aid of the Kentucky, and I say now that the Government did not attempt to assist those seamen in distress. It is all very well for some people to talk now because a tragedy was averted; but there might have been a tragedy. On Wednesday last, March 10th, when a strong gale and snow storm raged on this coast there was every possibility of a terrible tragedy, but fortunately for the S. S. "Kentucky"

the wind blew from the North East instead of from the South or South East. When the Captain of the Red Cross Liner Silvia makes a statement as he did in the Government House on Sunday, and charges the Government with being negligent, I think it is something that the Government and everybody else ought to take notice of.

Of course, I was expecting that somebody would be made the "Goat" of, and, apparently, Mr. Russell, the Manager of the Railway and the servant of the Railway Commission has been made the "Goat" of in this instance and the written report given to the House is signed by him. The Prime Minister made the statement the other day that if the ship was in imminent danger or distress that the crew could have been taken off. Well then, why did not the "Ingraham," with Mr. R. G. Rendell, who was the Manager of the Tug Company on board, take off the late crew of the ill-fated steamer Regulus a few years ago? Because she was not able to accomplish the task, and in the morning the Regulus was lost and all the crew were hurled into eternity, and a similar thing might have happened this time to the S. S. Kentucky. The Silvia would have all she could do to save herself, if the wind were blowing on the land. Now it is not my purpose to embarrass the Government by keeping up this subject, but as the matter is brought up I could not allow certain statements to go unchallenged. Meanwhile, I shall content myself by perusing the correspondence tabled by the Prime Minister for the present.

THE HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Speaker: If I am not out of order, I would like to say that the Prime Minister has stated practically all the facts. The story told by Mr. Russell is perfectly true, and, as Mr. Hickman stated, the matter of salvage could be settled by the London Salvage Association or Admiralty Court; but that was not the idea of the owners of the S. S. Silvia. There is quite a bit to say about the matter, but I would prefer to remain modest over it at the present, as I may have to refer to it later. I may say that we offered the Caribou as well as the Kyle to go to the assistance of the Kentucky, and we were told that the Silvia would do. I think the story has been told in full, in the correspondence, but, if this matter should come up again, I shall be only too pleased to give my views on the affair.

Petitions were presented by:

Mr. Ashbourne from Herring Neck re: Fishery.

Mr. Warren from Seal Cove re: Telephone.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, I beg to table information in reply to question number 12, asked by Mr. Grimes on the Order Paper of March 9th.

I also beg to table answer to question asked by Mr. Brown on the Order Paper of March 10th, question number 19.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay on the table answer to question on the Order Paper of March 12th, No. 7, asked by Mr. Cashin.

Also to question asked by Mr. Brown on the Order Paper of March 12th.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—On March 12th Mr. Brown asked a question to which I replied, and which I now confirm. The police officers of the Herbert Green did not receive any extra remuneration for their services.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—I beg to table information asked for by Mr. Scammell on the Order Paper of March 12th.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I beg to table information asked for in

question 12 on the Order Paper of March 12th.

Also to question asked by Mr. Cashin, No. 10, on the Order Paper of March 12th.

Also to question No. 9 on the Order Paper of March 12th.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay on the table of the House answers to the following questions:

No. 27 on the Order Paper of March 9th—Mr. Ashbourne.

No. 15, on the Order Paper of March 10th—Mr. Scammell.

No. 18, on the Order Paper of March 10th—Mr. Brown.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—In reply to a motion of Mr. Cashin, which this House adopted on March 11th to be placed before His Excellency, regarding correspondence between His Excellency and Mr. McNeily, I am commanded to lay all correspondence between His Excellency and Mr. McNeily, and any correspondence with the Secretary of State on the table of the House. This is all the correspondence available.

Mr. Brown gave notice of question.

Mr. Cashin gave notice of question.

Mr. Puddester gave notice of question.

Mr. Scammell gave notice of question.

Mr. Halfyard gave notice of question.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Speaker, Mr. Cashin has asked some questions of the Finance Department which it will be hard to get. I hope he appreciates this, and that he may have to wait several days for answers.

MR. CASHIN—I am quite willing to allow for questions that are hard to answer. There are some questions which have not yet been answered, and I think ought to be answered. There is one to the Minister of Justice.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—That question is in the course of preparation. I could have given any special information, but understood that you wanted all possible information. I may say that question No. 10 on to-day's Order Paper is in the same strain, and the whole information will be published to-morrow. I expect to lay on the table of the House a compendium of all the lawyers in town to-morrow.

MR. CASHIN—May I ask if the Minister of Public Works has completed the information he has been holding up.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—I am not holding up any information. I am trying to find out something essential to this information, and then will immediately table it.

MR. CASHIN—May I ask the Hon. Minister of Finance when we are likely to get the Public Accounts.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Some parts of the Public Accounts are not yet ready; I expected to have them before this. I am rather anxious to lay them on the table, so that you can have some fun. I can't tell when they will be ready as I don't know.

Questions

(1) MR. BROWN asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the Table of the House a list of all passes issued by the Railway Commission from January 1st to date, and to state names of such persons to whom passes were issued.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I beg to table the information asked for.

(2) MR. GRIMES asked Hon. the Colonial Secretary to lay upon the Table of the House the following information: (1) Who are the contractors now installing a heating plant in the Court House in St. John's; (2) Were tenders asked for the performance of this work; if so, Table tenders; (3) To whom was contract awarded; (4) Table all docu-

ments in connection with this work.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—I beg to table the information asked for.

(3) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing the amount paid the proprietors of the "Daily News" for printing and advertising by the Department of the Liquor Commission during the year 1925 to date.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—I have asked for this information, and will have it to-morrow.

(4) MR. CASHIN asked the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the Table of the House a statement showing the amounts paid for supply of groceries and provisions to the various Government Institutions from January 1st, 1925, to date, together with names of persons to whom such groceries were supplied and the amount received by each person.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—This answer is in course of preparation.

(5) MR. CASHIN asked the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the Table of the House a detailed statement showing the quantity of eggs supplied to the public Institutions since the 15th June, 1924, prices paid for same and names of suppliers.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—This answer is in course of preparation.

(6) MR. CASHIN asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the Table of the House a statement designating the public buildings and equipment and contents thereof, throughout the Colony, that have been insured by the Government since the 15th of June, 1924; the respective amounts of insurance so carried; names of Companies and local agents with whom insured and amount of premiums so paid.

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

(7) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing in detail: (1) All property, equipment, contents, and stores on which fire insurance has been carried by the Newfoundland Government Railway Commission since 15th June, 1924; (2) The respective amount of insurance so carried; (3) The names of Companies and their local agents, with whom insured; (4) Dates of payment and amount of each Premium.

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

(8) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister to give in detail particulars of the amount of $12,000 spent for the entertainment and expenses of the British Parliamentary Delegation.

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

(9) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister if the Hon. Richard Cramm is still the Solicitor for the Newfoundland Government Railway; does Mr. Cramm receive a Retainer as such Solicitor; if so, state amount of same; also lay upon the Table of the House a statement showing all amounts paid to Mr. Cramm from June 1st, 1924, to date, together with particulars of same.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—I beg to table this information.

(10) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to lay upon the Table of the House a statement showing all amounts disbursed for legal services since June 1st, 1924, including disbursements made in connection with Assessor's Department, Customs, and Death Duties.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—I beg to ask that this be deferred till to-morrow.

(11) MR. HIBBS asked Hon. the Colonial Secretary: (1) If the Gov-

ernment has concerned itself with the possible effect of the "Canadian West Indian Treaty" upon the marketing of Newfoundland codfish in such markets as Jamaica, Barbados and Trinidad; (2) If the Government has taken any official steps to discover the possible effect of such a Treaty; (3) If there are any correspondence between the Government and the parties to this Treaty in relation to this matter, and if so, to Table a copy of such correspondence.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I beg to table the information asked for by Mr. Hibbs. I should like to point out that there are one or two confidential documents included in this, and would ask that these be not published.

(12) MR. ASHBOURNE asked the Minister of Agriculture and Mines to state whether any cutting of pulpwood or pit props from the Three Mile Limit is now going on; if so, to Table a list showing districts concerned and the names of parties to whom permission has been granted to cut.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—I beg to table the information asked for.

Address In Reply

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker, I have a few remarks to make in the course of debate on the Address in Reply, and on the Speech from the Throne.

In the second paragraph of the Speech from the Throne it is stated that "the continued prosperity of the Colony since the last Session has been well maintained, and I congratulate you accordingly." If the Government through His Excellency wishes to convey that this country is in a state of continued prosperity it is a fiction, which I shall show later on. It is very sad to see the Representative of His Majesty, seated on the Throne, reading what is known as the Speech from the Throne, written by the Government and placed in his hands to read as written; I say this is a very humiliating position, and a very sad one for His Majesty's representative.

This country perhaps has been prosperous during the past year. There might have been prosperity, in general trading, but it is a prosperity founded on money borrowed by the Government, and that is not true prosperity, not a true basis of prosperity. A country or a business or an individual cannot be prosperous and keep on borrowing each year—Prosperity can only come by producing wealth, things worth money whether for home consumption or for export, producing products, such as fish, feed, hay, vegetables, grain, fodder—that is the sort of prosperity we must have, and not by borrowing each year—we must produce before we can have any real prosperity. I say therefore that this statement in the Speech is misleading, and nothing the Government can say will change this.

I was once in the Assembly of the British House of Parliament and heard a member characterize the Speech from the Throne as a "bribe and a gag." I do not go so far as to call this a "bribe and a gag," but if there is a case where the Speech from the Throne could be called a bribe it could be applied in this case. I repeat that it is unfortunate that His Majesty's representative, seated on the Throne, must deliver such a speech.

The sealing and codfishing industries are said to have been more productive the past year than in 1924. I cannot say anything as to the sealing industry, as I am not directly interested in it, but I presume the Prime Minister, who is interested in it, knows what he is talking about. One thing I do know, and that is that there is more money in the exportation of seal skins and seal oil than that of codfish for the last few years.

We have been told that the codfishing industry has been more productive than the previous year, and I am unable to see that. In 1924 Labrador fish sold as high as $8.50 per quintal, and the bulk of it at $8.00; Shore fish went as high in 1924 as $10.50. In 1925 Labrador fish sold at $5.20, some reaching $5.50 per quintal; Shore fish, the bulk sold for $8.00 per quintal, so from a standpoint of comparison in values I cannot see how this is possible. True, the catch may have been little larger, which may help to make up some of the difference in value, but I cannot see how it can be called more productive. Most of our outport merchants last year did very poorly in their trading, majority of them purchasing their fish at greater prices than they realized in St. John's or in the markets abroad. That is very general all over the Island, and cannot be counted as very great prosperity. The Speech from the Throne states that exporters will probably realize on their exports without material losses—the Prime Minister is an exporter and should know what the foreign markets are like—he probably had an opportunity to read the Speech before it was sent to His Excellency, I know he did not write it. The different markets have been overstocked, Mr. Speaker; prices have declined in Spain, Italy, Portugal and Greece—the prices prevailing there will not give the exporters their costs.

The prices paid for fish of last year's catch will not be found sufficient for the fishermen to carry them over during the season. The fishery might have paid with these prices two years ago, but it will not now, on account of the excessive taxation which has been put on fishermen's supplies, by this Government during the last Session of the Legislature. The cost of living for fishermen has been increased, and on that account they need a higher price for what they produce. This country can never be prosperous until we guard our fisheries, and we cannot properly guard our fisheries until we reduce the cost of catching fish. The reason we have fish unsold to-day in the market is that the price is too high for the consumers. The fishermen should be in a position to produce cheaper fish and greater quantities of it. Borrowing money and spending it on the construction of highroads and on docks and on such schemes do not constitute prosperity. If every man employed last summer and paid out of Government monies were instead employed in the fishery, and then caught only twenty quintals of fish per man, I believe that this country would be a great deal better off financially. We have to encourage the fisheries and the development of agriculture, and whatever the price of that encouragement may be, it has to be given. Only through this, can Newfoundlanders attain prosperity. The Speech from the Throne refers to the standardization of fish, and the Prime Minister says it is not the Government's business to interfere in matters of this sort, but it is rather the business of the Board of Trade and of those who are commercially connected with it. I do not, however, agree with this. I think that although the Government should not impose regulations with regard to prices of fish, it is their duty to interest themselves with regard to improvement of the product. If some scheme can be worked out whereby the proper standardization of fish can be accomplished, I think that scheme will bring in big returns. If we had a proper system for the standardization of codfish I don't think we would have to fear about getting a ready market. It is the duty of the Government to try and find some such scheme and put it in force. I rfeer, of course, not to regulations on the prices of fish, but only standardiza-

tion of it, leaving the dealer to buy and sell on what terms he likes. Then 50 p.c. more fish would be disposed of than the catch of 1925, and disposed of for cash. The reason I am referring at such great length to the fishery is because I am interested in it, and I believe it is the thing that we Newfoundlanders have to look to, and to which we should give the best of our attention. I think that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries should be in his place in this House during the Session. I am sure that all will agree that his is the most important department of the Government, and this House cannot meet without Legislation and discussion on the subject of the fishery and he should take part in such discussion and hear what is to be said on the subject. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries should be present here on the floors of this House. A few days ago Mr. Lake brought in a petition asking for bait depots on the West Coast. I was glad to support that petition, and consider the subject of it of great importance, and the Minister too should be here doing his duty listening to these matters pertaining to the fisheries. The Government has practically destroyed the split herring fishery in this country. Not very many years ago quite a large quantity of split herring used to be put up in Green Bay. In numerous small settlements in Notre Dame Bay people make herring barrels during the winter, and in the spring catch herring with their nets, clean and salt them and sell same, probably getting enough to tide them over the summer. Now a law has been introduced whether by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries or the Fishery Board whereby every body putting up herring for sale must have a license and a branding iron. These people whom I have mentioned engage in the herring fishery only in a small way, getting from three up to five or ten barrels for sale, and are not in a position to get a license or a branding iron, so that they have to give up this Fishery.

Last year's herring fishery was small, and that was partly the reason. The herring caught in Green Bay is a poor herring, I mean to say that it is not fat but rather thin, but is considered for that reason very suitable for sale to the West Indies, because the fat herring will not keep in a hot country. They are really sound, clean herring which are exported to the West Indies and accepted as the best and is what is required. The Government Inspectors call these spring herring No. 2, and the law demands that No. 2 herring cannot be exported except in pork barrels. This means that those who have spring herring caught last year, and called by the inspectors No. 2 herring will have to leave them in their store or throw them away, unless they are in pork or beef barrels. I claim that this state of affairs as a result of the law is ruining one of the best industries of the country. Instead of bringing in laws of this kind, the Government should be encouraging the herring industry. We have lost much of our market for herring in the United States on account of a duty imposed by the United States Government on Newfoundland herrings, but there are a good many other markets, and the Government should encourage this industry, if necessary, even to the extent of putting a bonus on herring in order that it should be put on its feet again. There are then many reasons why the Minister of Marine and Fisheries should be here to hear the discussions taking place on fishery matters, for these matters are the most important of those to come before the Legislature. It is very good for the Prime Minister to tell us that there is a prospect of money being spent by the A. N. D. Co., for improvement of

their plant at Grand Falls, a prospect of an aluminum production in Bay D'Espoir and other prospects of development elsewhere. All that is only prospective. These developments are required, but until they materialize the country should concentrate its attention on the industries that we have, and most particularly on the fishery. It is not only the fishermen who are depending for their living on the success of the fisheries but also the clergymen, doctors, lawyers, and the general public.

A Newfoundlander likes no place better than Newfoundland, no matter what position he holds in another country. The other day on board the S.S. Sachem as we sighted the coast coming in to St. John's, I was talking to two Newfoundland passengers, both of whom belonged to the District which I have the honour to represent. They had been working in Boston and earning $10.00 a day as carpenters and were coming home on a visit. When we came in sight of the shore of Newfoundland they showed their great delight in seeing the homeland once again, and expressed plainly how glad they would be if they could only get employment here, even if it were at half the wages they had earned in Boston. There are thousands of other Newfoundlanders outside the country in a similar position. If the Government thinks development should be made in any particular way with regard to agriculture or the fishery or our mineral resources, I think they will find this side of the House will be strongly in favor of any practical scheme. We all want to see success in our country, and this can only be attained by common sense, interest in what tends to its development, and the Government will not be opposed in any sincere policy of development and in any genuine advancement, and I hope and trust that the Government will sincerely take these matters into consideration.

I was very sorry to hear the Prime Minister say that he had no news about the Gander development, for I had hoped that he might be able to tell us that there was a good prospect of its going ahead, but apparently there is no legislation coming before the House this Session on that subject, so I take it for granted that there is to be no development of the Gander for 1926.

Now in reference to the St. John's Dry Dock, we are told construction is proceeding rapidly and the erection of the fire-proof ware-houses has been commenced. I understand that the contractors who are doing this building are doing the work of warehouse construction on a cost plus basis. That is certainly an oversight on the part of the Government. They could not have had in their minds the construction of these warehouses when framing the contract for the dock. They should have made the $70,000 payable to W. I. Bishop, Ltd., plus both for the construction of the dock and the ware-houses. I do not know what the particulars are of the transactions between the W. I. Bishop Co., and the Government, but shall be able to speak further on the subject when fully informed.

I feel sure, however, that the Dock has cost a good deal more money than it should have cost. The construction of that dock has no doubt been carried on with great rapidity. Work proceeded day and night, Sundays, and week days. It seemed that it had to go ahead without stop regardless of anything. Now this night work was not necessary and the Dock could have been constructed almost as quickly with the night work cut out. How can a gang of men work at night any way effectively especially in this country during the winter months. It appears to be a positive waste of money to have the work

done and construction carried out in this manner. The way the construction work is going on at the dock always appears to me as if it had to be done as things were done during the war, when construction work was executed in rush fashion regardless of cost, thinking only of the object to be attained. This had to be done when the war had to be won. There appears to be no attempt at all at economy on the part of the Government in these matters. The other day the Prime Minister made a statement that this country had to go on borrowing. I am very sorry to hear that from the Prime Minister, and the Government have no right to go on borrowing. Last year when the liquor bill was before this House and the Government was making a change in the liquor law a statement was made that the reason this was done without reference to the people was, because they had a mandate from the people by reason of what was contained in Mr. Monroe's manifesto. Now if that applies in one case it surely applies in another, and if so the Government has no right to go on borrowing money because the manifesto of Mr. Monroe told the people before election.

"The condition of public finances is very bad, I fear that it is worse than is generally known. Public expenditure must be drastically reduced. The customs tariff requires re-arrangement with a view especially to encourage the prosecution of the fisheries. The cost of the public service must be reduced and efficiency increased. It would be worse than useless—it would be deceptive for me to enter into details in this connection, for only a Government in office filled with a reforming zeal and energy could wisely decide the direction in which reform should be undertaken, I promise that if given power I shall cause a careful investigation to be made into the way in which improvement can best be made in the financial methods of the country, and I shall enforce a policy of wise economy and retrenchment. The trappings of Government are too costly. There are too many unearned salaries, Sessions of the Legislature are held too late in the year and are unnecessarily long while the pay of the members is greater than their work deserves, or the colony can afford."

If the Prime Minister was elected on that then I do not see where he has a mandate for borrowing money and continuing to borrow money, and the Prime Minister has no right to continue to borrow money. He should strive to carry out his policy of economy and retrenchment and at least he should not burden the country with further taxation to pay interest on borrowed money.

When his Government came in power the pay of members of the House of Assembly was $750 per session. He raised it to one thousand dollars per Session. The Manifesto must have been written to deceive the electorate. There was never such an exhibition of falsehood and deceit in this country since Responsible Govrenment. The customs tariff requires re-arrangement with a view especially to encourage the fisheries. The cost of public service must be reduced.

The reason I refer to these matters is because of the statement of the Prime Minister that the country has to go on borrowing, and this I take it is a statement that he and his government intend to go on borrowing. They have, I say again, no right to go on borrowing. Now there is one other thing that the Government has done besides borrowing money. They have practically saddled this country with ten million dollars debt resulting from the guarantee in connection with the construction at the Humber. Twenty to twenty-five million dollars were to be required for the work and this country guaran-

teed about ten million dollars. Ten million dollars or £2,000,000 were guaranteed by the Imperial Trade Facilities Board of England £3,000,000 have since been found by the Armstrong Whitworth Co., to do the whole of the construction work. It now appears that the cost is between thirty five and forty millions and they have not sufficient money to carry on and want to raise about ten million dollars more and they come to the Newfoundland Government and say that they want to raise more money, and that the only way it can be done is by the Government giving up their first claim on the assets of the Company in favor of the Bond Holders of the new loan. That this further loan might be raised the Government agreed to give up their prier lien.

Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister was consulted in reference to this, but while he was consulted, he was told what to do. There were three propositions put up to the Government, one was to call in a receiver, second was to give up our security, and the third was to guarantee an additional loan. The Government accepted the second, and I presume the Prime Minister came to the conclusion that the manufacturing of paper at the Humber should be carried on, and the only way was to give the Company permission to raise an additional sum of £2,000,000, on the security of its assets. I wonder if the Prime Minister took into consideration the fact that the capital of the Company is very large, and if there are $40,000,000 capital in that plant, and if the interest, say, is only 5 p.c., which is a very low rate of interest for a public utility, the first overhead charge on the profits will be $2,000,000 for interest. I do not want in any way to criticize any industry in the country to the detriment of that industry; but I would say now that I wonder if the Prime Minister took into consideration that a company, with an enormous overhead, on which interest is $2,000,000 can exist; and whether he should not have had a re-adjustment of capital, and whether the $15,000,000 or £3,000,000, which the Armstrong Whitworth Company put into the concern, should not have been re-adjusted, and the value of the shares reduced. This is always done in companies which are over-capitalized, and cannot keep their heads above water on account of the heavy interest charges, which is one of the first charges on the profits. I hope the Government has been wise, because if that Company should have to go into the hands of the receivers, well, then I say, Newfoundland has no real security for the first £2,000,000 which it guaranteed, and it would be just as well to tack that £2,000,000 on to our national debt, and to say that it is $10,000,000 more than the Custom accounts show at the present time. Now, when the first Session of this House took place after the present Government came into power, one of the first things that the Prime Minister denounced on the floors of this House, was the Minute of Council transactions of the past Government. I looked up the report in the Hansard, and I found that he denounced it in every mood and tense possible and stated it was a disgrace to any country or government, and should not exist. He criticized the late Government for their attitude in this regard, and what do we find now? We find that there is more business done by Minute of Council than there was ever done in any past Government in the Colony. I have at the present time, before me the report of the Auditor General, under Section 33-b of the Audit Act, for the period ending December 31st, 1925, which is as follows:—

Expenditure Under Order-In-Council.

The following is a list, per Department, of Pensions, Salaries for

new appointments in the Civil Service, and for increases to salaries for which there is no provision in the Estimates for the year 1925-1926, viz:

	Per annum
Marine and Fisheries	$3080.44
Public Works Dept.	375.00
Finance Department	9753.00
Agriculture and Mines	1054.00
Contingencies	925.00
Public Charities	1720.00
Justice Department	750.00
Posts and Telegraphs	6667.80

In addiiton to the above, I submit a further statement showing in detail all payments for extra services, etc., paid to permanent employees of the Civil Service. As these payments are contrary to provisions of the Audit Act, they have been disallowed by me, pending the decision of the Legislature. In consequence the Departments incurring and being responsible for these expenditures are correspondingly indebted to the Bank of Montreal until Legislative authority under a Supplementary Act is obtained, when the Bank will be re-imbursed.

Colonial Secretary's Dept.	$1,230.00
Contingencies	4,075.00
Customs Department	1,873.82
Justice	3,240.00
Education	350.00
Public Works	600.00
Marine and Fisheries	805.00
Agriculture and Mines	500.00
Public Charities	969.50
Assessor of Taxes	1,581.25
Government Engineer's Dept.	1,972.84
Posts and Telegraphs	920.40

This sum of $170,748.34 is owed to the Bank of Montreal and no provision has been made for its repayment. As pointed out in previous reports, in view of the fact that all these expenditures were illegally incurred, and as there are a considerable number of missing vouchers, returns for relief allocations, etc., which have not been produced, this office cannot accept any responsibility in connection with the balance still due which I shall be unable to pass unless and until Legislative provision is made therefor.

S. S. Earl of Devon a|c—(Marine and Fisheries Dept.

Under Order-In-Council of date July 20th, 1925, the S. S. Earl of Devon was engaged for the Northern Labrador Service at the rate of $150.00 per day; the earnings from freights and passages were to go to the Government. A special account was opened in the Bank of Montreal to meet the expenses in this connection. The Account at present stands as follows:

Cost of Service	$17,550.00
Amount earned and paid into this acct.	1,050.00
Leaving a debit balance of	$16,500.00

As there is no vote for this expenditure this debit balance will have to remain in the Bank until Legislative provision is made therefor."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Government certainly had no mandate from the people to carry on in that way, and incur all these expenses by orders of Council, instead of putting these items of expenditure in the Estimates, and bringing them before the Legislature so that it could be passed by the Legislature in the usual way. Money has been spent by the obnoxious order or Minute of Council.

My chief argument in this is, that this Govrenment came here and took charge of the affairs of this country on a Clean up and Keep Clean Policy, and the first thing stated on the floors of this House of Assembly during the first session of the present Government was that nothing would be paid out on Minute of Council. The present Government denounced it through and through. Every member present knows that; and in face of all that, there is the expenditure

of this money by Minute of Council for new appointments, pensions and increased salaries of Government officials, and how, I ask you, can this country be prosperous when amounts like those that I have read out, are allocated every year by Order of Council to pay additional salaries and new appointments. There have been a large number of new appointments in the General Post Office, and a large number of large pensions. It is inconsistency, on the part of the Government and it is inconsistency on the part of the Prime Minister to get up here on the floors of this House and to enumerate a policy which he is about to pursue, and to turn about and change his mind like a woman, and do something altogether different from what he intended to do when he took charge of the Government of this country. I feel sure that the Prime Minister was as zealous in the interests of this country as any man in that position, but he is weak and unable to stick to what he intended to do when he went out to take charge of the affairs of this country, and I say that the Government had no right, because they were in power, to do as they liked. The people of this country elected them because they thought that they were the best people to conduct the affairs of this country. This Government entered into power pledged to a certain policy, and if they now find it impossible to carry out this policy, they should say so and resign like British Parliamentarians and not be doing things contrary altogether to what they outlined and contrary to what they intended at the beginning.

Now, the Government it appears can do what they like, because they have a majority in this House. They can bring in a Bill of any kind at all, or whatever resolution they like, and having the majority they can carry it. It makes no difference whether it is good or bad, and we on this side of the House being in the minority, can only criticize same, but they can carry it through and they have carried through many bills which I consider have not been in the interests of this country.

The Prime Minister on opening day gave a great eulogy to the Minister of Public Works, Mr. Russell, when he took the trouble in his reply to the Speech from the Throne to tell us what a great man the Minister of Public Works was, how cheaply he bought the goods which were ordered through his department. It is a most unusual thing for one man to eulogise another in that respect, and it almost puts the suspicion in our mind that everything is not alright. I suppose that the Prime Minister to pacify the Minister of Public Works for taking the handling of the High Roads Commission out of his department and putting it in the Colonial Secretary's department, gave him that eulogy on the floors of this House, and the Minister of Public Works if he is a very weak man like the Prime Minister himself, he will fall for it. But I do not think that that will satisfy the Minister. All the monies in connection with roads have been handled in the Public Works Department and gone through the Minister's hands, and are now taken out of his hands, we presume, because the Government considered that he is incapable of handling it. The Prime Minister drowned his sorrows by eulogising him on the floors of this Assembly before the gathering that was here on opening day.

Now the Government has spent considerable money on the re-railing of the railroad, from here to Clarenville, and Capt. Randell told us here in his speech last week that he has seen sleepers left on the railroad that were rotten. I have seen the same thing, I saw it out at Donovan's and picked away two or three of the sleepers they were so rotten.

If they are going to do a job which they call a good job, certainly it does not pay the Government to leave rotten sleepers under the new rails and then come and tell us how smoothly and easy the train rides and what they have done to give pleasure to the people travelling over the road.

I understand that this Government is to bring a bill into this House in connection with the new hotel, by which the Government will guarantee the interest upon a bond issue for the construction of that hotel. Now I am going to say this, that I am glad to see this hotel in St. John's. I will do anything I can do to help along things of that nature, because by having a hotel we will have people coming to this country who were never here before. Perhaps eventually a man with wealth might come here and he might see some thing here that might interest him, and he might leave a great deal of money here for development. I might say that when I was away this winter I made every attempt possible to induce people of good standing to come down here. I also made an effort to interview Mr. Henry Ford; he was away at the time that I was there. I waited two days thinking to see him and to get him to come down to Newfoundland. If we could get him to come down here in the summer it would be announced in all the leading papers in Canada and the United States and it would do more to advertise this country than anything else. However, I have not dropped it altogether; I was in touch with his secretary and I am still working to see if it is possible, but my point is this. The inconsistency of this Government. There must be hotels here and if the Government felt that the hotel could not be built without assistance and the bond issue could not be taken up by the public without the interest guaranteed, why then let the Government guarantee the interest making sure first that it is necessary. I would support anything in reason to get a hotel here and to bring people who scatter their means, but what I want to point out is the inconsistency of the Government and the Prime Minister in these things.

Now during the last session of this Legislature there was a bill before this House by which we were asked to guarantee the bonds and not the interest on the bonds. We were to provide a sinking fund of about thirteen thousand dollars a year, and if the earnings of the company were not sufficient to meet their payments then the Government would advance the amount.

At that time we brought up the matter of the interest on the bonds and here is what the Prime Minister told us:

"Clause nine which is the important one provides that we guarantee 3 p.c. sinking fund for the bond issue of $450,000. We have to pay out as a sinking fund provided the hotel earnings do not provide it $13,500, and for that we get back redeemable bonds. I might say in that connection that this is the best proposition 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 percent. guarantee of interest on the mortgage bonds and a two percent. sinking fund as well, consequently, this proposition seemed to us almost too good to be true 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."

This is what the Prime Minister stated in the Assembly last session.

He and his Government have gone entirely back on their statements and now purpose putting through a bill to guarantee at least 6 p.c. interest on the Bonds, when he tells us he refused to accept a proposition from W. I. Bishop last year asking the Government to pay 5 p.c. on the Bonds.

The Prime Minister also told us the mortgage bonds were covered by a reputable Quebec Company. I understood he meant that the bonds had then been underwritten. He also told us that "Clause 12 of the hotel agreement provides for the protection for us against the engagement of foreign labour and for the employment of local workers."

The Prime Minister also made the following statement:

"What we figure out is that if the Bond owners find they are getting no interest and have to wait 30 years we figure out that the Bond Holders will say that they are not going to wait 30 years and sell out for the present value, we would buy out the Bond Holders of one third the value of the Bonds, that would be very much less than the cost."

Mr. Speaker, I argued at the time the Prime Minister made that statement it was unbecoming and meant to be gloating over the fact that the bond holders in the hotel would be squeezed out and compelled to sell at a severe loss.

Now in face of all this we are told in the Speech from the Throne that this House will be asked to consider a bill confirming an agreement.

"The agreement entered into by the Government with the Montreal Trust Company in relation to an issue of bonds for the Hotel now under construction in St. John's will be submitted to you for confirmation." Does the Prime Minister think the members of this House and the public whose interest we are to serve have short memories and are unable to detect deception. It will be very difficult for me to believe any statement I hear from the leader of the Government when so many have turned out to be unreliable.

I am not knocking the hotel, I am glad to see it erected in St. John's; the construction has given labour to our people and the running of the hotel will give permanent employment to a large staff. It will also encourage the growing of vegetables and fruit, the raising of chicken and cattle. But what I do object to is the misleading statements handed out to this House from time to time by the Prime Minister.

I thank the Hon. Minister of Justice for giving me some information. I do not want to discuss it any more at the present time, but there is some bill to be brought in here and a member of the Government and a member of the executive outlinde to me what it was. That is the authority I have for speaking as I have spoken in reference to that matter. It is going to be a bond issue, that at least is stated in the Speech from the Throne. That is where I first got the idea that there was going to be Legislation in regard to this matter and a member of the Government told me what it was. Whether his information is correct or not is another thing, but that is the source of my information and that is why I am speaking on that subject. My point is not that you are bringing in a bill, I don't know what the bill is exactly, the chances are that if the Bill is a good one we will support it. But my point is the inconsistency of the Government coming in here and making certain things and then coming back here one year afterwards and doing something else that is absolutely different and opposite.

I am going to have a few words to say in connection with the high roads because I believe that the money wasted on the highroads policy last

season is too bad, and I say that there is no reason at all why the money should be spent entirely, in Conception Bay. I am very glad that the Member for Burin, Mr. Lake, has come into the House, and I wish that Mr. Long were in his seat also because I want to tell them that the district which they represent is entitled to some of this money which is used for the construction of high roads for the Tourist Traffic. I do not know at the present time of any district that could be benefited more by the expenditure of a hundred thousand dollars than the District of Burin, and when I have outlined what I have in my mind I am sure that the member for Burin will agree with me.

The people of Fortune and Grand Bank and other places around Fortune Bay have no harbours, they are all artificial. There is a small road at the present time between Grand Bank and Fortune. A partly constructed road from Fortune to Lamaline, also an unfinished road between Grand Bank and Garnish, a fair road from Garnish to Burin, a bad road from Burin to Marystown and a few miles of road on to Rock Harbour would complete the whole requirements.

Grand Bank and Fortune are fine weather harbours and often the people have to wait ten days to two weeks for a mail, as steamers can only call there when the weather permits.

With these road connections the whole of Burin District can have a daily service with St. John's. A substantial motor boat or small steamer can leave Rock Harbour every morning and connect with the train for St. John's at Placentia or Argentia, and can return with the passengers off the train the same day. Freight can also be carried. From Rock Harbour a few hours by motor car can bring the traveller home to any part of the district. People from Hr. Breton, St. Jacques, Belleoram, English Harbour, can cross the bay in motor boats to Garnish and reach Marystown in a couple of hours.

I claim, Sir, that $100,000 spent in Burin District will do more benefit than $250,000 spent in any other district in the Island. I do not understand why the Member for Burin District do not demand their share of the highroads money and get this work done.

Burin District produces more wealth than most districts in the country. There are very few in that district who accept Government charities and very few if any working last summer on the Highroad Construction or Dock construction.

The Island of St. Pierre which is only twenty miles from Fortune would give a great many tourists to this country if there were roads to travel to the rivers in Fortune Bay, which are teaming with salmon and trout during the summer months.

Passengers landed at most of the above ports from one steamer have sometimes to wait for ten days or two weeks before they can get away again. These places can be linked up with Placentia Bay, and I do not know why the Member for Burin District has not seen that some of this money were spent in his District, and if I were in Mr. Lake's place, I would give the Government no rest until I got sufficient money to do what I have been outlining. That is one of the things on which this money could be spent to much benefit, and I do not doubt that there are other Districts in this country as well needing roads, instead of the whole lot being expended in one section. Every kind of an animal was employed last summer; I saw a goat last summer attached to a cart hauling earth to a tourist road that was being built. I suppose they had to get the goat because everything was

in use, I suppose the cats were not big enough. However, the goat was there, and I say that in this tourist policy all the attention should not be given to one particular lot of tourist. There are enough roads branching out from St. John's at the present time to satisfy all the tourists that the hotel is going to accommodate, and these roads reach enough salmon pools.

The Dry Dock has been the topic of discussion by everybody and I have had a little to say about it before. I say now as I said before that this dry dock should never have been constructed. It is alright to have a concrete dock if we could afford it, but when you have a dock that with a little repairs costing about a hundred thousand dollars, would do for the next twenty years, why borrow and spend one and a half millions. The contractors had to blast out every bit of wood out of which the old dock was constructed because it was so solid, it was absolutely unnecessary to have gone to this expenditure. This dock that we have at the present time must be used for the same purpose as the old dock, which is taking on small fishing and coasting vessels; and if it is used for that purpose the revenue which you will get on enough small schooners to fill the dock will not yield enough to pay for pumping it out. I make that statement right here on the floors of this House. The revenue at the present rates charged for small schooners in that dock even if the dock is filled will not pay for the electricity and coal that will be used in pumping out the water. The old dock's revenue hardly covered expenditure. The Government are expecting crippled steamers to come in here for repairs, but they will have to change their policy, they will have to make a drastic change in their policy from what it is at the present time. At the present time there is a charge for duty on coal for bunkering a steamer coming here for bunkers has to pay in addition to the cost of bunkers at Sydney, the freight between Sydney and this port, and there is 70c. a ton duty, and then there is five per cent. sales tax which makes the total over a dollar a ton duty and sales tax. In addition to that there is the profit for the man who is selling the coal. We are not going to get steamers to come here for bunkers if they can reach any other port such as Sydney or Halifax. Captain Randell outlined the other charges in this port. The actions of the Government during the past year have been broadcast through the world. Many of the shipping concerns have mutual protection societies, particularly the Scandinavian companies. The Captain of a Scandanavian ship can tell you the port charges of every port in the world and if there is an overcharge in any port of only five pounds they will take legal action to protect their shipping. A steamer came into St. John's last year, chartered by a group of people here to carry away the product of the country, fish. She had to go down to Port Union and take on part of the cargo there. The steamer went there, and while she was there a storm came up, she was tied up to the Government wharf, and because of the tide and the undertow she did a little damage to the Government wharf, not very much. The steamer came back to St. John's and the Government issued a writ of attachment for $3,000.00 damages to the public wharf at Port Union, and I was told by a reliable man that the damage could have been repaired for two hundred dollars. The owners of the steamer paid $2900.00 before they could get the steamer released and she could proceed on her voyage. What is the use of docks in this country if you are going to treat the steamers that come in here like that. They will keep as far from New-

foundland as they can possibly can.

In another case a steamer was loading Government rails, that had been taken up between St. John's and Clarenville, at Heart's Content. The sea came in and she strained the wharf, and there was a claim made against her. The claim was made by the Railway and I was instructed by the Captain of the ship to try and settle the claim, and I settled the claim for about three or four hundred dollars; but when the Minister of Marine and Fisheries knew of the damage to the wharf and that the matter had been settled he went into the air becaus he wanted, I suppose, to charge the ship two or three thousand dollars. If you are going to spend two or three million dollars on a dock and you are going to treat the shipping of the world that way you will get very few ships to come here to dock. You will only get ships like the "Kentucky" and the "Metegama" that was in a collision up off Cape Race two years ago. You will certainly have no steamer come here for bunker when she can go somewhere else. You will never have a steamer come here for a port of refuge because the port charges are too high, and they will never come here after last year unless the Newfoundland charter rates are away above those of any other place, to pay the extra charges. So I say that the Government's policy in reference to the Dock will have to be changed drastically and quickly and advertised if it expects to have any results whatever for the money that has been spent on the dock during the past year.

Now I made a referenc to the steamer Caribou on an occasion in this House, and I am charged by the Prime Minister with broadcasting reports that I had heard on the street. I never broadcast a statement without some foundation for it. The reports about the "Caribou" were not what I heard on the street, altogether. The reports of the "Caribou" and her fittings were what I saw myself and examined myself. I say here and now that the Caribou is not worth the money paid for her, and the fittings are fifty per cent. worse than than any British shipbuilder would put in any steamer. I never heard of a steamer yet built in any continental port that was good as that built in a British port.

Now I am coming back again to the S. S. Kyle and the S. S. Kentucky, and I am sorry that the Prime Minister is not here although I have not very much to say. All that I have got to say is that I want to defend myself. The Prime Minister said to-day that I should withdraw some statement that I had made. If there were any reason for any withdrawal of any statement that I made I do so. If I made a false statement about the Prime Minister or anybody else I would withdraw it when I found that I was wrong, but the correspondence which the Prime Minister read this afternoon, and some of it I have here on my desk bears out everything that I said. I said that the Government did not send the "Kyle" to the rescue of the steamer, and they did not. I said that the Government asked for fifty per cent. of the salvage which Bowring Bros. would get from the Silvia for the Kyle and the correspondence bears me out. I also said that the steamer could have been had on the day pay basis and that is also borne out, and I do not see anything that I can take back or anything that is not true, because it is all borne out by the correspondence tabled. Perhaps I had better repeat for the Prime Minister, what I said when he was not in the House, and that is that I see no reason why I should take back anything, I mentioned a few days ago in the Assembly in reference to hte Kyle going to the rescue of the Kentucky. I

stated that the Government asked fifty per cent. of the salvage and that they refused to send the steamer without the agreement about the salvage to rescue the lives of those on board, and also said that they could have engaged the steamer for a lump sum by the day; and I also say that the correspondence bears me out.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I asked you to take back what you said about not sending assistance to men in distress.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—It should not be necessary in a British Colony for a Government steamer to be paid to go to the rescue of a ship in distress. If it were a case of salvage surely the salvage is always paid to someone, and where there was no agreement it could be settled by arbitration, and if the steamer were entitled to the salvage you could put an attachment on the ship and hold her until the owners or underwriters put up bonds as security in case of a lawsuit. It is my contention that you did not do that, and I do not see why you can say that I have misrepresented the facts in this matter. I am no more responsible for the writings in one paper than you are for the writings in another. I am not the editor of a paper and if you were to take the burden of evertyhing that is written in the Evening Telegram and Morning News you would have a heavy load on your shoulders. I made mention of something that happened long ago, I do not charge you with it. I had some private correspondence with His Excellency the Governor and some very private correspondence with the Secretary of State for the Colonies, direct correspondence, and the Evening Telegram and the Daily News published it. I did not give it to anybody. It came out in the papers supporting your Government. Where did they get it? The Governor claims he did not give it out, but it passed through the Colonial Secretary's office, and the inference is that it also passed through your office, and was given to the press by someone without any sense of honor. It is not my intention to cast any reflection on anyone. I did not intend to convey to the House that I charged His Excellency the Governor. I said that I did not charge the Prime Minister with being responsible for the publication of the correspondence, and I do not charge him with the publications that appear in any paper, and I do not think that he has any right to charge me in the same way.

There is one important item in the Speech from the Throne in connection with Bell Island. This cannot be discussed here very much, because we have not seen the contract. The only intimation that we have about it is that it is for a long term. If it is for a long term I trust that it is a good contract and that there is settlement in reference to the additional wage for those working on Bell Island. However, we will take that matter up later on. The proposer of the Address in Reply, Mr. Puddester referred to the annual borrowing as a "hardy annual." I think that it is regrettable that it should be referred to as a "Hardy Annual," because there should not be a "hardy annual."

MR. PUDDESTER—I referred to the yearly interest charges as a "hardy annual."

MR. HICKMAN — The Honourable Member referred to the interest as being the "Hardy Annual." It looks as if it is a "hardy annual," and I say that it is regrettable that any member should have to refer to the additional interest charges that have to be met out of taxes as a "Hardy Annual."

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the following amendment to the Address in Reply:

That the following paragraphs be

added after the word "Legislature" in the Report of the Select Committee appointed to draft a reply to His Excellency's Speech:

"This House notes with regret that in Your Excellency's Speech no mention is made of a revision of the present Tariff which discriminates against the masses and relieves wealthy persons and Corporations from contributing their proportionate share to the common burden.

It is in the interests of the country that an immediate reduction be made both in taxation and public expenditure. A Royal Commission of a non-partisan character should be forthwith created to report upon the best means whereby the present excessive expenditures of the Government Departments may be materially reduced and increased efficiency in the Public Service made possible.

This House is of the opinion that prompt action is necessary for the protection and encouragement of our staple industry, the Fisheries. The basis of Newfoundland's prosperity has been and is its fisheries, and an earnest effort should be made to preserve and expand them. At the present moment while your Ministers are expending millions of public moneys upon a visionary Tourist Policy, the basic industry of our country is permitted by them to languish and decay.

The Income Tax, and Bank Tax should be re-imposed and the revenue resulting therefrom devoted to the payment of a bounty to fishermen upon Labrador, Shore and Bank fish.

The extra taxation placed by the Budget of 1925 upon butterine, tobacco, lines and twines, and clothing, works great hardship upon the fishermen and labouring classes of this country. In justice to them, an immediate repeal of this excessive taxation should be effected.

We deeply regret that in the Speech from the Throne Your Excellency has not seen fit to make any announcement with respect to filling the vacancy in the representation of St. John's East in this House which vacancy has now existed for over a year. In view of the Constitutional issues involved and of the Statutory duty cast upon Your Excellency by the law of the land, this House is of opinion that the prayer contained in the petition signed by nearly 5,000 electors of the said District and presented to Your Excellency in October last, should be at once acceded to."

The further debate was then adjourned.

Second reading of Bill to amend Sec. 4 of Cap. 1, Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of the Promulgation and Construction of Statutes."

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Speaker: In moving the Second Reading of this Bill I might point out that this is an Amendment to Section 4 of Chapter 1 of the Consolidated Statutes. The substance of it is to permit lengthy indictments in future to be printed or typewritten, instead of being written by hand. This Amendment also does away with the Engrossing Clerk of the House having to write out all Bills. In future, if this Bill passes, they can be typed or printed.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Section 4 of Chapter 1 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of the Promulgation and Construction of Statutes" 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 to Amend the Act II. Geo. V., Cap. 37, entitled 'An Act further to Amend Cap. 35 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Postal and Telegraph Services.' "

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—Mr. Speaker: I beg to move the Second Reading of this Bill. We are now asking that an extra five cents be added on all dutiable parcels coming into this country. As the duty thus collected goes into the Government direct and as we are all desirous of getting all the revenue we can and as the Department of Posts and Telegraphs have to handle all these parcels we think it only right and proper that an additional five cents per parcel tax should be added.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act II George V., Cap. 37 entitled 'An Act Further to Amend Cap. 35 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Postal and Telegraph Services'" 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. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Speaker: In moving the second reading of the Bill entitled "A Bill respecting the taxation and immunity from taxation of State enterprises," I have nothing further to add than that this is a matter for the Imperial Government, and does not affect us at all. Regarding the question as to whether the Commercial Cable Co. has paid taxes, may I say that it has done so. I understand from the Attorney-General that this Bill does not affect us.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the Taxation and Immunity from Taxation of State Enterprises" 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 PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker: Before moving the adjournment of the House, I should like to refer to a death which has occurred to-day, of our friend Mr. Piccott, a late member of this House, and one who was popular with all. This was evidenced last year when a pension was proposed for him in his failing state of health—I never saw an item of public expenditure which met such universal commendation, the consensus of opinion being that Mr. Piccott was very well-liked, and most deserving. Mr. Piccott has passed from us, and I take this opportunity of moving the sympathy of this House be extended his relatives.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker: I rise to second the motion that the sympathy of this House be extended to the relatives of the late Mr. Piccott. I have known Mr. Piccott for years, and was an opponent of his in Hr. Grace District in 1923, and never had a better opponent politically, nor a better and fairer fighter. He gave liberally of his means to all who were in distress, in fact, he impoverished himself by giving to others. He gave supplies for the fishery and aided his fellowmen. Harbor Grace District had a good representative in the late A. W. Piccott.

I endorse the Prime Minister's remarks and wish to second the resolution.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, may I be pardoned for a word. I was associated with the late Mr. Piccott the first time he came in the House, in what was then called the Peoples' Party. I can also say in common with the Leader of the Opposition that Mr. Piccott opposed me in 1923, and it seemed quite apparent to me at that time that he was not really equal to the task. I remember saying during that campaign that whether Mr. Piccott were returned or not, if our Government was returned, I should do my best to secure some sort of a pension for Mr. Piccott in his then state of health. We were eventually returned in 1924, and I had

the opportunity—one of my first acts as an Executive Councillor was to look after something of this nature for him, and the Government willingly acceded. Arch Piccott was the friend of all—he had no enemies; his political convictions changed, perhaps he thought for the best. That did not interfere in any way with the esteem in which he was held. I heard this morning with real regret of his death, and wish to support this motion of sympathy to his relatives and friends.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Speaker, I can't let this opportunity pass without an expression of my regard for the late Mr. Piccott; he was a great personal friend of mine. Coming as I do from a district which he represented; having been associated with him, and having been practically his right hand man, I must do so. Always a friend of everyone, he was a man who did credit to the district which he represented. I know something of his work as Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and of the work he did for his district during these years. I wish, in common with the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition, to express my regard for him. I am sure all, and more particularly this district of Harbour Grace, will mourn his passing. He was always free with his money, and always a friend in need—he had a big heart, and could not turn anyone away. I wish to support the resolution that the deep sympathy of this House be sent his relatives.

MR. MOORE—As one who came into public life as a colleague of Mr. Piccott, I am strongly in accord with the sentiments expressed here to-day. He was a great friend of mine for more than 18 years, and all during the Morris Administration. Only the other day I had occasion to go through his old district, and the men would call out "How is Mr. Piccott?" I should like to leave on record my personal regret, and my accord with the sentiment expressed in this House of sympathy with his friends and family.

Motion carried unanimously.

On motion of Hon. Prime Minister the House thenl adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 16th, at 3 of the clock in the afternoon.

TUESDAY, March 16th, 1926.

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

Petitions were presented by

Mr. Ashbourne from Lewisporte re wharf.

Hon. Mr. Woodford from Harbor Main re road.

Mr. Cashin gave notice of uestion.

Mr. Ashbourne gave notice of question.

Mr. Hickman gave notice of question.

Mr. Halfyard gave notice of question.

(1) MR. BROWN asked Hon. the Minister of Justice to lay on the House a copy of the report of the inquiry into the death of Graham Collins, Papermaker, killed at Grand Falls, December 19th, 1925.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—On searching through the files of the Department I discovered a telegram from the Magistrate at Grand Falls in connection with this matter. I wired him asking whether he had made an investigation, and instructing him to forward a report if he had done so, and to give reasons if he had not. Investigation should have been made. I hope to lay the information before the House on Thursday.

(2) MR. BROWN asked Hon. the Minister of Public Works to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing the amount of money sent to Twillingate District and recommended by others than the elected representatives and to state

names of those who recommended same.

Deferred.

(3) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the Table of the House a statement giving the following information: The names of ships arriving at St. John's with cargoes of coal shipped from Sydney; the number of tons in each cargo; to whom each cargo was consigned and the duty paid on each cargo; this information to be given since January 1st, 1925, to date.

HON. MINISTER of FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Will table the answer to this to-morrow.

MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister, as Chairman of the Railway Commission, to lay on the Table of the House a statement in full showing the amount paid by the Railway Department to the Honourable M. S. Sullivan or firms, which Mr. Sullivan represented, on account of purchases made by the Department from Mr. Sullivan or from the firms which he represented, since July 1st, 1924.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I am not yet in receipt of a reply from the Railway.

(5) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries: (1) If any tenders were called for in connection with the Labrador service, which last year was performed by the S.S. "Earl of Devon"; (2) If any offers were made by steamship owners; (3) If tenders were called for to lay copies upon the Table of the House; if no tenders were called for, why not.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — On making inquiries at the office of the Marine and Fisheries, I cannot find any report of tenders and I imagine that the S.S. "Earl of Devon" was the only boat available for the service. If there is any correspondence dealing with this it must be in the possession of Captain Winsor. Mr. Goodridge can find nothing in connection with it.

MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to lay upon the Table of the House comparative statement of Revenues from all separate services for the months of January and February in years 1925 and 1926.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I beg leave to table the information.

(7) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to lay upon the Table of the House statement showing the total Public Debt of the Colony on the 31st December, 1925; the half yearly interest then payable; the amount of such Interest transmitted abroad, and amount payable to residents of the Colony.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I beg leave to table the information.

(8) MR. CASHIN asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the Table of the House the following information: All tenders received in connection with the supply of meat for the various Institutions for this year, and if the lowest tender was not accepted, why not.

Deferred.

(9) MR. CASHIN asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the Table of the House the following information: All tenders received in connection with the supply of bread for the various Institutions for this year, and if the lowest tender was not accepted, why not.

Deferred.

(10) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay upon the Table of the House a statement showing the amounts paid for legal services by the Highroads Commission together with particulars of same; is anyone retained as Solicitor for said

Department; if so, whom, and what is the retainer paid or payable.

(11) MR. PUDDESTER asked Hon. the Minister of Finance to Table a comparative statement as taken from the Public Accounts of the Colony for the years 1922-23, 1923-24, 1924-25 showing the amounts paid the different local printing firms in each of these years; showing also a total comparative statement of both local and foreign printing in these years.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS — I beg to table the information.

(12) MR. SCAMMELL asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing the total amount of money allocated by the Department of Marine and Fisheries to each electoral district in the country since July 1st, 1924, to date, under each of the following heads (a) Ordinary Special; (b) Loan Special; (c) Surplus Trust or any other source.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I expect to have the answer ready tomorrow.

(13) MR. SCAMMELL asked the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs what the Mail Courier between St. Anthony and Goose Cove was paid per trip in each of the seasons 1923, 1924, 1925 respectively.

HON. THE MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—I beg to table the information.

(14) MR. SCAMMELL—asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House a statement showing the total amount of money allocated by his Department to each Electoral District in the country, since July 1st, 1924, to date, under each of the following heads: (a) Ordinary Special; (b) Loan Special; (c) Surplus Trust or any other source.

Deferred.

(11) MR. HALFYARD asked Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs to lay on the Table of the House a detailed statement of payments made from the vote of $1,200.-00 for Winter Postal Routes and Camps, from July 1st, 1925, to date; give names of parties and purposes of each payment.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—Information is being prepared. I may have it at any moment.

HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—I beg to draw attention to some questions not yet answered. No. 16 on March 11th, and No. 17 on March 12th, one of them dealing with the Liquor Control Board.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—In reply to that question I may say, that the Controller will be putting in a report in a few days, and you will have all the information you require on the subject. I gave this answer to your question before, but you were out, and if you still wish an immediate answer and will not wait for the report, which will be ready in four or five days, you may have it.

MR. CASHIN—I beg to draw attention to three outstanding questions. No. 3 and 4 on yesterday's Order Paper, and No. 10 to the Minister of Finance.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—It takes considerable time to prepare such questions extending over two years, and is contrary to the custom of this House to ask them. Questions are not usually asked extending further back than the table in the public accounts.

MR. CASHIN—The correspondence tabled yesterday in answer to my motion does not seem to be complete. I cannot find any correspondence as I requested between His Excellency and the Secretary of State for the Colonies. I think we are entitled to that correspondence, and I want to know when we are going to get it.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I said yesterday when tabling the correspondence that there was no other correspondence available.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—As seconder of that motion, I should like to say that I would like to see that correspondence too. I have not seen any such correspondence, and I am very anxious to see it.

HON. MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—I beg to table the answer to Question No. 1 on the Order Paper of Wednesday, March 10th, and the Question to No. 9 on the same day and to No. 2 on March 16th.

Address In Reply

MR. CASHIN—Before going ahead with my remarks on the Address and Reply, I wish to say that I regret that I was out of the House yesterday afternoon when a motion was made by the Prime Minister that a vote of condolence be passed on the death of Mr. Piccott. I would like to associate myself with that motion. I knew Mr. Piccott for a number of years, and held him in the very highest esteem. It is unfortunate that his health has not been good during the past few years, and that, for that reason he has not been able to take part as he used to in public life. I wish to express through this House my deepest sympathy to his wife and family.

The Speech from the Throne which was submitted to us the other day, in my opinion, should outline the policy of our administration. It certainly does in England and in Canada. It certainly does not seem to do so here. "The continued prosperity of the Colony" it says "has been well maintained," and it goes on to illustrate this by suggesting that the seal and cod fishery during the past twelve months have been "more than successful" or words to that effect. Mr. Puddister confirms this in his Speech on the Address in Reply to His Excellency, by saying, that "the fisheries of this country during the past twelve months had a value of $13,000,000." I propose to convince this House that Mr. Puddister's figures are two million dollars astray. I shall quote figures by the Government representative appointed by the Fishery Board, and table statistics as to the catch of fish and its value. I shall now attempt to tell the country how Mr. Puddister got the value of $13,000,000, and what is the real value of fish caught 1924-25. We will take first the catch of fish for 1924. The people of this country always make up their accounts to the end of the year (December 31st), and it is up to the end of the year that we wish to know how accounts stand. In 1924 there were 325,000 quintals of Labrador fish caught for which the fishermen received $7.00 a quintal equalling in the aggregate $2,275,000. In 1925 we caught 411,222 quintals of Labrador fish and got $5.25 a quintal equalling in the whole $2,158,915.50. You will see that there is a discrepency in value already. Now with regard to the shore and Bank fishery in 1924. The shore fishery procured 750,000 quintals at $9.25 a quintal equalling $6,937,500. Last year, that is 1925, we caught more fish—801,164 quintals at $8.50 a quintal equalling $6,809,894. The value of the fishery for 1925 was $8,968.50.

The total value of the confishery alone for 1924 was $9,212,900. Now, the earnings of the fishermen of this country for the past year was easily three millions of dollars less than it was the previous year, owing to the high tariff imposed and inflicted upon them by the present Government, despite what is contained in the Speech from the Throne to the contrary, and Mr. Puddister got his figures from Export entries at the Customs. Mr. Speaker, I would like, with your permission, to read an Editorial Article, which appeared in the "Evening Telegram" of last Saturday dealing with

our fishing industry, and which, to my mind, is about the severest criticism that has been levelled against the Government since their advent to power.

"What are we going to do about the "fishery? Once a year the Board of "Trade 'calls attention' to the neces- "sity for action of one kind or an- "other. Every now and again some "public spirited person, in whose "breast hope springs eternal, express- "es his views on this problem or that "in connection with the methods of "curing or catching, and these opin- "ions are often of the highest value, "but so far as results go, his would "seem to be a voice crying in the wild- "erness. Apart from the press, there "does not seem to be a public body "which considers that there is any oc- "casion for concern, or if there is, it "takes good care not to commit itself. "If, as experience shows, the cod no "longer frequents its old resorts, and "former methods of fishing are prov- "ing unprofitable, it means that with "a considerable portion of the gear at "present in use becoming valueless, "the industry will be brought to a "standstill. And what then? Then we "presume an investigation will be "started to ascertain why the fish left "and where they went. In the mean- "time the fishermen will live on his "savings! In the meantime the fish "will hold high holiday in the deep "within a stone's throw of the old re- "sorts! There are places in .New- "foundland where the cod fishery has "been abandoned just because it no "longer pays to prosecute the indus- "try by the old methods. Time was "when many of the gold fields in the "world were worked exclusively by "the placer mine, but when the rude "implements used by these pioneers "could no longer wrest the precious "metal in paying quantities from the "earth, it did not necessarily mean "that the mines were abandoned be- "cause the surface had been scratch- "ed clean. Machinery replaced the "pick and shovel with the result that "the mineral at greater depths could "be unearthed and even greater wealth "secured. Practical fishermen have "advanced certain reasons as to why "the fish have receded from the shore, "but we have yet to hear that any of "them believe that the quantity of fish "in the water is materially less than "it was formerly, and we are still un- "convinced that Newfoundlanders lack "the enterprise necessary to prosecute "the industry under different condi- "tions when they have been shown "what is the right course to adopt. "This can only be ascertained by in- "vestigation—not some time later, "when dire urgency compels such a "course, but now before the fishery is "deserted. It is, after all, the applic- "ation under modern conditions of the "Command to those former fishermen "to cast their net on the other side of "the boat. It is not our intention to "minimize the value of our timber re- "sources or to suggest that the great "industries which of late years have "been established are not of immense "importance to the country, but any- "one who imagines that they will take "the place in Newfoundland of the "fisheries as a source of employment "for the bulk of her people is living in "a fool's paradise. Money has been "expended to promote this new de- "velopment, and rightly, but far more "imperative is the need, and with even "greater justification can the demand "be made that public funds should be "devoted to the preservation of the "staple industry."

Through the channels of this House, I would like to extend to the gentleman who wrote that article my sincerest congratulations for having the courage of his convictions, and I say that it is regrettable that such a man is not a member of this House, nay, Prime Minister of this country. I re-

peat that the article that I have just quoted is the severest castigation the Monroe Government has received since they came into power two years ago. When we went to the country two years ago we promised that, if elected, we would reduce taxation and reduce expenditure in order to make this country a fit place to live in for the fishermen and the working classes. What has happened since? Why the very day of the opening of the House this Session the Prime Minister stated that he would not carry out the promises contained in his Manifesto of 1924. Well, if the Monroe Government are not men enough to carry out the signed agreement that they made with the people, I say let them get out and give place to the Opposition. Where is the Bank fishery to-day that was in evidence twenty years ago? The Minister of Agriculture and Mines in supporting the petition presented for a Bait Depot on the West Coast, read an extract from the "Canadian Fishermen" so it is not necessary for me to go into the details of it. Three hundred Newfoundland fishermen have gone to Lunenburg this year already to go Bank fishing. In fact, I will go further and state that there are to-day on board one Lunenburg fishing vessel on the Grand Banks none but Newfoundland fishermen. Now what is the Government doing about that? Still we are told in the Speech from the Throne that the Government is stimulating the cod fishery. We should be catching two million quintals of cod fish in this country per year; and I want to state right here and now also that the way the shipments of fish go from this country at present is nothing short of atrocious. Every other week or two, cargoes of fish are sent from here to the foreign markets and piled on top of each other with a consequent reduction in price abroad. I say, if ever there was a time in the history of this country when it was necessary for business men, particularly fish exporters, to look after themselves it is now.

Take the seal fishery. I understand the sealers were allowed to kill on March 13th. The Act is very vague on this point. As an ordinary layman, I think that the time set down for the killing of seals is after March 13th, but, if the law was broken, it is only in keeping with other things under the present administration. The Prime Minister stated that on account of the bounty, the fishery was better last year than the previous year. How could that be so when all the vessels operating on the Grand Banks last year had their keels laid and were built and purchased in Nova Scotia.

Speaking of the development of our Forests, as dealt with in the Speech from the Throne, I would like to know what that has to do with the progress and prosperity of this country for the year 1926. There are a considerable number of officials working at the Humber, but, as one who has visited there, I am in a position to say that it is not all a bed of roses for some of the officials working in that area. No doubt, Mr. Stadler, the Manager of that concern, has his faults, but I found that he was doing the very best possible for all concerned.

There is also a paragraph in the Governor's Speech regarding the New Hotel. I had hoped to see the Bonds in connection with the New Hotel put on the local market. Last year a Bill was brought in here which led members to understand that we would not be responsible for the Interest on this scheme. The Government has already entered into an Agreement with the Montreal Trust Company in relation to an issue of bonds for the New Hotel. Last year they wanted bonds guaranteed at 5 or 5½ per cent. interest and now, it appears, that they are going to submit a new Bill asking for 6 per cent. As far as we can learn, the

money has already been raised by the Montreal Trust Company. Why was not the money put on the Newfoundland market? I know three men in the country who would have taken four hundred and fifty thousand dollars of these bonds, with a guarantee of six per cent. such as outsiders are getting. But no attempt was made to put these bonds on the local market. The Government gives the Montreal Trust Company what they are looking for and Newfoundlanders have to pay the piper. Already there are three millions of dollars going out of this country yearly in Interest, and there is no reason why the Government and particularly the Finance Minister, should not give an opportunity to the local people who have money to invest, to purchase the Bonds in connection with this hotel project.

We are also told in the Speech from the Throne that in August of last year Members of the Imperial Parliamentary Assoc. visited Newfoundland and were the guests of the Government. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think this is a ridiculous statement, because the people of the country did not have a chance of meeting those English Delegates. A Parliamentary dinner was held at the Seamen's Institute and I doubt if Sir W. F. Coaker was invited to that dinner. Sir William Coaker represents a large body of fishermen in this country and I think that he should have been invited—apart from politics. After these gentlemen left our shores, the first thing the Government did was to enter into an agreement with the Besco Company. Until this Bill is brought before the House, we do not know what the clauses therein contained are like, but we can only hope and trust at the present juncture that the contract will be a decent one so far as the miners on Bell Island are concerned.

With regard to the new Dry Dock, all I have to say is that I voted for it and I feel that I have nothing to take back in that connection; but there are lots of things that can be said over the way that labor was handled up there.

With respect to the Railway Commission, I do not know whether I am a member of that commission now or not. I was never notified that I was fired; I presume that the Government had not enough courage to do that; neither do I know if anybody was put in my place. As to the re-railing of the road from here to Clarenville, the Prime Minister stated here the other day that more money has to be raised to do that work. If the Government had known last year or if they had taken the advice of Captain Randell and others of the Opposition a whole lot of unnecessary work would be saved. If the Government, instead of embarking upon their famous tourist policy, had expended two millions of dollars on the re-railing of the railway, it would have been more beneficial to the country.

As to the new steamer "Caribou," I might say that I am not an expert on shipping, nor on the construction of shipping, but I do say that the interior work of the "Caribou" is the cheapest class of material that I have ever seen in any passenger ship. Her power is not up to the "Lintrose" or "Bruce" and she consumes between forty-five and fifty tons of coal per day.

Then there is another paragraph in the Speech from the Throne which is misleading. It deals with the Pecuniary Claims Tribunal at Washington. That, I repeat, is a deliberate attempt to mislead the country and its people. Although I am not a lawyer, I say that these claims were not in our favor, but, on the contrary were against us, and I shall endeavour to point out to this House some other details in connection with the Pecuniary Claims Commission and which cost this country a vast

amount of money on account of legal fees. Some years ago American vessels went into Bay of Islands and took herring and upon their seines and nets they were supposed to pay a Customs duty, which they did. A protest was entered against the Government and that is the only part of the case that Newfoundland won in connection with the award of the Pecuniary Claims Tribunal at Washington last November, despite any statement to the contrary by the Government, or by the Speech from the Throne. But what about what we didn't win? And why was not that part put in the Speech from the Throne for His Excellency the Governor to read to the people of this Colony? What about the vessels that put into Bay Bulls, Ferryland and Bonne Bay and other places in a damaged condition and with part cargoes of fish on board? The American people entered a protest for the way these vessels had been treated and won it, and the people of Newfoundland have to pay the piper in the way of extra taxation brought about by the Monroe Government. Yet, we are asked to believe what the Government sees fit to try and ram down our throats in the Speech from the Throne.

Another matter dealt with in the Speech from the Throne is the Labrador Boundary Question. It is better that we forget all about it entirely. That has been a milch cow for some people and the unfortunate part of it, especially for the fishermen and working classes of this country, according to the member for Fortune Bay, that it is going to continue. As I have already stated, the best thing we can do is to forget about this Labrador Boundary affair, if it is the intention to have decent Government in this country.

Now I make the statement that there are certain members of the present Monroe Administration who received legal fees during the past two years or less to the extent of forty thousand dollars.

I asked questions regarding how much money was paid Mr. Cramm, member for Bay de Verde, for legal services in connection with the Railway Department. After pressing, I was given information that was not correct, but I may say that it was not the Prime Minister's fault. Mr. Cramm, I now find, put in a Bill last year for four thousand dollars, but, this bill was considered too high, therefore, it was cut down to two thousand five hundred dollars before it was paid.

I am prepared to prove now that he did get $2500 more on account of that. The bill was put in for $4,000 and was cut down by the Railway Commission.

I asked another question the other day, and the answer that was laid on the table by the Minister was not correct. The same Department, sir, used the axe on another question in connection with the private car "Terra Nova," which leads me to believe, Mr. Speaker, that information, coming from that direction, is not good, is not right. That car "Terra Nova" has been flying all over the country during the summer; people have been going on shooting excursions and everything else with it. There are men up there doing nothing and getting paid for it. As a matter of fact, there are men around town to-day doing nothing, and getting paid for it, and I challenge the Government to contradict that statement. Clean up!

The Geological Surveys of the Country.

I hope the Government will do something in connection with that, Mr. Speaker, and whilst I am on that matter, I would take this opportunity of giving a few statistics as to how much money may be saved this country should coal be found in com-

mercial quantities on the West Coast. There are around 300,000 tons of coal consumed in Newfoundland annually. At a cost of $6 a ton that would be $1,800,000 paid out of the coffers of Newfoundland annually for coal. For argument's sake, if that mine over on the West Coast is found to contain coal in commercial qualities, and those 300,000 tons of coal should be used here that $1,800,000 would remain in the country. Coal can be mined to-day in Virginia for $2.20 per ton plus about $2.60, for its haulage and $1.50 freight. Now, if coal can be mined in Virginia for $2.20 per ton, it can be mined in Bay St. George for the same price, adding to that a rail rate of $2 per ton and other charges, and we should be able to sell it for $8.00 per ton. And yet, the Government are prepared to pay more for their coal than they get it for here. While on that subject, Mr. Speaker, may I say that the Minister of Public Works tabled an answer to my question here to-day in connection with the coal tenders last year.

THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Speaker: May I hand a note to Major Cashin, to correct one of the items in that answer, which should read $19.90.

MR. CASHIN—These were the tenders called for last year. The question which I asked the other day was to table any report made in connection with the consumption of this coal, and why has the report of Mr. Forbes, Boiler Inspector, not been tabled. Seeing that I was a member of Cashin & Co., Ltd., I do not want to make any comment, but, in that contract alone, the Government threw away practically $10,000 on account of politicis. Mr. Whiteway and Mr. Power were on that Board. Mr. Linegar was also a member of that Board; he was also a party to throwing away $10,000 belonging to the public of this country, and he smiles to-day when you tell him about it.

How does 1925 compare with 1924? That is what the people of this country want to know. I say, sir, that the financial year 1925 was $1,500,000 short of the year 1924 in revenue. There was that much more expended in 1925 than the country took in. Your revenue was $10,456,000 and your expenditure $11,600,000. Then the Speech from the Throne comes in and says that we are prosperous. Is that not a ridiculous statement? Patriotism that pays is generally what the present Government works on. Mr. Puddester comes in and makes (in his own estimation) a wonderful speech, no doubt well prepared beforehand to boost the finances of the Government. He tells us how well they are doing. He did not tell us how much money the 'Daily News' got out of the Government for printing. There was over $20,000 paid out of the Public Treasury of Newfoundland last year to Mr. Puddester's Company. Well may he come in and make a speech and tell us that the country is prosperous, when he can get $20,000 or $25,000 for printing. Then he goes on to say that the Railway ate up the Surplus. I am going to make a statement here to-day that the railway is costing $1,000,000 a year, and not a member of the Government can contradict me. It is even more than $1,000,000 and I am prepared to prove it. Your deficit will be around $400,000. You receive $300,000 from the Postal Telegraph Department for subsidies, that is $700,000. You don't pay any interest on moneys that are expended on capital account. That capital account is $5,000,0000. At 5 p.c. that would be $250,000 more. Now how much are you short of $1,000,000 plus depreciation? I am prepared to make the statement that, if you cut out that expenditure and forget about the interest and the subsidies which you

receive for carrying on the railway, the railway would not lose $400,000 a year if properly operated. And Mr. Bennett, the Colonial Secretary, stated that no politics entered into the management of the Railway. I am prepared to prove that politics have been used in connection with the Railway; and I am prepared to bring conclusive proof of this forward, from their own Minute Book, in support of my argument. I notice in the Minutes (very small I admit) that the "Daily Globe" had some advertising from the Railway, but, on account of their attitude, this was cut out. Is not that politics? No tenders were called for marine insurance, only on the "Caribou"; $15,000 worth of insurance was allowed to be given out without any tenders being called for. Is that politics, or is it not Another gentleman even goes so far as to write to the Government asking them if they would charter the "Caribou" to go to the icc on an excursion trip.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—We did not charter her, did we?

MR. CASHIN—But that same individual owes this country $11,000 and you are not taking any steps to collect it.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—What has that got to do with the Railway?

MR. CASHIN—It has this much to do with it, that if it were someone else you would have given him two or three weeks to pay up.

It is enough to make one's blood rush to one's head to hear the present administration talk about law. They have not done anything legal yet since they came here. Here we have the Auditor-General's Report 33 B. When I was a member of the Opposition with several individual members of the present Government, we were directly opposed to the attitude of the Government because they paid bonuses to civli servants, and we resolved that it was never going to be done. And now there are pensions and bonuses by the gross. We find the Deputy Minister of Finance getting over two thousand dollars. At one time the present Finance Minister himself was one of the very men most opposed to paying a bonus. Judges of the Supreme Court, of the District Court, everyone getting it. I suppose it is a case of when one gets it that all the others are entitled to it.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Speaker, I would like to say for the information of the Hon. member, that we did not contract these bills. We simply paid the bills that others had entered into; that is all.

MR. CASHIN—This is up to the end of December, 1925. There were no Estimates put through for last year. Those names are not in it and they should be in it. There are names not down in the Estimates although these same people were walking around the city last year and getting sixty or seventy dollars per month out of the Finance Department. My point is this, Mr. Speaker, I like to be consistent. This Government gave out about two hundred thousand dollars in pauper relief last year, and then to come in here and say that we are prosperous, why it is ridiculous. One district got nearly forty thousand dollars for pauper relief. As Mr. Halfyard pointed out the other day . . . . . .

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say a word. These judges were employed to do certain work. They sent in their bills and were paid although we did not employ them.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker, the Hon. gentleman can explain this to the House after I am finished. He can also explain why that is inexistence.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Speaker, I will explain it all right. The Hon. Member can be quite

sure about that. But you directed the question to me and I thought you wanted an answer.

MR. CASHIN—I suppose the cat can look at the queen. I don't know what this means, I am not a lawyer, but I will say this much, that no matter what you do you are going to be compelled to pay for it. And if the reports are correct, the lawyers are going to get a good rake off out of it, according to what they have got during the past four months.

Now, what clause have you not violated? You violated the Election Act. You violated the Customs Act. You violated the Prohibition Act. You violated the Election Act because you were too cowardly to fight. You violated the Customs Act to give someone else an opportunity to make some money. And as for the Prohibition Law—that Law is being violated every day. Some people are fined two and three hundred dollars while others go free. Is not that class legislation?

Then the next paragraph is in connection with the Board of Liquor Control. A man gets drunk twice. He gets fined two or three hundred dollars or he is put in jail. I am not a prohibitionist, Mr. Speaker, and I am not an advocate of prohibition in this country or in any other country. I think it is a farce. It has caused more crime in the United States and even here in Newfoundland, than if the open bar was still in existence. I know that you people are worrying about law in adjoining countries when you didn't worry about it in your own. Now whiskey or beer or anything else that is exported from a foreign country to be transhipped to an unknown port is allowed in this country at twenty-five cents a case. This gave this country about twenty-five thousand dollars last year. And you propose to stop that now. Have you made any arrangement with the United States, seeing that you are stopping this, whereby they could take off the $1.25 duty they have put on our fish entering the United States? Have you any correspondence in connection with that? Or did you think of that at all? If you are going to do this to please the Prohibitionists in the United States, well, the least that they might do would be to allow the Newfoundland fish in to the American markets free. Is not that logical? But I do not believe that the Government has ever made an attempt to do anything in that direction.

Besco Contract!

We will discuss that contract when it is brought forward here. This contract, sir, as I said on opening day, should be most carefully studied. This contract will be binding, for the next twenty-five years. I can't make any definite statement. The Company on Bell Island claims that they are not making any money there. I claim that they are. I claim that the Dominion Iron and Steel Company is a paying concern; and to prove that I will quote an extract, if I can find it, from the Financial Post of January (1926) wherein it states,—I will give you the gist of it: "The Dominion Iron and Steel Company have had a very successful year mainly on account of their valuable iron ore deposits." Now, where are their valuable iron ore deposits? On Bell Island. And then this Company has the impertinence to say that they are not making any money. I can foreshadow that contract. I can almost see it now as an attempt to fasten on the people of Newfoundland a leaden weight.

To-day in North America, the Minnesota Mine is practically depleted. Where are they going to get their ore next? We have heard a lot of talk about shipping the ore to England. The Company will have to change their furnaces in order to manufacture this ore, but we have

not heard anything about any kind of wage that will give Newfoundlanders only 27 cents an hour. When that Bill comes before the House I will have something further to say about it?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have just slightly scanned the Speech from the Throne. Now for a general outline of the policy of the Government.

On opening day, sir, I made a statement in this House that the present Administration was a class legislation Government. This I propose to prove before I take my seat. I propose to make another statement, Mr. Speaker, and that is that this Government is the most successful failure since the advent of Responsible Government in Newfoundland. In the year 1924 we went to the country pledged to retrenchment. That was stated in the Manifesto issued by the Prime Minister, and if I am not out of order, now, sir, I propose to state that that Manifesto was conceived in iniquity and brought forth in sin. And further, I will say that it had its origin in a design to injure the integrity of this country. And the author of that Manifesto is without peer in deliberate wickedness and treason to the common people of Newfoundland. The gentlemen opposite may laugh. But it is true. I ask the Prime Minister now what promise has he carried out, with the exception of the Prohibition Act? Not one. On the contrary, he has done the very opposite and he has made no attempt whatever to carry out any of the promises that he made to the people in 1924.

Now, sir, we are told that they can't lay off any of the hands in the Post Office, in the Finance Department, in this, that, and the other Department. But you have taken more on in every office. The one trouble about this Government is that it is getting too superfluous. There is danger of its being broken down with its own weight. Our job, Mr. Speaker, is to study to simplify it. Have you done this? The number of civil servants to-day is becoming alarming. Already they constitute a vast non-productive army in this country. There is too much red tape which hinders rather than helps justice in Newfoundland. I would make this suggestion, Mr. Speaker, that the Government should be the same as a stock company. The shareholders in that Government are the people of this country, and they should share in the gains and the losses the same as any private company. Before there will be any good Government, the Government must get away from the idea that the public treasury is legitimate spoil. It is a rank infectious growth which is strangling the life out of this country. This Government now in power contains more political iniquity than was ever known under any previous Administration.

One of the greatest injustices of the Monroe Government was the decision to abolish the Income Tax, and the Business Profits Tax. And the increase in the Tariff in this country in my opinion (and I am subject to correction) has drawn a line of battle between the rich and the poor of Newfoundland. It is a crime against the common people of this country. If I have an income of $20,000 a year, should I not contribute more to the upkeep of my country than the man with only five hundred or six hundred dollars per year? Upon the shoulders of the poor must continue to rest the great burden of taxation. I repeat that there was class legislation from beginning to end last year. The Income Tax and the Business Profits Tax were taken off. The duty on butterine and tobacco, clothing, lines and twines was increased. And yet the Prime Minister told us that the price would not go up on lines and twines.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, that is not correct.

MR. CASHIN—I do not know, as I did not buy any, but here are the prices: Eighteen thread St. Peter's line has advanced from $5.25 to $7.00; these are figures I procured from the Colonial Cordage Company. Twine did not go up, but lines did. I am not attacking this Company because the Prime Minister is a shareholder therein. Butterine factories have a protection of five cents per pound, equal to $300,000 per year—is that right? Last year they got an extra cent, making it $60,000. Look at the case of cigarettes. A certain Company gets a protection amounting to $120,000, a sum equal to half their capital, and it is the shareholders in the United States who reap the benefit. Who pays for tobacco, lines and twines, clothing? Take clothing: last year tailor-made clothing went up 10 p.c. and readymades 25 p.c. Who is it wears these readymades? Is this anything but class legislation?

Referring to the paragraph on Besco, I said that when this contract comes into this House party feeling should be forgotten. Mr. Speaker, I belong to no party; although the Daily News did say that I seconded Mr. Hickman's motion, I did not, but I may do so before I sit down. The members of this House should vote as their conscience directs; any man who votes for a party measure which he has reason to think would hurt this country or the people who live in it, is not fit to be in the House. This present Administration was born in ignorance and nursed in knavery. There were a great number of people against that Tariff last year. I was reading in an American paper not long ago the speech of William Jennings Bryan at Chicago, the speech by which he first made himself nationally and internationally famous, in which, in ending, he told them they should not press crowns of thorns on the heads of the people, that they should not crucify them on a cross of gold. Can I say more than that the present Administration has pressed a crown of thorns on the heads of the fishermen, and is crucifying them on a cross of gold? If we only had a Government that was not lured by the golden signs of greed—if we only had a decent Government.

We have been informed by the Government that if we produce too much fish we can't sell it. I repeat again that we can't produce too much—according to the statement of the Government it is better for the fishermen to quit producing altogether. The fishermen have borne much from the present Administration, and we see a proof of this in the fact that there are 300 Newfoundlanders manning Lunenburg vessels this year. This with a Government pledged to protect the fisheries of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I propose to second the Amendment proposed by the Leader of the Official Opposition, so the Daily News can now go ahead and publish it. I shall, with your permission, read the Amendment in full.

Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in seconding the Amendment and now propose to deal with each paragraph in that amendment.

The first paragraph is in connection with a revision of the present Tariff. There is nothing in the Speech from the Throne regarding revision, but I note from the Prime Minister that there is further borrowing—no effort to reduce and make it easy for our fishermen to earn a living. It is all very well to employ men on the dock, hotel, and highways, but we are producing nothing. The dock is there all right, but at such a cost that the interest charges will eat up its earnings.

The Highway Commission

Nothing has been tabled in this House in connection with the activi-

ties of that Commission. Twelve months ago we were told it would cost $5,000 per mile to build roads, now it is $7,500, and in some instances 100 p.c. more. But that $5,000 was to build new roads, and it has cost that to repair the old ones. A commission was created in place of the authority of the Public Works Department, and we had an expert imported to improve them. Mr. Speaker, we will wait until the snow and ice are gone from the roads before we believe this improvement. Further, the upkeep will be at least 20 p.c. of the cost—20 p.c. of two millions is $400,000; add 5 p.c. for interest and we have another $100,000, so that charges on this borrowed money is costing the country 25 p.c. per year. Last year there were 2500 men working on the roads in Cenception Bay, and worked with everything, even, it is said, goats. Mr. Woodford smiles; perhaps he knows that the goats came from Hr. Main?

HON. MINISTER POSTS & TELEGRAPHS—No, there are no goats in Harbour Main. The Hon. Member must be thinking of Buckley's Goat.

MR. CASHIN—Twenty-five hundred men working last year to produce nothing there is another million to spend this year. I recommend that this useless expenditure be saved the country. But there are other ways of spending; there is $20,000 paid out in fire insurance to Government heelers which could be stopped. There would be no trouble in carrying out the suggestion made by the Leader of the Opposition regarding the Tariff. I am strongly against taxes aimed to save the money of wealthy companies. Take the Imperial Tobacco Co., saving twenty or thirty thousand dollars per year. Anyone who attempts to compete is kept out; the Government's excuse is that it costs seventy dollars or eighty dollars per month to keep a tidewaiter up there. I am down on any corporation filching by their greed the revenue of the country. There is a paragraph of interest regarding reduction of taxes,and that a Royal Commission be appointed for the purpose. Mr. Speaker, on opening day, I think the Hon. Member for Fortune referred to something of this sort being done in England, where Sir Eric Geddes was appointed—don't you think this could be done here? Last year a gentleman from Canada was procured to enquire into our Post Office, and nothing was done.

HON. MINISTER POSTS & TELEGRAPHS—Oh yes there was—considerable changes were made. Our staff is reduced by six.

MR. CASHIN—I refer to the Telegraphs Department also. And the service there is disgraceful.

HON. MINISTER POSTS & TELEGRAPHS—If I might explain, Mr. Cashin complained to me privately about the service, and I took the matter up with the Superintendent who told me that this is likely to happen any time, we have poles and wires coming down in storms, currents, etc.

MR. CASHIN—That is not at all the real explanation. It is not the fault of the present administration, but is it not the fact that the contract made by the previous administration, with the Commercial Cable Company, provides for a number of messages for that Company to be sent over Government lines, and private parties have to wait?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Ask Mr. Halfyard, he will tell you.

MR. CASHIN—I see he is smiling. I had nothing to do with it, but I am asking for prompt action. Two years ago the Prime Minister, in his Manifesto, said that under the new conditions our country would be better. Well, if financial conditions are such that he can afford to spend two millions on a policy which did not go

before the country, a policy which is the idea of a gentleman who was not then associated with this party, and who now sits in another House—if this country can spend two millions in that way, surely it can spend half a million on an industry which has been and will be the mainstay of this country. To prove that it will remain the main industry, let me cite these figures: Take the Humber (which now employs about 2500 men) and give it 3000 men, give Grand Falls 3000, which makes six thousand; add 3000 for the Gander if it develops, making 9000; add 3000 more for Bell Island, and 3000 for another that may come up, and we have 15,000 men, representing, let us say, 60,000 people, four times fifteen. Our present population is 250,000, take 60,000 from this and we have 190,000—how are they going to live? Is it to be through the fisheries, even if all these industries are to be established. We can find no statistics to prove that we get any revenue whatever from these other sources, but it can be proved that we get revenue from our fisheries. And it can be proved that we get profit from our fisheries. Last year Lunenburg vessels caught 250,000 quintals, and we with forty vessels caught 120,000 quintals. The Lunenburg fishermen netted $8.00 per quintal, that is, $2,000,000 went to Lunenburg, taken from Newfoundland. At the same time we took only one million; add to this the fact that these people take in bait and ice down here, they make two millions of dollars from this fishery. If the Lunenburg men with a fleet of 20 or 30 vessels can succeed we are bound to expand; if Lunenburgers make money Newfoundlanders can also make it. And one of the reasons why we lost and Lunenburg makes it is because they use the co-operative plan. I believe there is a vessel on the West Coast commanded by Captain Tom Hollett, trying this plan.

Much has been said within these four walls regarding the standardization of fish and no attempt has ever been made to do anything. Today there is a market in Southern Brazil that has never been tried by Newfoundland. There is a market in South America that is supplied by the fish caught in the waters of Scotland and Norway, and packed in boxes. But there has never been an attempt to explore these markets, to find out if we could do business with them. But, Mr. Speaker, I contend and I am sure that I am correct, and Hon. Members opposite know that I am correct, that it is the duty of the Members to make some attempt to get the industry which is the staple industry of Newfoundland on its feet again. To-day, sir, in the markets in the Mediterranean, there is much fish unsold. Mr. Monroe knows that better than I do. But I contend that that condition of the markets has been brought about by our shipping so much fish in steamers, that space has not been left between one cargo and another sufficient to guarantee that the previous cargo has gone into consumption. People may have their own ideas in that matter. But there is regulation in regard to the shipping of fish that has got to come. It has got to come here. There was an attempt made here to do this before, but the attempt failed because Sir William Coaker attempted to put a price on the Commodity, which was absurd in my opinion, but the regulations of shipment would never have done that. At the present time we catch 1,250,000 quintals of fish in Newfoundland. Seventy-five per cent. of that is shipped in steamers; twenty-five years ago there was no such thing as shipping fish in steamers. We had our own fleet of a hundred and fifty sailing vessels in which we sent our fish to the markets of the world. The crews in them were our own men. Five or

six men to a vessel. And these men, I might say in passing, are the equal of anyone else in the world. They made so much money. There was a high insurance paid on the fish and the hull, higher than that which is paid on steamers. But the money that was paid to the sailors was spent in this country.

At the present time we are paying about seven hundred thousand dollars to foreign steamers to take our fish to the markets, whereas that seven hundred thousand dollars would remain in this country if we were to use the sailing vessels. Is it not time, Mr. Speaker, that something should be done in this direction? I may not be absolutely correct. I may not have my "I's" dotted and my "T's" crossed.

With regard to the seal fishery, I am going to make a prediction here now. Something has got to be done in connection with that industry pretty shortly. The seal fishery is decreasing year by year. We have got below the hundred and fifty thousand catch. To-day the sealers have got thirty or forty thousand killed. It is a question if within the next few years it may not be necessary to have a close season for two or three years. Then there will be a hullabaloo. You had to do that with the Lobster fishery. You will have to do it with the Seal Fishery. The biggest catch was six hundred and some odd thousand. That was taken in the sailing vessels many years ago. There are steamers going out to the fishery now that have been engaged in the fishery for fifty-one years. Fifty-one years ago this Spring my grandfather was captain of the "Ranger." She was first in. It appears to me that acocrding to the policy of the Government as outlined in the Speech from the Throne, that nothing is contemplated by the present administration in connection with this fishery. It is a case of feather your own nest first and stay in as long as you can. For the next four years they will have another scheme to deceive the public. That is their policy. I am an independent member of this House and I have an independent vote. If the Government brings in anything that I think is good for the country I will vote for it, I have no party affiliations. I came here and I am going to keep my word. I told the people that we were going to reduce taxation and reduce expenditure, but when we came in here we were asked to increase expenditure and increase taxation.

I was told that I was a traitor because I left the Monroe Party. I say now, as I said last year, that the Monroe Administration is betraying the people of Newfoundland whom they have stabbed in the back. First a friendly embrace, when they were after the votes, and then they stuck them with the golden stilletto through the back and out through the stomach, and then hung their hats on both ends of it. They have enriched the big corporations at the expense of the fishing man and the working man of the country.

This year these corporations are making from thirty to forty per cent. The butterine factories are making three or four hundred thousand dollars between them all. The tobacco company will make a hundred and twenty thousand and the ropewalk twenty-five or thirty or forty thousand and the clothing factories have an extra twenty-two per cent. put on all readymade clothing. And what is it being put on for? I have been told that it is to increase the revenue. But if it is to increase the revenue why take off the Income Tax? If you put on that and still kept on the Income Tax I would agree with it. It was stated in the Speech from the Throne last year that the Business Profits Tax was going to be taken off. You were called heroes by both sides

of the House. Two or three weeks after that, bang, comes the new tariff and not one individual member of the Government knows anything about it, from the Minister of Finance down. The Minister of Justice, the legal light of the Government Party, said that he would eat it before he could understand it.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —I said before I could make one. I could not attempt to make a Customs Tariff. I do not know anything about the job. I mind my own job and mind my own business.

MR. CASHIN—Then why do you not carry out your job? If you did your duty, there is a vacant seat on that side of the House which should be filled. And you are violating the law laid down in the Statute Book of the country. Tear the leaf out of it. You attempted to bring in legislation in this House to wipe that law out. Here is the original bill, right here.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —If the Hon. Member will not mind my interrupting.

MR. SPEAKER—Will the Hon. Member kindly address the chair?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I don't want to get into this thing, but . . . .

MR. CASHIN—I would not be in it but for the Minister of Justice and he knows that. Now that I am in it I am going to stay in it.

But I was on the tariff of last year when this interruption took place. Mr. Monroe said that lines and twines would not be increased, but they were increased, and increased considerably. Mr. Monroe is no more than any other Member in this House. But he got up here the other day and castigated every member on this side of the House, and he said that we should only speak for half an hour. I am going to speak as long as I like in this House. Mr. Monroe or no other Monroe is going to stop me or tell me how long I should speak or tell me what I should say or anything else. We are come to a pretty pass now when we have to be told that we are not to speak for longer than half an hour on the Speech from the Throne that is written to deceive, and did deceive.

MR. SPEAKER—The Hon. Member is out of order when he makes insinuations of that kind. It is not right to cast reflections of that sort upon any one.

MR. CASHIN—What I meant to convey is that the Speech from the Throne is misleading. In another word, it was meant to mislead.

MR. SPEAKER—Kindly withdraw that please. I ask the Hon. Member to withdraw that because it was deliberate.

MR. CASHIN—As an individual member of this House and as a Newfoundlander have I to come into this House and withdraw what I have said or what is in my mind?

MR. SPEAKER—That expression is not parliamentary and will the Hon. Member please withdraw it.

MR. CASHIN—If the expression is unparliamentary I shall withdraw it, but if what I have said is correct, then I do not withdraw it. But if I am compelled to come into this House and tell a lie to be in order . . . .

MR. SPEAKER—We will not discuss this. Kindly confine yourself to the question.

MR. CASHIN—I was called to order on the point that I said the Speech from the Throne was deceiving, or that it was meant to deceive. Apparparently not critically correct. I think I proved my statement that I was critically correct when not long ago I said that the Speech from the Throne did not tell the whole truth about the matter in Washington. And I claim that one half the truth is the worst kind of lie.

Mr. Speaker, that does not tell of all that happened. The Minister of Justice knows better than I do that

it is not all true—better than I can tell you, because he is a lawyer, and I am not. As I said before that part of the Speech from the Throne kindly gave an inkling of who had written it. You led me astray, sir. I will have to go back to find where I was. I was talking about the Prime Minister attempting to close the mouths of the members of the Opposition and the members opposite, and I said that I considered it autocratic. It does not stand for good Government. It would have been a great blessing to the country if your Administration had been wiped out. Your Administration betrayed every promise to the people. You have used your office to pry open the doors of the Treasury and heave the money overboard. And then we are told to keep our mouths shut. It is a wonder that the Prime Minister did not ask us to move out altogether, that we were not entitled to seats in this House. I speak for myself. It is going to take the Prime Minister some time to put a padlock on my lips. I do not expect any good from the present Administration.

Mr. Speaker, I have been talking about the fisheries of this country this afternoon, and I think that I have outlined to you, to the best of my ability, what it is possible to do to benefit the fisheries of Newfoundland. If you do not want to do this then I am only wasting my time coming here and asking you to do it. Two days ago Mr. Long presented a petition to have a bait depot erected at Burin. I intended to have two, but possibly not so large, as the one asked for by Mr. Long—one at Ferryland, another at Cape Broyle; and yet another at Fermeuse. This would be a benefit to the fishermen of Newfoundland as well as for the fishermen from the West Coast also. About the end of July they come to Ferryland to take bait and ice. During the caplin school there is little difficulty in getting bait; but when the end of July comes and the caplin go off into deep water, it is practically impossible to get bait, and I have seen twenty sail of vessel anchored waiting for the squid to come in. Sometimes it has been necessary for them to come as far as Holyrood to get their bait. If there were bait depots in these various places they could stock up the bait in cold storage when it was plentiful, sold to this company that would be backed by the Government, and when it was scarce it could be supplied to the fishermen and to the vessels that would come in for bait. At the same time I believe that it would be a paying business. There are lots of vessels that come down on this coast from Lunenburg looking for bait and ice and they are ready to pay for these things. But you have done nothing of that nature to encourage the fisheries. This is the first attempt that is to be made. Only yesterday I received a letter from Captain Hollett telling us that the petition was to be presented and asking me to support it. I wrote him and told him that the petition was presented by Mr. Long and supported by Mr. Lake and myself, and it is the first piece of legislation brought in by the Monroe Government that is of any use to the fishermen of Newfoundland. I hope that you will be successful in getting that bait depot in Burin, but one is not enough. One at Burin will only serve the people in that section; I want to see these bait depots everywhere. If the Government were ready to come in here with some idea of that kind it might show the fishermen that you were going to do something for them after having persecuted them for the last twelve or fourteen months.

The Income Tax

There is enough Income Tax and Business Profits Tax due down in the Customs House to-day to pay a bonus to the fishermen for the next twelve

months. According to the Auditor-General's report there is nearly three hundred thousand dollars owing to that Department. If you were to reimpose the Income Tax this year you would get four or five hundred thousand dollars. The Bank Tax is not so large. You could well afford to take the duty off tobacco, the extra duty, I mean. I am not asking you to let it in free. You could take off the extra ten per cent. now on lines and twines. Put back the Income Tax and you will have enough to pay the fishermen of Newfoundland fifty cents a quintal on codfish during the coming year. Then you would be doing something for the people of Newfoundland. Then you would be able to go back to the fishermen and say that you had carried out your promises at least to some extent. It would be unreasonable for you to go back to the fishermen of this country after acting as you have acted and ask them to support you. And why would you be unreasonable? If the Prime Minister can not carry out his contract to the people of this country he should resign and tell them he cannot carry it out. That is the decent thing to do. And the Prime Minister has not attempted to carry out his contract. Mr. Speaker, butterine is largely used in this country by the fishermen and the working classes. To-day it is thirty-five or thirty-six cents a pound wholesale. To-day you can import this same stuff, or stuff like it, (that is all you can call it "Stuff") for twenty-five cents per pound; three and a half to five cents duty; that makes it thirty cents; and then if you make two or three cents profit you should be able to sell it here for thirty cents a pound. Still the price is thirty-five or thirty-six cents a pound and these factories are making a hundred thousand dollars a year, put by in reserve after paying twenty or twenty-five per cent. on their capital stock. I can prove that. The Minister of Finance made that statement himself here some time ago. And that money comes from the fishermen and the working classes of this country. We have to-day an extra seven or eight cents a pound on tobacco, and that means quite a bit. It comes to $50,000 a year; I think I heard Mr. Grimes say so the other day. All that extra duty on tobacco, is that right? Is that amendment unreasonable? Is it not the duty of the Honourable Members of the Government to vote for that section of that Amendment? It is undoubtedly their duty. The fishermen of this country are anxiously watching to see if the Government are going to vote for it or not. The Government are going to bring in a Loan Bill. They are compelled to bring it in, but where are we going to get the Revenue to pay it? You can't keep going on like this. The present Tariff is all wrong and if you can't see any other way of governing the country you should give it up and let somebody else try. The country can be run properly you know. I don't want the job but I do want to see a proper attempt being made at it. I can make a few suggestions how it can be done in a better way than it is being done at present, and the Government should attend to these suggestions; and as for this side of the House it will support every wise measure proposed to it. A great deal of goods is imported paying no duty at all. Is it not possible to have some kind of straight tax imposed on these articles (now free) in order to make up the deficiency? As to lines and twines: Without them a fisherman cannot carry on his trade, cannot exist. It has been historical, so to speak, in Newfoundland, that lines and twines be admitted duty free, and it was not until the Monroe Administration came into office that lines and twines were put on the duty list and ten

per cent. paid into the coffers of the country for them. Then Mr. Monroe promised that they should not be raised, but they went up afterwards, considerably more than ten per cent. in some instances. How can a fisherman go fishing if he cannot afford to buy lines and twines? Those who know tell us that the trap fishery does not pay in the long run, but trawling does. This matter is then of the utmost importance to the fishermen. A good fisherman does not go working on the roads, so don't count the road work you will give as anything of benefit to the fishermen. In connection with your road policy, don't contemplate the fishermen, for as I have already said, good fishermen will be out fishing. And is it not our duty to encourage them to do that?

This Highways policy, to my mind, is madness, sheer madness? Why? Because it was our duty first of all to make some attempt to fix up the fisheries which have been going backward during the past few years. In '24 they made a step to come forward, but what happened? Last year they went backward. That explains to this House why more fish was caught in Labrador than in the previous year. The Labrador fishermen went out expecting to get seven dollars for a quintal and had to be satisfied with five and a quarter. A great quantity of the Labrador fish is unsold. A man told me yesterday that he was offered only $3.50 a quintal for prime Labrador fish. As to the standardization of fish, I believe the only way we can get it is, not by enforcing a rule whereby merchants have to cull their fish, but fish exported as No. 1 should be branded No. 1 by the exporters. That would make the merchants watch their step. Inferior fish must not be sent out as No. 1, and this must be insisted on to keep our markets. Again new markets should be sought after. There are a million people in South America who never heard of Newfoundland fish. I was a member of the Fishery Board when we made a suggestion in this connection, and all the answer that was given us was a sarcastic letter and it ended there. We suggested that a man be sent abroad to work up markets in South America. We send no fish to Argentine or to Chile and these countries require considerable fish. No attempt is being made to get into this market. Whose duty is it to see to matters such as these if not that of the Government? It may possibly be the duty of the trade, but it is also the duty of the Government. It is so in every country. In Canada the Government make it their duty with regard to wheat production. Fruit growing is assisted in British Columbia and so everywhere. This country cannot stand it much longer, unless more money is going to be spent on the fishery. Last year twenty thousand dollars was the the amount spent on the fishery; and for a visionary tourist traffic we had two million.

The Prime Minister told us this in his Manifesto: "The fisheries will "ever be the mainstay and first con-"cern of the people of this country." What has the Prime Minister or his Administration done for the fisheries in Newfoundland? Nothing. They cannot say that they did anything. They did not. The only thing they did do was to persecute the fishermen by imposing an extra duty of ten or twelve per cent. on lines and twines. We told them we are prosperous. We cannot prosper under such conditions: $17,000,000 spent during the last year; $1,500,000 on the dole account; $1,500,000 on the previous administration's deficit; $2,-000,000 on Highroads, not actually spent yet; the railway deficit, about $500,000, and another $500,000 on the "Caribou"; $10,000,000 revenue spent

and another million on top of that, and the fisheries of Newfoundland getting only $20,000. There ought to be a public meeting of fishermen called and a vote of thanks passed to the Government on account of it. Mr. Monroe says in his Manifesto that he is no maker of pleasing promises, but a plain man of business, trying to say what he means in a way people would understand. They took him at his word. People may say to me that it is a poor way to get the Amendment through by abusing the Government in connection with it, but the Government are not going to vote for it; I know full well they won't vote for it, but they tell us that any sound criticism and suggestion will be given consideration. My answer to that is that our sound suggestions will be jumped on by the Government. It is enough to make a man weep; to read that, and see what has been done, and what they intended to do. It is a tragedy. The people of this country are crippled, broken down, the result of false promises. I put it to the Government now as a party of ordinary commonsense men. I ask you, do you intend to do anything for the fishermen of this country. If you do, I ask you to vote for this Amendment; I am going to support it, and I ask you to support it also. It is the duty of the Government to do something; it is their duty to demand that the Prime Minister carry out his promises: "The financial condition of the country is very bad"; he told us in his Manifesto when seeking office. The same applies to-day; we have to borrow more money; we have to fix the railway, but, if instead of putting $2,000,000 on the Tourist Policy, we had taken that money and expended it on the Railway, we would not now be looking for more money for the railway. Then we could have a good railway from here to the Humber, which is badly needed. The Company there is going to produce a vast amount of paper, and our railway is not good enough to handle it, when it is required to transport it for them. Again we cannot supply railway cars suitable for carrying wood to the Humber; 180,000 cords of wood are consumed annually there; if placed four feet high and four feet wide in a pile, it would reach from here to Corner Brook.

What are we going to do in connection with reforestation? Surely we shall have to put something on our Statute Books that will reflect credit on us. The fishery comes first, and next to that is the paper and pulp industry. We must have an Act governing reforestation; if not, the entire forest will be cut out within the next quarter of a century. But there is nothing in the Speech from the Throne in that direction. There is enough timber on the Humber to operate that wonderful plant at Corner Brook, if properly protected, for the next eighty years; but there will not be any of us here then, and probably it would be for the country's good if a lot of us were not here today. Still the Humber industry has been given power and concessions that the fishery never got. There are sitting opposite me here this evening a number of gentlemen in the Government ranks who represent fishing districts in the country, and yet they are prepared to sit idly by and not raise a voice on behalf of their constituents. I know also that the Government members will not vote for this Amendment which was proposed by the Leader of the Opposition and seconded by me; but, if these members will vote for the Amendment, whereby the people of this country can get what is their just due, I am prepared right now to vacate my seat in this House.

Where is the Committee that was appointed to investigate the mineral resources of the country that the pre-

sent Government promised? A considerable amount of money is spent on wild cat schemes in connection with mines, while two million dollars goes out of this country every year for coal. Why not appoint your Commission to-morrow and find out the extent of our coal possibilities and appoint an expert, one who knows his business and will be honest and straight; because, if there are large areas of coal on the West Coast there is every possibility of a lot of string pulling being done, and because there are a large number of people in this country who have an interest in these coal mines. It is not my intention to delay the time of this House very much longer and I know that the Government members are getting tired of listening to us.

But I hope, Mr. Speaker, that there is a time coming in Newfoundland when there shall be some administration come into this House that will be a Government for the people, of the people and by the people; and I say to-day that the present Government is not for the people, of the people or by the people. If the Monroe Government was a Government for, of, and by the people, they would carry out the promises they made to the electorate; but this is a Government of money sharks. You have protected industries to such an extent in this country so that all you can be termed to-day is a money Government influenced by monopolists and your actions have proven that. When we get away from party politics which exists at present—and I might say that there is nothing more debasing—and each man votes according to his own conscience, then and not till then are we going to have clean Government in this country. I am not a member of any party; but I would not sit in any Government or any party and come into this House knowing that by my vote I was bringing a hardship upon the people whom I pledged myself to look after. That is what I call party slavery and something that I am not prepared to indulge in.

There is another clause in this Amendment in connection with the vacancy existing in St. John's East. Before proceeding to deal with this subject, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

On motion of Mr. Cashin the Debate on 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 Thursday afternoon, 18th instant, at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, March 18th, 1926.

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

Petitions were presented by:

Mr. Scammell from Pacquet re: Road.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I beg to table reply to question No. 3 on the Order Paper of March 11th, and to question on the Order Paper of March 16th asked by the Hon. Member from Twillingate, Mr. Brown. I may say that the latter is a temporary answer, being the original of a wire answer we received this morning. If he will let me have it again I shall give him a copy.

(1) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to lay upon the Table of the House a statement giving: The names of the various employees of the Board of Liquor Control with the salaries paid them; also the contingencies account of said department from January 1st, 1925, to date.

The Hon. Minister was absent from the House. Deferred.

(2) MR. CASHIN asked the Minister of Agriculture and Mines to lay upon the Table of the House a statement showing: (a) The amounts paid from January 1st, 1925 to date, for legal services, particulars of same and to whom said amounts were paid; (b) The contingency account of the said Department in detail.

HON. MINISTER AGRICULTURE & MINES—I beg leave to table answer to this question.

(3) MR. CASHIN asked the Minister of Agriculture and Mines: How many leases or licenses to cut timber are at present in force on the Labrador, and who are the leasees or licensees of same.

MINISTER AGRICULTURE AND MINES—I beg leave to table reply to this question.

(4) MR. CASHIN asked the Minister of Agriculture and Mines to lay upon the Table of the House a statement in detail showing: How many timber leases or licenses were cancelled since June 30th, 1924; the names of the persons whose leases or licenses were so cancelled, and where said leases or licenses were situated.

MINISTER AGRICULTURE AND MINES—I beg leave to table answer to this question.

(5) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay upon the Table of the House a statement giving: The names of all employees of the Railway receiving salaries of $2,000.00 or over, and the amounts paid each of them.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The Railway Commission do not consider it necessary to give lists of salaries paid railway employees, but I shall to-morrow table a list of the salaries over $2,000.00.

(6) MR. ASHBOURNE asked Hon. the Prime Minister if the Government has any information as to when construction will begin on the Flour Mill.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—We have no information of any kind.

(7) MR. HICKMAN asked Hon. the Colonial Secretary to lay upon the Table of the House the amount of relief given out in the districts of St. John's East and St. John's West during: The month of December, 1925; the month of January, 1926; the month of February, 1926; the month of March to date, 1926; give each month separately.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I beg leave to table the information.

(8) MR. HICKMAN asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay upon the Table of the House the agreement between the Government and the W. I. Bishop, Limited, for the construction of the Dock and the construction of all the Buildings and Warehouses on the Dock premises.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I shall have the information to-morrow.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKKS—I beg leave to table answers to the following questions.

Question No. 9 on the Order Paper of March 10th.

Question No. 9 on the Order Paper of March 16th.

Question No. 8 on the Order Paper of March 16th.

Question No. 10 on the Order Paper of March 11th.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I beg to table answer to question No. 12 on the Order Paper of March 16th, asked by Mr. Scammell.

MR. SCAMMELL—May I ask if the Minister of Public Works has an answer to question No. 14 of March 16th?

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—That is being prepared. I shall have it to-morrow.

MR. CASHIN — Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw your attention to Rule No. 239, re the Public Accounts.

(He reads rule)

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that as you have been strict and impartial in the administration of the Rules of this House this matter should have your ruling. On the first day I asked for these accounts and they are not yet tabled——that is 15 days since. Some steps ought to be taken, and I suggest the adjournment of this House until these are tabled. There is considerable inforamtion in these that members on this side of the House would like to have to deal with in debate.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Regarding this rule, the object is to have the accounts at the earliest possible moment, and the Minister of Finance stated in this House that would be done. As far as the Government is concerned, and I speak in the absence of the Minister of Finance, he has stated that he has taken it up with the Deputy Minister who is not yet ready. We shall also be glad to have them, as they will be of aid to Ministers as well.

MR. CASHIN—I understand that, Mr. Speaker, but my point is this: That if I violate the rules I should be brought to order by the Speaker, and rightly so—if I, as I may possibly do, break the rules this afternoon.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—This is merely one of the rules of the House that is never intended to be insisted on.

HON. MR. SPEAKER—For the information of the House I may say that this will be drawn to the specific attention of the Minister asking that the request be complied with.

Address In Reply

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker, when the House adjourned I was speaking on the amendment which is now before the House. Since then the Daily News has seen fit to make some observations on this fact, incorrect observations, which I would like to deal with before proceeding. I am referring to their report of the debate of Tuesday last in which they stated that the "Junior Member for Ferryland continued." I would like to say that I am not the Junior Member for Ferryland; I am the senior member for Ferryland, at the request of the Prime Minister, which in all probability the Daily News knows—that is point No. 1.

I would like to say that I do not mind criticism from any paper, or from the public press if they criticise me rightly. I have been reported to have said in this House what I never said—that 1100 fishermen from here had gone to Lunenburg this year; I said 300 had gone—I trust the Daily News will correct this to-morrow. I should also like to point out that in answer to a question I find this concern got from $300 to $400 for printing labels for rum bottles; this Company is strictly a Prohibition concern, but they are willing to take money from the rum business. Let them talk as much as they like as long as they do not mislead the people. So much for this rag this afternoon. I do not intend while I have a seat in this House, be it for a long or short period, to allow myself to be misrepresented. I will deal straight with it, and give publicity to it. We all know why this paper supports the Government.

Referring to the Tariff, Mr. Speaker, which is properly the subject of this amendment, I should like to say that perhaps I may be able to induce the Government to reduce duties, under the burden of which our fishermen cannot make a living. I should also like to point out that in an answer given me by the Minister of Finance and Customs the returns last year were $45,000 less than the previous year under the old tariff from January to June, 1925—this is, I suppose, the prosperity Mr. Puddester would have us believe we have. Is

this because the tariff is too high or too low? Is it because the people can't afford to import because of the high tariff? Is it true that the revenue for the Calendar year 1925 was one and a quarter million less than the expenditure? Can it not be blamed on the new tariff that the returns are $45,000 less than under the old? We can only conclude that if there were a reduction the people who are affected would buy, and that more money would go into the coffers of the country. With reference also to expenditure I just received an answer from the Minister of Justice regarding lawyers' fees paid by the Government for the past two years which I would like to read:

(Reads)

Totalling in all, Mr. Speaker, practically $70,000 was spent in these fees—the old saying is correct. I submit in all seriousness that payment of such a sum is not right. We have a Department of Justice with a Deputy Minister getting $3500 or $4000, and we have a Minister of Justice. Some of these sums were paid for drafting bills, which ought to be done by the Solicitor of this House. $6000 was paid for this purpose to an outside solicitor—is this tending towards retrenchment? I say we are paying a Minister of Justice, a Deputy-Minister and a Law Clerk for doing the work of this House.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—You know as well as I do that I could be getting ten times $4000 right now.

MR. CASHIN—Go to it and get it, but I question if you ever made $40,000 in one year.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—The Hon. Member has no right to make personal references to me in that way.

MR. SPEAKER—Order, gentlemen. The Member for Ferryland will address himself to the Chair. The Hon. Minister of Justice can correct his remarks after he has sat down.

MR. CASHIN—My point is that others do the work which the Law Clerk of this House is paid $800 per year to do—the drafting of bills and various other legal work.

The Liquor Bill cost $1,000 and the Highway Bill $250, and it is the duty of this Government to see that the man who does this is the Law Clerk of this House, and it should not be given out to some other lawyer. I don't question the Minister of Justice's right to make money. He is quite welcome to it. What I do object to is, that $70,000 of the money of this country was spent on lawyer's fees. The work could have been done for $20,000, if that wise economy that was promised had been practised, but it was not done. This afternoon I propose to suggest that it is the duty of every member of this House no matter on what side he sits, whenever any Legislation comes before it for the betterment of the country, to vote for it. I lay down the proposition in concrete form. I say that when they went to the country in 1924 retrenchment was promised. Now we find expenditure has increased and taxation has increased. We find no bounty on fish as was promised in some form. This is an amendment before the chair, and I say that it is the duty of every member, and in particular of every representative of a fishing constituency to vote for it. I will go over the districts one by one. Let us take first the District of Ferryland, which I represent. Ferryland is a fishing district. If I gave my vote against this Amendment I would be violating the confidence which those people placed in me three years ago. I would feel that if I dared show my face in that District for election once again they would be justified in driving me away, and not permitting me even to speak to them. We come next to the District

of Placentia and St. Mary's, represented by the Hon. M. S. Sullivan, W. J. Walsh and E. F. Sinnott. This too is a fishing district. Does not Mr. Walsh think it his duty to stand by his people in this matter to vote for this Amendment in their interests? Does not Mr. Sinnott think so? Does not Mr. Sullivan think the same? Yes, they do think so in their heart of hearts, but, actions speak louder than words. What will the fishermen of Salmonier say about it? What will the fishermen of Fox Harbor say? We come now to the District of Burin, represented by Messrs. Long and Lake. Mr. Long is not a native of this District, but, Mr. Lake does belong there, the son of a fisherman. I take the liberty to say that if his father were here he would vote for it, and that it is the duty of Mr. Lake to vote for that amendment of such importance to his fishing constituency. The other day he supported earnestly a petition for the building of a bait depot, and I say that he should just as earnestly support this amendment. It is their duty to these fishermen who expect it of them. Whether they carry it out or not it is not my business. Next we come to the District of Fortune, represented by Mr. Warren, an Independent Member. He, no doubt, will show the people of Fortune Bay that he still has their interests at heart; that he will not give them any cause to regret that two years ago they elected him by the largest majority on record. Next comes the District of Burgeo and La Poile, another fishing District represented by Mr. Chambers, a fisherman planter, who has himself been through the mill. He can be, if he wishes, independent of Government or Opposition, and vote as is his duty for this amendment. I feel that Mr. Chambers knows in his heart and soul that if he votes against that amendment he is voting against his conscience. It may be pointed out to me that I am trying to talk politics. I have no politics at present, and have no faith in party Government as it exists at present. Next comes the District of Bay St. George, represented by Mr. Power. This is an industrial district. The Humber is a hive of industry. There has been inaugurated there the greatest industrial development since Newfoundland was discovered. It has cost some $40,000,000, ten million of which the Newfoundland Government are on a demand note for. Three thousand Newfoundlanders approximately are employed there, ten per cent. more or less. Under existing conditions in Newfoundland do you think these are getting a good show for a living? The cost of living being high as it is, they are not. I have spoken with men working there when I was out there, and I claim that they find that under existing conditions, it is practically impossible to make two ends meet. Some men it must be agreed are getting pretty good salaries, but at the minimum wage of twenty-five and thirty cents per hour, it is pretty hard. The herring industry in Bay of Islands is of great importance. During the past twelve months the herring industry of this country is worth $350,000 according to the customs' record. If these figures are as accurate with regard to herring as those we got for fish it must be about $200,000, but we will put it down for $350,000. Bay of Islands is the future centre of prosperity in this country, and it is the duty of its representative to see that taxes of an exorbitant nature be repealed. If the income tax were put on again a half a million dollars a year could be collected from those perfectly well able to pay it; those who are rich should pay their proportion. Next we come to the District of St. Barbe. I have no doubt, Mr. Scammell will follow the lead of the leader of the Opposition and support

the Amendment in the interests of his Districts. Next comes Twillingate. This is a fishing and industrial district, as it now includes Grand Falls. The representatives of this District know that they would be lacking in their duty to these people who sent them here, if they failed, or even hinted that they would refuse to vote for this Amendment. Next comes Bonavista District. This is represented by the Prime Minister. It is one of our greatest fishing districts; the greatest Labrador fishing district. The Prime Minister has his own ideas on the Income and Business Profits Taxes, but he must remember that he represents the masses of the people, and it is his duty to see that the people whom he represents are not tortured. Last year they got $5.25 per quintal for Labrador fish. There were four hundred thousand quintals caught and the total value was not equivalent to that of three hundred and twenty-five thousand quintals caught the previous year.

I regret the absence of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I trust he will secure a good load of seals, but I claim that his place at present is in this House. He is being paid by this country to run the office of Marine and Fisheries, and in his different capacities as Head of that Office and as Member of this House he should be here to-day. There are other captains who could take his place at the sealfishery. However, he has his own ideas on the subject, and possibly he thinks he is just as much entitled to carry on his business as any other Member of the Executive.

Next comes Trinity Bay represented by three members on this side of the House, whom I have no doubt will render a good account of themselves when the time comes to vote. Bay de Verde, represented by Messrs. Cramm and Puddester comes next. A fishing district pure and simple, with perhaps a hundred men or so on Bell Island. These men are from the masses of the people. These men are taxed, over-taxed and they look to their representatives to have this amendment passed. The district represented by Mr. Hickman, the Colonial Secretary, Mr. Bennett, and the Minister of Public Works, Mr. Russell—Hr. Grace—comes next. Here amongst other things the work on the roads and the Labrador fishery are sources of employment to the people. Thirty thousand or forty thousand dollars was paid out by this Government on poor relief or pauper relief of some kind to that district during the past eighteen months. Two years ago these representatives, as candidates, made certain promises, and if they do not now vote for this amendment in the face of these facts how can they again reasonably solicit the confidence of their constituency. We come to Port de Grave and its representative, Mr. Bradley,—a fishing district again. The people there have for their industries, the fishery or mining on Bell Island or work on the motor roads. These people too have been taxed, and it is the duty of the member who represents them that the promises made them are not going to be violated. The duty rests upon him to see that the trust imposed upon him two years ago is upheld. The district representd by Mr. Woodford and Mr. Cahill—Harbor Main—is not so much dependent on the fishery as other districts, and the fishery is not so much prosecuted there as elsewhere, but, I say in justice to it, that from it came some of the greatest fish killers in Newfoundland. From there came Captain Lewis, one of our greatest fishermen who once held a seat in this House, and since has left his bones in Italy. 'Twere well for Harbor Main and for our country did such a man sit in this House to-day. Is it not the duty of

those who do, to act as their illustrious predecessors have done and would do were they here again? Is it not their duty to vote for this amendment? The district next that must be referred to is St. John's East, represented by yourself, sir, the Speaker of this Assembly, and by the Minister of Justice. In this District the great mass of the people are common working people — people who have to work day and night. In Torbay and Outer Cove we find poor fishermen, some of the finest in Newfoundland. What is going to be said to you by these people whom you represent if after what has been promised they find themselves taxed 14 or 15 p.c. more than under the preceding Government — taxes, which it was promised should be reduced. With regard to Bell Island and the Besco contract, which is to come before the House for discussion, I shall defer my remarks which will be even stronger on the subject than at present. I have a vague idea, though not definite, of that contract. Again what is St. John's West going to say to this in two or three years from now, after their support was solicited promising a reduction in taxation. What do you expect the Petty Harbor fishermen, who were promised a bonus on fish to say to you if you still insist that this extra taxation continues? The Labor element is looking to Mr. Linegar, what is he going to do. Everyone of the representatives of this district is expected and is in duty bound, to carry out the agreement made with it two years ago. We came in here last year and enforced an extra duty on lines and twines, tobacco and clothing. Absolute necessities of life to common people, all of them. At the same time the Income Tax and Business Profits Tax were taken off the wealthy people. I put it to you, is it the action of a Government formed for the poor? It is rather the action of a Government formed for the Plutocrat. Therefore, I say to the members who sit opposite, in your power it rests to relieve the common people of Newfoundland of a burden of taxation that has become so appalling that they are tottering beneath it. I say that under present conditions in Newfoundland, fishermen and laboring classes find it most difficult to exist. I say that right here in St. John's there are children crying for bread, and not so much because of unemployment, but because wages are still small, much the same as last year, and costs of provision are gone up 14 p.c., but wages don't go up 14 p.c. In St. John's West there are children practically naked and this administration came in and shoved on 22 p.c. on clothing. Is that an action of a Government with the interests of the people at heart? I have gone over the tariff and I now propose to have a few words to say on another part of the amendment. I speak of the bye-election, or the bye-election that was to be, in St. John's East.

On that clause I intend to take up the time of the House ten or fifteen minutes, and then I shall leave the matter in the hands of the Honourable Members of the Legislature. We have heard so much concerning the election in St. John's East that I think it will be necessary now that we come to consider it, to throw the minds of the Legislature back two years, and now with the assistance of my notes, let us do so. You will all remember the Spring of 1923, three years ago. It was then I first came into public life. We came into this Chamber under the administration of Sir Richard Squires. On my first entry into public life in Newfoundland, we came into this Chamber, Sir Richard Squires was Prime Minister at the time, and we put through the Humber deal. After that deal was put through, developments

occurred in this House which occasioned the resignation of the then Prime Minister, and the Minister of Agriculture and Mines. After these resignations took place, Mr. Warren, who was at that time the Minister of Justice, was called upon to form a Government. He stated, from his seat in this Chamber, that he intended to try and form a Government mainly from the ranks of the representatives of the people of Newfoundland in this Legislature,—a very wise thing. Consequently negotiations took place between the members of the Government and the then Opposition. The present Minister of Justice was at that time the Leader of the Opposition Party in this House. A round table conference was held for days and nights. The principals in the round table conference were the Minister of Justice, Mr. Warren and two other gentlemen, not now here. These conferences were held all hours of the day and night, and finally, no arrangements could be come to whereby a coalition could be formed from both sides of the House, mainly on account of some individuals who did not think they were good enough, and others who thought that they were. They did not agree on it. The result was that negotiations were called off. Mr. Warren came in here a few days afterwards and formed a Government from the old Government. He put through the principal legislation of the year, and then the House closed.

Mr. Hollis Walker came out in the interim, and conducted an investigation into the doings of the previous administration, and of some of the Ministers. It is not necessary to deal in detail with what he did. But, following that, in the Spring when the House met on opening day, I think it was, I remember it distinctly: Mr. Warren occupied the Prime Minister's Chair, Mr. Cramm, at that time Member for Bay de Verde, and now an executive member of the present administration, rose in his seat and moved a vote of want of confidence. This motion was seconded by Mr. Calpin, I think, who was then the representative for Harbor Grace. What happens then? The Hon. Mr. Warren went to the Governor and asked for a dissolution, which was granted. He was eventually told to form a temporary administration to carry on the affairs of the country until the General Election was over. A lot of dickering started now. Mr. Warren started to form up a Government. He found it was most difficult. Himself and Mr. Higgins, Sir William Coaker and the present Prime Minister, and other members not now in the House, started negotiations. I remember distinctly all that happened. Some of the present administration were very anxious to link up with what was then known as the "Coaker element." There were others who were not in favor of that, and they did not link up. Mr. Warren formed a Government consisting of, in the Executive, himself, Mr. Monroe, Mr. Bennett was included although he was out of the country at the time, Mr. Higgins, Colonial Secretary, Mr. Hawco and Mr. Sullivan; Mr. Ayre, Hon. Dr. Robinson and Dr. Roberts were the other three.

That Government stayed together for three or four days, and finally one of them saw fit to jump, and Mr. Warren then went to the Governor and resigned. In the meantime, Sir, Mr. Hickman had been appointed Leader of the thrown overboard Coaker faction, and he started to work things up. The Governor called on Mr. Hickman to form an administration, which he did. No one knew where they were who had been in the previous administration, which had dissolved. Everyone was trying to get in out of the weather. There are lots of them in the present Administration. Finally, a set of reso-

lutions were drafted; the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs is smiling now. He was present in the office in the Gear Building. These resolutions found their way into the hands of a private citizen of St. John's. A public meeting occurred in the Casino Theatre. This private citizen moved that Mr. Monroe be called upon to lead a party against Mr. Hickman. He was seconded by, I think, Mr. Browne, the honourable member for St. John's West. He came on to the platform, gave a few words, and generally speaking, got a warm reception. After he had finished, I think the present Honourable Minister of Justice came on the platform. He pledged his support to Mr. Monroe, and also gave a few words in connection with the doings of the past Government. After that happened Mr. Monroe started to form up his party, to pick up his crew. He started to ship his crew to go trapping, votes at that time.

Now, Sir, the present Minister of Justice, who had at that time been intimately associated with me politically asked me—I regard myself as being drawn into it, and in order to make everything clear, it is just as well to tell all. He asked me if I would follow him, and I told him, at that time, that I was thinking of going out of political life altogether. But he brought other influences to bear, and at last I consented to stand, and I told Mr. Higgins that it was necessary for Mr. Monroe to ask himself as he was the Leader of the Government. He wrote me soon after that and I replied that I would stand for his party. A meeting of the party was called, such as it was at that time, to gather in Mr. Monroe's private residence. I remember the occasion distinctly. A considerable number, who are not now members of the Government were there. I was there. Mr. Monroe had his Manifesto with him, and I remember the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries telling Mr. Monroe, that if he wanted to be elected, that he had to promise the fishermen a bounty on fish, or something of that nature. Anyhow it was decided that that clause should be inserted in the Manifesto. But we got our clearance and set forth to fight the Hickman-Coaker regime of that day. Our Manifesto told that we went to the country pledged to give a bounty on fish, to reduce expenditure and reduce taxation. Naturally, our Government was returned by the electorate of Newfoundland, with an overwhelming majority. After the General Election was over, we met in the Legislature, I think it was around July of 1924. I remember it distinctly. We had a party meeting in this House. Nothing had been done in connection with the operation of the Railway, no commission had been appointed. I remember making a few remarks criticizing our party, which I presume, is often done, although I have not been a member of many parties, regarding their actions in operating the railway, I left the party meeting that night and the following morning I called at the Minister of Justice's office, and I told him that I wanted to go on the Railway Commission, as I had four or five years railway experience, and I considered that I was entitled to a seat on the Commission. I asked the Minister of Justice if he would support me for a seat on the Railway Commission in the Executive Council. He said neither "Yes" or "No." He replied, telling me that the three men he had intended to back were Sir John Crosbie, Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Bennett. I left his office, and I told him that I figured from what he had said that he was not going to support me. Next morning the Prime Minister phoned me and asked me to call and see him. When I entered his office he greeted me with "Mr. Cashin, I understand that you are dis-

gruntled." I told him that I was not exactly disgruntled, but I considered that in view of the fact that I had four or five years experience in connection with the railway, that I should have been on the Railway Commission. Mr. Monroe said: "But I remember, Sir, that in your remarks you distinctly stated that you did not want a job." I said, "I know that I did. But if I went on that Commission I intended to act without drawing a salary and the members who are to go on that Commission should not get one either." That night Mr. Monroe called up my house and told me that he had put me on the railway commission, and I thanked him over the telephone. The following morning you yourself, Mr. Speaker, came to my office and told me that the Minister of Justice had told you he had put me on the Railway Commission. I remember distinctly that I told him that the Minister of Justice had nothing to do with it, Mr. Monroe had done it. No doubt, Mr. Speaker, you remember that incident very well. Shortly afterwards a loan Bill was introduced into this House. I was sitting in my old place next to Mr. Moore. I had heard about the Loan Bill. It was to borrow $7,500,000. Sir John Crosbie had it on his desk. I asked Mr. Moore if he would inquire of Sir John as to whether he was going to introduce that Bill without a party meeting beforehand. Mr. Moore did so and Sir John Crosbie said "Yes, he was going to introduce it." He said that party meetings were never held about loan bills. I told Mr. Moore then that I was going to object to that Bill if it were introduced as I considered that it should be brought before the party first for discussion. He left his seat a few minutes afterwards and went outside into the Speaker's room. I followed him a short time afterwards. He told me that a gentleman, who is not a member of this House, but the leader of the Government in the Upper House, would like to see me in his room. When I entered the august chamber I was saluted by severe reprimands by the Leader of the Government in the Upper House, for my impertinence and audacity in questioning the right of the administration to bring in a Loan Bill without consulting the members of the party. Mr. Cramm was there at the time and I think that he will agree with me that I told that gentleman that I did not intend to support any loan bill of that nature which meant the paying out of millions on high roads and nothing to the fishermen of Newfoundland. He flew at me in a rage and I flew back at him and I told him that as far as I was concerned that I did not know that he was associated with our party at all. However, he evidently brought some pressure to bear because that Bill did not come up that evening for discussion and the following day we had a party meeting here in this House. The Loan Bill was then down to six million dollars from seven and a half. I objected at the party meeting to the two millions being expended on highroads and nothing for the fisheries. I was strong against it, as a matter of fact, although the Daily News said that I voted for it. Anyhow that Bill went through this Legislature just as the Liquor Bill went through. And here the story begins. This is where St. John's East comes into effect. A bye-election was held that Autumn in Bonavista Bay. Mr. Monroe, the Prime Minister and Capt. Winsor were opposed by two gentlemen who are not in the House today. Grave fears were entertained in this city as to the election of Mr. Monroe. The members of his party feared that he would not be elected, so much so that Mr. Higgins arranged with a gentleman to contest the election in St. John's East after Mr. Vinnicombe's appointment

as Liquor Commissioner. Then what happened? Mr. Monroe was returned, St. John's East was forgotten again. But the next thing, Sir, we have a party meeting in this House one evening and we are confronted with a new Re-Distribution Bill, and I may mention in passing that this Bill cost this country to frame $2,000. We are confronted with this Re-distribution Bill and here is the original. The present Bill is the same as the one on the Statute Book with the exception of the last clause. The last clause in the Bill as it then was, reads as follows:

(Reads)

We had a party meeting. I was not a lawyer and therefore I did not know what that section meant. I left that party meeting and I found out that that section would mean not only the tying up of St. John's East, but it legally meant that if such a thing were to happen as the passing of two or three members to the Great Beyond, that those districts would be unrepresented until the next General Election. The next morning I called upon the Prime Minister and I asked him what that meant. He explained it to me very timidly, and I told him right there and then that if the Bill came into the House with that clause in it, I would leave his party. He asked me to wait, which I did. I came to the House that afternoon. That Bill did not come up for discussion.

The following day, or if not the day after, the Prime Minister rang me up again and asked me to call and see him, which I did. He told me then that you had been to see him, Mr. Speaker, and that you were pronounced in your disapproval, and that he was taking that clause out. So the country has to thank you, sir, for taking that clause out of that Bill. Now what has happened since? I think, Mr. Speaker, in that connection that my remarks are to the point and are correct. There may be a mistake of a letter or two, but that clause was put into that Bill by the present Minister of Justice, in an attempt to bar up St. John's East and any other district which may be vacated. Why the very District which you have the honour to represent returned the Monroe Party, with a greater majority, than was ever polled before, so much so that not one of the candidates opposed to you saved their nomination fee. If the Government thought that they still had the confidence of the people, which was so well demonstrated two years ago, why did they not open up the district of St. John's East. Is not that the position, sir. Or otherwise if you had not done anything wrong to the public of this country, you would open up the District.

As I said before, it was arranged to open up the district. And why was it not opened up? What is the good of having this law on the Statute Book if it is going to be violated, and you are going to hide behind someone else's coat-tails. I shall read in this House, Mr. Speaker, a clause which has been inserted, no doubt, for this very contingency. A clause in connection with the Election Act in this country, which is that when a District is vacant for six months, or words to that effect, that the Governor or the Government shall forthwith issue a writ to fill such a vacancy. The present Government have taken the blame for violating this law. If there was a panic in this country and five or six members of this House happened to die owing to disease of some nature, according to the clause in that Bill the country could not be represented in this Legislature at all. That Bill was framed by a gentleman who does not occupy a seat in this House. He took two or three years to think it out, before the Monroe Administration was ever thought about. Here is the law.

You have heard a lot about law. Section 4, Chapter 4, of the Consolidated Statutes, third series, reads as follows: (Reads)

And I leave it to any commonsense person to interpret it any other way. What does that mean, Mr. Speaker? Does it mean this: That six months after a vacancy has arisen in any District, Ferryland or any other, that it is the duty of the Government to issue a writ to fill the vacancy created by any ordinary individual. That is the construction which I put on that law. That law has not been carried out. What is the good, Sir, of our coming in here and trying to make laws, if we are going to go out to-morrow and tear them to shreds? It would be just as well for the Government of this country to-day, to take the Statute Book, and consign it to the boiler room, as for what good it is or for what respect you have got for the laws contained in it. There is only one conclusion to come to, Sir, and that is that your Government is afraid. Have they attempted to do anything in that connection? Petitions have been represented, entreaties have been made. Now, Sir, I am not an anarchist, I come in here to make a statement. I am neither an anarchist nor am I going to wind up these few words by throwing a handful of bombs around the House, but I want to tell the people of this country that this Government has violated every trust that was placed in them two years ago. You defied the law in several respects and not in the Election Act alone. The Customs Act has been violently torn to shreds. The Daily News has advertised me as being totally and absolutely opposed to Prohibition. That Act has been much criticized. Some people can get clear and others have to go down to jail. And if that is a right law to have on the Statute Book I am not a Newfoundlander. When the time comes, sir, the people of this country will have, if this sort of thing continues, to put forth their terrible strength. And then, sir, this House of Assembly and everything connected with it will totter to ruin. Now there is no greater supporter of law and order in this Assembly than this individual right here. There is not a better Britisher in this House to-day. No better one than I am. But in the British House of Commons to-day what is the rule in connection with such acts as that. Are laws flagrantly violated over there? Why members over there have been known to resign on account of association with distant relatives of the Minister. But here we have no laws carried out properly now. I do not intend, Mr. Speaker, to prolong this debate further in connection with the Bye-Election, but merely point out again that the Government is afraid to open the District of St. John's East and give the people there their proper representation in this House. If the Government had not perpetrated foul outrages on the people of this country, they would be the first to open the District. I leave it to other Members in this Assembly as to whether or not the story I told is a falsehood. What I have told is the truth absolutely, and I am prepared to take my solemn oath that it was the truth, and I defy any Member of the Government to contradict it this evening.

Before taking my seat I would ask the Members of the Government to consider carefully before voting for or against this Amendment, remembering that they are not voting for themselves personally; but they are voting for the rights of the people who sent them here to represent them. I would also like to impress upon them that it is their bounden duty to stand by the people who stood by them, and when the vote is being cast that they be not unmindful of the fact that the day of reckoning is near at

hand and if they intend to continue committing further outrages on the people that the day will come when they will be repaid in full.

Mr. Hickman moved and Mr. Cashin seconded the Amendment to the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, which appears previously.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Speaker: In rising to support the Amendment I think the Leader of the Opposition deserves a great deal of credit and commendation for having brought it forward, particularly as it is in the interests and welfare of the working classes of people of the country. There is nothing in the Speech from the Throne that holds out any hope for the future of the country or for the fishermen and toilers in it, and, I feel that, as a member of this House and of His Majesty's Opposition, I cannot do anything else but support the Amendment wholeheartedly. Last year a great deal of news was broadcasted throughout this country concerning the big revenue that was being collected by the present Government and naturally the people were led to believe that at this session of the House taxation would be reduced, but as there was no mention of this in the Speech from the Throne the Leader of the Opposition decided to bring in this Amendment that we are now speaking to. One of the chief planks in the Prime Minister's platform in 1924 was reduction of taxation and a bonus on fish; also he was going to make this country a Paradise for Newfoundlanders to live in. No doubt, we have a Paradise alright—a fool's Paradise. Why, Mr. Speaker, one-third of the population of this country are being fed on pauper relief. The Prime Minister had a lot to say about the doings and misdoings of the Liberal administration and he was going to set to work and rectify what he termed misdeeds. I think he has done that and overdone it. The Prime Minister was also going to give some consideration to the labour question in this country, so he promised in his Manifesto. Now I would like to ask him what he and the members of his Government did in the Summer of 1924 when I introduced the Logging Bill in this House and which tended for the abolition of the sub-contract system—a system of slavery. That Bill was brought in here by me in good faith and it was to relieve the hewer of wood from the yoke of slavery. These men had to go in the lumber woods and toil and slave from morning until night and in many cases they came out of the woods in debt and had to get free passes over the railway home, while their families were half starved at their homes. When I introduced this Bill the members of the Government said that if this Bill was going to become law that it would almost put the Logging Companies out of business. I stood my ground then because I knew that it would not put these Companies out of business, as I shall prove presently. I wish Hon. Mr. Sullivan was in this House now so that we could know for certain, if the figures I am about to quote, are correct or not. I am informed on reliable authority that the A. N. D. Company, which cuts logs and runs a pulp mill in this country, made $1,400,000.00 on last year's operations, and, after paying interest and dividends to bond-holders and shareholders, they were able to put $960,000.00 to profit and loss account. Of course, I am subject to correction, but if that is the case it is certainly not good enough, and then to see the toilers of this country and their families almost starved to death. I wonder do the members of the Government who voted against the Logging Bill last year call this a square deal. It appears that the only kind of legislation the present Government desires to see in this

House is class legislation. They simply allow the wealthy and the monied interests to go ahead and make all the money they can; while the poor man must lie down and die. In course of time this country will be stripped of its timber resources and the men who did the slavery and are still doing it will be dead and there will be millionaires in England as a result of the hard toil of the poor loggers. Where is the Prime Minister now and his Manifesto and all the promises that he made to the electors two years ago?

I wonder does the Prime Minister know if the Newfoundlanders got all the good jobs on the Humber? I would like to point out to him that there are several jobs on the Humber to-day that Newfoundlanders are capable of filling and which are filled by foreigners. I believe that, if the Prime Minister took a trip through the different departments on the Humber, he would find that he has not lived up to any of the promises that he made in his Manifesto, and I am afraid he would also become conversant with a lot of raw deals that were meted out to Newfoundlanders. While on this point I would like to ask Mr. Lake, member for Burin, and who is Government Director at the Humber, if the workingmen in that territory are paid fortnightly or monthly.

MR. LAKE—I shall answer that question to-morrow.

MR. BROWN—I am informed that the men are paid monthly. If that is so, it is a crying disgrace. I never heard of an industry of that size paying their wage bill for labour monthly. I don't believe that such a thing exists in any other part of the British Empire. I first thought that the men were paid weekly on the Humber or fortnightly at the furthest. Why some of these laborers who go there to work don't have enough money to take them to Corner Brook station, and then have to wait between four and five weeks before they get any money to send to their families. I contend this is a disgrace of the first water and I have been asked by a number of workmen on the Humber to have the matter ventilated here with a view to have things remedied, at least to have a fortnightly pay for the men.

Now I would like to refer to a remark made here by the Prime Minister on the opening day in speaking about tourist roads. He said that two roads built by the Liberal Administration started nowhere and ended nowhere. I would ask him now to state where these two roads are? When he answers me I will proceed to deal with them.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—According to the Speaker's ruling, I shall answer your question when you have finished, but not before.

MR. BROWN—I presume the Prime Minister referred to the Badger and Deer Lake roads. Well I am not familiar with the Deer Lake road, but with regard to the Badger road, the Prime Minister knew very little of what he was talking about when he referred to it the way he did. I drove over that road. It starts in one end of Twillingate district and ends in another. It is a blessing and a benefit to the people in the north side of Twillingate district. Hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of freight is hauled over that road, particularly during the winter season. That road has justified its existence and the people appreciate it more than almost any other thing that was ever done for them in that district. You are spending millions of dollars on tourist roads in Conception Bay and Placentia Bay, and I do not know of a single man from my district who has got a day's work on them. The same applies to the Dry Dock. I have asked dozens of times to get Twillingate men jobs on the Dry

Dock and Highroads, but without success. Now the people North contribute just as much to the general revenue of this country as the people in the South do, and I do not see why the northern people should be discriminated against when public works are going on. Take the business of the northern people and the business of the West Coast out of St. John's to-morrow and where will St. John's get off, I wonder? Still, despite the fact that all this work was given on roads in and around Conception Bay and Placentia Bay, we find that there was more able-bodied relief given out in those districts than what was given to the northern districts. So far as the Highroads scheme is concerned, it is just as well to give that by its proper name and call it a relief policy. We are living on borrowed money. The Monroe Government has not brought about any prosperity in the country and never will, even if they are here for six years more. Some days ago I asked for information as to the amount of able-bodied relief that was given out in the different districts as from the first day of July, 1924, to the thirty-first day of December, 1925. The answer that I got shows that Bay de Verde district where roads were being built got $3,821, as against Bonavista with a population of 24,000, got $7,000; Burgeo and La-Poile got $1963; Burin $3245; Carbonear $1300; Ferryland $220; Fogo $927; Fortune $845; Hr. Grace, with a population of 12,000, got $30,305. I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works, who represents Hr. Grace, if he thinks that good enough. I notice a man named W. H. Young of Upper Island Cove, in Hr. Grace District, who got $19,650. I wonder when are the people of Upper Island Cove thinking about going to work and let the Government support the northern people for a while. If conditions prevail this way much longer, the people of the north will come here some day and take this House of Assembly on their backs. The district of Twillingate, which has about twenty-seven thousand people paying into the revenue of the Colony, got $7,719 relief, whilst the Commissioner of Public Charities could not give relief, he said, to a dozen very needy people whom I made application for. Just imagine the Commissioner of Charities saying that he could not give relief to people in bad circumstances in Twillingate district; but in Hr. Grace district where public moneys were thrown out galore all the year round over $30,000 was given out in relief. I wonder if the Minister of Public Works feels ashamed on hearing these figures read out this evening! If I were in his seat I would run away and hide. Then again the district of Placentia and St. Mary's, where road building was also carried on last year got able-bodied relief to the extent of $23,881, but some people in Twillingate district could not get a bite to keep them from starving. I would like to ask the Prime Minister if that is what he would call a square deal to all, as he loudly professed he would give. The people of the northern districts are not supposed to get anything, but the people in the southern districts are to get all they want. There is also a statement here showing $23,676.51 was distributed for relief on the Labrador coast. I notice that Josiah Gosse is down for $11,205, E. Neal $9,700, Lewis Dawe $1315 and L. Butt $1400. I would like to know if that money was for the people of the southern districts who went to the Labrador to prosecute the fishery or for whom?

Now I come to the S. S. Caribou, which is referred to in the Speech from the Throne. I have not got much to say about her because I was never near enough to see her in the water even; but I am informed

that before that ship left the stocks on the other side of the water that she gave birth to a fawn in the shape of a twenty-four foot motor boat, and that this offspring is now the property of Capt. Stevenson and is comfortably quartered at Port aux Basques.

A few days ago I heard the member for Ferryland say that he could not get a message through to St. George's district in 24 hours. Well, I want to inform the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs that it takes longer than that to get a message through. A message was sent to me from St. John's on the 16th of February last notifying me about the opening of the House, and I have not yet received that message. On Feb. 25th I wired the Colonial Secretary asking him if the House was going to meet for the despatch of business on March 3rd and stating that I had not received any notification of when the House was going to meet. I got a reply stating that the Legislature was going to meet on March 3rd, that notification had been wired me and that telegraph offices were instructed to forward message to my address. However, I have not received that message yet in spite of the army of clerks that are engaged in the Posts and Telegraphs Department. On March 11th I asked a question in this House for a copy of the correspondence respecting the appointment of Mr. Lloyd Young, a mail courier, of Springdale, and I received an evasive reply from the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs. Now I have a copy of the correspondence and here it is.

(Reads correspondence)

This man Young is a returned soldier who spent four or five years overseas, and when the Monroe Government came into power he was superceded by a man named Spence, who was a pronounced supporter and heeler of the present Government. Well, I would ask, with all due respect, is Spence's vote more important and more deserving than Young's four or five years of war service. Here is a copy of Young's application to the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, and I shall read it for the information of the House.

(Reads application)

MR. BROWN—Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs if he knows about this.

HON. THE MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—Mr. Speaker, I will have an inquiry made about it. I seem to remember something about it. I will get all the satisfaction I can for the Hon. Member.

MR. BROWN—He said that he would go to a lawyer and demand the appointment or damages. It turned out that this returned soldier, Young, got the position for two months, and for the last two months Mr. Spence took it over again. That is not a very good return for the man who risked his life for his country and for the British Empire and then to be turned out of his job in this way and he and his family have to go hungry as it were.

We heard in 1924 a lot about the cutting down of the number of civil servants. The places were overmanned and underpaid. Great things were expected to happen. But what did happen? I heard the Minister of Posts say two or three days ago that there were not so many men in his department. Six less than in 1924, when he came into the Department. I would like to know if there has been an increase in the Telegraph Department.

HON. THE MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—There has been no increase in the Telegraph Department. There were some changes after we got Colonel Ross's Report.

MR. BROWN—A lot of people laughed at that report. I accept the Hon. Minister's answer. Now I want to go on for a minute or two on this

question of able bodied relief, and I want to say that there has been in the district that I have the honour to represent during the past winter, hunger, and people cannot get the necessary relief. If the relieving officer when he sees that he has to give the relief, does it, he gets a calling down for it. Why, sir, in the name of common sense, cannot a district like Twillingate get relief from hunger when they need it. I know cases and cases they have been turned down. In some cases they get a little. I am tired from writing for relief for the district of Twillingate. No district brings in more revenue than Twillingate, because previous to the Humber business it was the banner district of the Colony. There is as much from Grand Falls as from two or three of the smaller districts of the country. But they seldom ever get relief. And still you spend thirty thousand dollars in the district of Harbour Grace and twenty three thousand in the district of Placentia with not nearly as great a population. It is not good enough. It is about time that you got down to business and get busy. The Prime Minister says:—

(Reads from Manifesto)

They promised the people of the country that they would do something. Mr. Monroe made the promise but he did nothing. "The trappings of Government are too costly." I quite agree. Too cheap now I suppose.

(Reads)

Mr. Monroe said that if he had his way that he would never spend another five dollars on roads for I do not know how long. Instead of five dollars he is going to spend two million dollars.

(Reads)

Sir William Coaker will be back in this House again pretty soon, and he will do something for the fishermen of the country. There never will be another Monroe Administration.

Prohibition. I will not say very much about it. We have a law on the statute books of this country today called the rum law. What is it doing? It gives the bottle a day to everybody in and around St. John's who can get it, but if the man in the outport wants a bottle a day he cannot get it. It is discrimination of the worst kind. The man in St. John's can get his bottle of rum or whiskey, but the man in the outport does not get one in six months, and if he sends in the money to get two bottles at a time he cannot get it. There is a "Square Deal."

Mr. Speaker, I think that it is about time that the Government got down to business and do something. The Prime Minister gave out promises in his manifesto, and the people are still looking for the fulfilment of them. They are tired looking for a reduction in taxation or a bonus on fish or something contained in the manifesto written to deceive the people and put the Monroe administration into power. North, South, East and West we hear the cry:—"When are we going to get a chance."

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I demand a greater chance for the people of this country and far more consideration for the working classes than has been given them by the present administration.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention to intervene in this debate because I felt that I would be but reiterating what had already been said, with a certain amount of volubility from this side of the House. But now that there is this amendment on which of course we will have to vote, and it has been made clear to me that those who sent me here to this House expect me to take interest in the matter on one side or the other when a question comes before the House, I propose to say where I stand.

I had a few words to say on the

opening day with regard to the Speech from the Throne and I intimated then that my friend, Mr. Puddester, would have a bad time when the Speech came up later for discussion. But the passing of ten or fourteen days made me more conciliatory, and I do not intend to refer to it at all. But there are some points in the Speech from the Throne to which I propose to refer, and I propose to do this as shortly as I can in conjunction with that seriousness with which some points of it are involved. The Prime Minister has suggested that we should be limited to half hour speeches. When I sat in that chair I thought that speeches should be limited to a quarter of an hour. The Prime Minister told us on opening day that he had undergone a change of idea in many respects. It is the custom for members on this side of the House to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the motion for the address in reply. But if there is anyone who should be congratulated it is the Prime Minister on the speech that he made that day. I do not say that from a party standpoint, but I say that for a gentleman who is not, I was going to say a professional politician, (he is getting very near it now), but for a gentleman who can get up and without any chance of preparation defend the policy of his party, I want to say that the Prime Minister made a notable effort on opening day, and I think that his party should be delighted because of the fact that he did get up and do as well as he did. I am going to criticise and I am going to take every opportunity of criticising him, but I do think that if there is any man deserving of congraulations it is the Prime Minister. He told us that he had a change of heart. He did not express it in that particular way, but he did intimate that some of the impressions that he had formed before he entered political life, some of these impressions had been changed since he got in the Prime Minister's chair. He said that is only when one gets in the Prime Minister's chair that he knows how difficult it is to carry out promises, and that some of the promises will never be carried out. He made a very frank and open confession. And he is not the only one that has had a change of heart. And I am reminded of the change of heart of many in this very chamber. There are gentlemen sitting over there on the Government side who very far from speaking for only thirty minutes or a quarter of an hour, would speak for three days at a time. The Hon. the Prime Minister must forget that around him are these very members—the hangers down. For five years I sat on that side of the House listening not to thirty minute speeches! They went on for thirty days! What a change of heart since then. When I was Minister or Justice, and sat over there the Leader of the Opposition invited those beyond the bar to come on in and wipe out the place. I have heard the place almost torn down with applause from no less than the voice of the Speaker himself. But now he has got into the chair and I stick by him. I have seen the galleries raging. Some fellows wanted to come over the barriers here. There has been a great change of heart around this place and today it is like a wake. An absolute wake. But now if a man says "here here" or moves his feet when he should not the sergeant-at-arms' sword is out six inches immediately, but in the good old days a man could be applauded and a man could be encouraged to make a speech, but to-day, Sir, I really feel that this change of heart that has come to the Prime Minister is seriously affecting the political life of the country. They are like lambs here now. Lions are better. What has done it? There was one occasion that might not be called

parliamentary, but they gave expression with their hands and they gave expression with their feet, and with their voices, they gave expression to their feelings. It is, I quite agree, better for parliamentary life and practice, but I feel sure that there are some strangers within hearing of my voice who can look back with regret on the days of the "Hangers Down" and say that they have not their equals under the conditions of the present time. So much, Sir, as a preliminary canter for the Speech from the Throne. If it has been productive of nothing else it has been productive of upholding the dignity of the chair, and while I was joking before I agree that it is in keeping with the dignity of parliament.

I said on the opening day that this Speech would be famous for its verbosity. It is very lengthy. I happened to look up the Speech from the Throne of last year. It was eaqually lengthy. I do not mean to go into it detail by detail, but there are some aspects to which I must refer. The Speech from the Throne is the same as has been made by every Prime Minister that proceeded him. Luckily I never issued a manifesto to this country. I happened to be pitchforked into the job of Prime Minister, with a party that I had never created, and I had the honor of leading that party until such time as this House took occasion to defeat me. But there is an old saying: "Oh, if my friend would write a book." The man who writes a manifesto to this country is a fool. I do not know why it is done. I do not believe that one half of the country ever reads it. But it is a useful thing. If there were no manifestos issued what would the men on this side do? They must have something to talk about. There are some misguided people in this country who believed that a man is going to carry out his promises. There are a few of them who do look back at these manifestos and ask themselves if they did right or wrong in voting for that particular gentleman. Now I had nothing to do with the manifesto written by Mr. Monroe. I did not even read it. When I heard it read the other day by Mr. Ashbourne I asked him what it was and I discovered that it was Mr. Monroe's manifesto. He need not have taken the trouble. He did not need to write it. He need not have made any promise at all. All he had to do and all he got authority to do was to carry on as Warren carried on for the nine months I was there. He need not have written the manifesto at all. All he had to do was to do as we had done. We had to purge our party of certain elements that were not a credit to it. That is what we had done, and all that was expected of him was to carry on in the same way, and he was supposed to do nothing but to reduce the taxation. The Government that preceeded him for the nine months wrote his manifesto for him and what has he done? What has the Government done? "Clean up," "Clean up and Keep Clean and a Square Deal to All." I heard it mentioned not only here. But the other day I was down in the Court House listening to a trial and someone mentioned the words "Clean up" and to my amazement everybody around broke into ripples of laughter. If I had been the Prime Minister I would not have come out with any policy. But if there was ever a party elected to this House from which there was nothing expected, it is the party on the other side of the House. If there was anybody in this country who never expected anything and would be satisfied with nothing, they can get what they want in the present government. There was no necessity to branch out into any tourist policy or anything of that sort.

All the Government had to do was to "Clean up." To-day that "Clean up" is a joke. Now then, Sir, this is what brings me to my feet. I said when I started that I had really no intention to intervene in this debate at all because everything had been said already, but the amendment forces me in justice to the people who were good enough to put me here with the large majority I got, to take some action. After all we have to look at the fisheries of the Colony and them only. There are two hundred and fifty thousand people in this country, and one fifth of them, leaving out the women and the children, that is fifty thousand men that you have to provide a living for. Now let us see what you are doing about providing a living for this fifty thousand. You have, thanks to the so-called "Hopeless" Squires Government three thousand men working at Corner Brook. Two thousand at Grand Falls. Fifteen hundred on Bell Island. That is fifty five hundred. Then there are those who are wholly interested in agriculture. I speak subject to correction by the Minister of Agriculture, making it about 10,500 people in this country living by these industries; in addition to this there are a number of people living by other means of this sort, so we can allow from 15 to 20 thousand for these. If we do not depend on the fishery what are the other people of this country to do? Our country is unique in this respect, regarding these industries. Take the Humber, with its three thousand people employed there; they don't do much but cut down the trees and take them out, making paper, which is sent away. The fisheries employ many in a subsidiary way—take the women who make the fish, the men who make the boats and nets—I don't need to recapitulate all those who earn from this industry. But we can only provide for 15,000 to 20,000 in other industries. Further, I submit that while the Customs' returns show the pulp and paper industry brings in more money and more wealth, the fishery is worth 10 times as much as that industry.

As I said, the present Government was put in power to do nothing, but the people are now aghast at an expenditure in which they had no part—the people are aghast, I say. By some fertile brain the Government have evolved a policy which they did not then have; and in the same breath the Prime Minister says he is going to do nothing for the fisheries unless the Board of Trade or some body moves. I say this is a great mistake.

I do not wish to appear to refer to the Prime Minister personally—he is a good sportsman and a good friend of mine—my references are to his party—the Government suddenly drops the fishery and embarks on their policy of highroads. I read something regarding the fiords of Fortune Bay, Mr. Speaker, and their beauty, and I myself have in this House referred to the beauties of Fortune Bay. I understand the roads were to be built were mostly likely to aid the tourist traffic, and I understand a gentleman has been imported from outside, a Mr. Cochius, (and I take off my hat to him and his work). I understood the roads were to be built as cheaply as possible, and that no politics were to enter into their making. I do not know whether politics have entered or not, but I do know that the fiords of Fortune Bay have not been benefited. I asked for a sum in this House to link up some of the best salmon rivers and pools in that district, but there was nothing doing. All this talk was to get a vote through this House for the people of other districts. I asked for a mere $300 to make salmon rivers in a part of my district accessible, but no! But I understand there is a

motor road being built from Gambo to Wesleyville. Where the tourists are to come from for a motor road there I don't know; I don't know a great deal about the place, but I do know that Bonavista got $30,000 for a motor road, instead of a branch railway.

Now I said the Government whom the people expected to do nothing suddenly launched out on a Tourist Policy, and the Prime Minister says he won't do anything for the fisheries unless the Board of Trade does something. If any men find fault with Fishery Regulations, it is not the members on this side of the House—I say this for all members on this side of the House, and for all parties. I tell you that Water Street would like to see Fishery Regulations, provided they didn't regulate price. Haven't the Trade made suggestions to the Government which happens to be in power to do something? I was in the Squires Government with Sir William Coaker which put through the Regulations—we may possibly have done better, but we did something. The country is ripe for fishery regulations without regulating price—all want standardization; all want cooperation. I say it is the duty of the Government to give the lead. And hasn't the Government been asked to do so? Of course they have.

I do not suppose any Government was more unpopular than we were when we passed the Fishery Regulations—there was a regular furore. I was Minister of Justice at the time, and took a great deal of interest in the regulations. I attended three meetings of the Board of Trade and I propose to read to the House a resume of what took place. The meetings were the largest in the existence of that Board; speeches were made by men who knew what they were talking about. Later owing to political difficulties they were cancelled, but they contained a germ which has grown and will find expression.

In 1920, after the passing of the famous or infamous fish regulations, the Board of Trade held a meeting. It was held on the 5th of February. It was largely attended. It was adjourned again until the 8th of February. So that every opportunity might be given for the discussion of these famous or infamous fishery regulations. As a result the Board passed the following resolution:—

(Reads)

Is not that an invitation for the Prime Minister if he wants an advance from the trade, when they say that fishery regulations are essential. But those that happened to be in force were made hurriedly at the time. They were made without the proper thought and consideration. But I say that that is an invitation for the Prime Minister and for the Government to do something towards fishery regulations of some sort, either for standardization or cure for marketing.

Now I will be asked, why it was that considering that these resolutions were passed by the Board of Trade and forwarded to the Government that the Government of that day did nothing? The answer is simply that we were so blamed for having thought of the idea of fish regulations, they decided to leave it to somebody else. And we left it and here you are. We decided to withdraw the whole thing. At first we were told that they were illegal. Then we enforced them under the War Measures Act. Eventually we had to succumb to, I will not call it public opinion, although at the time public opinion was rather against fishery regulations of that sort at the time. But what I say now is that the Government has the chance of doing something, and that they will be sup-

ported on this side of the House if they endeavour to do something that will encourage the fishery of the country, because you have these thirty thousand men to look after. The tourist traffic will not keep them going. We have eventually to get down to the fishery as our mainstay. I have been told another thing, that I want to catch more fish. I do not want to catch more salt fish, because I will be asked immediately where are we going to sell it. We cannot sell it, and down goes the price, and it is not worth the catching. And again I come back and say that instead of devoting attention to the tourist who may or may not come here that the tourist we have here already ought to be encouraged more than he is. Mr. Codfish, Salmon, Halibut, Lobster &c. You do not have to build a hotel to get him here. Mr. Herring, you do not have to guarantee anything for him. Mr. Lobster—he has been locked up for three years. Mr. Smelt, Mr. Caplin, Mr. Salmon and Mr. Trout, the finest tourist that this country ever knew and without whom this would not be a country at all.

MR. BROWNE—What about Mrs. Salmon.

MR. WARREN—Mrs. or Mr. what are you going to do about it. You don't want a hotel for them. I agree with the hotel. But I do say that you have overlooked the very finest tourist, Mr. and Mrs. Salmon, for the tourist you don't know will come at all.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE:—They are fine on the table.

MR. WARREN—And we should see that they are on other people's tables. I believe in spending a half a million dollars in publicity like big stores like Wannamakers in New York and other people in the United States. I know that our Codfishery can profitably produce a certain amount of salt fish. Now there are various methods of treating food, and in this country we have been confining ourselves to the production of salted cod and sending it to the markets on which we have solely depended. They still hold on. But there are other products of the fish. We are catching and salting the fish just as we have been doing it for the last hundred and fifty years. At the same time other governments have been exploring the products of their countries with Government assistance in every possible way. Do you know that in Ontario to-day New Zealand butter is being sold for forty five cents a pound, while butter made in Ontario is sold for forty eight. How is it done? Not merely by private enterprize but by Government assistance, and I think that the Government should explore every avenue and find out what can be done or what can be made out of the tourists that we have around our shores. I asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if he expected to secure the advise of an expert about the propagation of the lobsters during the close season of three years, and the Minister said that he did intend to take the advice of an expert.

I do not know whether you have or whether the lobsters are thanking their stars that they are not being caught in the lobster pots and are propagating themselves or whether there are any steps being taken during the close season to replenish the lobsters around our coast. I asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries—incidently I disagree with all on this side of the House—I think that he ought to be at the sealfishery and bring in all that he can get. The short time that he will be out there will not amount to a row of shucks as far as the House is concerned. I asked the Minister if he intended to get expert advice and his answer was that he did not have much use for expert opinion. Of course he is not a lawyer.

He said that the only thing that happened after we got the expert advice in this country was that we had to pay for it and then nothing came out of it afterwards. He is quite right. We do get some expert advice around this country some times. We have a few experts coming here and we do get expert advice and they tell us what they have learned in other countries. Mr. J. Allan Taylor was invited to come here and he held forth to the Board of Trade on the possibilities of our fishery other than the codfishery, and Capt. Winsor was quite right. All that they did was they paid him and what he said had fallen on deaf ears. To-day I was looking over the Everybody's Magazine for March and there was an interesting article on the Codfishery of Gloucester. And there I find that in Gloucester, much the same is in Chicago, where the pig goes in and all that is left is the squeak. It is very profitable to the men of Gloucester because they utilise every part of the fish. I do not have to go very far to illustrate what I mean in this connection. We do not catch the codfish and sell it in Newfoundland for the fish itself. One of the by-products is the cod-liver. That means a lot of money to us and private enterprize has found out that cod-liver oil has its uses and they make good money. But if cod-liver oil and cod-oil can make good money there are other parts of the fish that can be utilized to advantage as well. Listen to what Mr. Allan Taylor has to say about some of the by-products of the fishery in Newfoundland. And I want to mention right here that whatever he said is printed in the pamphlet, distributed amongst some of the members of the Board of Trade there, who paid no attention whatever to it and finally it found its way into the hands of a lawyer like myself, who knows nothing about fishing, and I purpose to read it to the House. Mr. Taylor is a member of the Council of Association of British Fisheries. He is a past president of the Fleet Wood Fishing Association, a fellow of the Rural Statistical Society, and a fellow of the Rural Economic Society. Personally I do not know whether these recommendations commend him to the House or not. Now then it is quite evident that he had a good deal to do with the fishing business.

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

Hon. the Colonial Secretary tabled Report of Highroads Commission.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

Mr. Ashbourne gave notice of question.

Mr. Scammell gave notice of question.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, March 19th, 1926.

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

Petitions were presented by:

Mr. Ashbourne from Bridgeport re telephone.

Mr. Warren from Garnish re well.

Mr. Ashbourne gave notice of question.

Mr. Cashin gave notice of question.

Mr. Warren gave notice of question.

Mr. Randell gave notice of question.

HIS HONOR THE SPEAKER—I have to call the attention of the Honourable Minister of Finance to Section 239 of the Rules of the House, requesting that the public accounts, as asked for by an honourable member be laid on the table of the House.

THE HONOURABLE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Speaker, I might say that these accounts will be ready to be tabled on Monday afternoon

next. Although the accounts were closed on December 31st last, there is yet one department in which the accounts are not yet available.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker, I was the individual member of the House who asked that the public accounts be tabled, and I wish to draw your attention to Rule 239 and to point out to you that as you have been strict and impartial in carrying out the Rules of the House this session, that you will apply the same strictness and impartiality in having tabled the document that should be tabled long ago. Sixteen days have elapsed since this House opened, and those public accounts, which should have been tabled ten days after the Legislature was called together, are six days overdue. In the light of that, and in view of the fact that you have been carrying out the Rules of the House to the extent of having all I's dotted and all T's crossed, I move that this House should adjourn until Monday next or until such time thereafter as the public accounts are tabled in order to be consistent with the manner in which you, Sir, are asking for the enforcement of, and carrying out, the Rules of the House.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker, an explanation has been given by the Honourable Minister of Finance that the public accounts will not be ready for the consideration of the House before Monday next, and I suppose we should accept his reason; nevertheless, the fact remains there is a rule laid down, and in justice to you, sir, and to the House that rule should be carried out, and the House should adjourn until such time as the public accounts are tabled. I, therefore, beg to second the motion made by the honourable member for Ferryland.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I may say that the members on this side of the House are going to vote against that motion. I think the Finance Minister has given a very good explanation, and as the Minister of Justice pointed out here yesterday, it was never anticipated that either one of the rules of the House are as inflexible as the laws of Medes and Persians. Just as soon as possible the public accounts will be brought down, and I don't think that there will be any particular loss to the House in not having them tabled to-day, although I am sorry that they are not available to-day. However, as the Minister of Finance has definitely stated that they will not be here until Monday, I do not see any advantage in adjourning the House to-day in order to wait for the accounts. Besides the Member for Fortune Bay has not yet finished his speech on the Address in Reply, and I do not see anything in the Speech from the Throne or the amendment thereto concerning the public accounts. I have only to say again that this side of the House will vote against the motion for an adjournment.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker, it is evident that the Government have taken it into their heads to not alone break the Rules of the House, but, according to what the Prime Minister has said, would just as well have the Rules burned. If it is not the intention to have Rule No. 239 carried out, I give notice that I will on to-morrow move that that Rule be expunged from the Rules of the House.

THE HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Speaker, I think the Honourable Member for Ferryland is entirely out of order.

HIS HONOUR THE SPEAKER—I think he is. The motion for an adjournment should not come at this juncture unless with the consent of the House, and I submit for the sanction of the House that I cannot accept the motion at this time.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker, I

would like to explain my reason for seconding that motion. You asked for a seconder, and I thought it was in order to second that motion.

HIS HONOR THE SPEAKER—Unless with the leave of the House I cannot accept the motion.

MR. WARREN—How do you propose to find out the leave of the House.

HIS HONOR THE SPEAKER—Without the leave of the House I cannot accede to the motion for an adjournment.

Giving Notice of Motion and Questions

Mr. Ashbourne, Mr. Cashin, Mr. Warren and Mr. Randell gave notice of questions.

(1) MR. ASHBOURNE asked Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs to lay upon the Table of the House a statement showing: (a) The salary paid the Postmaster at Summerford; (b) Whether the Post master attends to the Telegraph work of Summerford; (c) Whether any messenger for the delivery of messages at Summerford is paid; (d) If Summerford is a money order branch; (e) Number of Mail Couriers who call at Summerford and distribute Winter mails; (f) If Postmaster at Summerford has to supply his own fuel; (g) If any remuneration is paid Postmaster at Summerford for extra time when mail boat calls after hours.

HON. THE MINISTER OF POSTS—I beg to table the information.

(2) MR. SCAMMELL asked Hon. the Prime Minister how much the Railway Commission contributed last year toward the cost of the airplane used at the sealfishery last Spring.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—The Railway Commission contributed toward the cost of the airplane used at the sealfishery last Spring the sum of $363.25.

Address In Reply.

MR. WARREN—When the debate adjourned yesterday afternoon I was endeavouring to convince the Government that, since they had actually borrowed money to get some revenue out of the beauty spots of Newfoundland, at the same time they might utilize some of the money they had raised with a view to making more revenue and more money out of the staple industry of the Colony. I do not agree with the statement made by the Prime Minister that, so far as improving the cure of fish or the fostering of the salt fish business is concerned, as conducted at present, it should be left to the Trade and that the Government should step in when some sort of an agreement was reached by the trade. I read the resolution of the Board of Trade and which I said was an invitation to have something done about it, but I did not go on to read from the annual report of the Board of Trade, and in which the opinion of one of our fish exporters expressed himself as to how the handling of fish should be regulated. I do not mean the fish regulations that we have had here; but fish regulations to get better prices for the fish that we export. Here is the extract from the report:

(Reads extract.)

That is another invitation to any Government to utilize some of the time at its disposal. It is an invitation to make an effort, even if nothing comes out of it; and because of the fact that practically everybody else in the Island, with the exception of those who are engaged in mining and in lumberng, have got either their money or their property invested in the fisheries, I think that an honest and determined attempt should be made to try and do something to encourage the staple industry of this Colony.

I was going on to point out what was told to the Board of Trade by Mr. J. Allan Taylor, a man of considerable standing in the fish world and who tells us how we could make money. His remarks were published

in pamphlet form, but, as has been said by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, his remarks fell on deaf ears, as no attention at all was paid to what he said. I commend the report of Mr. Taylor not alone to members of this House, but to other people outside this House as well for their consideration. Referring to the cure of fish, he advocates a different system to the one in vogue in this country, and he advocates that the curing of salt codfish should not be done by those engaged catching the fish, but should be done by the people on shore, the same as is done in Norway and in other countries. Then referring to the utilization of waste and offal of fish he says in his report:

(Quotes from Report.)

Well I would suggest to the Government that they devote a small portion of the money that they borrowed in that direction. Mr. Taylor winds up his report with a review of research work and quotes some statistics thereon. I understand that those in charge of the Memorial College here are going to engage the services of a Biologist in the near future. In other countries a Biologist is a special feature of any department that requires one. I do not propose to deal with this thing at any further length, but I would commend to the House this paragraph:

(Quotes from Report)

Now that is from a man who knows what he is talking about and I would suggest to the Government that they try, however unproductive their efforts prove, and do something for the improvement of the fishery of this Colony.

Reference has been made in this House to an article which was published in the "Evening Telegram" on March 10th, and which deals with the bank fishery. The article reads as follows:

(Reads article)

Now, of those 300 men engaged in the fishery at Lunenburg, 285 are constituents of mine. At first sight, it would appear that there is not much harm in a fisherman going to Lunenburg to be paid in wages, and thereby earning a living, rather than go to Labrador to fish himself. There is a difference, however, for the vessel in which he goes to the Labrador, is outfitted in this country, and that supplies employment to his fellow-countrymen. On the other hand, if he goes to Lunenburg, he gets his wages only, but there is no other benefit to the country. Outsiders get the benefit of the labour, and no employment is provided for Newfoundlanders beyond this, as would be for the outfitters of vessels and such when fishermen go on their own expeditions to the Labrador. Again they are supporting an outside industry, which, if not in direct competition, may, to some extent, lessen our chances for the sale of our product. The Lunenburg fish, I believe, is sold in the West Indies, but it is very much like ours, and if it were not caught and cured, we would have that market for our fish. If it is worth while for Lunenburg to fit out ninety vessels, about 23 more than the previous year, why is it not worth while for our fishermen to do so; and why is not our fishery improving in the same proportion. This is another avenue for the Government to explore.

I don't purpose to say anything more on the subject to any great extent. I have made certain suggestions which the Government might consider, and I have endeavoured to be constructive in my criticisms, and not destructive.

I come to the question of the Amendment. I am going to vote for the Amendment, but it is because there are a couple of things I approve of in it, but there are a great many things that I don't approve, and, if they were not mixed up with

the others, I would not support it. The first thing, and I am committed to it is . . . .

(Reads from Amendment)

Decreasing of Expenditure.

As to the reduction of the public service, that sort of thing is very dangerous to handle. In 1898, after the Morine Government made an effort with regard to reductions in the Civil Departments, the result was that Mr. Morine became, not only the most famous man in Newfoundland, but the most universally hated. In my opinion, an attempt, by the Government, to reduce the Civil Service is not worth while. In the first place, too many have what we call "pull," and, if any such member of the Civil Service found that there was a likelihood of losing his job, or of having a reduction in his wages, they would immediately do their utmost to use that "pull." Men would come, even to members of the Opposition, requesting them to assist in keeping them their jobs by using their influence with the Government. But if we are paying men who do not earn their salaries, this money, undoubtedly, should not be paid, and the man in the street is going to want to know the reason why such men can't get out and earn their living as he has to do. Every effort should be made to reduce expenditure, and I am committed to that portion of the Amendment. I believe it would be well for the Government to emulate those who have been successful in this line in other countries, and attempt to attain the desired object by means of an outside Commission as Sir Eric Geddes' Commission in England and others elsewhere.

Next comes that part of the Amendment referring to the Income Tax, etc.

(Reads from Amendment)

I am against that. In some countries, the Income Tax is regarded as a necessary evil, and is only for revenue purposes. It can be imposed only in a country where there is plenty of capital, and it is entirely unsuited to this country. The merchants are supposed to be the wealthy people of this country, and very few others accumulate much money. It does not follow, because they have made some money, that they, most of all, should be taxed, and to impose such a tax is placing a handicap on capital. I regard it as a capital levy. Such a tax is most unsuitable to this country.

The Amendment next refers to the bonus on fish. The district that I represent is a fishing district — the primest fishing district in this Island. I have gone over that district, and when I speak on the subject, I am expressing, not only my own views, but those of the fishermen I have spoken with. I have heard the bonus on fish spoken of a good many times, but I have never seen a scheme that would be any good. The opinion of how those schemes would work out, is that the man who gets plenty of fish would get plenty of bonus, and the man who gets a poor catch, and who could ill afford it, is the man who would have to pay for the bonus. I certainly don't propose to support that.

With regard to the extra taxation placed by the 1925 budget on butterine, tobacco, lines, twines, clothes, the Amendment has something to say.

(Reads from Amendment)

I agree with part, not all, of that. It is a mistake to think that for the reason only that a man makes plenty of money that he must be taxed. We are a protectionist country, if ever there was one. We protect our industries with a view to keeping our money within the country, and with the further view of giving employment. Now, there are here two classes of industry which we can protect. The manufacture of rope and tobacco are industries in one class. In the

case of these industries the raw materials are imported from outside and assembled here into tobacco or lines and twines as the case may be. Employment is supplied to the workers in the factories only and money expended on material goes to outsiders. In the case of butterine factories and such industries it is a different matter. I don't know how many persons are employed at the butterine factories, the number is probably not very great. But when we consider those who are provided with work by the factories, outside their own walls, the number becomes quite large. To make butterine milk is required. That we may get milk, cows are required. To keep cows, hay is required. The men who grow hay, keep cows and sell milk are therefore all indirectly getting employment from the butterine factory, and when we buy a tub of butterine we pay for it, knowing that our money is going not only to the owners of the factory and their direct employees but to all those outsiders who provide the materials that go to make the butterine. The status of industries of this class is quite different from that of those other industries whose products are composed of materials imported in the raw state from other countries. I think I am right in stating that the duty on raw materials of butterine figures out at about two and a half per cent. Before the present government these raw materials were duty free. There is also an extra cent a pound for pure butter which is used to a big extent in butterine manufacture. I again say, that when we talk about reducing taxation we must consider that it has to be done scientifically. If taxes are to be taken off some things and placed on others we must consider less favorably those who do not pay for the protection that they get, and more favorably those who make plenty of money which however spreads prosperity over a great many throughout the country.

The amendment next refers to the matter of the bye-election in St. John's East. As regards that I must say that on principle, I think that the election should be held. Politically, I don't know that it would do any good, but on principle I feel it must be supported;—on principle such as was laid down by the present government party before it went to the country. If one thing above others might be mentioned that the Government with which I was associated was accused of it was the violating of laws by governing by Minute of Council. I don't suppose that any government had a harder time than we had, so that we were forced to do things that other governments would not do. The present government, no doubt, has profited by our experiences. If we governed by minute of council, it was because we were compelled to do so. We laid all our cards on the table when we did do so, and for everything, so far as I remember, that was done by us by minute of council, we afterwards were indemnified by the House. In the matter of this bye-election the law specifically states that if a vacancy occur in any district that the Governor shall issue a writ within six months for an election in order that it be filled. I have no intention of going into the details as to how the law can be interpreted. It will suffice to say that the advisers of His Excellency considered that the word "Governor" meant the Governor in Council and if the Governor, so advised by his Ministry, decided that there should not be an election, there should not be. If that is correct, there is nothing more to be said. The moral responsibility of it rests with the Government. They blamed us for governing by Minute of Council. It is so much the more wrong that they blamed us for doing the equivalent.

In an issue of the London Times which I have here there appeared an article under the heading "Government refuses to allow Bye-election." It is a telegram from a St. John's correspondent as follows:

(Reads telegram)

Save us from our friends! A correspondent of the Times from our own country writes in the greatest of English newspapers, for the information of the world at large that if the Newfoundland Government, elected by the way, to "clean up and keep clean," called a bye-election "the expenditure would be considerable," or in other words they would try and corrupt the electors of St. John's East. We should not be maligned thus. For such statements to be broadcasted throughout the world is about the worst possible thing for the country. Here is a Government that was elected because they were going to "keep clean," and a correspondent of the London Times says of them, practically, that they would spend fifty thousand pounds in corrupting the electors in a bye-election.

(Reads from "Times")

This reference to another Commission to investigate certain matters in Government Departments, certainly comes as "home news from abroad." Two years ago Mr. Scammell, the member for St. Barbe, asked the Minister of Justice to table the Auditor's Report on the Liquor Department. The Minister of Justice replied that the matter was the subject of an investigation and that the formation could not at that time be supplied. Later the Minister of Finance and Customs was questioned on the report of the Liquor and Customs Departments. The reply was that the Government had decided upon having an investigation into these two departments, and as the furnishing of the information required would place suspicion upon certain people who would not be given a chance before that investigation to clear themselves of any charge the report could not be tabled.

As regards cleaning up and keeping clean the Minister of Finance seems to be the only one who has honestly made an attempt. He certainly must be given credit for having practiced what he preached and having shown some fireworks. He has dismissed men from his Department, and whatever influence may have been brought to bear on him to take some back again I have no intention of taking any credit away from him for what he has done. What has been published in this article that we cannot hold a bye-election because there is going to be another Commission of investigation is absolute nonsense. I believe the Government did contemplate it, but they looked at Warren and said we have had one Commission, don't let us touch another.

(Reads from "Times")

So those are the reasons that have been advanced to the British Public for our failure to hold the bye-election. As I have stated, politically I do not believe it would do a bit of good, on principle I think it should be held, for when the matter rests with those who have upbraided others for not observing that law there should be no question about it whatever.

I have dealt with the different sections of the amendment and I propose to vote for it. I am in favor of some of those sections, others I am most decidedly against, but rather than lose those I consider of value I shall vote for it.

I have dealt shortly with certain parts of the Speech from the Throne. We have talked quite enough on the Address in Reply, and if I have wearied the House I must apologise, but my experience after some years of public life is that anybody who does not voice his convictions when

he gets a chance is no use in public life.

In conclusion I may say I do ask the Government to do something with some of the money that they have borrowed to help our staple industry, the fisheries. It is our staple industry, even though the phrase is somewhat hackneyed, and as such is of the utmost importance to all of us.

MR. CAHILL—I should like, at this juncture, to offer a few observations on the motion before the chair, and my remarks will take the form of a few brief comments on the statements of the Opposition in criticism of the Address in Reply and the policy of the Government. I do not imagine that it is particularly necessary for the Government to make any special statement in answer to the shallow criticism of the Opposition, but it occurs to me that the fact of Government members remaining silent in their seats despite the charges of the Opposition might possibly be misconstrued by some. Furthermore, speaking as a member of the Monroe Government, who has just as much confidence in that Government and its Leader to-day, as he had two years ago, I cannot sit unmoved in my seat and allow the unfair criticism, the illogical deductions and perverse comments from the Opposition to go unchallenged.

On opening day Mr. Hickman, the Leader of the Opposition, opened the debate for the Opposition, and his first reference was to the Dock. Of course, the honourable gentleman could see no good whatever in it, and he talked of a nickel watch being just as good and able to keep just as good time as a gold watch, but the fact remains that a nickel watch does not as a rule keep time as well as a gold watch, and it certainly does not last as long. Our opinion is that Newfoundland is now at the stage where it deserves a gold watch. In the past, unfortunately, it too often happened that the politicians have walked off with the gold watches, and the country had to be satisfied with a nickel watch. It is the policy of this Government to let the country have the gold watches, if there are going to be any handed out.

With regard to the liquor question, and to the comments of the Opposition upon it, I may say that, if there is one question, that should be discussed in a broad-minded manner, that is it. If there is one subject that should not be handled in a partisan manner, that is it. Above all, if there is one subject that should not be handled in a hypocritical manner, it is certainly the liquor question, and I am sorry to say that I do not think these qualities were absent from the remarks of the Opposition Leader.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition seems to have the unfortunate habit of making a break, at least one break. On opening day last year, no, I think the year before, it was his uncalled for reference, his flippant remark, concerning Earl and Countess Haig, the visit to Newfoundland of which had been referred to in the Speech from the Throne. For this he was very severely called to order by the honourable member for Ferryland. Of course, Mr. Cashin is somewhat closer to the Leader of the Opposition to-day then he was at that time, although he has taken the opportunity to remark more than once lately that he is connected with no party in any way. Mr. Cashin, it appears, is like the dove first sent out from the Ark, 'that found not where its foot might rest." The break made by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition on this opening day was his reference to the "Caribou." It is absolutely disgraceful to my mind that a gentleman holding the position of Leader of the Opposition should come into this House and make accusations

based on mere rumours heard in the streets like the hon. gentleman made regarding the Caribou.

MR. HICKMAN—I corrected that. I said that I have seen the ship since.

MR. CAHILL—Now what is the actual truth about the Caribou. I had the pleasure, Mr. Speaker, of making a trip on the "Caribou" some two months ago, and talking with the Captain and officers, who one and all say she is a first class ship in all respects,and well worth the money spent on her. After all, the criticism is as to the interior fittings, it is admitted by everybody that the hull is o.k. And I can say that Captain Stevenson is proud of his ship—he has "taken a shine out of her." And whose judgment are we to take? That of the Opposition, whose remarks are colored by a spirit of partizan criticism, or that of Captain Stevenson, who kisses his wife and children good bye and goes out to trust his life and the lives of his passengers. I have no doubt of the soundness and seagoing qualities of his ship, that all unprejudiced men will come to one conclusion.

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition was followed by the member for Fortune, Mr. Warren, the leader of the Independent Party. Now Mr. Warren is such a nice spoken gentleman, such a "hail fellow well met" that it is difficult to separate and distinguish the politician from the private citizen. Mr. Warren stated that he would not allow to go unchallenged any remarks against the previous administration, and I admire him for that. But he is clever enough to know that it is the only thing he can do, to so take exception to such remarks. I should like to point out, however, that if he is going to defend all acts of the previous administration I for one do not envy him his job.

Mr. Godden then had a few remarks to make, in fact he was the leader of the debate for the Opposition, and as the leader usually sets the pace, it is no wonder the debate was lacking in fire and vague in facts. Mr. Godden really had as much to say in favour of the Government as against it. He said nothing against the Dock, or the Hotel or the Railway—in fact he commended the latter, especially under the management of Mr. Russell. The only thing he criticized was the non-reduction in taxation, and if he waits a little while he will see this. The rule in the past has been to promise much and do nothing, but we do not do things that way—we promise little and do much. This opposition and criticism of the Government party is absurd—we do not claim to be a party of supermen; we do not claim to be able to do the impossible, but we do our best. We do not make extravagant promises, but we are doing pretty well—we have had such an awful mess to clean up and have been busy. In time we will get it cleaned up.

The hon. member for Fogo, Mr. Hibbs, followed in the debate. The hon. member was apparently trying to capture the record which Mr. Halfyard has as the champion Marathon speaker in this House, but he was not successful—apparently he lacked the necessary stamina. Now Mr. Hibbs is in the fortunate position of being also the editor of a paper, and when Mr. Hibbs the member speaks, Mr. Hibbs the editor can describe and praise his own speech—"Brilliant Speech," "Opposition Members Shivering in their Seats." Of course one of the things with which Mr. Hibbs was chiefly concerned about was the Highroads; Mr. Hibbs lays claim to many things, but he poses as an absolute expert on Roads—Mr. Hall and Mr. Cochius are not in it. The hon. member made the assertion that those employed were only the supporters of the present Government. I can correct that

statement, at least as far as Harbour Main is concerned. My hon. colleague and myself nearly got into hot water, because it was found that very, very many of the superintendents employed on the Holyrood to Salmonier Road were men opposed to us in the last election. I admit that we changed that to some extent; we would have been foolish not to do so. The hon. member takes quite a shine out of the work he did on the road known as the Cow Path. I can tell the hon. member that that work was not done so well as he would lead us to think, and that large expenditures had to be made on it by the Road Commission last year. The hon. gentleman also had a great deal to say about retrenchment, and regarding the borrowing of money, and that we criticized previous administrations for this. But it is not true that we criticized other Governments merely because they borrowed money, but because they wasted and squandered this money afterwards. If this Government borrows it is under the cheapest conditions, the money is actually required and will be spent in an economical manner. What we criticized was the spending of other Governments.

The hon. gentleman also referred to sales under the Liquor Act. He was actually horrified because sometimes two bottles, as he states, had been obtained in one day. I wonder if under the previous Act anyone ever obtained more than one bottle in one day? He also spoke about the high price. Well, there is something in that; I have to pay it myself, and don't like it sometimes, but it must be remembered that under the previous arrangement we had to pay prices that were just as high, and also had to pay doctors $2.00 for a script in addition, so the cost is comparatively much less. Of course I know that one prominent member of the previous administration did make a change in this—he "broke the price" and I believe you could get a script from him for 50c. The hon. gentleman is apparently a great admirer of the Prime Minister as a political orator and has quoted his speeches many times. I could wish that the hon. member would emulate the Prime Minister in one way—that of the brevity of his speeches. The hon. member for Fogo, with the help of numerous newspapers and articles delivered a lengthy speech, filled with unfounded arguments and irrelevant discussion, and forced me to think of the truth of the old saying, "He that speaks much is much mistaken.

Mr. Hibbs was followed in debate by the Senior member for Trinity, Mr. Halfyard, and I must say that as far as our expectations of a harangue were concerned, Mr. Halfyard did not disappoint us. The hon. member went to some pains to compliment the Government, and criticized us very little. The only thing he really blamed the Government with was doing things other Governments had done, and I must say he certainly got hot under the collar on this part of his subject. If it were not for the jocular interruptions of the Minister of Justice, I fear that an accident would have occurred—that the hon. member would have burst a blood vessel—it would have been sad indeed to have a fatality in the House, especially one with the hon. member officiating as the corpse. The hon. gentleman worked himself up to quite a pitch, but of course he was not as angry as he pretended to be. If one did not know the hon. gentleman so well he would not know that it was acting. But I must say that he played his part well.

The hon. member for Carbonear, Mr. Duff, followed in a very brief speech. Practically all he said was to compliment the Government for a

reduction in expenditure of nearly $700,000.00.

The hon. member for Trinity, Captain Randell, also did his duty nobly as a member of the Opposition. His speech was in the main a very good one, but the only false note was his criticism of the Caribou. Of course, being a good honest mariner, he admitted that her hull was perfect in every respect, and confined his criticism to the interior fittings. He said the Dock was a good honest job, and there for ever. I thought he would give the Government the credit for the Dock as a good job, as a little while before he had been talking about the railway and criticized it because he said some of the sleepers were bad, and he said if a job were done at all it should be well done. It is refreshing to note at any rate that he says the dock is a job well done, and gives credit to the country for money well spent.

The hon. member from Twillingate, Mr. Grimes, also referred to the reduction in expenditure of $700,000. He gave us the credit to some extent, but took it away by saying that we had taken the estimates of the Warren Administration. He might also have said that the present tariff which he criticised so severely, was prepared by and taken from the previous administration. If he is going to give the credit one way he might as well give it in both. I for one am glad to say that after this we shall be taking nothing which is the work of any previous administration. We will regulate our own tariff and handle our own expenditure.

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition wound up the debate and moved an amendment to the Address in Reply. He was very amusing in the care he took to impress the fact that the Speech from the Throne was not written by His Excellency. I was amused by his laboring this, which every schoolboy knows. Of course the Hon. Leader of the Opposition wants the Government to meddle in all sorts of things and all kinds of business. That idea was dealt with by the Premier, and can also be better dealt with by other members than myself. I was also much amused by the remark of the Leader of the Opposition when he naively confessed that the reason he wanted something done for the fishery was because he was directly interested in it. This is certainly in direct opposition to the pretended sentiments of the other members of his party, who were so piteously pleading for the poor fishermen. I am not a fisherman, but am inclined to think that I would rather be one than a merchant during the past year, for a fisherman makes his money anyway, and that is more than the merchants did last year.

Of course he had to point out that the Premier was weak, and swayed and influenced by the members of of his party. If he was Premier he would not be influenced—Oh no! Not at all. I am not going to contradict that.

Another thing worthy of mention is facility in collecting rumours. He has brought us rumous of the "Caribou," of the new Hotel, the "Kentucky." In fact he brings in a new one every day, and some member of the Government has to tell him wearily that there is no truth in it and that's all there is to it.

The hon. member for Ferryland, Mr. Cashin, followed the Leader of the Opposition, and seconded the amendment. I have referred to—by the way before I go on, I must really apologize to Mr. Scammell; I just saw him looking at me, and recalled that I had omitted referring to him—he had a few remarks also, and I must confess that I was disappointed. He came to the House with his blushing and manifold honours thick upon him, and I really thought he would spread himself. He is or was a

speaker of eloquence and readiness, and he didn't do himself justice. He thinks the Speech from the Throne should be debated at the close of the Session, and would remedy the British Constitution. Well I suggest that as a pleasant occupation for Mr. Scammell when he gets back to the quietude of Port Union he try to do so. However he took a most doleful and pessimistic view of everything. He very grudgingly acquiesced in the remarks of sympathy on the death of the late Queen Alexandra, but absolutely would not stand for any suggestion of invocation of Divine aid on our deliberations. I fear that he is not only becoming a confirmed pessimist, but in danger of being an infidel as well, as time goes on.

However I was going on to make a few remarks in reference to the Speech made by the Hon. Member for Ferryland, Mr. Cashin, and I was going to say that while other members of the Opposition side showed great lack of vigor and force—their heart did not really seem to be in their work—but certainly I cannot lay that charge to the hon. member for Ferryland. He had no hesitancy in making a most forceful speech and he put his whole heart and soul into it. In fact he rather overdid the thing. He painted a very dark picture, that the Government were a collection of scoundrels and nobody had any virtue or sympathy for the fishermen, but certainly it is a great mistake to abuse everyone and to see nothing good in anything they do at all, because if you abuse them too much you will only gain sympathy for them. I think that is what the the honourable member did. He quoted from the Telegram, the next thing he will be doing is quoting from the Daily News. He was talking in connection with the fisheries and he quoted one editorial. It is a pity he did not quote another certain editorial which gave reasons why this Government was opposed to a bounty on fish, and showed how it would not work out, but rather that it would be a bad thing for the fishermen of the country generally. However, he made a rather bitter and savage attack on the Premier. This, sir, was quite uncalled for. It is funny how two gentlemen can be so diametrically opposite in their opinions, on the subject of an individual. Honourable the Prime Minister does not require any defense from me or anyone else for his political conduct. His reputation for honesty and sincerity of purpose are too well known. I believe there never was in this country a man who sacrificed his business to a greater extent, or went to the country with a greater sincerity than the present Prime Minister, and I firmly believe that there never was a Premier who had a party behind him so united and with such confidence in him as the present Prime Minister has. He has admitted that he cannot do as much as he expected to do, but if he is given half a chance I believe he will do more for the people of this country, including the fishermen mind you, than any Prime Minister that ever sat in the Prime Minister's chair. The honourable member for Ferryland finished up his speech yesterday by taking this House in a sort of a Cook's tour around the different districts of the country, and we were invited to visit in mind each separate district, and when we got there he instructed us as how we should vote on certain questions in connection with the fisheries. Well, I admire his nerve and his political life. I do not know what his object was in doing this, or what connection it had with the Speech. One peculiar omission I noticed in the honourable member's itinerary on that occasion was that he made no reference to Ferryland. Now the honourable member has attacked the Prime Minister and the Government

pretty severely, very caustically indeed, and he has taken the stand, and has spoken as if he was the sole friend of the fishermen of Newfoundland. He stands on the rights of the fishermen, and he said that the Monroe Government has broken all their promises to the electorate. I simply want to ask him one question. He claims he broke from the Monroe Government because it would not do anything for the fisheries, then how does he explain the conduct of his colleague, Mr. Moore. Is he not as staunch a friend of the fisherman as Mr. Cashin, and has he not done as much for the district? Has he not put more people in the hospital than the honourable member? Certainly I gave the honourable member, Mr. Cashin credit for exercising his convictions and for having the courage of his convictions, but the only point I want to make is that the honourable member has not the same view of the Monroe Government apparently as his colleague. Because the latter has stood up in this House on several occasions and announced his great faith in the Prime Minister and the Monroe Party, and I claim that he is just as good a member for his district as Mr. Cashin—just as good a friend of the fisherman, and if he is right in having faith and confidence in the Government, as I believe he is, then Mr. Cashin is wrong.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there were three or four points that were obviously noticeable to any one who had the physial endurance to sit and listen to all the speeches of the Opposition. I leave it to any one within sound of my voice as to whether the points that I make are not correct. First of all anyone will admit that the speeches of the Opposition at the prseent session of this House have so far lacked force and vigour. They did not seem to have any heart in their work. The 12 criticisms of the Government were very mild. Some of them even were actually more favourable to the Government than against it. And this is in decided contrast to the speeches of last year. I wonder what the reason is. Secondly there was no unity of action and no unanimity of opinion in the speeches delivered by the members of the Opposition. What one man praised the other man blamed, and vice versa. The argument of one man was nullified by what the other man on his own side got up and said. Really if the members of the Opposition intend to make any impression on this House I would suggest that they get together and have a little more unity of action.

In the third place, although the members of the Opposition naturally tried to paint the actions of the Government as black as possible, yet there is not in one of their arguments any suggestion of any wrong doing or scandal or even mis-management on the part of the Government. And I think, Mr. Speaker, that in the light of the experience of this country in the matter of Governments during the past few years, this in itself is a very great compliment to the Government, and it should be properly known and appreciated by the country at large.

In the fourth place the point that I want to make is this, that with the possible exception of the speech delivered by Mr. Ashbourne, there was not one constructive idea, not one piece of constructive criticism, not one practical suggestion offered by any member of the Opposition. It has been all destructive criticism. The favourite rule of the Opposition members was to denounce all the actions of this Government, but nobody got up to tell us what we are going to do.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I started my few remarks by expressing my confidence in the Monroe Government, and I sincerely believe that this confidence is shared by the great majority of the

people of this country. And I also believe that the Monroe Government can safely and securely stand on its record so far. The Opposition members have insinuated that the Government has done nothing. Well I claim that in the short period of its existence this Government has done a great deal.

When this Government took office the credit of this country was at the lowest ebb both at home and abroad. To-day it is possibly at the highest peak that it ever was in the history of this country. The Government can go out to-day if necessary and borrow money on the best possible terms in the markets of the world, and that I claim is the very best evidence of the confidence reposed in the present Government. That is the result of a conviction on the part of those people who make it their business to know these things. The financiers in the world market realise that the Government of Newfoundland at the present time is in control of economical and long headed business men, who are running the country efficiently, and that they will make it prosperous if given half a chance.

The Government has done a lot. It has built the highroads. And that is something. We have now roads that we never had before. And I claim that these roads will be a benefit to this country supposing that there never were a tourist to go over them. We have a hotel in the East End of the City and a dock in the West, and those two items are a credit to the town and the country. As far as I am concerned a thrill of pride goes through me whenever I go along by one or the other, and I say to myself that this old town is looking up in the world. We have something to show, something definite, tangible and worth-while, something in the shape of a substantial asset, for every dollar we have spent.

Certainly the Government have reduced expenditure. The figures produced by the hon. member for Bay de Verde on the opening day, showed that expenditure has been reduced in every department with the excpetion only of the Fisheries Department. And surely the members on the Opposition side are not going to raise any objection to the increased expenditure in that direction. Then we have taken off the income tax, and, by the way, the hon. member for Fortune absolutely pulverised the arguments that the Opposition have been using against that, and in particular the arguments of the hon. member for Ferryland, Mr. Cashin. The hon. member for Fortune stated that the income tax was an unfair tax. He said that he would not support that part of the amendment which asked that the income tax be placed on the Staute book again. He was also against the idea of the Government doing anything with regard to a bonus on fish. He, the Hon. Member for Fortune, said that his constituents did not want a bonus on fish, and that they would look with suspicion on any one who came up to that district preaching bonus on fish.

I also wish to support and approve the argument of the same hon. member in regard to the increasing of the duty on materials imported for a butterine factory. He showed that it was not wise to increase the duty on materials of that kind. The only criticism I have for the Speech of the hon. member for Fortune was for the way in which he quoted from an article in the London Times. This article was written by some unknown person and the Government was not responsible for it at all. Consequently it was no point against the Government to criticize this article.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that if the Opposition have deluded themselves with the idea that the Govern-

ment is falling down on its job, and that they are becoming unpopular with the great majority of the people of this country, they are very much mistaken indeed. I think that such a thought is an insult to the intelligence of the common sense people of this country by crediting them with shorter memories than they really have. I know that the Jews of old wished to return to the flesh pots of Egypt. But I cannot be persuaded that the people of this country, who have suffered so severely for years past will forget so soon what they went through, and that they will want to return again to the flesh pots of the previous administrations: to the days of squandermania and reckless expenditure—hectic borrowing—to the days of liquor, pit-prop and other scandals, rockshed and indiscriminate poor relief. And to-day when they know that all this has ended, nothing will convince me that they have forgotten it all so soon and that they will be anxious to return to such an unfortunate state of affairs again.

Mr. Warren has referred repeatedly in this House to the man in the street. That is a rather indefinite term. But I take it that he means plain, commonsense John Citizen. The man who is not particularly swayed by prejudice and is not given to believing all that he reads in the papers or hears from politicians. And this is the type of man who after all finally decides an election. To that man I would confide this Government's future with every confidence. I believe that this man, figuring things out in his own way, will say "Well, I admit that the Government have made a few mistakes, but taking them all in all are they not a decided improvement on the administrations that we had before? Are they not doing the best that they can? Have they not had a frightful time cleaning up the mistakes of the previous Governments. And if we are not going to send Mr. Monroe back again, who are we going to choose to put in his place?" I believe that he will say if the Monroe Government again appeals to the country: "You have done good work. I congratulate you on your record so far, and I have very great pleasure in giving you a renewal of my confidence."

MR. LAKE—Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that after the way that Mr. Cahill has gone over everything so fully that there is nothing left for anyone else to say. But as my hon. friend Major Cashin has seen fit to point a few remarks at me regarding the fisheries, I suppose that I shall have to take care of myself. Well, to go on with the Speech from the Throne, I can't say very much about it as I was not here on opening day when it was given out. But it has been used by all the members opposite for trying themselves out. Now I, like the Prime Minister, think that the debate on the Speech from the Throne should be confined to short speeches. I certaintly think that it is a great waste of time to use the valuable moments of this session on the Speech from the Throne. I also think, Mr. Speaker, that we should open this House in January instead of March, in order to give some of us who are interested in the fisheries an opportunity to get back to our work, and also to give a chance to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to get back to his avocation. I am sure that no one will have any objection to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries going out to catch seals, and I think that the Opposition should congratulate the Minister of Marine and Fisheres for having displayed the admirable spirit he did in going out there. For myself I would rather be back today in my own home getting my bankers ready for the fisheries. I hope

that they are now on the Grand Banks reaping their reward.

I have listened to every member on the opposition side right up to the last minute, as I have spent all my time in this House. I have been interested and also amused in many ways at the suggestions that have been put forth, but I have yet to hear of any concrete suggestion from any member of the Opposition as to what we should do for the fisheries. We have heard the thing thrashed out form beginning to end. Mr. Warren stated in his speech that he believed that the fishery regulations were sound. But deep down in his heart I don't think that he did believe it. And I have yet to see that any one part of those fishery regulations was good to the country. My district, sir, suffered the most by those fishery regulations. I admit that the standardisation of the fish would be a good thing if properly carried out. I would like to hear what some of the members of the Opposition would do in order to make some regulations that would be a benefit to the fishermen of this country.

I as a fisherman from my childhood, my father, as Major Cashin says a fisherman and a pioneer of the bank fishery, of which we hear so much from my hon. friend Major Cashin, has it all over Major Cashin as far as fishing goes, or the assistance that he has given to the fishermen of this country. I know that Major Cashin used to buy our blubber. No doubt he made money out of it. But I never heard that he invested any money in the bank fishery or the shore fishery, and I understand that he is now withdrawing from his district. And as I also know that he is engaging in the coal business, it is evident that he cannot have found the fishery a paying proposition. But I may say that every dollar that I have ever made has been invested again in the fisheries of this country. At the present time I have three vessels in the bank fishery and I don't think that Major Cashin can throw anything across at me. In reference to that I may also state that I understand that of all Major Cashin's wealth, and I presume that he has some wealth, not a dollar of it has been invested in the fishery of this country.

In order to be a good politician you have got to have a lot of figures before you, and I have made some notes which I will use as I go along. However, I guess that I will be rather jumbled before I get through. I am very pleased to hear one remark from my hon. friend Mr. Ashbourne. Now, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ashbourne to my mind has made the one speech in this House which has been worth while. One thing that he said was:

(Reads.)

That is exactly what I said here a year ago. I would suggest that the whole lot of the fishing laws of this country be wiped off the Statute Book and that new laws be made regarding the fisheries of this country. And also that those laws be not made altogether by what Mr. Higgins called the necessary evils of this country, that is the lawyers—I am taking his own words for it—but that these laws be made by the fishermen of this country, the men who are at the seal-fishery and out on the Grand Banks. These are the men whom we would like to see drafting the fishery laws of this country. And I would like to be one of the men on that committee —free of charge, of course.

I may say that I do not intend to go over all the speeches of the hon. members opposite. That has been already done by Mr. Cahill. But there are one or two things that I noticed as I went along. Mr. Grimes said that he believed that the fishery laws of this country need to be revised. I am also of the same opinion, and I

sincerely think that these laws are a disgrace to a country of fishermen. Coming back to Major Cashin, I wish to say that in his district some one in the past made a law and had this law placed on the Statute Book, whereby fishermen cannot catch bait in the greater part of Ferryland District. If that is not a disgrace to any citizen of Newfoundland I would like to know what is. And I would thank Major Cashin if he would see that these laws are removed from the Statute Book, and that every fisherman would have free right to catch fish when and where he liked with the one exception, that they should not usé a small mash trap to catch tom cods, a practice which is ruining the fishery of this country.

That is one law that I would have on the Statute Book. Now, sir, Mr. Warren said just now that there were 285 or 300 men came from his district and went to Lunenburg. That was misleading, although I don't think that Mr. Warren intended it to be so. There are about 400 from Burin and Fortune Bay. We have about forty-five vessels and these forty-five vessels are contributing about 900 to the fishery of this country, and it would be a good thing for the hon. member for Ferryland, Major Cashin, with his ability as he tried to tell us the other day, if he would place that ability at the service and for the benefit of the fisheries of this country, and invest his wealth in the fisheries in order to enable us to bring the fish to our shores; we would then look upon him as a true friend of the fishermen of this country. Mr. Speaker, Major Cashin said the other day that no good fisherman worked on the roads. I represent the South Coast because I live there. That is where I have my home and that is where I expect to raise my family, and I want to tell you that a real fisherman does not want to be coddled by the Government. They do not want to be sent road-building or to go into the lumber woods, and it is because of that that four hundred of them packed their bags and took passage on the Glencoe or the Argyle and went to Lunenburg. And when we get back to our prime once more maybe we will be able to invest some of our hard earned money in bankers so that they will be able to go fishing in schooners from their own country. And I believe that the Prime Minister will see that this Government will put the first real bait depot we ever had in Burin District. During the month of February I received the following message from one of our captains: "Shall I secure bait for March month?" And I wired back, "Do what you think best"; and he wired again the next day that he had so many thousand frozen herring aboard his vessel. I received a wire on Tuesday of this week—I am a little mixed on account of the holiday—on Tuesday of this week I received a message that the frozen herring that he had were no good to carry to the banks, and "Shall I get fresh herrings here?" And I wired him to throw the frozen bait overboard and buy fresh. Had we a bait depot in Burin, on the south part of the island, we should not have to be carrying over frozen herring and when the fresh herring are in the season dump them overboard, because when the fresh herring are not available we would be able to take the bait from the depot. Last year several vessels did not use our herring but baited with frozen herring at Canso and got large voyages. I believe that a bait depot would be the best asset to this country, in which we could invest some of our money. I heard the other day for the first time from my hon. friend Mr. Warren that the Government would pay thirty per cent. of the cost of con-

struction of bait depots. That was the first time that I heard that. I would think that Mr. Warren, representing a southern district, would have told everybody that the Government would stand thirty per cent. of the cost. But I suppose that Mr. Warren is like the members of this Government, affected with "Clean Up" and does not wish to spend the money. But the South West Coast does not wish to waste this country's money. About a year ago we brought a Bill in here to assist the Western Marine Railway. These people invested nearly a hundred thousand dollars of their own money, and because of the infamous fish regulations which made conditions such that these men could not finance their operations, we had to bring a Bill into this House to assist them with thirty-five thousand dollars, and I am very glad that the Western Marine Railway has paid off its bonds as provided by the Government of one thousand dollars and has paid a profit, so that will go to prove that the South West Coast does not want help from the Government. All they want is a loan that they are able and ready to pay back. They are ready to pay back what they get for assistance. They want to catch fish, and I want to assure this House and the Government that if this country will loan the people of the South West Coast the moneys to build a bait depot that the country will be repaid a hundredfold, because they will not only pay back the money but they will pay it back in the form of revenue—more revenue, because they will catch more fish. Although at the present time it looks as if we had too much fish in this country, but that may not be always the case. And I would not be against having one or two men as Trade Commissioners for this country. I do not want the members opposite to think that they are the only people interested in the fisheries of the country and have them at heart, because I have every dollar I own in the fisheries of this country because I want to see them prosper for the sake of myself and my family. The hon. gentlemen opposite said that we were not doing anything for the fishermen at all. I think that it was tabled the other day that thirty-five or forty or fifty thousand dollars, I do not know the correct amount, was spent to help the people of the country to build new boats and repair old boats and thus give them assistance, and I understand that the Government will pay the bounty on rebuilt vessels in future from twelve tons up. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that is something that this Government has done for the fishermen. It was chiefly Labrador and the smaller off-shore fishermen who benefited, because the bankers very rarely rebuild their vessels.

I lay stress on the bankers of this country because that is my business and I want to see that business prosper. And I want to see this Government or any other Government give them every help possible, I do not want to see thme pauperised as by the past Government. We dont want the dole in Burin District. And I feel sure that if we have anything like normal times and do not have any such a thing as these infamous fish regulations, the curse of this country, that there will be no necessity of anything of that sort at all. I say that these fish regulations were the curse of this country, and the people of Burin district were too law abiding to break them at the proper time. Now there is another matter that I want to speak about. My hon. friend Mr. Duff cast a reflection on the South West Coast. He said that the northern part of the country were good people and they paid their dues to the Government. He said that the people of St. John's were law abiding

citizens and looked upon the people of the South West Coast as being smugglers. I want to tell Mr. Duff that the people of the South West Coast are not the only smugglers. I do not want to say that they do not go over to St. Pierre and do not bring back a pound of tobacco, but I want to say that there are many in St. John's, men and people from the northern outports who often brought in a suit of clothes without paying the duty. I am sorry that Mr. Duff is not here because if he were here I would have something more to say on that and if he would look back over the past records that the amount of dole paid was not very much in Burin District and in Fortune Bay and on the whole South West Coast. It was not good enough for the member for Carbonear to cast that reflection, Mr. Speaker. Now there is another matter that I would like to tell the Government, and that is that I have made the acquaintance the other day of a gentleman named Captain Rendall a fishery expert, and I want to tell this House right here and now that we are going to have a fishmeal plant in the town of Lamaline. And we are not asking the Government for anything, because we are independent up there. When we have this fishmeal plant we will be able to utilize the offal of the fish and in a very short time we will be able to show the results to the country. And I believe that this assistance would not be necessary for this bait depot now if it had not been for the infamous fish regulations, we would have had the bait depot down in Burin District. And I am going to ask the Government and I feel sure that the Government is going to respond and loan this money to build this bait depot as they did for the Western Marine Railway. Now, Mr. Warren said just now that he did not believe in a bounty on fish. Well, so much for that. I do not think that I shall contradict that statement because I am not quite sure just what the feelings of my district are. They never expressed their views on that matter to me and possibly they are too independent to want the bounty. But there is a good deal in what Mr. Warren said because the big fellow who got a lot would get the bounty and the small fellow who got a smaller amount would have to pay. As far as I understand the manifesto of this party when I went to the country was that they would pay a bounty on fish if the conditions would warrant it. I think that is it. As far as I understand things are fairly prosperous so that they do not need the bounty on fish. And all that I ask the Government is for a bait depot in the town of Burin for the district of Burin.

I have heard a great many remarks about the S. S. Caribou. As a practical seaman, I have sailed over every ocean, one place and another. And I went over the Caribou and with the assistance of the Captain I took the trouble to go right through her. And what kind of a paradise do the hon. gentlemen opposite expect to live in when they cross over to the other side, if they expect to live in a better place than aboard the Caribou, in one of her first class rooms. Personally I could see nothing wrong with her. I am one who has built vessels in this country out of local and imported wood. After the ship warms up with the heat of the engines and with the steam heat it is possible that some of her fittings were a little warped. But I ask the hon. gentlemen opposite if they will not find that aboard the best of them. I am satisfied to say here and now that all the talk that we have heard about the Caribou is all a joke. May be they know more about it than I do. I am very well satisfied that the Caribou's fittings are O.K. I should like to live in a House so well fitted, but I never expect to.

Now Mr. Speaker, I have a twofold

place in this House. I have the honour to represent the biggest fishing district at the present time and I have also the honour to represent the pulp and paper industry. May be I am conceited according to Major Cashin. Now, we hear a lot about the pulp and paper business. And I want to assure this House that I have not been asleep during the last eight or nine months since I have been appointed to the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company, and I should like to give the House a few facts about the concern. Last year when I went to Corner Brook they had just started operations. I made a thorough investigation of the whole plant, and I found, Mr. Speaker that they were manufacturing paper on a very small scale and that they had just started the No. 1 machine, and if I can get the figures from this mess here I will give them to the House. I cannot remember them all in my head. Now according to this report of September 27, 1925 they had in operation No. 1, 2, 3, machines and the average production was 127.4 tons daily for the three machines. Now the last report on March 12 compares nicely with that and shows that today they produce at Corner Brook for No. 1 machine 99.79 tons, No. 2 100.46 tons and No. 3 101.14 tons, a total of 301.39 for the three machines and when No. 4 is going they will turn out more than the required amount of four hundred tons per day. Mr. Stadler informs we that by the end of June they will turn out a total of four hundred and forty tons, per day, which is ten per cent. more than they were figuring on. I have several reports here which will not interest the House as I feel sure that all we are interested in the manufacture of paper is the labour situation. Mr. Hibbs stated the other day that there was a shameful state of affairs at the Humber in connection with the labour situation. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that this is quite fair. For in this telegram received a few days ago, this was the official report furnished by me to the Colonial Secretary of the Colony, in connection with the proportion of Newfoundlanders working at Corner Brook it shows of the thirty-two hundred men working out there there twenty eight hundred of them are Newfoundlanders which in a place of that kind I think is very good. Mention was also made of the fact that the Newfoundland guarantee has now taken third place. I think that matter was very well explained by the Minister of Justice. And if my hon. friend opposite wishes to get more information he will find that in the 1923 contract and was not Mr. Scammell a member of the Government who made the contract.

Now, I should like to make a few remarks on the employment situation in connection with this great enterprize, which seems to many to be almost the most important aspect of the whole matter. As everyone knows. Mr. Speaker, there has lately been a lot of discussion on this subject. I feel certain that the statements already made in this House by the Col. Secretary and the clear and sensible exposition given by the Telegram have been sufficient to satisfy all reasonable and fair minded persons that so far from this country having any real cause for complaint on this score it is to be congratulated on the fine showing it has already made. Truly we in Newfoundland have cause to be proud of the fact that in an industry so technical as the paper-making industry not less than ninety per cent. of the total payroll is represented by Newfoundlanders. But although this has been clearly printed already I think that it is fitting that I should give the House the benefit of my own views on the subject, derived from personal contact with the

company by personal observation for some months past.

First of all Mr. Speaker, let us take a general view of this sort of problem. There is a clause in the N. P. P. Co. Act of 1923 providing for the employment of Newfoundlanders as far as possible. Such provisions are common in Acts of this nature in which the Government gives assistance of some form or another to private enterprizes but a brief reflection will show anyone that they are dictated by sentiment more than anything else.

In other words ordinary economic considerations will in the great majority of cases produce the result aimed in this case, everything is so much in favour of the Newfoundlander that the clause in question is hardly necessary. Surely the management of any concern would, other things being equal give the preference, as between any two applicants, to the local man, the man on the spot. I think that I can assure the House that in the case of this Company, since I have been there as a director, at any rate, this has been very much the case. If they have gone outside Newfoundland, it has been because they have had to. They have had several unfortunate experiences of transporting men, and in many cases that means their families also, at great expense and of having to pay their passages back again. Will any management conceivably carry their national prejudices so far. Assuming that they have them, as to give themselves the trouble and expense of that sort if it can be avoided? I know it is not so with this company, at least and they have repeatedly shown me how pleased they are when they can get a local man to fill any position. Recently Mr. Stadler sent me fifty applications for new jobs and if there is any member on the other side wants to fill a job, all he has to do is to apply to me at the Crosbie Hotel and he will get an application form, I shall be quite pleased to recommend anyone that I think fit for the job.

MR. CASHIN—I suggest that the hon. member advertise that fact.

MR. LAKE—As the representative of the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company, I shall be pleased if anyone wishes to ask me any question about the company, to answer it, or if anyone is in need of an application form to furnish him with one.

To continue. But in the second place I would go still farther. A statutory provision of this kind will either have no real effect at all or if it has any, will almost certainly have a detrimental one. If the Company, under a sort of moral pressure, or suppose, that I being the Government director insisted on it in any case, employed a Newfoundlander because he was a Newfoundlander, irrespective of his fitness for the position, what would be the inevitable result. Loss of efficiency, of course. and if the thing were carried far enough, very serious loss, with the consequent endangering of our position as guarantors. This simple fact seems to escape these critics altogether, who would be the first to raise an outcry if that state of affairs came about. Isn't the question simply this Mr. Speaker, "Shall the Company employ the best man possible for every job, irrespective of nationality, or shall it strain efficiency wherever possible to satisfy mere national feeling"? From our point of view as a largely interested party, shall we entertain business considerations or sentimental ones? To take an extreme illustration, supposing every job was filled by a Newfoundlander—how long would the company last? How long before we would have to make good our guarantee? And then besides the matter of the $10,000,000 what would happen to the three thousand men and women and their families, thrown out

of employment? I think that I see a bomb exploded in imagination. It is rather amusing, Mr. Speaker, to note the change of point of view of these critics. I have in mind from the beginning, all reasonable people realised that the higher positions requiring expert technical knowledge and training, would not except in a few instances be filled by Newfoundlanders, but it was constantly expected that subordinate jobs could and should be filled. Now that it appears that all or almost all these minor jobs are held by Newfoundlanders, the critics turn about and demand that the same thing should be done higher up, in fact all through the whole business.

There is a simple and complete answer to all these objections and it applies to every position, from top to bottom, provided by this concern. If outsiders hold jobs which should be held by Newfoundlanders, where are the Newfoundlanders, to hold them? Where are they? Who are they? I know quite well that the Company does not know but that they would be very glad to. If advertisments are any criterion they simply do not exist. Let me give you a good illustration of many, Mr. Speaker. For weeks the Company advertised in our papers for a head stenographer. It received one application, from a girl of nineteen. Yet this position now held by a very competent Englishwoman is one of those marked by the Globe with an asterish as a case in Point where the Newfoundlanders are discriminated against. I can assure the Globe and anyone else interested that application forms are available in St. John's as well as in Corner Brook for anyone to fill in who thinks that he or she could get employment with the Paper Company, and I may say further with confidence that the Paper Company will be glad to receive the application and if it can possibly act upon it it will do so.

I could say a great deal more on this subject, Mr. Speaker, but I feel that I would be only wasting time. Sensible and fair-minded people don't need convincing on the subject, others simply do not want to be convinced. In conclusion of my remarks about the labour situation, I should like to give my personal impression on this whole subject, and it is this:—This wide distinction between Newfoundlanders and foreigners, as they have been called, is a little absurd. It is an individual question, not a national one, and Newfoundlanders vary as individuals as much as any other nationality. Some are good, some bad, some indifferent, but on the whole the management of the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company at Corner Brook get on excellently with the Newfoundlanders under them. They like to work with them and they have repeatedly told me and praised their work. Further, and this is a matter of importance, Mr. Stadler has explained to me that their mill is at present a training school where more and more Newfoundlanders are being trained in what is a very technical and skilled occupation and more and more are replacing their Canadian instructors. It is his hope eventually to have the mill as nearly one hundred per cent. Newfoundlanders as possible, and quite one hundred per cent. efficient.

Now Mr. Brown, the member for Twillingate asked me a question the other day and I am sorry that he is not here for the answer. In passing I would like to say that in asking me questions about the N.P. and P. members should take into consideration that I have to wire for the information if it is not already at hand. For the benefit of Mr. Brown the payrolls are paid at Corner Brook monthly. Now for the information of the House I want to say something about the quality of paper that is manufactured

at Corner Brook, and while we are working one hundred per cent. efficiently on our machines we are making the best paper that it is possible to make. I have it on record that the paper that we are supplying to-day to the New York Times has been passed by them as being the best they have every handled and for the information of this House it is now being used for the Editorial and front papes of the New York Times, and I think that is a pretty good advertisement for the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company. The Philadelphia Bulletin have ordered about six months requirements. Now they have used the whole lot up in six weeks and they are back asking for more. The Philadelphia Courier which is supposed to have the fastest machine in the world is also using the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company's paper. And all this goes to show this country and this House that they must be making the very best paper that it is possible to make over there at Corner Brook. But, Mr. Speaker, I think that it is a crying disgrace for the press of this country to speak of Corner Brook in the way that they have been doing. You cannot expect to take a man out of a fishing boat and expect him to be a hundred per cent. efficient and if you want a first class paper maker it takes four years. I think that the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company have done wonders. They have spent forty million dollars in Corner Brook. and what would Newfoundland do in that section of the country if this company had not spent this forty million dollars. I do not think that the fish business of this country is ever going to take second place in the industry of the country. Now I notice that there were some remarks made by some of the members on the other side that the exportation of fish was twelve million dollars. The codfish exports for last year amounted to $10,445,617. The paper industry exportations for last years were $6,272,886. Corner Brook was not then working. This year when Corner Brook is going at full time at four hundred tons a day with a working year of three hundred days, the exportations will be $8,400,000.00 at seventy dollars a ton. That will be over four million dollars. I should like to know what this country would do today if you swept away Grand Falls and Corner Brook, and the men sent to the fisheries. The press of this country should consider that matter. I have it on very good authority that if that kind of thing is going to continue that some of the important people will not be able to stay in Corner Brook, and these are the men who make for the hundred per cent. efficiency. Any man who talks like that is talking against his own conscience. This country has not paid one dollar of the forty million. Since I have gone to Corner Brook they have treated me well. Not dined and wined me as one of the members opposite said the other day. I go to Corner Brook on Business and when I get through with my business I leave Corner Brook. I am not one of the kind that wants to be dined and wined. I can very well take care of myself, in the fisheries of this country. Since I took hold of this job I have played the game as I have always played the game in every sense in this country. And I do not want the country to pay me. And they do not pay me a dollar for I am going to tell this House that the best this country could do when they made this contract was to pay a man ten thousand dollars a year if they are going to be responsible for ten million dollars. I did not want to be appointed to the job. I have my own work to do. I have my living to make. It is disgusting, Mr. Speaker, to hear what we do hear about the Humber and the fisheries of the country and

I should think that it is high time that the press of the country should uphold the country and not run her down, what we need is "producers not knockers."

MR. LITTLE—Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether I am out of order in saying a few words about the fisheries. I am a fisherman, Mr. Speaker. This interests me and I have listened to the speeches from the different sides of the House for the past two sessions, and it seems to me, Sir, that no party has made any practical solution of what could be done to make the fishery more successful. But before I make a suggestion, I would ask a question. "Do you want the fisheries improved?" Now taking it from what we heard from the other side of the House if we had any more fish in this country to dispose off we would not know what to do with it. Being a fisherman all my life, since I have been sitting here I have been discouraged. I have been going to expenses and putting every dollar I earned into the fisheries and it looks to me that it would be better for me to keep the few dollars that I have and throw them away. Now that is just what has happened in the outports. The people are discouraged to go to the fishery and why? Just what happened a few years ago. A few years ago we were told that the fisheries were becoming a thing of the past, but for the past two years it looks to me that they are coming back again. But now it looks to me that the men who spends money on fish is going to lose it. If you want more fish in this country, why does not some practical fisherman, a man born to the fishery get up and make some suggestion?

Get up and do something. Now I would like to ask any man on the floors of this House, what happens to the fish from the time that it starts to come to our shores, until it is shipped out of the country. Is there anyone able to tell me. I don't think that there is. Well I will tell you what the fish comes to our shores for. He comes here to look for something to eat, just the same as we are going home to-night to look for our tea. And when he gets his meal to-night he will come again to look for more, just as we will be looking for it tomorrow morning. That is practical.

Very well going back a few years what do we find. We find all around the coast of Newfoundland, bankers. What are they there for. They are out there to bait the fish. But we don't find any out there at the present time. Now what is the outcome. When they did bait their traps, we had cargoes of fish being brought in by the last of July. Now we don't get any spring fish at all. With this result. The fish comes in late. The merchants tell us that the price has gone down. We don't know whether it has or not. But that is what he tells us anyway. Well suppose it does. The reason is because they don't get the fish in the right time of the year, because the shore is not baited. Well now, the money does not come into this country and the merchant cannot give supplies. We heard a lot of talk then about poor relief being given out. But what can you do. Just before I came up here I was talking to four different people, and they did not have a bite to eat. Any man with a heart in his body at all had to do something for them. I went into a store and I had to give my word to the store keeper, to give them something. I cannot come back to the Government for that, but we have got to give it out of our own pockets. However things are different now from what they were twenty five years ago at the time that I am speaking of. At that time the people used to come with their fish, and put it into the merchants hand and if it did not cover their account, the mer-

chant would advance so much on the coming voyage.

Can any man do that to-day. Now what has brought this state of affairs about. The cry "down with the fisherman" has brought this about, and now the merchant is down and the fisherman is down too. That is just what it is. Now to come back to the question of the fish again. I will say is, that if the country wants to catch fish then put bait boats in all the outports, in all the fishing places. Now for instance down where I live, it is mostly a fishing district. Nearly every man is a fisherman. Well sir, there are certain times, in the year there is no bait. Now supposing the Government paid a man to bring the bait around the district. Say from King's Cove to Bonavista, I don't mean to give the bait out for nothing. Let every man pay for the bait. He would be glad enough when the fish is on the grounds, to pay for it. It would be an income to the Government. And this could be done in other districts as well.

One gentleman has mentioned about the traps. Yes, that would be a good idea. Cut out the small mesh traps altogether. I think that they are three and a half now. I think that is a standard size. I may make it four. I am saying this from experience.

Then there is another thing. Our friend, Mr. Lake also spoke of the different laws. Now these very laws are injuring us as a fishing country. I will tell you why. Well you have some fishermen using the hook and line and others using traps. The majority are perhaps hook and line men. And the trapmen are in the North. Now the men with the traps lay out more money than the hook and line men because his outfit is greater. Consequently he turns more revenue to the country. But still and all they are in the minority, and when a petition comes into this House, to make certain laws, these laws are made for the fishermen but not for the fishermen who turns in most to the revenue of this country. Now what is the outcome. Well if the fish comes in and does not come into the shore we have got to go out after them.

For instance during the past summer down in Bonavista Bay, where I have used my gear, and, I think, where I have done as well as any other man, just showing that I have the experience. Well last summer the fish did not come up the Bay and we started to put out our gear, and thousands of quintals of fish were brought into Bonavista Bay, where the traps were put over the line. Yet there was a law to that effect that you could not put a trap out there. But I was one of the law breakers and I am glad to be able to say that. Yet it comes up before a party on the Fishing Board or in this House of Assembly. Now who understands the situation I would like to know. Nobody has any practical experience. That is just the trouble. And I am going to say that the practical man is not heard in that case.

Now I am going to ask another question. Why is our fish made to such an extent now and in such a way that we cannot market it. We are told here that it is the fisherman's fault. But I want to tell you right here now that it is not the fisherman's fault, and why? Well I will tell you. Say the price of the fish is $8.50. That is about the price. The fisherman comes along with his fish and the merchant or whoever is buying it, says, yes, I will give you $8.50. Then I come along with my fish, or any man who is taking care of his fish. Any man who is making good fish. "Yes that is good fish. It is certainly worth a dollar more." But will he give you four cents more. That is what has been going on for the last thirty years. The man that

makes the good article does not get paid for his labour. What is his answer.

"I took the trouble to make good fish" he says. "I took all the trouble in the world. Made it so that it was ready to go in the cask with no trouble to the merchant at all. But I am not going to take the trouble this year. I will sell it so that they will have to kill it with a stick." That is the truth. I have had that experience.

Then there is something else that I want to tell you. That is that we are not placed in the position that our fathers were placed twenty-five or thirty years ago. I can remember the time when if I wanted a place for my fish I could go in and get the material and build the flakes. But you can't do that to-day Our women folk used to make the fish in those days, but they have got a little bit ahead of that now. And besides you can only exist on what you get for your fish now. And that is the trouble. You cannot afford to make a place that would care for the fish properly and the material cannot be procured as easily as in our fathers' time. The reason why is in a great measure due to the fact that our father's have not been protected in the past, and now with the horse out of the stable we are trying to protect him.

Now sir, I am coming a little nearer home. And now I am going to take this opportunity to speak of Bonavista Harbour. I am living down there in the roughest places in Newfoundland. Back a few years ago an effort was made, to do something for the harbour. And I want to tell this House that that is the one place of safety for the fishermen once they have turned the point. And yet we have not got a landing place there. Not one in Bonavista Harbour. Now that might be news to this House. We have to haul up our boats in all weather to save our property. A few years ago they started to make a harbour and I believe that they were sincere.

But it never materialized, and now with so much money tied up down there I am looking for something to be done there this year, or for some money to be granted in some way, in order than something might be done for the people. Now I want to say that there is another way in which you could improve the fisheries. If you go down below around the cape—Cape Bonavista—there is a place down there where from fifty to a hundred could fish if a little money was spent. But we can't get any money for it. But the question is if the money was forthcoming could we dispose of the fish. But I would like to say sir, before taking my seat, that I would like to see something for the harbour down there this year, and I hope the Government will make a move to do something. I hope I have not taken up too much time. Thank you.

On motion the Debate on Address in Reply was adjourned.

Mr. Cashin gave notice that he would on to-morrow move that Rule 239 under the heading "Accounts and Papers," be expunged from the "Rules and Orders for the Proceedings of the House of Assembly of Newfoundland."

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until Monday afternoon, 22nd, inst, at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, March 22nd, 1926.

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

Mr. Cashin gave notice of question.

Mr. Warren gave notice of question.

Mr. Duff gave notice of question.

Mr. Ashbourne gave notice of question.

Mr. Brown gave notice of question.

Notice of Motion

MR. CASHIN—On the last day the House sat I gave notice that I would move that Rule 239 of the Rules of the House be expunged, which demands that Public Accounts be brought down within ten days of the opening of the Session, and I suggested that this House be adjourned until this was done. I notice however, that the Minister of Finance and Customs has them on his desk. Even in the light of that, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister made a break also on the last day; he was not so well acquainted with the rules of the House, and said the House couldn't adjourn. He forgot, Mr. Speaker, that it was up to you to rule on that, and to see that the rules of the House be carried out. However, this should have been done before, and I now make the motion—that Rule 239 be expunged from the Rules of the House, since the Government does not intend to carry it out.

(There was no seconder, and the motion failed).

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, now that the question has been raised, as to tabling the Public Accounts, I wish to ask the Minister of Posts & Telegraphs when he will table his accounts? The same rule applies to all accounts as to the Public Accounts, that they be tabled in 10 days. The same applies to the Fisheries Dept. Without seconding the motion, I think Major Cashin is to be complimented on the courageous way he acted in this matter.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—They are in the hands of the printers, and I expect them in a few days. I shall lay them on the table as soon as I get them.

MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Mr. Speaker, with regard to the Public Accounts, the delay for which I am in no way responsible, although Finance Minister. Apparently there has been some change in one or two departments which has caused the delay, but it will not happen again. I should like to suggest also, Mr. Speaker, that you arrange that these be not taken from the House, but that they be placed, say in the Clerk's room, and be looked at there, as I don't want any of these to be lost, as they are unbound.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker, I think the Public Accounts are in your charge, and I trust you will make no such rule. During the last two sessions I have taken them out, and always returned them, and I think we should have this privilege of having them to look over in the Opposition Room.

MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—I have no objection to the Opposition Room, Mr. Speaker, but I would like to refer to the incident of several years ago, when the Public Accounts were lost. It is too much work to have to get them together again.

MR. HICKMAN—The Hon. Minister of Finance was in Opposition himself then.

MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—I know it. But I was only one of twelve, and I don't know which one of these it was. And, knowing the present opposition, perhaps that is why I am cautious.

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Act 15, Geo. V., Cap. 23 entitled "An Act respecting the Encouragement of Shipbuilding."

Notice of Question.

(1) MR. ASHBOURNE asked the Minister of Agriculture and Mines to

Table a copy of the Chief Wood Ranger's report for 1925.

(2) MR. CASHIN asked the Prime Minister if it is the intention of the Government to have the Railway Accounts put in the Estimates the coming year as suggested in the Auditor General's report.

(3) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the Table of the House a statement in full, giving every detail shawing the Expenditures in connection with the Four Million Dollar Loan raised in 1924 and the Two Million Dollar Loan raised in 1925; a detailed statement of amounts paid in England and to whom paid; a detailed statement of amounts paid in Newfoundland and to whom paid; and all other charges in connection therewith.

(4) MR. CASHIN asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the Table of the House copy of the Contingencies Account for his department from the 30th of June, 1925, to date.

(5) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to lay on the Table of the House, copy of the Contingencies Account of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, from the 30th of June, to date.

(6) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs to lay on the Table of the House copy of the Contingencies Account of his Department from the 30th of June, 1925 to date.

(7) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Justice to lay on the Table of the House copy of the Contingencies Account of his Department from the 30th of June, 1925, to date.

(8) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Colonial Secretary to lay on the Table of the House copy of the Contingencies Account of his Department from the 30th of June, 1925, to date.

(9) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the Table of the House copy of the Contingencies Account of his Department from the 30th of June, 1925, to date.

(10) MR. WARREN asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs if the loan for $500,000 authorised for the Dock (in addition to the $675,000 allocated by Cap. 22 of last year's Acts) has been raised and if so upon what terms.

(11) MR. RANDELL—asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the Table of the House the answer to the following questions: (1) What amounts are paid the Highroads Commission in respect to salaries per annum; (2) What salary is paid Mr. Cochius as an official of the Highroads Commission; (3) Give names and salaries of other officials of the Head office of Highroads Commission.

Questions.

Answers to the following questions were tabled:

Question No. 3 on the Order Paper.
Question No. 5 on the Order Paper.
Question No. 8 on the Order Paper.
Question No. 9 on the Order Paper.
Question No. 10 on the Order Paper.
Question No. 11 on the Order Paper.

Question No. 1 was not answered, the Minister being absent.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—In answer to Question No. 2 I may say that the Railway Accounts will be tabled. They will not be put in the estimates.

MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS—The answer to Question No. 4 is being prepared.

HON. MINISTER POSTS & TELEGRAPHS—It will take about 6 days to prepare the answer to Question No. 6. If there is any particular item in the meantime I think I can furnish it; but I would like a week at any rate to answer the question.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—No. 7 is in course of preparation. I shall have it to-morrow.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—I beg to table answer to Question No. 4 of March 15th.

Address In Reply

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of replying to some extent to some of the remarks made by the gentlemen who have spoken from the Opposition benches, and also to comment on the amendment brought before us by the Leader of the Opposition. If I take somewhat longer than my suggested half hour, I hope the gentlemen on the other side will realize that I am not striving for length, but I have to deal with fifteen days' oratory from the other side of the House, and with a number of matters which have been brought up.

In two weeks of this session, Mr. Speaker, about 170 questions have been asked by the Opposition and answered by the Government— answered probably more fully and promptly than in any other previous year. Even with all this information (and it is considerable) they have not established one charge against the present administration. This indicated, Mr. Speaker, the Government I have the honour to lead is even better than I thought it was. The criticism has been in the main unconvincing, and the constructive criticism small. Mr. Ashbourne, whom I regard as one of the members of the opposite party who really interests himself in his country, told us we ought to use the pruning knife until it hurt, but he gave us no very acceptable constructive suggestion. He also suggested that we ought to place a bounty on the packing of herring, and that we ought to increase the bounty on shipbuilding. With the latter suggestion I am entirely at variance. I think the bounty on shipbuilding is encouraging shipbuilding, and we cannot do more. It has been represented by Mr. Chambers and other members interested in the West Coast fishery that it is necessary to encourage the building of the 12 ton boat, and it is our intention to do this, and I have this afternoon given notice of a Bill to this effect.

Mr. Cashin made a suggestion during his speech that we spend $100,000 for the purpose of aiding the St. George's Coal Fields to develop, and I am also at variance with that proposal. We told the St. George's Coal Fields people that we were willing to give them the advice and assistance of the Government geologist, but most of the Government took the position that we should not give Governmental financial aid to private enterprises. If we help the St. George's Coal Fields, we should have to help the Lead and Silver Mines at Argentia, and we should likely be called upon to aid all the mining industries of the country. A former government spent a large sum of money in prospecting at South Branch, called, I think the Begonia Mines, and the only thing they succeeded in doing was in sinking a couple of trucks, and there was no development.

Mr. Warren has offered some constructive criticism regarding the fisheries. I will deal with that later when I take up the question of the fishery.

Now there have been some misstatements, and I should like to take time to correct them. Mr. Hickman said that under the fishery regulations or instructions No. 2 herring cannot be exported except in pork barrels. He must have read the instructions upside down, for No. 2 herring can't be exported in other than uniform packages containing 200 lbs., where packages containing 160 lbs. were permitted.

MR. HICKMAN—Did you get that information from the Department of Marine & Fisheries?

HON. PRIME MINISTER—Yes.

MR. HICKMAN—Well, they refused us a permit on our application.

HON. PRIME MINISTER — Well, you'd better try again. Mr. Hickman was sad because the member for Bay de Verde referred to the public debt as a "hardy annual," and also went on to tell us that the Auditor's Department had found us guilty of illegal expenditure by Minute of Council. Mr. Hickman might know that this report by the Auditor General is also a "hardy annual." If we have spent anything in an emergency, it has always been under a proper clause—there has been practically no expenditure by Minute of Council that has not been done under section 33. The Minister of Agriculture and Mines wanted us to immediately appoint a geologist, and we refrained from doing so because there had been no vote by the Assembly for that purpose.

The New Dock

Captain Randell mentions the fact that the Dock might have been repaired for $100,000. Captain Randell was in this House when the report of Colonel Mitchell was made, (and his report was quite clear) to the effect that it would take half a million dollars to repair the Dock; that it would cost $50,000 to build a coffer dam, and another $50,000 for the gate —three is Captain Randell's $100,000 before there is any attempt to repair at all.

CAPTAIN RANDELL—I said from $100,000 to $200,000.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—I understood you to say $100,000 and marked that down at the time. I do not want to misquote you. In passing I should like to make one remark. I asked Mr. Harvey this morning for information as to comparative cost of upkeep, and he gave me this. The old Dock took 3½ hours to empty, and 3⅛ tons of coal to do it. The new Dock will take 2½ hours as against 3½ hours and 2½ tons of coal as against the 3⅛ tons. The drainage pump will be operated one hour per day instead of continually, as was the old one. Think of the saving that this will effect.

Captain Randell also said that we made a mistake in letting any old sleepers remain when we were railing the line last year. The point I want to make is that if any sleepers had three or four years life remaining in them it would be an absurdity to say that we should not get that use out of them and then replace them, if required, at the end of that time. The favourable comment of the whole community on the work done is the best proof that we have not left any great quantity of rotten sleepers. The Member for Trinity also commented on the horse power of the Caribou. He said that it was one thousand less than the Lintrose, and considerably less than the Bruce. As a matter of fact it is only five hundred less than the Lintrose and considerably more than the Bruce, but what is of much more importance is the coal consumption of the boat, and that will be realized by this House and by the public. The coal consumption of the Caribou is 10.99 per hundred miles. The Kyle's is 12.64, and the Glencoe's 10.19, or very nearly as much as the Caribou. I think that should be sufficient proof of the engines and give us a good idea of how economical the Caribou is. Mr. Cashin referred to the prices charged by the Cordage Company, and that brings me to one of the points raised in the amendment to the Speech from the Throne.

"The extra taxation placed by the budget of 1925 on butterine, tobacco, lines, twines and clothing works great hardship among the fishermen of the country, and in justice to them these taxes should be repealed."

It is the same old story brought up again that was hammered out last year, attacking the Cordage and To-

bacco Factory because I happen to be identified with them. The Tobacco Factory is really a very great benefit to this country, because duty is paid on every pound of tobacco manufactured by it. If the Tobacco Factory were not there the country would not be so sure of getting the duty on tobacco because much of it would be smuggled despite the vigilance of the Customs' Department. Five hundred thousand dollars is paid into the revenue of the country in cold cash by this Company every year as duty on their products. Protection on tobacco production in Canada and the United States is very much greater than here. Two other tobacco factories were started under the same protection and both failed. This should certainly prove that the Tobacco Factory is not too heavily subsidized. Mr. Cashin read out a price list of the Cordage Company to show how prices have gone up. I don't mean to say that he had any intention to deceive. After hearing it I wrote and asked the Cordage Company for a statement of facts. Here is the reply:—

Dear Sir,—Out of 90 items on our price list under heading of lines and twines, eight items are higher to-day than this time last year. These items are confined entirely to Italian Hemp fishing lines, the consumption of which, compared with other fishing gear, is almost negligible. The proportion of Hemp Lines is less than 7 per cent. of the total value of lines and twines sold by us. Reductions in the prices of cotton lines and twines far more than offset the advance in hemp lines.

By reason of the great advance in Italian Hemp, we were simply compelled to increase the price of these lines. In Italian hemp twine, although the cost of raw material made equal advance, we made no change in our prices for the reason that we were well stocked in the grade of Italian hemp required for the manufacture of hemp twines.

You will recollect you stated in the House last year that no prices would be advanced unless the cost of raw material demanded it. This is exactly what happened; at one time it looked as though there would be a famine in this fibre.

The sale of Hemp Lines is so small that we hardly reckon upon them as being a source of income.

Yours sincerely,

F. C. ALDERDICE.

Hon. W. S. Monroe, M.H.A.,
City.

Total number of items on our Lines and Twines Price List, 90.

Total number of items increased in price, 8; total number of items reduced in price, 35; total number of items unaltered, 47; — 90.

The quantity of Hemp fishing lines used is very small compared to other kinds of gear. The total value of Hemp Line is less than 7 per cent. of the total value of Lines and Twines used by the fishermen of this country.

I want further to tell the House that if there was not a Cordage Company here the "Kentucky" would never have been brought in. When the Silvia was at Halifax the order was given the Cordage Company to make the biggest tow rope capable of being made here, and that line was on the wharf ready for use before the Silvia arrived, and that line was responsible for bringing in the vessel.

The Member for Fortune Bay dealt to some extent with protection and its application in favour of butterine, tobacco and clothing factories. I am not going to say anything now about the butterine factories. As regards the clothing factories, they appear to be going out of existence which is surely proof they cannot be over-protected.

Income and Bank Taxes.

Next in the Amendment comes the statement that we should replace

the Bank and Income Taxes and use the Money so received to pay a bounty on fish. We should "rob Peter to pay Paul" so to speak. Let us look into the matter and see how Peter and Paul appear to us. There is a great deal of talk about replacing the Bank Tax. We never took the Bank Tax off; we only reduced it. The Squires administration wanted money, wanted it badly. They wanted fifty thousand dollars from each of the large institutions and the Banks were accordingly taxed ten times as much as anyone else. We came into power with the cry of a square deal to all, and even if the Banks have got some money they should not be denied a square deal. The Bank of Nova Scotia paid forty-eight thousand dollars as a tax before the reduction, and last year paid twenty-one thousand dollars, which is still a very big tax and a considerable amount of money for any Bank to have to pay. It is from one and a half to three per cent. more than the Banks are asked to pay in any Province of Canada. I state that fact without fear of contradiction. We have no right to ask any more than a fair tax from the Banks, and I take it that after that iniquitous tax was imposed they could have closed down their doors or enforced high interest on their loans. If they wished they certainly could have got it back from the country somehow. They did not, and trusted to the honesty of some succeeding Government to reduce that tax.

Coming to the income tax, we consider that tax unfair. Only thirteen hundred people paid an income tax, and of these eight hundred were salaried men. The salaried men could be got hold of, for the employers had to hand in a list stating salaries paid. The poor clerk had to pay up, but the well-to-do fishermen never had to pay, and I wouldn't value my life very much if I tried to collect it from them. As far as the other five hundred were concerned, those of them at least that were fish merchants might fare very ill. Money expended in the fish trade is rather a speculative investment. A man may think he has made a lot of money on fish and pay income tax accordingly, and shortly after he finds that in fact he has made a big loss! For an accurate calculation of what would be a fair tax the assessment would have to be made by taking an average of a number of years and finding the real profit. All in all the only proper way to tax the people of the country is through the Customs' House. Let me get back to Paul now and see where he is. The Opposition say that this money so obtained should be expended for a bonus on fish. When I first started to lead a party for the last election, and was asked by the men of Bonavista Bay to stand as candidate for that district I was requested by a number of The United Fishermen to put a clause in my manifesto that unconditionally promised a bonus on fish. I telegraphed a reply that I would abandon my place as leader of the party if required, but I would not put in an unconditional clause. If a bonus on fish was necessary it would be given but not otherwise. Should a fisherman be well able to provide for himself, wife and family, we have no right to tax the shoemaker and farmer to provide that bonus, for these latter perhaps may already be having great difficulty in making ends meet. You demand that we pay them a bonus, but despite your demands, we must first consider whether the circumstances warrant it. I say too for the Bonavista men and for most of the fishermen that they have not looked for a bonus on fish. It is the politicians who are making all the fuss for their own ends. The fishermen are satisfied if they can make their living without the assistance of a bonus and are not

looking for it. Mr. Scammell having been recently appointed President of the Fishermen's Protective Union, felt that he should put up a great show of attending diligently to the interests of the fishermen of the country, and that this might appear in his paper. He made, however no constructive suggestion and wound up by saying that we should forget all about hotels, highroads, and everything else and devote ourselves entirely to the fishery. It is only three short years ago, since Mr. Scammell's predecessor in office, preceded me through Bonavista Bay preaching that the fishery should be forgotten and attention devoted to the Humber: that the fishery was gone and the Humber now was the only thing. Both of these gentlemen are aware that it is for a government of a country to take care of all its industries. The Opposition also suggested that fish regulations should be again imposed. We should put back, they say, the regulations but not interfere with the price. The West Coast fishermen have said that interference with shipments would give them just as much concern. Some time ago I offered my assistance with regard to fish regulations if the Government would do their part and I stood by them until I found them being generally resisted or until I found that Sir William Coaker's two positions, that of the Minister of Fisheries and President of the Fishermen's Union, were clashing. I say that fish regulations cannot be carried out. Standardisation cannot be carried out under any regulations the Government can make. If you want to know the solution I say that if all the firms combined into one there might be a solution. If the firms would co-operate we should do something with the fishery regulations, but without co-operation we cannot, and otherwise everyone has to work out his own solution. Another necessity we are told is the use of Malagash or rock salt. If we insisted on the use of this we are told fish would be immune from turning red and the best results would be obtained. Mr. Chambers, a Newfoundlander now in Nova Scotia, wrote me several letters on the subject of mineral salt, and I told him that if he could prove that its use was the solution of our fishery difficulties we would be justified in preventing the importation of any other kind. Mr. Scammell complains that mineral salt costs much more and would object if an attempt were made for its sole importation. The difficulty of a Government attempting to regulate fishery cure is obvious and that is one example of what happens. It is for the exporters to work out a solution. The standardization of herring has been affected and the regulations are being carried out. With turbot too the standardization has been very satisfactory. I have here a letter from a large importer of turbot in Quebec which says that they have found the turbot imported from here very satisfactory and that they hope the Government will continue the standardisation regulations.

St. John's, March 18th, 1926.

Dear Mr. Monroe,—We beg to quote the following paragraph from a letter received from A. H. M. Hay, Quebec, dated March 8th, 1926, with reference to Government inspection of Turbot:

"We want to take this opportunity to tell you that we think the Government Inspection in Newfoundland (which we understand was inaugurated last Fall) seems to have been very satisfactory as we had very little if any trouble last Fall in connection with defective fish. This has certainly made the business more satisfactory for all concerned and no doubt your Government inspection

will be continued this coming season with the same good results."

Yours very truly,

THE MONROE EXPORT CO. LTD.
M. A. SHEA,
Director.

Hon. W. S. Monroe, City.

Mr. Warren, quoting Mr. J. A. Taylor as an authority, has made suggestions with regard to the fishery. I heard Mr. Taylor speak in the Board of Trade and I must say that I was not very deeply impressed. He gave a long account of how flat fish are sold in the English market and I do not see that he gave us many constructive suggestions. It is all very well for a man to sit in an armchair in St. John's and think out suggestions for improving our fishery, but there must be some practical knowledge behind those suggestions. His suggestion for curing-stations, the exporters know is impracticable because our fishermen are too scattered to permit of its working out satisfactorily, and the fishermen, I fear will always as now have to cure their fish themselves.

Somebody has referred to the agreement between the West Indies and Canada. The Leader of the Opposition asked for correspondence in connection with it but has not made any comment on the matter. It has been a matter of considerable concern to me, and, if Canada ratifies it as the West Indies already have, I do not see that we can do much until we see what chances there are of a steamship service being available. When we consider how little we buy from the West Indies it may not appear that the preferential tariff would be of great service to them. If Canada ratifies the agreement and arrangements are made for a steamship line, we may with a small subsidy get them to run to our doors if they have Montreal as a terminus, but we cannot depend on our own steamship lines. Mr. Hickman said that in his Manifesto he was going to have a line of steamships to the West Indies. A steamship line from here to the West Indies would be very expensive and entail quite a large expenditure.

Cleaning Up

Mr. Warren said that when we came into power we should not have had any manifesto. He thought we needed no constructive policy. He insinuated that we really should not do anything at all but I do not think he meant we should merely sit in our offices and draw our salaries. He threw some bouquets at the Minister of Finance and then went on to say that no one else in the Government did anything; nothing at least in the way of cleaning up. Everybody knows that the Minister of Finance has done some cleaning up. He has become famous for it. He has collected overdue taxes and duties on goods brought into this country by dealers before we came into power. Quite a number of people are still smuggling and there is quite a lot to be done. His department is not, however, the only thing that is under process of cleaning up. The Post Office wanted cleaning up and got it from Mr. Woodford, not only as to the actual cleanliness of the department but also as to the officials. For years there had not been any kind of an audit on outport post offices and when an investigation was made into their accounts, shortages were found as high as ten thousand dollars. We felt that the officials had been almost tempted to take the money by lack of oversight and so there have not been any prosecutions as yet, though of course the officials were dismissed. The outport offices have been cleaned up and things are better off in the Post Office. Again two or three hundred thousand dollars used to be handed out on rock sheds before this government came

in. They looked for them last winter and some would have done so this winter, if any encouragement had been given; $400 was expended this year instead of two hundred thousand last. If that is not cleaning up what is? Twenty seven thousand dollars was voted by the Squires Administration for a blind school and ten thousand per annum to support it. The twenty seven thousand dollars is gone and the country has never seen a blind pupil. Ten thousand dollars were given as a salary to a man who was supposed to look after the blind school that was never started. The rest went in improving a building owned by Sir Edgar Bowring. We cleaned that up and have taken steps to look after the blind. We have the boys in an industrial school and the girls are being looked after and working in Harbour Grace.

We have got the boys working in an Industrial School in St. John's, and the girls making dresses in Harbour Grace. These two institutions will be self-supporting very shortly, so the managers tell us. We voted $5,000 towards their support, and I know from the lady in charge of the Girls' Department—there are three or four ladies looking after the Department there at present—that the actual earnings of the school are enough to-day to pay their board and let them have a little bit of money for themselves.

Now, with reference to hospital patients. When we came into power, there was a tremendous list of patients awaiting admission to the hospital, and every boarding house in the city was full. This is also a question that has been grappled with and cleaned up by the present Government. We have established a Board of Health, but I am sorry to say that it has not been as successful as I thought it would, owing to our agreeing with the members of the Medical Society to increase their fees. I have written to the Secretary of the Medical Association asking for a satisfactory solution and adjustment of the difficulty.

Respecting group insurance, I may say that when Mr. Halfyard was Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, he established a group insurance in that Department, and everybody up there was insured, the Government paying for it out of the Contingencies of the Department. Whether Mr. Halfyard was justified in what he did, I do not know, but he certainly was to blame for having this thing go on for years, without the consent of the Legislature. A few years afterwards, when Mr. Halfyard was Colonial Secretary, another group was insured in that Department. But was it right or just for the officials of the Post and Telegraphs Depts. ot be insured and the officials of the Depts. of Customs and Marine and Fisheries not insured. We have abolished all that group insurance and a little later on in the session, when talking about our Pensions' Bill, we may or may not deal with this matter.

Again speaking to the amendment offered by the Leader of the Opposition, I would like to make a few observations in relation to the second paragraph of it which reads as follows:

"It is in the interests of the coun-
"try that an immediate reduction be
"made both in taxation and public
"expenditure. A Royal Commission
"of a non-partisan character should
"be forthwith created to report upon
"the best means whereby the present
"excessive expenditures of Govern-
"ment Departments may be material-
"ly reduced and increased efficiency in
"the Public Service made possible."

Now what does that mean? Does it mean that we are to ask the British Government to send out a Commission here to govern us? Are we to hand over control of Government

to a Commission that may be sent here from England to discharge a lot of unnecessary officials because we have not the courage to do so ourselves? I think the honourable member for Fortune Bay at the time referred to a period when Mr. Morine made a "clean up" and thereby made himself "peculiarly unpopular."

MR. WARREN—Mr. Speaker, I made no suggestion whatever that the Government of this country should be governed by such a Commission; nor do I say now that the Government of this country should be governed by such a Commission.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The suggestion certainly was, as far as I could understand it to get rid of a certain number of Government officials. Anyhow what in the name of fortune is the sense of such a proposition? If we have not the courage now to dismiss what we consider useless officials, how are we going to have the courage to dismiss them after somebody else tells us that they are unnecessary. I think the proposition a silly one and simply a blind put up to embarrass us.

With respect to the last clause of the Amendment, I would like to say that anybody reading the Opposition press for the past twelve months would be inclined to think that the one great outstanding thing of importance to be tackled by the Government of the day was the filling of Mr. Vinnicombe's seat in this House. His Excellency the Governor has been abused like a pick-pocket. The Secretary of State has been appealed to; the Prime Minister of England has been cabled to; questions have been asked in the House of Commons, and all the cry is "violation of the constitution." Now I am going to tell this House that we are going to have an election in St. John's East as soon as the members for St. John's East are satisfied that the people of St. John's East want it. We put our case and our reasons for advising against it before His Excellency the Governor. We advised His Excellency, and, of course, he is called upon to take our advice. He has been abused for taking our advice, which I consider very improper. Mr. Galbraith, K.C., who was one of the Imperial Parliamentary Delegates, who was here last year, addressing his constituents in the Old Country on his tour through Newfoundland said that one thing more than anything else that impressed him was the loyalty of the people of Newfoundland. In describing his drive from Placentia to St. John's, Mr. Galbraith told how flags and bed sheets were flown by the people as they bid a hearty welcome to the representatives of the Mother Parliament, and he added that this was something that must never be allowed to be interfered with by any action on the part of the British Government. I wonder what those who cherish this sentiment would think if they saw the criminally libellous articles that pere published by a newspaper, which Mr. Brown, the member for Twillingate, told us the other day is the only newspaper worthy of the name in Newfoundland.

As I have already stated, we advised the Governor pointing out how unnecessary it was to hold a bye-election in St. John's East and we gave him precedents for inaction—precedents where vacancies were left open before. For instance, on February 7th, 1903, A. W. Harvey, then a sitting member for the district of Harbour Grace, died and the vacant seat created was not filled until the end of July, 1904, or nearly two years after. Again on the resignation of E. P. Morris as Minister of Justice, J. M. Kent was appointed to the vacancy. For the six months Mr. Kent was Acting Minister of Justice in 1908 he had no seat in the House of Assembly, but no bye-election was held during that period. In February

1916 Mr. Kent was appointed to the Supreme Court Bench and from then until the General Election of 1919 the district remained unfilled. In January 1917 Mr. O'Dwyer died, so that for nearly three years Mr. Higgins was the sole representative for St. John's East. About the same period a similar circumstance occurred in the district of St. John's West. Mr. Kennedy died and the then Prime Minister, (now Lord Morris) who also represented that district, went away, and for the rest of the life of the Legislature up to the Fall of 1919 Mr. Bennett was the sole representative for St. John's West. In the Summer of 1916 Mr. C. H. Emerson, member for Fortune Bay, was appointed Registrar of the Supreme Court, and from that time until the Fall of 1919 the seat was vacant and the district remained wholly unrepresented. Now a certain gentleman, who has been particularly active in pointing out the unconstitutional behaviour of the present Government, sat here as a member of the Executive Government when the Government of the day was represented by one member in St. John's East and one member in St. John's West and I never heard of him advancing the slightest objection to that. Surely, if the whole of St. John's was represented by two members then, it is better represented by five members now; besides Fortune Bay was absolutely unrepresented during the period I speak of. Another reason we gave to the Governor for not opening the district of St. John's East is that the whole position of the matter has been changed by the Redistribution Bill. Under this Bill, St. John's East takes four members, one more than it did before. Two members are for St. John's proper, a Roman Catholic and a Protestant, a Roman Catholic for the external section and a Roman Catholic for Bell Island. In view of this, where would the new member run for now? Don't you think that St. John's East is getting justice through the Minister of Justice himself? I say that St. John's East is well represented in this House and does not require any more representation at the present juncture. Another point is that the women now have a vote and in order to have an election in St. John's it would be necessary to take another voters' list, including the names of all the women, putting the country to considerable expense and then that voters' list would be absolutely valueless at the end of the Government's term of office. These are the points that we must hesitate over and consider before opening up St. John's East. We are not afraid to open up the district, because I think the Minister of Justice and his colleague are just as popular as ever, despite the challenge of Mr. Cashin. But we are not going to accept that as a challenge to have an election that is going to put St. John's East and the whole country to considerable expense. The Government is perfectly willing to take all the responsibility and to stand by our actions in this respect; but we do not think it is right to throw the blame on His Excellency the Governor.

MR. RANDELL—Mr. Speaker, I would like to have a few words to say on the subject matter now before the Chair. To show that I am not what has been referred to here as a "prejudiced politician," I want to take back some of what I said with regard to the S.S. Caribou. The Prime Minister was quite right in what he said as to the horse power of that ship, as I found out that she is five or six hundred less than the "Lintrose." As to what the "Caribou" is like compared with the "Bruce," I have not found out.

I have listened to the gentlemen who have spoken from the other side of the House and I was struck forcibly

with the remarks of the member for Hr. Main regarding the "Caribou." With all due respect to Mr. Cahill as a lawyer I take it that his view in relation to the fitness of the ship as an ice-breaker or a first class ship is not what one would consider as coming from one of authority. If I was a member of the Government Party just after a General Election and I said to the Prime Minister that I wanted to become Minister of Justice,why I think he would be inclined to believe that I was gone crasy. Therefore, I hold that the utterances of Mr. Cahill about the "Caribou" cannot be taken seriously.

MR. CAHILL—Captain Stevenson is my authority for the statement I made.

MR. RANDELL—I have yet to hear of any captain or any seaman say anything different than that his own ship or his own dory was the best. Surely then, one would not expect to hear Captain Stevenson say anything disparaging about the "Caribou." The Prime Minister said that per hundred miles the "Caribou" burnt 10.89 tons of coal, the "Kyle" 12.54 and the "Glencoe" 10.19. Now the coal that a ship will burn depends upon the speed she is making, that is, a ship running at ten knots an hour may burn 15 tons of coal, but if running at the rate of thirteen knots she may burn 30 tons. Therefore, in figuring it up the Prime Minister should have stated the speed of the ships.

I would also like to have a word to say with regard to the remarks made by Mr. Lake respecting Corner Brook and employment there. I was interested as to the number of Newfoundlanders employed there and the need for efficinecy regarding paper making. I did not hear Mr. Lake say anything about ships up there or the efficiency needed for the shipping end of that Company. I have been told that they have a new ship there, but I do not know if they have one Newfoundlander employed on her. Now I think that I am safe in saying that with regard to anything in connection with shipping or marine matters that you will find men in this country who are just as efficient as men outside of it. You may not find expert papermakers; but when it comes to ships, Newfoundland has the men to man them. Now I make the charge here to-day that money has been misused in connection with the construction work of that big industry on the West Coast. I cannot congratulate myself on being a member of the Party which was instrumental in bringing about that big industry and I have not changed my views. Now since we are guaranteeing the interest on ten million dollars put into that industry I think we are entitled to the privilege of criticizing how that money is spent; and I want to tell the House of one or two ways in which money has been misused over there.

I know of several things that have been done wrong in connection with the shipping end of that business and I believe that if they had a good Newfoundlander there in charge that he would prove himself 100 per cent. efficient and would be superior to many of the importations that they have in that industry. In February 1925 that Company imported cement from Europe. They did not have a man on board that ship who knew anything about ice conditions. The ship was chartered to go to Port aux Basques to discharge her cargo, whereas if they had a proper man in charge of that ship she would have got to Corner Brook before navigation closed; but the ship was forced to come in here and the cement had to be sent over the railroad to its destination at considerable additional expense. I hold that that was money mis-spent; because at the same time three thousand tons of cement was brought to Corner Brook from Montreal by another steamer. About the same per-

iod the Company wanted coal and they could not manage to import any from Louisburg and they went and ordered a supply from the United States and got a ship there to bring down a cargo.

She got into Port aux Basques without a mast. Evidently he came to the conclusion that he wanted a Newfoundlander there. I spoke upon the matter at Corner Brook in a conversation I had with Mr. Stadler, and the latter was very free in his discourse and criticised Newfoundlanders. I went to him and thought to do some business with his firm, but he told me that we were away behind the times in this industry, and he quoted my own instances as an example. He said "You come along here looking for business that has already been done and fixed up.' I asked him in what way he considered that he was speaking generally. I admit the accusation as far as I am concerned. Then he said "Your trains are never run on time; your boats never leave or arrive on time; in fact, you Newfoundlanders have not the least idea of the value of time." "Well," I said, "perhaps if you come to St. John's and see the sealers leaving, you would say that they, at least, leave on time."

But, to get back to my contention, I say that money has been misused there. The year before last they loaded a ship at Montreal—I am speaking of the Construction Company; perhaps the Newfoundland Power and Paper Utilities Corporation cannot be blamed—but they loaded the ship at Montreal, worked all day Saturday, Saturday night and Sunday, and they got her away to come down to Corner Brook. The ship was the Ceuta.

While I am on this matter of shipping, I may say that I am led to believe that they had five big cargo boats there at the one time. Now, if that is not mishandling shipping business, I do not know what is. I made reference to the pier, a new pier that was built there last year. I was criticised here in this House for what I said last year, and I was asked as to where I got my information. They had built the pier, but there was not enough water alongside of it, and they had to go to the Newfoundland Railway Pier afterwards and build a shed that cost $15,000.

Another thing they have done. They have practically subsidized the Clarke Steamship Company to run between Montreal and Corner Brook, and it has been stated by Mr. Stadler that Newfoundlanders cannot get a look in, Those are a few of the things, Sir, that I know about that happened in connection with this big industry. I do not want to obstruct this industry, but I want to tell the truth. I do not want honourable members on the opposite side to be getting up here and saying that everything is rosy when they know it is not really so. I have heard that legislation is about to be brought into this House with regard to the further extension of the bonds of that Company. I rather expected something of that sort. In those few instances I know that money could have been spent better; it could have been handled better as far as shipping is concerned.

Before I sit down, Sir, I would like to ask the honourable member for Burin, who is a Director on the Board of the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company, representing this Government—how many Newfoundlanders are employed on the ships this Company has, or has had built? I know of only one, and I want to repeat, Sir, that we can supply men to man those ships—men that have 100 per cent. efficiency, to use the honourable gentleman's own words. You may not be able to find paper-makers here, but that is a class of man that you can find.

I would also like to make a few re-

marks with regard to the opening of St. John's East. After listening to the arguments put up by the Honourable the Prime Minister, I may say that I cannot agree with him, but two wrongs never made a right yet. You can bring up all the precedents you like, and bring them along as arguments, but still there is the law, and the man in the street could just as reasonably say, if he does something wrong: "I have broken the law, but I see it done by those higher up.' The law is not being carried out. There is the law on the Statute Book. No excuse can be brought forward that can exonerate the Government from blame when they ignore that law. Precedents count for nothing when the precedents were wrong.

Before I sit down, Sir, I want to say that I trust that the honourable gentleman for Burin will use his influence with that Company to see that our Newfoundlanders are looked after better in connection with the industry at Corner Brook, and more especially in connection with the shipping business. Because surely we have men in this country that would be useful to those people, more so than those we can import. I hold that the A.N.D. Company would have been much better advised if they had all Newfoundlanders in the ships that they have touching at Botwood. Sometimes those ships have come out and have gone to Heart's Content, but they must be loaded at Botwood. I remember another ship, with a foreign Captain who had to get Mr. Glace from Channel to come down and get his ship into Port aux Basques to discharge her cargo of coal. Why did not the Captain bring her along himself? He lacked the knowledge which the local man had. The same thing might happen to her as happened to that ship which came in here with a cargo of cement. I repeat, Sir, that I would like for the honourable gentleman for the district of Burin to give that his first consideration, in connection with the position that he holds as the representative of this Government on that Directorate, and to see that Newfoundlanders get a fair show.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of making a few remarks on the subject now before the House. And before doing so I would briefly refer to some of the remarks made by those who have spoken on the Government side of the House. I am sure that none on this side of the House will find fault with the speeches that were delivered by the Hon. Member for Harbour Main, Mr. Cahill and also by the Hon. Member for Burin, Mr. Lake. It seems that those on the Government side of the House have been afraid to speak, and that they have succeeded in finding two men with the courage to make some defence against the statements that that were made by the members of the Opposition. Mr. Cahill was very witty and he tried to be sarcastic. He said that Mr. Halfyard complimented the Government. He failed to say how I complimented the Government. Mr. Cahill complained that the speeches of the different members of the Opposition were not forceful enough in their denunciation; that they lacked fire and were uninteresting on that account. I certainly agree with him that there are no words in the English language strong enough to condemn the action of the present Government.

Well the rules of the House compel us to keep within certain limits of method, procedure and language, and if we did not present our arguments strong enough you can consider in your minds that if we were in another place, we would all be sufficiently fiery and strong in our denunciation of all that the Government has done. Mr. Cahill complained that in connection with the road work under the

supervision of the Highroads Commission, that very few men, supeintendents and others, employed on the road work were supporters of him and his colleague during the last election. After he found this out he took steps to have this corrected. Certainy common justice should be meted out to any voter in the district of Harbor Main or any other district for that matter. I am glad that the junior member for Harbor Main had that measue of justice accorded his constituents because if he ever contested that district again it would be a bad thing for the member, if he had some of his constituents saying "He did not look after them when the roads were being built." But I don't think that the senior member for Harbor Main can be accused of any delinquency or neglect in that respect. I feel sure that as far as his supporters are concerned, they got justice and were not discriminated against.

With regard to reduction of taxation we were practically told by Mr. Cahill, "That if we live long enough; (that is what the statement means) and if we had patience, reduction of taxation would certainly come around. But the Government cannot do impossibilities. And we only had to wait patiently and find what could be done in the future." The Amendment to the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, was not considered at all by the members last Friday. It was simply ignored. Therefore we do not know what the attitude of the Government members will be when it is put to a vote. Evidently they are keeping an open mind on the question and they are not going to commit themselves, one way or the other, and I trust that when the motion is put, that the Amendment will be supported by the hon. members who spoke last Friday.

We are told to have patience, and no doubt the promises made a couple of years ago would be performed. I think that the Hon. Member for Harbor Main intimated that "the Government promised little and did much." But what they did promise they have not performed, that is to go back to the pre-election promises. There was no occasion for the Government to make any promises since. I refer to the promises that were made to the electorate and on the strength of which they were returned to power. Still all these promises have been performed in a way that the electorate did not expect, and they will have to exercise their patience if they expect these promises to materialize as they were led to believe when they were asked for their votes.

Some remarks have been made about the Caribou. These remarks have ben effectively replied to by my colleague Capt. Randell. Now Mr. Lake takes great credit for having accomplished something. And no doubt he has, for he has presented a petition to this Legislature for a bait depot for Burin District. He has presented a petition and therefore has done something. There was so much talk and splurge made about that request that you would not know but he was taking the bait out of cold storage and supplying the bait, to the fishermen himself..

One astonishing part of his speech was when the Hon. Member for Burin, Mr. Lake, said that he heard for the first time from the Hon. Member for Fortune, that there was such a law on the Statute Book, with a view to encourage the building of cold storage plants, that the Government would allow thirty per cent. of the cost of the construction. Now, for a fisherman and a man who claims to be the fisherman of the West Coast, for such a man not to know that there was a law to this effect on the Statute Book, well he must be an Englishman. He cannot be a Newfoundlander. I

saw Saturday night in a newspaper, an article which stated that "there are two things which an Englishman never reads; one is the Bible and the other is the Acts of Parliament." Evidently Mr. Lake was not troubled much about reading the Acts of Parliament. But we would all think that he would be interested in acts dealing with the fisheries. No doubt he has a copy of the Consolidated Statutes. All he has to do is to take up the Consolidated Statutes and turn to Volume 3, Chap. 166(and read the Act "Of the Encouragement of Cold Storage."

The Hon. Member for Burin spoke of the fishery regulations. He further said that the only good that he found in them was in the matter of standardization. WeopehI,llhhtttaoetaoinn ardization. Well, I hope that the member will use all his influence to get his colleagues on the Government side to interest themselves in some kind of regulation with regard to the cure and the exportation of fish. It is the most important thing that we have to consider. We have heard a lot about the survival of the fittest, and that private enterprise should not be interfered it. That is alright as far as it goes. But the fishery is a national question in this country, and if those who are handling fish do so in a way that brings disaster to themselves as well as to those who are prosecuting the fisheries, and all others depending on the fisheries, it is certainly time for someone in authority to offer some advice.

I think that the trade, Water Street if you like, is in that state of mind at the present time, that it is the right moment from the Government to do something in connection with the standardization of codfish and also with regard to the regulation of the exportation of codfish. As it has been said by a member in another chamber, that it is no good for the Government to attempt to regulate the sale of codfish, if you have not public opinion backing you up. That is the meaning if not the exact words. That member also said it was disappointing that there was nothing in the Speech from the Throne with regard to the regulation of the export and the standardization of codfish.

Go back to 1910, I think that is the first Hansard of the speeches that have been made in both Houses. Read there the speeches that were made by the fish merchants, in the other chamber, right down through the years. You will find the same old story, from year to year, from the leaders of the fish merchants of Water Street who are now passed away. But their words are on record. They had the same complaint as we have now of the bad cure of fish. What is going to happen if we do not have a good cure. We hear this repeated in their speeches, and then the same old answer, "We are losing our markets." It is monotonous. It was time for some attempt to be made but when it was made the time was inopportune. It was the worst time in the history of the world and in the history of Newfoundland fisheries. An honest attempt was made to bring about better conditions. The Prime Minister this afternoon has been honest enough to say that he assisted to the best of his ability the Fish Regulations which he thought would bring about better conditions of things in the fisheries. And after all the regulations were made by men who should know what they were doing. There was the Advisory Board and the Fish Exportation Board, consisting of the principal export merchants. The Government of that day did nothing without advice. But of course we have short memories and we forget the conditions that obtained in the civilized world at that time. It really made no difference whether the

regulations were in force or not. The marketing of fish as to price on the West Coast and on the north coast and on the east coast would have been just as bad. The price of fish would have been low at the opening of the shipping season and would have decreased as the season advanced. The slump would have certainly come. The price would have been very low, and you know what that would have meant. Hardship and loss to contend with. Practically the same conditions would have obtained whether the regulations were in force or not.

But it is just as well to forget those things and try to do something now. Or rather let us not forget them but learn by experience. And some attempt should be made to bring about better conditions with regard to the marketing of codfish.

The Prime Minister spoke of the satisfactory working of the standardization of herring and turbot and of the salvation of the country being in co-operation. I think that the Government should do something to bring about that co-operation and help. It is no use for the Government saying that it is none of their business and allow things to go on as they are going and have fish collected and sent to market just as people please. That is not the right spirit to exercise at this time. The reason why the regulations before failed was because they were introduced at a most inopportune time and because there was too much antagonism manifested amongst those interested. The result was that those who took a leading part became disheartened and threw the whole thing down. Nothing in that regard has been done since, but it appears that something is being asked for and something must be done for the proper marketing of our fish. The time is opportune, but regulations are useless without the approval of fishermen and merchants alike. It all goes to show, however, how public opinion swings from one side to the other. Therefore, I would suggest to the Government to start now and try and do something that will be worth while and I feel sure that you will not have any criticism from this side of the House, even if you fail in the attempt.

Mr. Speaker, I said that trade commissioners would be a benefit to the country. I hope and trust that the Government will see their way clear to appoint two or three trade commissioners, because I believe that that would be a real benefit to the country. It is all in keeping with modern commercial life that anyone who has anything to sell now must have his agents and his salesmen. And when we ship cargoes to the Mediterranean ports and to the Brazilian ports, we should have someone there to look after the interest of the shippers.

Now we come to the speech made by the Prime Minister this afternoon, and we have no fault to find with his method of delivery. H e was very mild in his remarks and no body is going to find fault from that point of view. We do not agree wth the Prime Minister in all that he said, when speaking from his point of view. He was defending the action of the Government, and that is his place. And it is strange how differently we look at things from a different angle under different circumstances. The Prime Minister is trying to defend his Government for the expenditure made by Minute of Council. And the Prime Minister may be earnest and sincere in his statements because it is his first experience in the administration of Government and being a party to the allocation of moneys, and he does not find any fault with the method of allocating moneys by Minute of Coun-

cil; but, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Ministers colleagues have been loud in their condemnation of this method of spending money, and no doubt the Prime Minister must be governed to some extent by his colleagues who have had experience in Government, and if they were to protest loudly enough against spending money by this method I daresay he would have to agree with them and we would hear no more about spending money by Minute of Council. The Prime Minister rightly says that it is legalized by Section 33B of the Audit Act, but the Prime Minister is only correct from the standpoint of keeping within the law. The Prime Minister's colleagues, when in opposition, said it was illegal. They are not practising what they preached, but right the contrary. In the Auditor General's Report tabled the other day we find him moaning and complaining about the actions of the Government, and he said:

"In my last report I stated that certain expenditures, properly chargeable to 1923-24, were paid out of the vote for 1924-25. I stated that the sum thus illegally charged amounted to $57,765.10. I regret to report that, notwithstanding my objection, the same illegal procedure has been repeated, the erring department on this occasion being that of the Customs, which spent $35,703.20 from 1925-26 votes to pay 1924-25 bills.

"The Marine and Fisheries Department spent $25,973.85 and the Postal Telegraphs Department $58,393.13 in May and June 1925, but in the case of the Marine and Fisheries Department, payment was for work in rebuilding ships for which service the vote was taken in the 1925-26 estimates. In the case of the Postal Telegraph Department, the payments were for steam subsidies for the year which commences with the initiation of the service on May 1st. This method of payment was not adopted until last year. In my opinion it is eminently undesirable. Subsidies should be paid monthly while the boats are running and estimates for each year should be made for the number of months the boats are on the service, beginning with those payable on the 31st July. There should be no departure from the provisions of section 38 of the Audit Act, which reads: 'The public accounts shall include the period from the 30th June in one year to the 30th June in the next year, which period shall constitute the financial year. All estimates submitted to the Legislature shall be for services coming in course of payment during the financial year.'

"In order to comply with this provision it is clear that Supplementary Supply will have to be taken at the next session of the Legislature to provide for the amount paid by the Postal Telegraphs Department for the May and June steam subsidies and for the Customs expenditure illegally made, unless the Legislature is willing to consent to the continuation of this procedure and thus divest itself of the control over public expenditures which is its constitutional right."

We find that under 33B of the Audit Act, by special warrant "A" under this Act, $241,500.00 was paid out. Under "B" for pensions, new appointments and increases in salaries not provided for in the estimates, $24,-324.36 was paid. We will have to take supplementary supply to cover these expenditures. For extra services paid to permanent employees $18,117.81. We heard that everything was to be put in the estimates. Then overdafts. Short-voted $137,700.02. Making a total of $421,642.19. This is the Government that was going to spend everything by Legislative authority. And while on this point I am reminded of the large amount which was spent for "able-bodied re-

lief." From Feb. 1st to December 31st, 1925, $210,000.00. And then the Prime Minister says that they are cleaning up because they have no rock sheds. The winter before last, those who got relief worked in rock sheds, but last year nothing was spent on rock sheds and the dole was given out for which nothing was got. That is the clean up.

The Prime Minister referred to another clean up, and that was the Blind School. He said a lot of money was wasted. There was a committee appointed consisting of the best people of St. John's, influential in Church and State.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — Half of them members of the Government—five of them.

MR. HALFYARD—The Government had one or two representatives on the board. And after all, the Industrial School for the Blind was a humanitarian undertaking. And we naturally supposed that the committee appointed would manage things the best way possible, and I dare say they did, although it did not prove successful. But because the Government has adopted a different policy that is cleaning up. The people of Bonavista Bay did not know anything about the Blind School when you talked cleaning up. The Government is doing nothing at all that the people of the country expected when they were told that things were to be cleaned up. But the Prime Minister acknowledges defeat in the attempt to do something already. He said that they appointed a Board of Health because the old system was only a waste of money. The Board of Health is an absolute failure and they are going to close it up.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I did not say that we were going to close up the Board of Health.

MR. HALFYARD—I understood that the Prime Minister said that they were going to close up the Board of Health.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I said that the arrangement with the Medical Society had failed. I did not say that we were going to close up the Board of Health.

MR. HALFYARD—I do not know how much money has been saved by this, but I do know that in the isolated districts the Board of Health, not intentionally, but possibly by pressure brought to bear upon it by the Government to save money, has caused untold hardship and suffering, and I do not want to say anything here that would increase the sufferings of those who have suffered the loss of their loved ones, but months have elapsed before persons who have been given doctors' certificates for the General Hospital have received notification or authority from the Secretary of the Board of Health to come to St. John's. I know of one case where this actually happened, although the Relieving Officer had sent letters and telegrams to St. John's. In another case I received a letter from a Minister about a person who was seriously ill. The letter was given the Secretary; about a month elapsed and I received another letter from the Minister saying that he had arrived home and found the person still there and nothing had been heard from the Board of Health. I got in touch with them right away. But I do not know if the matter has been attended to yet. Mr. Speaker, the Government will find out that they are up against a very knotty question in dealing with applications for the General Hospital. It is difficult to lay down a hard and fast law. It is difficult to know who can pay and who cannot. If a person is near the General Hospital it is easy for that person to get admission. But the people of Bay Bulls Arm, Chance Cove and Chapel Arm, miles away from the railway, with

no means of sending a telegram, have to suffer. I do not think that it is intentional on the part of anybody, but because of this idea of saving money. The sick poor you will have with you always. They cannot pay, and some of them are so timid that they are afraid to ask and so they do not get to the hospital and suffer in consequence. Of course under the best system people will suffer. But I am pointing out that as soon as you begin to economize in this respect you may make a mistake that you will regret. I was referring to the report of the Auditor General under Section 33.

(Reads.))

That is when they were paying out ten or twelve thousand a week.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—That was for the whole country, I would like to inform the hon. member.

MR. HALFYARD—St. John's got its share.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —She should have it.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—I think that the city of St. John's and suburbs, east and west, got $87,000.00.

MR. HALFYARD—Well $210,000.-00—$123,000.00 spent in the rest of the country. Anyhow we were told that we were not going to have any more dole and the hon. member for Burin, Mr. Lake, was very strong on that point. And yet the present Government had to pay out two hundred and ten thousand dollars last year. Most unfortunate. Now the Prime Minister in his remarks this afternoon said that the banks should get a square deal and when the Government came back they endeavoured to put things right for the banks. "The banks trusted them and we did not disappoint them." I wish the Prime Minister could say the same about the rest of the country, not only the banks but the fishermen and laborers throughout the country, "We did not disappoint them." Then the Prime Minister said, speaking of the bonus on fish, "that they had to give the fishermen some encouragement and they promised the bonus." But the bonus never came. But the bankers with whom a great many men have to deal with day by day had to be given the "square deal." The Prime Minister admits that his Government promised the fishermen a bonus. The fishermen took it for granted that they were going to have a bonus given them. It makes no difference what the Prime Minister thought or how it appeared to him. A lie that looks like the truth is the worst kind of deception. The Prime Minister says that "there was no promise given unconditionally." What we want to deal with is the idea conveyed to the voters throughout the country. Wherever the Monroe Manifesto was read the idea conveyed to the people was that a bonus would be given on fish and therefore, as this was a most tempting promise, a good many people voted for the Monroe Party who perhaps would otherwise not have voted for that party. They were, therefore elected on false pretences and should apologize to those people whom they have disappointed. The people believed that they were going to get a bonus. It makes no difference what conditions were contained in the statement or in the minds of those who read it. We have heard a lot of talk of the honesty and sincerity of certain people. I would remind my hearers of the failure of Sir Austen Chamberlain. He was lauded to the skies one week and the next British public opinion regards him as "A lamentable failure." His own supporters condone his actions by saying that he is honest and sincere. The same may be said of the Prime Minister of Newfoundland. A lamentable failure as regards carrying out pro-

mises. He may be honest, he may have been sincere when he made them. A lamentable failure—and it is time for him to step out and give place to somebody else. The banks have to be looked after, of course. We had to keep our promises to the banks! I did not know there was anything in the Monroe manifesto about promising the banks there would be a reduction in their taxes. With regard to the income tax the Prime Minister tells us to pity the poor clerk whose statement of salary is made by his employer and submitted to the assessor and made up according to how much he receives over a thousand or two thousand dollars as the case may be. I think the poor clerks—and we all know that they need every cent they get, still taking into consideration the conditions of things with regards to taxation—even if they did have to pay out a few dollars would have been very willing to put up with the income tax. "The poor clerk had to pay up and the fishermen did not pay" the Prime Minister tells us. He tells us too that the only way for this country to get revenue is through the Customs House. The poor fellow then with a family to support is taxed on food, clothes and other things whether he earns money enough to provide for himself and family or not, and you say that is a just method of taxation. It is the easiest, laziest way to collect revenue; it is unjust, most unjust. If a man paid according to his income that would be just. Why should we differ in this respect from other countries. I know in Canada the income tax is greatly decried but fifty to fifty-five million dollars are collected a year as income taxes. The United States have still kept up the income tax in a modified form. What we get from the clerks would be about twenty or thirty thousand dollars. Increase the nontaxable incomes to $2,000 and $3,000 respectively, then no poor clerks in the ordinary acceptation of the term will have to pay an income tax. Those who can afford to pay are the ones to pay taxes. I believe you will do something when we get to "ways and means" and you bring in your budget speech.

Another clean up we are told is in connection with outport post offices. Let us hope the changes and innovations will give satisfaction. Group insurance has been cut out, because unfair. I am very sorry to hear that because I thought that it was a great benefit and a relief to an official to know that should he drop off suddenly his dependents would not be unprovided for for the time being. There are of course some good jobs in the Civil Service but quite a few are not earning so much that they can afford to put anything aside.

The only redeeming feature of a Civil Service position is that the holder will get a pension instead of going to the poor house when he gets sick or too old to work.

Post office officials salaries are small. I thought then this group insurance a good thing for them. It appealed to me from a humanitarian point of view. It is not very often that I do a thing on my own and I trusted to the good will of my executive colleagues to indorse what I had done. They answered me, what about the other departments? I said as far as the post office is concerned we can do it. The post office contingency vote is large and as we were conservative we did not spend it all. If we complied with the demands from different parts of the country we could have spent sixty thousand dollars more.

If a man knows that his dependents are provided for as by this insurance it is an extra inducement for him to hold his job longer and this results in better service. Other departments got together and had an insurance scheme practically worked out.

I do not make any promises but if

I should ever again become a member of a Government and have any influence with the Government I will certainly recommend that group insurance be introduced. I don't know that I could get my request approved. perhaps I would have a Prime Minister that is too strong willed like the present one. Of course the Prime Minister does not look at the thing from a practical point of view for like Caesar's wife "he is above suspicion," but I say it will do him no good if he does not institute something to take the place of group insurance. It will be said that money can be found for other things why cannot it be found to help us out. It would be a great benefit to the officials and something like group insurance should be given them.

If I remember correctly, the first clause in the Amendment asking for a revision of the present tariff, was not referred to at all by the Prime Minister in his speech this afternoon. Possibly there will be a revision of the tariff and I trust that there will be, as we all know there is ample need for it, and some attempt should be made so that the burden of taxation will be lightened on those who are least able to bear it. Speaking generally there has been an increase, but no reduction, in the tariff, whilst our public expenditure is practically the same as it was a few years ago. But while on this point I might say that I do not advocate a reduction in the salaries of civil servants in order to reduce taxation; but I do advocate that wherever a vacancy occurs that it should not be filled unless it is found absolutely necessary. I know you will find it difficult to dismiss civil servants, but, if I am correctly informed, quite a number of new additional appointments have been made within the past year in the civil service. I am inclined to agree with the remarks of the Prime Minister regarding the Royal Commission. We had a commission here to enquire into post office affairs. The Commissioner gave a report. That report was pidgeonholed and I do not think that any attention was paid to it after. So that unless the Government is determined to put into effect the recommendations of a Royal Commission, I think it a waste of money to go into the matter at all. This Government has made no effort to reduce taxation and reduce expenditure. It has been intimated here that the present Government would be afraid to put into effect the recommendations of a Royal Commission. Well, then, if they are afraid let somebody who is not afraid take the recommendations and adopt them.

The Amendment also states that an effort should be made to foster and extend the fisheries and make them more remunerative to the fishermen and incidently to the people of the whole country. Then, again, there is reference to the Amendment to the visionary Tourist Policy. Why will not the Government halt in this respect? Is it because it has been stated somewhere that you promised to spend two million dollars on Highroads that you are committed to it in such a way that you cannot allow that vote to stand over for a more opportune time and promote the fisheries instead in some way for the present. If you read the debates in the British House of Commons you will notice that a vote for twenty thousand pounds was held over until an opportune time was found to spend it. The same could be done with the Highroads. One million dollars was spent on roads last year and the spending of the other million could be left stand over for a more favorable time than now. The Amendment also asks that the Bank and Income Tax be re-imposed. I agree with that. The last

clause of the Amendment deals with the filling of the vacancy in St. John's East. The Prime Minister gives certain reasons why the Bye-Election should not be held and he stated that St. John's will have an election when the members for St. John's East find out if the people there want an election. I have been living in St. John's the past twelve months and all I can say is that if the people in St. John's East do not want an election, well I do not know what they want. Certainly they have not come here to tear the place down, but on the contrary they have acted in a decent and law-abiding manner. As far as the casual observer's opinion goes the people have made it known to the Governor and the Government that they do want an election. At the last session of the House there was a largely signed petition from the electors of St. John's East praying that an election be held. We all know that no action was taken and then after the six months had expired it was impresed upon the members of the Opposition to do something with a view to having the district opened up. Accordingly the members of the Opposition residing in St. John's as well as Mr. Cashin, the Independent member for Ferryland, waited upon His Excellency the Governor and asked to have the district opend up. Then when the district was not opend another petition largely and influentially signed, was gotten up, a public meeting was convened and Resolutions were passed there.

This was the Resolution which was passed at a public meeting and presented. (Reads resolution). Well, the people have gone as far as they can—I don't know what else can be done to have the district opened—this resolution was presented to His Excellency and nothing was done. The Prime Minister has quoted precedents for keeping the district closed. Well, I don't think you have any precedent where the people requested the district to be opened in such a clear and unmistakable manner—they made it as plain and demonstrative as possible. And outside of whether the people wanted it or not; the law is on the Statute Books that the Governor shall issue a writ —whether that means the Governor in Council or not does not matter. You are responsible as the Governor in Council, and you have brought about this state of affairs—and it certainly takes a lawyer to understand your interpretation. It is most unfortunate—your disloyalty to the King's Representative, to put him in such a position—but then, take the example we had here to-day. Mr. Cashin brought in a resolution to have the rule expunged from the books, because the Government was disregarding it—well, take this off the Statute books if you do not intend to carry it out. The Government is not justified in ignoring the laws for political purposes—this ought not be allowed to happen. You are acting in an arbitrary, high-handed and unreasonable way with the laws of the country. The mind of the ordinary layman does not agree with your interpretation, and you are holding the country up to ridicule—it does not increase respect for the laws when they are so broken. And what other Governments did or did not does not matter—it is useless to cite them—you never had such an altogether unique demand. Practically the same statute was on the books in 1833. We got representative government in 1832, and 12 years after that, this Act was brought in, that is in 1844, and it says that in the event of vacancies the Governor is to issue a writ. (Reads statute). The same spirit that obtained then should be adhered to by the Government of to-day, and if this is not

done the conclusion is that the King's Representative is not carrying out the Statutes, and unfortunately that is just what is in the minds of the people of the country to-day, and all because the Government would not open the district of St. John's East. I do not care personally whether it is opened or not—I am speaking as a member of this House and from a constitutional standpoint —I confess that I am not interested a rap in St. John's East—I will support that part of the Amendment on constitutional grounds. There is no reference to it in the Speech from the Throne, and further I think it should have been opened last year. It makes little difference who is elected whether a Government or Opposition supporter, or an independent.

The Amendment to the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne is worthy of the attention and support of every member of this House, and I think that many members will be placed in an awkward position if they do not support it. They should take the viewpoint of Mr. Warren, that while there may be points on which they do not agree, there is a duty to their constituents to support it. They will then be doing their duty to the people, and will earn the goodwill of their constituents and the condence of the country.

On motion the Debate on 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 (Tuesday) afternoon, at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, March 23rd, 1926.

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

Petitions were presented by

Mr. Cashin from Goulds re road.

Mr. Halfyard from Hant's Harbor re breakwater.

Mr. Hibbs from Peckfords Island re fishery rules.

Mr. Hibbs from Fogo re keeping of dogs.

Hon. the Minister of Justice gave notice that he would on to-morrow move that a Select Committee be appointed by the House to consider and report on the advisability of the introduction of a Bill to Amend the Workmen's Compensation Act, and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council requesting that body to appoint a number of Councillors to be joined with the members of this House in connection therewith.

Mr. Brown gave notice of question.

Mr. Power gave notice of question.

Mr. Scammell gave notice of question.

Mr. Ashbourne gave notice of question.

Mr. Hibbs gave notice of question.

Mr. Cashin gave notice of question.

Mr. Halfyard gave notice of question.

Mr. Grimes gave notice of question.

Notice of Motion.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—To ask leave to introduce a Bill to Amend the Act 16 Geo. 5, Cap. 23, entitled "An Act Respecting the Encouragement of Shipbuilding."

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I beg to introduce the Bill and I would like to say that the Bill has not yet been printed, because just as it was about to be printed the question was raised whether the vessels should be registered. The Bill is simply a matter of giving a bounty to twelve ton schooners which were not included before. The point was raised by Lloyd's Agent as to whether or not it ought to be extended to ships not registered, and that is under consideration. I ask leave, therefore, to introduce the Bill respecting the

granting of the bounty to twelve ton vessels having regard to the point which I mentioned.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill to Amend the Act 16 Geo. V., Cap. 23, 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 to-morrow.

Notice of Question

Replies to the following questions were given, with the exception of Nos. 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10.

(1) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs to lay upon the Table of the House copies of all public news despatches sent to the outports since the opening of this session.

(2) MR. CASHIN asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the Table of the House the following information: All Invoices and Receipts for gauze purchased for the General Hospital and other institutions during the year 1925, and up to the present time; who supplied the goods; were tenders asked for; and if no tenders were asked for, why not; and by whom were the goods ordered to Hospital.

(4) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay upon the Table of the House a statement showing all amounts received since June 1st, 1924, from the Government by Mr. W. McK. Chambers, to date, together with particulars of same; has Mr. Chambers been acting in any capacity for the Government; if so, in what capacity or capacities, and is he still under pay.

(5) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay upon the Table of the House a statement showing all amounts received since June 1st, 1924, from the Government by Mr. T. Power, Member for St. George's, to date, together with particulars of same; has Mr. Power been acting in any capacity for the Government; if so, in what capacity or capacities, and is he still under pay.

(6) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay upon the Table of the House a statement showing all amounts received since June 1st, 1924, from the Government by Mr. W. Linegar, Member for St. John's West, to date; together with particulars of same; has Mr. Linegar been acting in any capacity for the Government; if so, in what capacity or capacities, and is he still under pay.

(7) MR. WARREN asked the Minister of Agriculture and Mines if Mr. D. Thistle has made any report to him recently upon the lumbering industry in Bay d'Espoir, and if so, to lay upon the table a copy thereof.

(8) MR. DUFF asked Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay upon the Table of the House the amount of able bodied poor relief given out in the District of Bay de Verde since January 1st, 1925, and to Table the returns.

(9) MR. ASHBOURNE asked Hon. the Colonial Secretary to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing the total amount per District paid out of the Public Charities Department for patients entering the General Hospital and other Hospitals, in St. John's and elsewhere.

(10) MR. BROWN asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the Table of the House a statement giving names of the various fishery Inspectors who have been employed by the Government since July 1st, 1924, to date, and to state the amount paid for wages and travelling expenses.

In reference to question No. 3.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—In reply to the honourable member, I would like to point out that it would be impossible to place such a large number

of statistics on the Table of the House, and I would suggest that he call on the Secretary of Public Works from whom he would get the information he desires, as Mr. Harris has been instructed accordingly.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker, before we go on with the orders of the day, I would like to make reference to a subject that was brought up here by the Prime Minister yesterday, as I think it is a matter that should be straightened out. When speaking on the Address in Reply, I referred in my remarks to the Herring Fishery, and I made some statement in reference to the regulations regarding herring. Yesterday, the Prime Minister said, according to the way he was reported in the Daily News, " that the statement of Mr. Hickman, as to the export of No. 2 herring, was entirely incorrect." Now, I have before me a copy of the regulations in reference to herring, and I might say that this morning I sent my clerk to the Department of Marine and Fisheries to interview Mr. Goodridge and Mr. Badcock there respecting this matter. My clerk was told by Messrs. Goodridge and Badcock that the statement I made is correct, and that the Prime Minister's statement was wrong. The Department of Marine and Fisheries will not issue a certificate for No. 2 herring, and you cannot get an export entry to ship herring unless you get a certificate from the Fishery Department. Green Bay herring, caught in the spring of the year, are branded as No. 2 by the inspectors, and therefore anyone holding No. 2 herring cannot export them. For the benefit of the House, I will read the regulations which I obtained from the Fisheries Department.

(Reads Regulations).

"No person shall engage in the business of packing and curing Split Herring at any place in the Island of Newfoundland, or Labrador, without having previously taken out an Annual License.

The owner or manager of every plant shall cause to be branded upon the head of every barrel or half barrel, the number corresponding to the number of the License of said curer or packer. For this purpose he shall obtain through the Department of Marine and Fisheries, a suitable branding iron, the cost of same to be fixed by the Department and defrayed by the Licensee.

No Branding Iron other than those obtained from the Department shall be used.

Any person in the Colony, selling, purchasing or exporting, or being in any way a party to any transaction in the nature of a sale, purchase or export of any standard package containing split herring, without the Brand, as aforesaid, shall be deemed guilty of an offence against the Rules and Regulations.

No. 1 Large

To consist of good sound fish free from damage of any kind, measuring 11 inches and upwards, from the extremity of the head to where the flesh and tail fins meet.

No. 1 Medium

To consist of good sound fish measuring not less than 9 inches and not more than 11 inches, from the extremity of the head to where the flesh and tail fins meet.

Each standard barrel to contain 200 lbs. herring nett, and each standard half-barrel to contain 100 lbs. nett.

Labrador Herring taken and packed on the Coast shall be branded or marked "Labrador," in addition to other brands or marks, and all fish taken and packed on the coast of Newfoundland, shall be marked "Newfoundland" in addition to other brands or marks.

The season for packing split herring shall be from the 1st August to

30th May, generally. For Bay St. George until 30th June.

Herring packed in pork or second-hand barrels of any sort during 1925 will not be branded by the Government Inspectors, and are so packed at the owner's risk.

Herring caught after May 1st shall be dipped in pickle before being packed.

Inspection is compulsory on all split herring in standard barrels and an inspection fee of 5 cents is to be paid to Customs Officer when passing entries, and the amount returned to the Department of Marine and Fisheries. Lots of 30 barrels and under shall be inspected 100 per cent., over that number 50 per cent."

A great many people in some of the bays, particularly up in the bottom of Notre Dame Bay, during the winter time make up ten or a dozen barrels, and in the Spring catch herrings with their net and fill the barrels and sell them and through that means they provide for themselves and their families to carry them over the spring. But, under the Regulations, they are compelled to have branding irons, licenses, etc. They cannot afford to get all this paraphernalia, and, consequently, have given up catching and packing of split herring.

Herring that are packed in second hand or pork barrels do not call for inspection, and even though they may be rusty or half rotten, can be exported. That law refers, I take it, to 1925, and I presume it will be changed for 1926. I want to bring that before the Prime Minister and the House, because I think the law, as it stands, is an entirely wrong law. The bulk of the herring caught in the spring of the year are very thin, and are branded No. 2 under the present inspection but they suit the West India market; and are taken there as No. 1 herrings, whereas the fall caught herrings are fat, and will not keep in the warm weather climate of the West Indies. I think the Prime Minister will find, on further investigation, what I stated was correct, and is the position of the herring fishery in this country at the present time.

You have in the Department of Marine and Fisheries nine inspectors costing the Colony annually in salaries and expenses nearly sixteen thousand dollars. If you destroy the split herring fishery as you are doing you are destroying a product that should be worth from a half million to a million dollars. The Government should not leave laws controlling the herring fishery to people who know nothing about it. It should not be left entirely to a department. It is a matter for whole Government consideration. Statistics will prove to you the fishery is waning, and certainly you must realize the great importance of this fishery to Newfoundland. We should not lose production of wealth, that is what insures prosperity. When the Prime Minister finds he is wrong on any point he should not make excuses to protect his blunders. His own officials say he is wrong so he could not have received the information he has given from the people or officials in the Fishery Department.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I do not know enough about herring to know how they should be packed, and I am entirely dependent upon the Fishery Department for my information in that respect. Mr. Hickman said the regulations stated that all No. 2 herring have to be shipped in pork barrels, and I said it was not so. What he has just read out to the House, does not contradict that fact. As Mr. Hickman is interested to a large extent, I understand, in the herring fishery—and I once heard him say that the only way to make money in herring was by handling a large quantity—I feel sure that the Fish-

ery Board would be glad to have his views upon the matter.

Address In Reply

MR. GODDEN—Mr. Speaker, in supporting the Amendment to the Address in Reply my remarks will be brief, as I am as anxious as anybody that this House gets down to serious business.

Last year the Government tried to blame us on this side for delaying the business of the House, but when we had finished speech-making, we found the Government were not ready with any business and we had frequent holidays for the first two or three weeks of the Session, and I would not be surprised if it isn't the same this year. The incident of the Public Accounts is an illustration of just how much in readiness the Government is for business. The tabling of those accounts yesterday was like a runner at the end of a long Marathon race, they just got here and that was all.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment now before the House suggests the carrying out of some of the promises already made by the present Administration, I refer particularly to their promise of Reduced Expenditure and Reduced Taxation. You ask how can expenditure be reduced? I say, one step toward reduced expenditure is to stop borrowing more money, if you don't borrow you don't have to pay interest. Another way to reduce expenditure is to reduce the number of employees of the civil service. How can that be done? If you give promotion to men of service, merit and ability only, and not appoint men because of party affiliation, in time the civil service could be manned by about two-thirds of the present staff, and you would have far greater efficiency.

As for reduction of taxation, the real object of this request in the Amendment is not to lessen the receipts to the Customs Department, but to have the Tariff readjusted, so that the burden of taxation is made easier for the laboring classes. Take off the Sales Tax, from all the common necessities of life, tax goods higher that are used by the wealthier classes, such as motor cars that are used for pleasure only. The present Government promised this country, reduced expenditure and reduced taxation; instead of carrying out that promise, they have done the very opposite, and they offer us no relief and no real explanation.

This Amendment calls for an interest to be taken in our Fisheries. The Hon. Prime Minister said yesterday that co-operation is what is needed, not Standardization, I say, we need both. Standardization of our fish products has become a vital necessity, just as it has in other countries with their products. By grading and standardizing, the United States sell more canned, dried and fresh fruits than any other country in the world. Canada, her near neighbour, who has better fruits in some instances, is now alive to the necessity of grading and standardizing, and by so doing are getting increased sales of their goods.

Government interference with industries is not as a rule desirable, but by assisting in a scheme for the standardization of our fish products, the Government will be doing a real service to Newfoundland.

As for the Bye-Election in St. John's East, I was one of those who waited upon His Excellency asking that the Constitution of the Country should be upheld, and that an election should take place. We have had no bye-election, and the Law on our Statute Books has been ignored, and the Government admit they are to blame for it. What is the good of making laws if the law makers are law breakers.

I have taken up more time than I intended; in closing I will urge the

honorable members opposite to be honest with themselves regarding this Amendment, and give it their support.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the Amendment now before the Chair. The Prime Minister said a few moments ago that he did not know much about the herring fishery. Well, I would like to ask the Prime Minister if he took my suggestion regarding herring in earnest or are we coming in here wasting our time? It is all very well to come here and be asked to make suggestions of a practical nature, but when they are given they are cast aside. I contend, Mr. Speaker, that sort of treatment is not good enough. I have here a report of the Marine and Fisheries Department which was tabled a few minutes ago, and it shows that the herring exported last year amounted to 40,437 barrels as against 52,832 for the year previous, a falling off of 12,395 barrels. The total value of the herring fishery last year was not three hundred and fifty thousand dollars. For the year 1918-1919 it was worth over two and half million dollars. That is the reason why I deemed it advisable to deal with the matter of the herring fishery, for the benefit of the Prime Minister, his Government and the Country. In bringing this matter to the attention of the Government I am but carrying out my duty to the people who sent me here. Last year the Fishery Board instituted certain regulations and when it became known in Green Bay that every man who packed herring had to have a license and a branding iron, and had to abide by a lot of red tape, a lot of the fishermen decided that there was nothing the herring fishery worth while with the result that there was a falling off in the catch to the extent I have already mentioned. I contend that herring is the most important of food fishes and I believe that if fostered the herring fishery would be of material assistance to our country.

Here is the report tabled this afternoon, and still when it was presented, advocating that something be done for the herring fishery, the idea was turned down flat and ridiculed, so as to seem that we did not know what we are talking about.

Why is it that the Government considers it necessary to keep men as herring inspectors? Why is it that they are paying herring inspectors? And why is it that last year an export tax of five cents a barrel was put on every barrel? I claim, Sir, that this is a handicap, and the idea, Sir, in my opinion, that every man who happens to catch four or five barrels of herring, has to send to St. John's for a branding iron and put his number on every barrel of herring is not the encouragement which the fishermen hoped that the Government would give to this important industry.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Is there an export tax on herring? I was not aware of it.

MR. ASHBOURNE—There is a tax of five cents a barrel.

I intend to give later on the amount of money that it has cost this Government to keep these herring inspectors going around our bays. It was with that in view that I say that if the Government thinks the herring industry so important, they should step in and do something for it.

I think, sir, that the remarks made by Mr. Hickman this afternoon should be taken full cognisance of by the Government. I deeply regret the fact that the Prime Minister should turn down my suggestion that something be done for the herring fishery, with such little comment. Surely to-day we recognise that the men who catch the herring is producing something that will put money in circulation in this country when exported, and that will help the coopers

throughout the country, and others to earn a few dollars. Indirectly he helps the man who makes the hoops for the barrels, and also the man who freights them. Referring to the coastal boats, they charge sixty cents a barrel for freighting them from the outports to St. John's. It all means money and here is a means whereby the Government can make some money. If this large amount of money is paid to the herring inspectors surely something can be done for the man who catches the herring, to the man who has to pay so much money for a branding iron, to the man who has to get a license and the man who has to pay a five cents tax per barrel.

Now with regard to the herring factories, I do not think that it is quite feasible at the present time to institute herring factories. I quite agree with the Prime Minister's remarks to-day in regard to group curing stations for codfish. It might be done in places which, as I may say, are grouped together. It can't be done with codfish which is caught late in the Summer and has to be ready for the early fall market. If the fish are caught in November or December (and the people have crops besides to look after) the curing of the fish has to be done solely by them. I do not think that they would have the time to cure the fish, unless they cured it artificially. Therefore, I say that I agree with him that I do not think that it is possible to have a separate station for the curing of fish, because the season is too short; and often the season is against the curing of fish. There is only a certain amount of sunlight, and if the weather happens to be disagreeable and wet, it takes all the longer for the fish to dry. On the other hand, I do not think the time is opportune at the moment for the herring factories because the fishermen are too scattered around the coast, and the custom has been, in the past, that every man puts up a few barrels of herring.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to correct the honourable member. There is no export tax on herring. There may be five cents per barrel paid for the inspection of herring, but there is absolutely no export tax on herring.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Well, Sir, I submit that nobody can export herring out of this country without first paying five cents per barrel into the Customs for the Department of Marine and Fisheries. Now, I understand that you cannot ship out No. 2 herring at all. I was told that down in the Department of Marine and Fisheries last week. If the Prime Minister is unaware of that, perhaps he could get it officially from the Department. Last year the exportation of herring in pork barrels was allowed, and that was one way in which people could export No. 2 herring. But this year, pork barrels are disallowed, and also No. 2 herrings are not allowed to be shipped out of the country. There are no doubt many barrels of herrings which are No. 2 now but which are not No. 2 when they are packed; perhaps a barrel of herring happened to be lying in the sun or was not packed properly, and, in this way, perhaps, got rusty. That would be rejected by the inspectors as No. 2, but it was No. 1 when it was caught or taken in, and it has come down to No. 2 herring.

In certain countries the herring fishery is a valuable asset; some have drifters and trawlers to prosecute it. In these countries they follow the herring out from the shores and the people make it their business, and they are engaged in it throughout the year. In Newfoundland this is not practicable; we have no drifters and trawlers, and consequently we have

to depend on the herring coming into the bays, and often we have to wait for them to come in to spawn. In Green Bay that is the time when the herring chiefly come in.

As regards our herring fishery, sir, I think that the Government would do well to look into the matter and find out certain things about the fisheries before they make up their minds and say that there is no need to pay a bounty on herring. I have here in my hand a clipping cut from one of the daily papers. It is a dispatch from Victoria British Columbia, dated March 19th.

(Reads)

Now, sir, in my opinion I submit that the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and the Government of Canada and particularly of British Columbia are very wise in trying to find out some of the matters which interfere with the successful prosecution of their fisheries. Not long ago, sir, our firm had a letter from the Marine and Fisheries Department of British Columbia in relation to the killing of seals, asking for certain information with regard to the killings of seals, etc., because they found out that their salmon fishery was being interfered with by the seals. They had it in mind to exterminate the seals from the Fraser and other rivers. In this connection they wrote to us in regard to the making of seal nets. They found that the seals were eating up the salmon, and they were determined to kill them out. I contend that the Government should take cognisance of the fact that other countries are looking after their fisheries.

I would like to congratulate the editor of the Evening Telegram on the way that that paper has been taking up the question of the fishery. I believe that on the same day that the House opened, Mr. Burry's article appeared in the Telegram, and any person who peruses it is bound to be stimulated with interest relative to the codfishery. He wonders as to whether or not the trap-fishing is going out of date or whether or not the fish are lying in deep water and do not come into the shore. These are the things that we should be vitally interested in, Mr. Speaker, and while I do not intend to discourse on that matter further, I would like it to be pointed out to the Government.

My suggestion with regard to the bonus on shipbuilding and the building of schooners was also made in good faith. I believe that we are going to be in the position very shortly where we will find that the bulk of our schooners are too old to prosecute the fishery with. We know that within the last few years the number of schooners that have been built is very small. It was with that in view that I gave that suggestion to the Government to consider the feasibility of increasing the bounty on the building of new ships.

I believe that last year the Prime Minister in one of his speeches said that the bonus provided for the building of ships had not been availed of to any great extent. That was my idea in bringing the matter to the attention of the Government. I do not intend to take up the time of this House to any greater length, except to say that I am in accord with the amendment, and I also wish to say that it was a matter of great regret to me that there was no mention made in the Speech from the Throne as to a possible reduction of the tariff. Last year the tariff was accepted by the Government, and I, for one, thought that when it would be put into effect the Government would see its defects, and that they would probably change it; but I do not see any reference to this in the Speech from the Throne.

With regard to the other matters of the Amendment I wish to put myself on record as being entirely in

accord with them, and having used up the time of the House considerably on the Speech from the Throne, I may say that I do not intend to speak at greater length this afternoon, but when the House goes into supply I will avail of the opportunity to discuss these matters further.

MR. DUFF—Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of supporting the Amendment. It is my duty to do so. I have noticed that no mention was made of the tariff discriminating against the masses. I would like to see a tariff that would be equitable to all. Now the Prime Minister told us that we do not give any suggestions from this side of the House. At least that we do not give any concrete suggestions. I would like to go into the matter in detail. As regards a reduction of taxation and expenditure, the other day in the speech that I made on this side of the House I perhaps hinted that that there was a great deal of smuggling going on along the Southern Shore. My friend the Hon. Member for Burin seemed to resent that imputation and he took it to heart. And in a speech that he made afterwards amongst other things he denied the accusation. Well I am very glad to hear that there is no smuggling going on at Burin. Now if the other members would get up here and say the same thing it would give the whole country great satisfaction. At the same time I am pretty sure that there is a considerable amount of smuggling done in cigarettes. Especially in that fancy brand of cigarette known as Indian brand. To support this statement I can give some figures.

Now with regard to road work, I must admit that Conception Bay is getting a goodly share of that. Perhaps the road work could be better distributed so that each part of the country would get a fair share, but at the same time I know that it is pretty difficult to regulate these things. Now I am not a preacher. And my main idea in getting up here is to impress upon the Government or at least try to impress upon the Government the importance of the encouragement of our staple industry. But I fear that when I get up here and do talk about the fishery that I am talking against a stone wall. It seems to me that every man should be interested in the codfishery, and still not a day passes but we do hear of people and fishermen at that leaving the country. I was in a place last year and I saw forty houses closed up. Anyone with sufficient means today is getting out of the country. Nothing was done in the matter and the Prime Minister informs me that nothing can be done. Now what we want is a good inspection of codfish leaving this country.

The fault lies with fifteen or twenty "big guns" as I would call them who are controlling this important industry. Now why should twenty men in this country be allowed to jeopardise the industries of this country for all time. And if the Government will not take a hand in and see that this industry is not neglected by the exporters as it has been, it is impossible to have co-operation. This thing has been going on for hundreds of years. Co-operation is the chief thing that is necessary to-day. I remember back in the Spring of 1914 I was speaking to some fishermen that were selling fish and I saw that the fish was in a bad condition. They told me that the fish was good enough. That is the very thing that is losing our markets for us. I knew at the time that the Norwegians were gradually getting into our markets. We practically lost the market for Labrador fish last year.

One gentleman that I was speaking to told me that he saw fish swimming in the water Monday morning and by Saturday it was on its way across the Atlantic. That is the kind

of thing that is going on and yet here we are with roads and a dock and a hotel, and the staple industry of the country going to ruin. We were told that some of the Water Street merchants were solving this condition of affairs by co-operation. I quite understand. These men are the big six. They have a gentleman from Spain who looks after their interests, but not the interests of the, but just as important, fisherman. The consequence is that the big dogs eat up the little dogs.

Now I admit that there are many persons in my district that would prefer me to come over here and talk motor roads and other things. But unfortunately I am not built along these lines. I believe myself that after all is said and done, and no matter what other industries we may have that we will always have to depend on the fisheries.

The Leader of the Independent Party, number one, seemed very much impressed by the report of Mr. Taylor, and he read it in this House. Now I fail to see what information he got out of that report. He suggested some ways in which the labor of making fish could be greatly conserved. Now I would like him to go up Fortune Bay and put his proposition up to the people scattered along the coast. But when you come to consider that the man who catches that fish and cleans it, packs it, and makes it up, does not need any labor saving device, you can readily understand that what is needed is some scheme not for saving labor, but a scheme for making good fish.

Why, sir, the people in this country are losing hundreds of dollars on the fishery every year in this country. They are losing a fortune. Every year the same complaint is heard about a bad cure, still the same condition of affairs go on and nothing is done about it.

Now Mr. Speaker, I have one other point to mention, and that is in connection with a statement that was made here yesterday. I have right here by chance a letter that was given around to the different members of the Postal Staff together with a Christmas Box, in the shape of an insurance policy. This insurance policy is according to the service. A man of four months service gets a policy of $400. A man from two to four years gets $600 and twelve years a $1000. That policy was given in lieu of a salary. We are talking about reduction, well for goodness sake give those men a chance to pay that policy themselves. At least the salaries would still be going on, so really this was a raise in salary.

And referring for a moment to the Finance Minister, I think he could tell us that there are lots of exemptions that ought not be going on. I know it is difficult to discriminate, but why should not all these people pay taxes. It is useless to take the tax off flour—the people have to buy other things that are taxed, and so pay taxes; if it is not flour it is something else. Then look at all the churches—why should they bring in goods duty free. And why should motor cars be brought in duty free, when the daily bread of some people is being taxed. We saw in the paper the other day about a man supporting three families, and without a loaf of bread.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—That report was untrue. There was a slight family breach which has been patched up. It was unfortunate that the papers got hold of it.

MR. DUFF—I am glad it was patched up, anyway. Then we have the instance of 300 fishermen going to Lunenburg to earn their daily bread. This sort of thing is disgusting the people of this country.

MR. PUDDESTER—Some of our people who have gone to Lunenburg have done well. Some are members

of the Canadian Parliament.

MR. DUFF—Of course they have This country did not give them a chance to live. And there will be more going out within the next two months. All the young men who can't support themselves here are going to get out within the next two months, and there will be nothing left for their old fathers but to get a job on the road. Look at the results of that storm on the Labrador. There are numerous fishermen who do not know whether they have a single thing left to carry on the fishery with. We have to do business in a more clear-headed way than this. I have a great deal of admiration for the Prime Minister, and think he is just the man to clear up the whole thing if he would put his time and mind to it.

MR. SCAMMELL—I desire to say a few words in connection with this amendment, but I will not detain the House any longer than is absolutely necessary for me to give further expression to some views I hold on matters arising from this amendment. Considerable time has elapsed since we opened this House for the present session and the most of it has been taken up with the Address in Reply. It has been time well spent, however, as far as the Opposition is concerned, in the public interest. And speaking of time, sir, I am reminded what an Elizabethan poet has told us that

"Time's glory is to calm contending kings,
To unmask falsehood and bring truth to light."

During the time spent on this debate we have seen that view exemplified each way. Did not the hon. member for Fortune Bay tell us here the other day that his own wrath had been somewhat mellowed since opening day and that he did not feel like going after the Government as severely as he at first had intended. So that the passage of time has at least calmed one contending king in this chamber. And I am sure, Mr. Speaker, on the other hand, that it cannot be successfully denied that during this short session so far has indeed "unmasked falsehood and brought truth to light." The Opposition has assiduously sought light in the public interests, on the doings of the Government. Our efforts to gain information have not been well received by the Government, and we have been twitted by the Prime Minister because we have so far asked 150 questions. We shall not be deterred, however, from doing our duty to the country and will continue to question the Government until the fullest light possible is shown on every activity of the Government.

Now, Sir, in supporting this amendment I have first of all to deal with some of the remarks that have been made here by the Government members. I shall first deal with those of the Prime Minister. I did not happen to be here the day he spoke, but I take it that the reported account of his remarks as taken from the Daily News is accurate. I note that he accused me of trying to make political capital out of some remarks I made about salt, when I was speaking to the Address in Reply the other day. I deny that I was talking politics then. In trying to show that it will cost more to produce fish this season, I said that some firms had circularized their planters asking them to use only mineral (Liverpool) salt on Labrador fish this season and to use 18 hogsheads to the hundred quintals at that. I argued that this must mean to those who are obliged to follow such instructions an increased cost of from 25 cents to 30 cents per qtl. for production. I made this point among many others to show members of the Government, that the cost of fishing was going up and that therefore it was the Government's duty to assist and encourage the fish-

ermen in some practical way, to deal with the ever increasing cost of production. I fail to see where there was any partisan politics about remarks such as those.

Now, the Prime Minister when he gets up here to speak seems never to be able to get clear of having something to say about Sir William Coaker. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have been told here that it is not fair to mention names of people who are absent from this House. I think if the Prime Minister can so refer to Sir William Coaker, we can refer to another prominent politician, whose name has been ordered taboo here. He says that Sir William went to Bonavista Bay in 1923 preaching "Forget the Fisheries." Personally I doubt very much if Sir William Coaker in 1923 gave utterance to any such language. He may have preached the Humber, but if he did so he did it because he knew it would relieve the fisheries, and make conditions much better for those remaining at home. He preached the Humber, not alone because it meant an industrial revolution for this country but because it would help the people, those in Bonavista Bay in particular, who had to remain at the Fisheries. I did not join in any cry of "Forget the fisheries" either. We preached the gospel of industrial development in 1923, but we did it for the relief of those who must remain at the fisheries. Now, the Prime Minister says I come here and advise, "forget everything but the fishery." That is very true. I do come here and plead that the fisheries are the chief thing just now to be kept in mind. If in 1923 we preached industrial development, we were right in doing so. But at the present time, I say our duty is to stress for a fishery policy, and I for one shall continue to do so until we have a Government on the floors of this House that is prepared to bring such a policy in force.

The Prime Minister asks which policy we are to follow. There can be no question of policy now. Our policy in 1923 was the Humber. We felt the need of industrial development and we gave the country the Humber. That was the need then. To-day the need is for a fishery policy. The need for something being done to revive a languishing industry, our staple industry, the one ordained by Nature to be our staple industry. The fishermen need encouragement, assistance. The whole fishing industry, every aspect of it, needs reform and improvement. Why question as to what policy should be pursued in view of the appalling situation the staple industry is in to-day. We have arrived, sir, at the stage when our every effort and all our energies should be directed to fostering this industry. But more on this subject later. For the present I shall pursue my criticism of remarks from the other side. Now the member for Burin, Mr. Lake, got up the other day to treat us to a talk on the Humber. He occupies a highly responsible position in connection with this enterprise as the Government director. He is paid to be the custodian or the watch dog of the interests of the country and the people. The Humber has been much in the limelight lately for more reasons than one. Yet Mr. Lake told us very little the other day about those things in connection with the Humber which are agitating the public mind. In fact all that Mr. Lake talked about chiefly was Mr. Lake himself. It appears he had no information to give us except a few odds and ends he had hurriedly got together since the House opened. What a situation for us to be placed in. We ought to be, we expected to be, we can properly demand to be enlightened and informed as to all the facts, circum-

stances and causes surrounding the relegating of our second mortgage on the outfit up there to a third rate position. We ought to have been shown why it was that it was that another ten million dollars should have been found necessary to finish paying for construction, etc., up there. Mr. Lake should have been in a position to explain all this more fully than he did. The country is aghast at the state of affairs that have developed in connection with this Humber venture and more aghast still that the Government on Executive responsibility, without consulting the Legislature or the people should have acted so hastily, and I add impudently improper, as they did in allowing this transaction over the third ten million dollars to be put over on us. Now we hear nothing from Mr. Lake about this, and we hear nothing from him as to labour conditions up there.

Does he not know that the labourers up there are clamouring for a fortnightly pay day instead of a monthly? We brought this matter to his attention early in the session. What steps has he taken to bring it before the Company What answer is forthcoming to this request of the men? No answer is vouchsafed.

Now I was told the other day by the Minister of Justice that the Government was able, under the contract, to act as it did in connection with this third mortgage, and that consequently there was nothing to bring before the Legislature in this connection. I have yet to be shown more clearly that what was done in this connection could really have been done under the contract. I do not believe that there were five men in the House of Assembly at the time the contract was made who knew or were aware that such a power was tucked away in the contract.

With all due respect to the Minister of Justice, and he himself was a member of the House at that time, I do not believe that even he knew that such things were possible and could be done under the contract. In any case, Mr. Speaker, whether it could be done under the contract or no, it still maintains that on a matter of such vital importance the Legislature ought to have been consulted.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, might I be permitted to say a word in this regard? This thing is too important to treat lightly. What I said was that this could be done under the contract, and there was no occasion for action by the Assembly. Quite obviously there was no cause for action by the Legislature. I must say that I thought the Legislature would have to be asked, and was surprised to know that this was not so. But the Treasury Board sent out their own lawyer. Nothing was done because nothing was required to be done. I do say that the thought of this contingency probably never occurred to anyone. The action of the Executive must have been enough or these people would never have acted on it. The correspondence covering it has been given the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCAMMELL—I thank the Minister of Justice for the remarks he has just made. They certainly still bear out my contention that even he himself knew such a thing could have been done by the Government or by the Governor-in-Council under the contract. However, the House was not consulted. The Prime Minister says that the Government was consulted, but from the correspondence tabled, it looks to me as if the Government were simply bludgeoned into doing as they did: they were really not consulted at all, and were given no time to deliberate the matter properly. The whole thing was copper fastened on the other side and sent out here, the Government being told in effect to agree to it; the Gov-

ernment was really taken by the throat; under the circumstances, therefore, the Government would have been in a much better position to-day if they had taken the House into their confidence. This whole Humber situation looks serious. We hear now for the first time that certain people interested in the operations have got their eyes open, but they should have had them open long ago. The extravagance and bungling, as far as construction was concerned, are now over and we have to pay for it in this way.

Perhaps the course taken by the Government was the better one of the three propositions presented. But to say that the Legislature could not be consulted.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I did not say that.

MR. SCAMMELL—You said that the Legislature did not need to be consulted.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I merely said that the Legislature would be able to do nothing, it would have necessitated calling the Legislature together, and the Government did not have enough time to do that.

MR. SCAMMELL—I know you acted quickly and perhaps you were obliged to act quickly, but in the public interest don't you think that it was a case where you should have made haste slowly.

Mr. Speaker, to pass on to a few more observations. The member for Harbor Main, Mr. Cahill, got up here the other day in a very happy frame of mind and started to talk to us all. He said that it was the politician who generally walked away with the gold watch, and in view of his lavish price of the Caribou, and the wonderful trip he had on her, I am inclined to think he must have been one of the politicians who got the gold watch.

And there were other speakers from the Government side as well, all talking of the prosperous conditions of the country. Now in this connection we have to face hard facts, and the facts that the Government have given us since we came here certainly do not show that the country is experiencing any great wave of prosperity.

The vaunted High Road policy is in itself a relief work, and in addition to that, during the past twelve months the Government has given out upwards of over a quarter of a million of dollars in poor relief through the Department of Public Charities, as well as some thousands more extra on unemployment account around Conception Bay. Where is the prosperity that you talk about? In view of these facts, I see no such prosperity in the country which honorable members opposite wish us to believe.

The only guage of prosperity, after all, in a country like ours is the condition of your staple industry, which again brings me back to some of the Prime Minister's remarks yesterday. We had charged the Government with deception and treachery, but we scarcely thought that out of the mouth of the Prime Minister himself would come the proof of these charges. He admits now that he was pressed to promise a bonus on fish but had really no intention of ever so doing.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Not unless necessary.

MR. SCAMMELL—And when will he consider it necessary? We have been charged with taking up the time of the House in discussing this fishery business and told that we have made no practical suggestions. Who will say that Mr. Ashbourne was not practical in his discussion of the herring fishery? Who will say that we have not heard a practical speech from Mr. Duff this afternoon on the export problem of the codfishery? The Prime Minister says all exporters won't agree to co-operate. I agree with Mr. Duff and ask—Why wait for

all? Is the whole industry to go, the whole country to suffer because a few will not co-operate? And we have urged the Government to take steps for standardization. The Prime Minister does not believe in that either. And there are other problems facing us. What about the fishing fleet? It is fast falling into disrepair. Many new schooners will have to be built shortly or the whole fleet will go. Very few can afford to or are able to get under way to get a new schooner costing $5,000.00. How are these planters so placed to be helped? One honorable member suggests a larger bounty. That no doubt is a very good suggestion, but independent fishermen don't want presents from the Government. My own opinion is that there should be a fund established and managed on sound business lines to assist deserving men of good repute as regards integrity and fishing ability, to get new schooners and fishing gear when needed. Such a fund could be handled well, and by loans from it on securities and bonds the best planters and pushing young men could be helped and encouraged to go on with the prosecution of the fishery. Men must have help and encouragement very shortly or we shall see a still further thinning in the ranks of our best fishermen. Is that not practical and practicable? Now the hon. member for Fortune Bay, Mr. Warren, does not think our markets have seriously diminished. I take issue with him there. The facts are to the contrary, particularly so in Italy and Brazil, where the decline in the sale and consumption of our fish is astonishing. But this does not concern the Government and we are told we are not practical in talking of such a state of affairs. The only practical thing the Government apparently knows anything about is spending money and wasting money, after telling us their watchword was to be economy. Let us see where some of the economy is practised. I have before me the Auditor General's report on expenditure to date. One of the items that strikes my eye first is seventeen thousand dollars or so paid the owners of the S. S. Earl of Devon last year for the Lower Labrador service. Over seventeen thousand dollars paid for a period of 115 days or $150 per day. The captain was to turn over to the Government all receipts for freight and passengers. So far only about a thousand dollars have been accounted for in this connection. Who was sent down to check this matter for the Government? What steps are being taken to find out if all the amounts so collected were paid in? Anyhow the Devon got $150 per day. Was any attempt at economy made in connection with this service. I say no. I know for a fact that one good boat was offered the Government at $120 a day. There was a chance of a saving of $30 or over $3,000 alone for the season. Then if the Government had sent the Sebastopol on their own account, she would not possibly have cost more than $100 per day, and saving of upwards of $6,000 could have been effected. But there was no evidence of any attempt at economy there. Now I digress to point out that this country would have been far better off if that wasted money had been saved to put a good trade agent abroad. Our Government was criticized unmercifully on what our opponents termed a "senseless" policy of trade agents, and when the regulations went the agents were withdrawn. A mistake, Sir. We need agents abroad even if they only sold the value of their salaries in codfish. The direct connection would be there and would surely lead to other business for the country. One honorable member referred here the other day to the possibilities of the Argentine as a fish market. I think it was Major

Cashin. In Brazil they are eating Scotch and Norwegian fish and we are losing ground there. Do we know why? Is the Government or anyone else trying to find out? Is not this a matter important enough for a Government elected on a fishery policy to notice? Apparently not; but thousands of fishermen's hard earned taxes are wasted on one service alone. Had our Government been guilty of such palpable waste as the Earl of Devon service shows up, we should never have heard the end of it. And another case of wanton waste is the staggering amount that has been paid lawyers since July, 1924, for doing work we all expect the Department of Justice to do. Over ninety thousand dollars scooped in by half a dozen lawyers in fees and commissions in this instance. This is an outrage. The Minister of Justice and myself have always been fairly good friends here and I do not intend to be unnecessarily impertinent with him, but I must suggest that this state of affairs be halted. If his department as at present constituted is not able to do this extra legal work on behalf of the Government, then I suggest that a permanent legal man ought to be attached to the department, a sort of solicitor-general if you like, and do the work because in any case, according to the staggering amounts that have been paid lawyers since you took office, tens of thousands of dollars can be saved to the country by so doing.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I would like to say that many of these gentlemen were paid for services performed before we took office.

MR. SCAMMELL — There is one gentleman here who drew some thousands who was certainly not engaged by us.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—He earned his money.

MR. SCAMMELL—Talking of prosperity again, I referred just now to the fact that over two hundred thousand dollars had been given out in poor relief and $4,200.00 in unemployment in the district of Harbor Grace. These figures are from the Auditor General's report.

On the opening day Mr. Puddester talked to us about this prosperity. I pitied him for the job he had in hand, and I failed to see how a man representing such a constituency as Bay de Verde could allow himself to be put in a position to get off such stuff as he gave us here on the opening day.

Now, Sir, getting back to the amendment, it seems to me that there are good and sufficient reasons why this amendment ought to be taken seriously by the other side. There can be no reason why the tariff should not be reduced, if the statements of revenue and expenditure as given out by the Government are correct. For example, we find that for the fiscal year ending June 30th, 1925, there is a surplus of over $300,000.00. Things are bad in the country, and if the Government were seriously minded to help the people why not hand back to them that surplus revenue. What do we want surplus revenues for when the times are so hard. How dare we boast of surplus revenues, of surplus revenues squeezing taxation out of the people and boast of surplus revenues while thousands of young men are leaving the country. You say you need the surplus to meet the deficit on railway account. You do not need it all. The Auditor General says here that the railway can be run with an annual loss of not less than $300,000.00. You have considerable money even after figuring that. If you have this surplus revenue you have no right to it, and your duty is to hand it back to the people whom you took it from last year by this outrageous tariff. I was told the other day that I was a pessimist. If I am pessimistic it is because at the present time I see no hope for this country unless

the Government does something along the lines of this proposed amendment and something to encourage the fisheries. Go up and down the country to-day and you will hear nothing talked of but the fisheries and what is to be done for them. The people want a fishery policy and I for one, as I have previously stated, shall not rest content until I see on the floors of this Assembly a party pledged to make the encouragement of the fishery and the stability of our staple industry their first care.

After all, honorable members opposite know that they came into power largely on a fishery policy, and you are certainly obliged to carry that out. Here is your chance. Put back this income tax on the well-to-do people and lighten the common people's burden by a corresponding reduction in taxation.

We believe from this side that you would be serving your constituents by accepting our proposal to reimpose the Income Tax and Bank Tax, and taking off the taxation on the necessary supplies for the fisheries. We want to see a bonus paid on fish. I have already pointed out that the cost of catching fish is on the upgrade. He would be a bold man to-day who would dare prophesy that the price of Labrador fish next season is going to be as good as it was this season. There is absolutely nothing to lead us to think any such thing. Even were it to be so, the price will not be as good to the fishermen in the long run owing to increased cost of production.

I cannot conceive why the Prime Minister is so determined to do nothing to assist the fisheries. It appears to everybody apparently but those on the other side that what is most needed is Government attention in this direction. In view of the situation I fail to see how honorable members representing fishing constituencies can possibly oppose our proposals as outlined in this amendment.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I wish to say a word or two relative to the last clause in this amendment, namely, the matter of the St. John's East bye-election. Essentially, of course, this is a matter for the electors of St. John's East themselves. They no doubt exhausted every possible means in their power to have the district opened, but they failed. We lent them our support in that fight because we felt they were fighting for their just rights under the Constitution and laws of our land. People who live in the city perhaps have very little idea as to how seriously this bye-election matter has been watched in the outports. The people know that there is great principle involved in this matter, and anyhow they have had their faith in our form of Government and those responsible for the carrying out of our laws, badly shaken. We may as well have had no election law at all. In view of what has happened in connection with this bye-election, the time might very conceivably come when half the districts in this country could be denied representation in Parliament because of the whims or opportune desire of an autocracy. A blow has been struck at the freedom of the people. A precedent has been established, and it is a dangerous precedent.

Now precedent merges into custom and custom in time merges into law, and if such precedents are allowed to continue, the time may well arrive when the people may even lose their right to send representatives to Parliament. In fact, there has already been such a curtailment of our rights, even as members of this House, that in certain respects we may as well not be here at all.

I have been elected to this House on three occasions, and on each occasion as Parliament assembled, we went to the Upper House and there

asked the Governor, through the Speaker, that our ancient rights and privileges as representatives of the people would be confirmed to us. One of these rights was freedom of speech. It now looks however, as if there is to be a curtailment of that right even.

First we are told here that we are not allowed to mention the name of a man prominently associated with the Government in all its misdeeds, and then an attempt is made to choke us off from getting up here and asking our questions as men. All these things are serious. Where are we and whither tending? The Government may congratulate themselves that they have won for the time being in connection with the East End bye-election matter, but the ultimate result of the Government's conduct in this connection may be more serious than they imagine, not alone to themselves politically, but in the general effect the establishment of such a dangerous precedent is found to have in the future. We know, of course, that the election was withheld because of political considerations, although honorable members opposite may say to us on the contrary, notwithstanding.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I think that I have in the time at my disposal fairly traversed the grounds of the amendment, and I trust that honorable members opposite will do their duty to their constituents, particularly those of them representing fishing districts; and let us trust that when voting time comes they will support us in our move to meet some of the crying demands of the people and the times.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the Member for St. Barbe for the emphatic way and the clear manner in which he presented his case for the fisheries. I quite agree with him and it is very hard to understand why the Leader of the Government makes no attempt to do anything for the fisheries and take the stand that he is taking, and how he has failed to keep the promises that he has made to the electorate of this country in assisting the main industry of the country. When one refers to the fishery report as we have had it here to-day and sees that the total exports from Newfoundland are twenty three million dollars and that over thirteen millions of that comes from the fisheries, one will see how important that industry is. More than one half of the amount comes from the fisheries, which to-day is in somewhat straitened circumstances, and yet we have the Leader of the Government saying that nothing can be done unless he gets suggestions from the trade. If we have to wait for suggestions from the trade we will have to wait for ever. As pointed out by the Member for Carbonear it is very difficult to get co-operation of the trade with regard to standardization and the exporting of codfish of the country. One thing is certain that the Government has not carried out its promises up to the present time of having this convention called as they said that they would when they assumed office. They were going to have a convention of the merchants and the fishermen of the country and find out something of the fishing industry of the country and what could be done for it. They have not done it, but from the statement of the Prime Minister there is to be a certain co-operation on the part of a few. We can understand what the co-operation of the few will lead to when it does not embrace the co-operation of the country.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I would like to ask the hon. member if he thinks that I can force everybody to co-operate.

MR. GRIMES—I think that the Government could issue a letter to the exporters and to the outports to come to St. John's and see if they

cannot devise ways and means to improve the condition of the industry. And I am sure that if the Government were to do this that a large number of exporters and fishermen would respond to it to see if something could not be done. It is true that some things in the last regulations did not work out successfully, but I think that it will be agreed that the greater portion of these regulations should be reimposed again and that they would be of benefit to the country. Now last year quite a number of people came to St. John's from Conception Bay and from Trinity Bay. They came to St. John's, and the people of St. John's had to do with less work because of the influx of men from these two bays. Why did they come here Most of these men were engaged in the fisheries of the country before, but they did not find that they made a living, and because of that they wanted to go at some work that would assure them of a more secure income. They come to St. John's and the labour market was oversupplied, and the poeple of St. John's could not get the same amount of employment last year as in years past. When is the Government going to remedy that condition of affairs? They introduced a tourist policy that gave a certain amount of employment last year, and it will give employment to some extent next year. But once that money is spent, what is going to happen? The only thing to do is to encourage the fishermen to go to the fisheries at the present time because if they do not go to the fisheries now they will not go next year, and one thing is sure, and that is, that there will be a larger exodus of people from the country than ever before. At the present time there are no new industries starting up. We have not any statement, no authoritative statement that there will be a new industry starting up that will absorb the surplus of men. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that we will have to do something to encourage the fishermen of the country to fish if we want them to keep on fishing, otherwise we are going to have the same trouble that we have had during the past two or three years. Borrowing money and spending it on unproductive works and having to repeat the same thing year by year. And the only sane thing to do is to give the fishermen encouragement to continue with the fisheries and to carry on with them year after year, and in this way the country could be brought back again to its condition of former years. Now what is needed is a thorough investigation to find out what is the best ways and means of encouraging the fishing industry and to have the fishermen go into it on a larger scale than at the present time. It is said that we cannot handle more fish than we have in Newfoundland at the present time, and if we had more there would be an overproduction and the price would go down, and it would not pay the fishermen for catching it. I think that idea prevailed two or three years ago of having men sent to the various countries of the world and trying to find new markets. Take Canada and the United States to-day. There is a great increase in their export trade over previous years. Canada is emerging today into a period of prosperity. The United States has largely increased her exports, and what is the reason? It is because they have sent consular agents representing them to the various parts of the world advertising the products of their country. Men advertising their goods who understand the language of the countries that they visit. And if the Government of to-day were to employ a couple of men and send them to the South American markets it might be a great benefit to the country.

All other countries to-day are getting back to normal conditions grad-

ually, as has been proven by Canada and the United States as regards their exports, and why cannot Newfoundland do the same respecting the export of codfish?

The Prime Minister referred to a request made of the Government in connection with an allocation for the encouragement of the coal industry of this country. I think the Government should investigate the St. George's coal areas or any other areas where there is any strong feeling or good reasons to think there is coal. It is true that $100,000 was spent in relation to the Little River coal mines some years ago, but that is no reason why the Government should not make further enquiries as to other coal areas and see if there is not a possibility by helping out a Company to start a coal industry in this country. There is no question about the fact that coal exists in this country, and, it has been stated, that coal can be brought in from St. George's and landed at St. John's at $9 per ton. Therefore, I think that the Government should make some enquiry as to whether that can be borne out in fact, and, if it can, I think it ought to be aided and subsidized for three or four years until that industry gets on its feet. It may be argued, as it was by the Prime Minister, that the zinc, lead and other mining industries would be looking for similar concessions. But what effect has zinc and lead got upon the country in general compared with coal. In the Old Country Mr. Baldwin, Leader of the Government in England, subsidized the coal mining industry there, and I see by the press despatch this morning that they were going to have a State subsidy this year by the raising of a loan to help out the coal industry of Great Britain. Well, in order to help out the people of the Empire, there is a precedent and an example set for us to follow. We have been told authoritatively that there is plenty of coal on the West Coast and that it is only a question of mining it. It has been stated by the Prime Minister that it is the intention of the Government to acquire the services of a geologist for a few months to enquire into our mining possibilities.

Now with regard to the question of reduction of taxation. A prominent member of the Government stated at two meetings in St. John's that one million dollars could be saved in connection with the running of the various departments. It has been stated here this session, of course, that a saving of $600,000 has been made. The people who attended those meetings were carried away, as it were, by that announcement. That prominent member of the Government stated that he would first of all have the Department of Marine and Fisheries combined with the Department of Finance and Customs, and to have the Department of Education taken over by the Colonial Secretary, as was done before, as well as the Department of Posts and Telegraphs. And in connection with the Department of Education I would like to ask the Prime Minister if there is going to be any attempt made to have included in the school curriculum something dealing with the fishery. The importance of that was suggested in this House some time ago. We are a fishing country, and, strange to say, our children know absolutely nothing about the main industry of the country. I think that something ought be done in that direction in order to make children better acquainted with the industries in which their fathers are engaged. In connection with reduction of taxation, I pointed out the other day that duties were too high, and the Prime Minister said yesterday that it was impossible to reduce taxation, particularly on clothing because the clothing industries of the country had gone out of existence. I do not know whether the Prime Minister meant to

convey that idea, but I know that that there has been no clothing industries go out of existence in this town. Now I do not say that the duty should be taken off readymades; but the duty should be taken off the raw material used in the making of readymades. That would help the industry and enable it to compete with the material of foreign markets. You would, perhaps, assist the clothing industries best in St. John's by giving them a fifteen per cent. reduction on the trimmings, linings and other material that go into the readymades. That is a matter which should receive the attention of the Government and at least as much attention as has been given tobacco and butterine. Clothing is equally, if not more, important as tobacco and butterine. With regard to the Income Tax, the Prime Minister said that the Income Tax could not be very well carried out in this country because most of our business is speculative in its nature. As an illustration, the wheat industry of Canada compares with the fishing industry of Newfoundland. Wheat is equally as speculative as fishing. Some years the wheat crop is good; more years it is not. Still the Income Tax is in force there. Business is just as speculative with wheat in Canada as with fish in Newfoundland. Here, Sir, we have an illustration in connection with the neighbouring Dominion which shows that in order to carry on the Government of that country they are not going to seek all their taxation from the people who are less able to bear the burden.

Now I just have a few figures here to show that in Prince Edward Island, where there are about ninety thousand people, or about one third the population of Newfoundland, the Government collects in the neighbourhood of $60,000, which is paid by 531 individuals and thirty one corporations. And there where agriculture is the chief industry of the country, out of a total value of products amounting to $26,000,000, $12,500,000 comes from agriculture. It is purely a speculative business and still the income tax is in vogue and they collect this amount. And in Nova Scotia they collect altogether $1,074,000 which is paid by 7,000 individuals and 209 corporations. In New Brunswick there are 6,300 individuals who pay $450,000 and the corporations pay $230,000. In Quebec 44,000 people pay $8,000,000 into the revenue of the country. In this Province 2,356 corporations pay $13,000,000. There is a total of $21,751,000 collected in income tax from the Province of Quebec. In Ontario, 103,390 people pay $11,000,000, and 2,356 corporations $13,000,000, a total of $25,000,000 in all. Now we come to the Western Provinces.

In the Province of Saskatchewan there is $$1,125,000 collected. 15,000 individuals pay $830,000 and 238 corporations pay $3,000,000. The same thing applies to the Province of Alberta and Manitoba. Out of a total value of the products of Saskatchewan $365,000,000 is from agriculture and $35,000,000 from other sources. In the Province of Alberta $277,000,000 is from agriculture and the balance from other sources.

This shows that the argument of the speculative nature of a business is not sound, and that we have just as much reason, perhaps more so in this country, to collect revenue in that way than to collect it solely through the customs. Now it was stated by the Prime Minister yesterday, that only twelve hundred persons paid their income tax, and eight hundred of those are salaried employees. Well, I do not know what is wrong, I am sure. I do not think that we ought to discriminate between the salaried employees and the man who is running his own business in this country. I think that any

man who has an income of $2000 a year should be willing to pay 2 p.c. into the revenue of this country. The man under salary is getting his wages regularly every year. The fishermen and other men engaged in speculative business on the other hand never know what their income is going to be from year to year. Their is an entirely different position altogether. So I submit, sir, that this matter should receive better consideration from the hands of the Government than it is receiving at the present time. And that they could very well reduce the duty upon the necessaries of life, such as sugar and materials that enter into the making of clothing and other articles, and you make up the reduction by what you get in the way of income tax. And I submit, sir, that you could raise $300,000 from that source alone. But supposing as it has been stated that by lowering the duty on these articles we lost $500,000 in revenue, I think that half of that comes back again. It would be spent in the country in any case. I trust, Mr. Speaker, that the Government before this session closes will find some means of reducing taxation, and I think that this is one way in which this could be brought about.

On motion the debate on 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 Thursday afternoon at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, March 25th, 1926.

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

Petitions were presented by:

Mr. Godden from New Chelsea re: Road.

Hon. Mr. Sullivan from Fox Harbor re: Dredging.

Hon. Mr. Sullivan from Regina re: Harbor.

Mr. Ashbourne from Friday's Bay re: Telephone.

Mr. Power from Bay of Islands re: Road.

Mr. Puddester from Grate's Cove re: Road.

Mr. Little from Bonavista re: Landing Place.

Mr. Brown gave notice of question.

Mr. Cashin gave notice of question.

Mr. Moore gave notice of question.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Speaker, on the 22nd day of March, in reply to Mr. Cashin, I advised that an answer was not completed. The Deputy informs me now that ther is no more information. If there is anything special the hon. member wants I can get it.

MR. CASHIN—I want the information in connection with the expenses of raising the loan.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—I can get that for you.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—I beg to table replies to the following questions:

No. 4 on the Order paper of March 23rd.

No. 5 on the Order paper of March 23rd.

No. 6 on the Order paper of March 23rd.

No. 10 on the Order paper of March 23rd.

This leaves every question asked me answered except that asked by Mr. Scammell on March 8th. The Deputy informs me that has been sent to the House, but I do not find it here.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS & TELEGRAPHS—I beg to table reply to question asked by Mr. Cashin on the 23rd. The contingencies are being prepared.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I beg to table reply to question asked

by Mr. Duff on March 23rd regarding able bodied relief. Also by Mr. Ashbourne regarding hospitals. I may say that I have just got the figures from the St. John's General at present, but will have the others later.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, in moving that a Select Committee be appointed by this House to consider and report on the advisability of the introduction of a bill to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act, and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council, requesting that body to appoint a number of councillors, I wish to explain to the House that this method of procedure is adopted because of the extreme importance of the measure. It is about 20 years since the present Workmen's Compensation Law was passed, and in the intervening period considerable alterations have been made in other countries in legislation regarding it, and affecting substance and method. In giving consideration to the question, we have drafted two bills, and the committee will thus be in the position to obtain the best possible results from experience, and to follow the ramifications of both suggestions. I may say that this cannot be regarded as a Government measure; it ought not be regarded in a partizan light. We are endeavouring to get the best legislation possible, and to see that the utmost protection is given workmen and their dependents in a measure applicable to the conditions of this country. I do not think it is necessary to do more than move formally for the appointment of this committee.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, I beg to second the motion of the Hon. Minister of Justice, that a select committee be appointed for consideration of this measure.

Pursuant to notice, Hon. the Minister of Justice moved, and Mr. Halfyard seconded "that a Select Committee be appointed by this House to consider and report on the advisability of the introduction of a Bill to Amend the Workmen's Compensation Act, and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council requesting that body to appoint a number of Councillors to be joined with the members of this House in connection therewith."

The following to be the Select Committee from this House, viz., Hon. the Minister of Justice, Mr. Halfyard, Mr. Warren, Mr. W. J. Browne, Mr. Linegar, Mr. K. M. Brown, Mr. Lake.

Replies to the following questions were tabled with exception to Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 14, 15, 17 which were deferred.

(1) MR. BROWN asked Hon. the Ministre of Posts and Telegraphs to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing the names of all the officials (male or female) in the Post or Telegraph Departments at St. John's; also salary per month and length of service of each official; also to state how many officials in Post or Telegraph Department of St. John's received an increase in salary since July 1st, 1924, and to give the names of such persons.

(2) MR. POWER asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to lay upon the Table of the House the following information: (a) How much coal was imported into this Colony from the United States of America from July 1st, 1924, to date; (b) Who were the consignees; (c) The value of each cargo; (d) The amount of duty collected on each cargo (not including sales tax); (e) Sales Tax collected on each cargo.

(3) MR. SCAMMELL asked Hon. the Minister of Public Works to lay on the Table a full statement of all moneys sent to James G. Baggs, Bay Roberts, for the calendar year 1925; why this money, if any, was not sent to the properly elected Chairman of the Road Board; also to lay on the

Table the returns for all money spent by said James Baggs.

(4) MR. SCAMMELL asked the Minister of Agriculture and Mines if any Licenses to cut timber on Crown Lands have been issued by his Department since July 1st, 1924, and if so, to give full particulars of such in each case; also to ask what sales of timber lands were made by the Government since July 1st, 1924, and to give particulars of such in each case, and further to give a statement showing what rentals (and by whom) are now due the Department on account of Crown Land Licenses.

(5) MR. SCAMMELL asked the Minister of Agriculture and Mines to lay on the Table of the House a statement giving full particulars of the amount of $300,000.00 referred to in the Auditor General's report as written off on account of Royalties or Rents due on timber lands, showing the size of the areas involved, and location of such in each case, and giving names of parties by whom they were held and showing the arrears due in each case.

(6) MR. SCAMMELL asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the Table of the House a statement giving particulars of the amount of $164,709.40 as referred to in the Auditor General's report, as having been surrendered to the Treasury as unexpended votes for the year ending June 30th, 1925.

(7) MR. ASHBOURNE asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing: (a) the amount paid for S.S. Caribou; (b) Copy of contract entered into for the construction of "Caribou"; (c) The amount of money paid for extras and equipment not included in the contract; (d) Cost of sending crew to Holland, including Captain's and Engineers' expenses; (e) Payment made and Bills incurred account S. S. Caribou for expenses other than ordinary running expenses since coming to the Colony; (f) Whether any compensation for late delivery on account of strikes, etc., was given; (g) Amounts paid Captain Stevenson in connection with trip to Holland.

(8) MR. ASHBOURNE asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing: (a) The number of schooners and tonnage registered in the Colony; (b) The number of schooners and tonnage built (or rebuilt), showing each year separately, for the past thirty years and now registered in the Colony.

(9) MR. HIBBS asked the Minister of Public Works to furnish information of the amount of public moneys sent to Wellington, B.B., since 1924 to date, and to state the names of the persons to whom allocations were made.

(10) MR. HIBBS asked Hon. the Colonial Secretary to Table for the information of the House a statement showing if Mr. James P. Hearn of Brigus is still employed by the Highroads Commission, and if so, to state in what capacity, and what services, if any, he has been performing during the winter months, and to furnish a statement of salary received by Mr. Hearn since the time of his appointment by the Highroads Commission to date.

(11) MR. HIBBS asked the Minister of Agriculture and Mines if any arrangements have been made to fill the position of Agricultural Expert recently vacated by Mr. Charles Steer, and if so, to state what time the appointment is to be made and to name the person who is to receive the appointment.

(12) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Colonial Secretary to lay upon the Table of the House a copy of all the Orders-in-Council issued by the Executive Government since July 1st, 1924, to date.

(13) MR. CASHIN asked the Minister of Agriculture and Mines: Is it

the intention of the Government to send a young student to an Agriculture College in Canada for the next one, two or three years; is it their intention to pay his full expenses for the term; if so, please give his name and qualifications; also, is it correct that a farmer's son qualified for the position and who graduated at the McDonald College was turned down; if so, why was the other preferred.

(14) MR. HALFYARD asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the Table of the House a list of all the foreign going vessels registered in Newfoundland; giving the age and tonnage of each vessel; also, the names of the owners.

(15) MR. HALFYARD asked the Minister of Public Works whether the painting of the Post Office at Winterton last Summer was by contract or days' work; if by contract, give name of contractor and amount paid same; if the Government provided the paint, give the number of gallons supplied, the names of the men employed and the rate of pay per day.

(16) MR. GRIMES asked Hon. the Minister of Posts or Minister of Finance and Customs: (a) Whether a number of lost parcels taken from the General Post Office during 1925 for auction were offered for sale; if so, what amount was realized; if the parcels were not sold how were they disposed of.

(17) MR. CASHIN asked the Hon. the Minister of Justice to lay on the Table of the House the following information regarding the inmates of the Penitentiary: (1) What were the various forms or methods of punishment to which prisoners have been subjected from October 5, 1922, to date; (2) Did any prisoners die between these dates; if so how many, when and where; and in each case what was the cause of death; was a doctor in attendance; if so, what doctor; were the patients treated in the Penitentairy or removed to the Hospital; what care of treatment was prescribed for the prisoners, and were those directions carried out; if not, why not; (3) In what condition were the cells, bed and bedding of any prisoners who died during that period found after their death; if any died, who prepared them for burial and who reported their deaths; (4) What exercise, specifying whether indoor or outdoor and length of time allotted therefor, is allowed the prisoners between May and November; what hours are allowed for exercise for those prisoners who are not employed at Government House, the Hospital or the Broom Shop; (5) What is the diet of the prisoners, specifying the variety and quantity; (6) What time are the prisoners required to retire; (7) What percentage of the prisoners are illiterate and what, if any, steps are being takn for their education; (8) If any system of education is being followed when was it inaugurated; (9) What subjects does it embrace and what, if any, trades or avocations are taught the prisoners; (10) Are prisoners who are employed at the Broom Shop, Government House or the Hospital paid for the work they perform; if so, do their families receive the money therefor; (11) Is any provision made for the families of those prisoners who are in the Penitentiary; (12) Is anything done to prepare the prisoners for future good-citizenship; (13) What is the average number of prisoners in the Penitentiary; (14) How many baths are in the building for the use of the inmates; (15) Do the prisoners bathe regularly; if so, how often and when; (16) Are prisoners whose conduct is good rewarded in any way beyond the time remitted in their sentence; (17) Are any of the prisoners suffering from skin disease; (18) Are the prisoners allowed to shave; who shaves them; how many razors, shaving mugs, brushes, towels, etc., are available in the insti-

tution for the use of the prisoners in this respect; (19) Does the Broom Shop pay financially; (20) What are its expenditures and receipts; how many men are employed and what salaries do they receive; (21) How are the cells lighted; if by electricity when was it installed and how were the cells lighted before its installation; (22) What recreation, physically and mentally, do the prisoners get; (23) What kind of clothes do the prisoners wear and what quality are the inside clothes; (24) Are any of the better conducted prisoners given the use of tobacco.

In reference to question No. 1:

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—Statement was laid on the Table of the House a short while ago containing all the names asked for to-day. If anything further is required I shall be glad to supply it. Mr. Cashin to whom I supplied the information or the Clerk of the House should have a copy.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Speaker, I ask that I be furnished with a copy of that information. In reference to a question on the Order Paper of March 23rd, the information supplied me by the Prime Minister is not what I wanted. My meaning may have been mistaken so I will ask the question again and frame it differently.

In reference to No. 6:

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—In reply to the Honourable Member I beg to say that information asked for may be obtained on Page 2 of Public Accounts.

In reference to No. 8:

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS: In reply I would like to call the Honourable Member for Twillingate's attention to the fact that it will entail considerable difficulty to get information such as this, covering a period of thirty years. I would like to have him modify the question to some extent.

MR. ASHBOURNE—If I may be permitted I would like to say that I asked this question to know how many vessels were built during the past twenty years, and to know how many of those registered of which there are three thousand, I think, are over-age and unfit for use. I may be able to modify the question to fifteen years to get the information I require. I want to find out the average age of the vessels of our fleet. I fear that many are over-age, and we may perhaps wake up some day to find that we haven't the fleet we think we have.

In reference to No. 12:

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—I regret that I am unable to lay on the table of the House the Proceedings or Minutes of the Executive Council.

MR. CASHIN—In reference to my motion of March 11th, and the answer received concerning the correspondence between His Excellency the Governor and Mr. McNeilly and Secretary of State, I would like to ask what exactly is meant by "no other correspondence is available." Does this mean that there are no other letters or that there are, and that he does not want us to see them. More than one construction may be put on the word available, and I want to be clear on the point.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—When His Excellency the Governor says that no other correspondence is available, I take it that any other private correspondence he may have is certainly not available.

Address in Reply

MR. HIBBS—I rise for the purpose of supporting the Amendment to the Address in Reply. The Amendment was brought before the House proposed by the Leader of the Opposition, and seconded by the Honourable Member for Ferryland, and since then I have had the pleasure of listening to the Speech of the Prime Minister in connection with it, and he

has given the House to understand that the Government has no intention whatever of acceding to any of the requests made by it. I, therefore, realize the utter futility of prolonging the Debate, but before I take my seat I propose to offer a few suggestions on different lines, and I do sincerely trust that the Government will take the matter seriously in the same spirit in which it is uttered and give it careful consideration at least before turning it down. The Prime Minister in his speech replying to the various speakers on this side of the House made a number of statements. I do not intend to refer to the speech at length but merely to touch on some of the high spots so to speak. The Prime Minister states that no constructive criticism has been offered. I take issue with the Prime Minister. I claim that there has been constructive criticism offered. It seems, however, that it is immaterial what criticism is offered, as the Government has no intention of paying any attention to it. I am sure that the Government realizes that the criticism offered has been practical and constructive, but it does not serve the purposes of the Government to accept it, so they excuse themselves by saying that it is not constructive. Mr. Ashbourne offered some very constructive criticism but, of course, it fell on deaf ears. The Prime Minister did refer to his remarks but merely to say they were not constructive. Mr. Cashin suggested that one hundred thousand dollars be expended on the St. George's Coal Fields. I have personally no interest in the St. George's Coal Fields except that which every Newfoundlander should have, that he wants to see development and would like to see Newfoundland producing her own coal. I am sure the Prime Minister will agree with that. Suppose the Government did render some assistance and give practical encouragement to this deserving object, they would not be doing any more than is being done in other countries. The British Government has contributed, I think, something like ten million pounds to assist the Kent Coal Fields development. They did this simply because struggling companies found that they could not raise the necessary capital, and the Government realized the great assistance development would be to Great Britain and that it would be a good thing to give this assistance. The same was done in Australia and other countries. This Government so would be establishing no precedent to assist the St. George's Coal Fields. Assistance was given before at South Branch, we know, money was expended and it proved a failure. There were then good intentions and an honest effort, and even if it failed, that is no reason why assistance should not be given in another case, and it is a great mistake to think it is. I think we have coal in Newfoundland perhaps second to none, and I think the Prime Minister is very ill-advised in not giving encouragement to the starting of the industry at St. George's. We have always looked on the Prime Minister as a first class business man, and we take off our hats to him for that. In fact he himself says that he is "no politician but a plain business man". Perhaps "being a politician" is contagious and as a result of keeping company with politicians it may be said, to his credit perhaps, that he is fast developing into one. His speech showed his method of warding off criticism and how he tries to answer criticism from this side of the House showed him to be a politician of a very keen mind. I noticed, however that he was guilty of one inconsistency. He mentioned the standardization of codfish and said it cannot be carried out under any regulations the Government can make.

"If the firms combined into one," he tells us in his speech, there might

be some solution. Co-operation is the only solution. If the firms co-operated we could do something, but without that we can do nothing. Further on in the speech he tells us of the standardization of herring that has been effected and regulations have been carried out, and with turbot also the standardization rules have been very satisfactory, and he quoted a letter from a large Quebec importer saying that they have found the regulations satisfactory. The Prime Minister seems in favor of standardization of herring and turbot, and he tells us that we have certain rules for herring and turbot which are working very satisfactory. If regulations have been applied to herring and turbot with advantage, why can they not be applied to the standardization of codfish. The amount of fishing done for herring and turbot is insignificant compared to the codfishery.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — The difficulties to encounter are also insignificant.

MR. HIBBS—That may be, but the same principles might be applied. I think that the present Government should be courageous enough to endeavour to effect the standardization of codfish. We did have standardization laws a few years past and everybody agreed with them and they failed as a result of party politics.

Referring to the Income Tax and the Bank Tax the Prime Minister mentioned two classes that are now being taxed: those paying Bank Tax and those who had to pay Income Tax in one class and the other class the fishermen, and he calls them Peter and Paul. That is a very nice way to express himself, but the Prime Minister fails to realise that Peter is well-to-do and we have not got to lose any sleep over how he is getting on. Paul, however, is a very poor man and it does not do to neglect him. If you keep your promises to Peter and fall down on those made to Paul that is not playing the game.

We admire the Prime Minister for keeping a promise that he made, and we all feel that he is very earnest and honest in his intentions. When he speaks of making a promise and says that he is going to keep it, we clap him on the back, but when he says that he is not going to keep another promise to another class of people we begin to lose faith in him.

There are quite a few things in the speech of the Prime Minister that I would like to criticise, but as I said I realise the utter futility of prolonging the discussion on this amendment because the Government show in their speeches that they have not any intention whatever of carrying out the suggestions in the amendment. I have been accused of obstructing the business of the House, but I do not want to waste the time of the House as I realise that it has been in session for three weeks and very little has been done, but before finishing I would say that the Prime Minister says that he has done some cleaning up and he refers to certain things that the Government has done and how they have carried out their square deal policy, and I must say that this is not observable to some people. It does not seem like a square deal not to keep the promises made to the people of the country. The Prime Minister might have meant well enough when he went to the country, but to-day his ideas, he is honest enough to say, are beginning to change. He is beginning to realise that a great many of the accusations made against his predecessors in office were not justified and were unfounded. His only redeeming feature is that he is honest enough to admit it. The Prime Minister when going to the country promised to reduce taxation and he comes in and increases taxation. That is not a square deal. He condemned his predeces-

sors for raising loans and then he comes in and raises loans and says that he sees nothing wrong in raising loans. That is not a square deal. He would not open St. John's East for a bye-election, is that a square deal? When the two representatives of St. John's East are satisfied that the people of that district want a bye-election then we will open the district, he tells us. I do not believe that five people in the country are going to believe that the Prime Minister was in earnest when he made that remark. Surely we have had sufficient to show that the people want a bye-election, and even if they did not, what difference?—for the law is there that says the district should be opened in six months, and it cannot be evaded. The Prime Minister says that the election will be held when the representatives are satisfied. Why not be straight and frank and say, "I know the law calls for it but we are going to defy the law and not have it." I speak no disrespect of His Excellency the Governor and I want to refer to the fact that some of the newspapers have been accused of attacking him. I do not think that they did. Perhaps the newspapers did not attack His Excellency but rather an attitude of his—an attitude founded of course on the advice of his Ministers, and perhaps the people running those newspapers have just as much respect for law and order and for His Excellency the Governor as those who have violated the law by not opening the district for the bye-election. There is no question about that, one has violated while the other has kept it.

I feel that it is absolutely useless to discuss the amendment, but I am going to refer to another suggestion and it is a matter that I trust the Government will take seriously into consideration. It is the matter of the fisheries. The question of the fisheries is the greatest question. We are a fishing country and the fisheries are of the utmost importance, not only to the fishermen and exporter, but to clerk and blacksmith and shoemaker and others. Two-thirds of the people of the country are dependent on the fisheries. It is therefore not a matter to be turned down easily and without serious consideration. Consideration has been given during the past few years to pulp and paper and other industries. And I say that it is not a matter that you can turn down easily. When earnest suggestions are made you cannot afford to turn them down without first giving them some serious consideration. I own, sir, that it has been the fashion of recent years to talk and think of other industries, such things as pulp and paper mills and mines and flour mills. These things are all very good in their way and it is furthest from my thoughts this evening to criticise them in any way whatever. But I do say that after all we all depend to a great extent upon the fishing industry of this country. After all, a bird in the hand is worth two in the bush.

In connection with the question that we are discussing this afternoon it is a great mistake, sir, for us, like Nero, fiddling while Rome was burning, to remain or pretend to remain absolutely indifferent to the facts that our greatest industry is languishing. This is not what the people of progressive countries do. They make an endavour to improve their industries to apply it to modern methods. They make every endeavour in their power to increase the earning power of that industry. But we here are prepared and siatisfied to let that industry take care of itself. And the inevitable result will be that in the not far distant future it will be only a memory of what once was. Now I suppose that you all will agree with me on that point no matter what your political persuasions may be. You will all agree with me that the fisher-

ies of Newfoundland are not what they should be. And we are not making the best of our opportunities. Supposing, for instance, that the great wheat crops of Canada were neglected, why the whole of Canada would feel it. Supposing the wheat crops and the wool crops of the United States were unsuccessful, would it not affect the whole of that great country? Of course it would. The same argument applies to New Zealand. If her great wool crops were affected in any way, the whole of the people would begin to realise the danger and they would immediately do something to remedy that. But here in this backward little country we are prepared to fold our arms and take things easily. I do say, sir, that something more serious should be done. Much more serious attention should be given to this most serious question. It is not enough for the Leader of the Government or the principle men of this country to say that it is a matter for the Board of Trade; to say that it is a matter for the people of the trade. I admit that it is a matter for the people of the trade, but when the people in the trade take no steps, when they make no move to correct conditions and to improve matters, surely we are not going to stand by and do nothing and go down with them to commercial disaster. I hope, sir, we are not.

Then, sir, what does the Government do. Is it not the Government's duty to regulate things and see that everything that pertains to the welfare of the people, society, commerce and trade is taken care of and protected. It is just a matter of passing the buck. Instead of doing anything, you say that it is the other fellow's business. Surely we are not going to suffer this inactivity to prevent us from making a move when we know that it is our business to do something.

Now, sir, before I proceed any further I would like to say that the conditions that exist in Newfoundland with reference to the fisheries apply with equal force to the conditions that existed in all countries a few years back. I would refer to the wool crops of Canada due to the wheat, and wool crops of the United States and the wool crops of New Zealand. The very same conditions that are existing in this country to-day applied to these countries in the not far distant past. But they woke up. They felt the modern touch. They realised that they could not go on in the unsystematic way in which they were going. The result was that a modern system was evolved.

Now, to come down to the point, Mr. Speaker, we are all agreed, number one, that the present method of marketing our codfish is disastrous. We all deplore the dumping system that has been, and is, going on. We all realise that. The Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance realise that, and they are amongst the biggest fish exporters in the country at the present time. All other exporters realise that also. Well, it is up to these men to do something to remedy this state of affairs and to help us to get out of the rut that we have been in for so many years.

I say that we, that is the Government with which I was associated with a few years ago, made an effort to do something to remedy and bring about a new and better condition of affairs. The fish regulations were introduced. I do not want to discuss them now, but I only wish to say that I heartily approved of them with one exception, that is the placing of certain unalterable prices on the fish. I did not agree with that first or last. But with every other section of the Bill I was in perfect accord. But they died a political death. They were killed through party politics. Nothing more or less. Now that is the point. And what are we going to

do about it? What is the solution? Now I want to say that the two words that mean all the difference between the success and failuure in connection with the marketing of our fish is "co-operative marketing". That is nothing new here. It is not so long ago since we had a man here discussing this question from different platforms—the Board of Trade, the Rotary Club and other places. I think it met with the serious consideration if not with the approbation of most of the people who heard it. Now, sir, I would say if everything else fails, I would say to the Prime Minister, why not give some serious consideration to the matter of co-operative marketing. The job is yours, sir, and the responsibility is yours. You are not a novice in this business. You are one of the biggest exporters in this land. You have a lot of practical knowledge. This is not the time for inaction. This is the time for the Government to take some action and to take it quickly.

Now I hope to make some suggestion to the Prime Minister through you, Mr. Speaker, that I hope he will give serious consideration to. It is not given in the spirit of carping criticism. Possibly if these suggestions were explored they would be found to be impracticable. But that is not an excuse in the world why the Government should not explore it. Of course it is not a new idea. It is twenty years old and therefore modern. Now I wish to point out what has been done in the countries of the American continent during the last fifteen or twenty years in regard to the marketing and selling of their produce by the co-operative method. I was handed by the executive officials of some of these organisations for perusal facts which I am going to lay before the House to show the gigantic proportions to which the idea of co-operative marketing has risen. The people of the country of Canada and the United States have during recent years marketed the produce of their countries largely through this particular system. In the United States the quantity of farm produce that has been marketed through these co-operative markets up to the year 1925 was valued at $150,000,000. It has been said, sir, that the co-operative marketing scheme has fallen through and that it has been abandoned. Now, sir, I want to point out that that is not correct. Those who talk that way do not know the facts. The facts are these: that up to the year 1925 that enormous amount of produce has been marketed on that system that we are just now discussing. There are some 12,500 associations in that great country, with a membership of 2,000,000 farmers and others. There are 3,134 grain elevators and warehouse associations, 1,966,000 dairy produce associations, 1,232 fruit growers' associations, 107 cotton growers, 25 tobacco growers, 15,098 live stock associations.

The California Fruit Growers Exchange in 1923 marketed 14,000,000 oranges and 3,000,000 lemons. These were worth in all $55,000,000. The Maritime Poultry Association marketed 266,000 cases of eggs. In a number of states wheat growers marketed goods to the value of $349,000.00. The Cotton Market Association marketed one million bales of cotton with a value of $104,000,000. The Rice Market Association marketed 610 million pounds of rice. The Tobacco Associciation marketed 602 million pounds of tobacco, worth $127,000,000.

We have sir, to ask ourselves the question, are we so much wiser than the rest of the world? And speaking particularly of the New World, are we so far advanced that we can easily discard, or not give a moment's thought to what those people in the neighbouring countries are doing to improve their industries? I remember

last year a bill was brought into this House and because it was based upon a Canadian Act, we were to consider that it must be pretty perfect. Because these people are a clever people and they give a great deal of attention to these matters, and therefore we have no doubt and do not for a moment fear to accept that bill in the main with a few alterations to suit our own local conditions.

Might we not turn them to Canada or the United States, and ask them what they are doing to market their great products. Their wool and their cotton and their wheat and all the other products of those great countries. Two-thirds of all the tobacco grown in the United States is co-operatively marketed. 90 p.c. of all the Cal. oranges, 85 p.c. of the prunes, 80 p.c. of the apricots, the National Live Stock Producers' Association, with 14 terminals in New York and elsewhere, handled over $100,000,000 of live stock for 1923.

Then coming nearer home, let us turn to the Dominion of Canada. What are they doing with regard to the marketing of their products? One half of the total wheat crop of the Dominion was marketed last year through the Wheat Growers' Association. Saskatchewan marketed through these associations one hundred and eighty one million pounds of bushels of wheat. The same thing applies to poultry farming, live stock and fruit growing and the co-operative idea has been put in operation there with astonishing results. Now I would like the Prime Minister if he would be good enough to listen to me for a few moments. I understand that he is busy and all that, but I think that the few remarks that I am going to make would be of interest to him. There is a man living to-day who is an outstanding authority upon this co-operative market system. No doubt every gentleman in this House is familiar with the man. He is a genius, one who has been consulted as a specialist in this co-operative idea, I may say with wonderful results. His services have been at the disposal of the producers of the United States and Canada. And the results have been marvellous. He is a comparatively young man, not over forty-five years of age. He is a lawyer by profession. That is the only objection that I have to him. But even if he is a lawyer and all that, he has done wonders on the American continent. He is held up everywhere as a genius. I am of the opinion that he would come to Newfoundland and give us advice. The Prime Minister pointed out a little while ago that he found it very hard to get co-operation. Well the reason for that may be that one man thinks he knows as much as another. One exporter is jealous of the other. That is our great difficulty. I may not have the knowledge that the leader of the Opposition for instance may have on these matters. But surely you cannot spend a lifetime in the fish business without gathering some facts. We all know that the conditions under which the fish is marketed in this country is disastrous. Here we have the competitive system. There is nothing but the keenest competition resulting inevitably in dumping on the market. One man is jealous of the other. He tries to steal away if he possibly can and get his cargo of fish on the market before the other fellow; it is a gamble and nothing else. The slogan is get there first. What is the result? Where there were only ten thousand quintals wanted you have put fifty thousand. The market is over supplied and disaster follows. Now if it were only those responsible for this condition of things were to suffer it would not be so bad. But everyone suffers. The fishermen suffer. Surely if there is any way of remedying that state of affairs, we should act right away. I want to tell the Prime Min-

ister that he must be courageous. He told us himself the other day when he was speaking in connection with the civil service, he said that it was very hard to dismiss civil servants and cut down expenditure. Well I must say that I sympathise with him in that. I realise that you must be strong and firm to do that sort of thing. But I believe that is just the sort of man the Prime Minister is. You have, I say, to be courageous and make an effort to improve matters, and if the people see that you are trying to do something, even though you fail, the people of this country will not condemn you.

Now I wish to call the Prime Minister's attention to the Fish Regulations of 1920. Sir William Coaker was the prime mover in introducing them. And he had his heart and soul in it. But the worst conditions possible obtained that year. It was the biggest catch that we had for twenty years. With the result that there was so much more difficulty in marketing the fish that year. That is why the fish regulations were so difficult to carry out. And then it was made a party matter; a political matter. We had a desperate struggle over that issue, with the result that they failed. Now the point I want to make is this that we were not turned down in 1923 on account of that. Well, if the Prime Minister makes an effort and fails is that going to affect his election in 1928. You will have a lot of people who will stand behind you and say that you made an honest effort and that they are going to support you again.

Now to come back to that man I was referring to a few minutes ago. It would only cost four or five thousand dollars to get him down here. I would suggest to the Prime Minister right here now, I hope that he will take up this suggestion. Never mind because it happened to come from this side of the House. Get this man down. Or at least find out whether he will come down and give us the benefit of the advice, which he can give you. See what really is the difference between the conditions here and in Canada and the States. See if he cannot apply his idea here. If he says after his conference with the leading fishermen of the country and the principle exporters, if then he says: "Well, I don't think that you can apply this system to Newfoundland." Well then that is all that you can do. It would only cost you four or five thousand dollars and perhaps he would not charge you at all, as he is a pretty wealthy man and he makes this his hobby. Surely the thing is worth trying. You cannot persuade yourself that the marketing of the produce of this country, that the fish is the only produce in the world that cannot be subjected to this idea of co-operative marketing of the codfish and to see whether or not the same principles cannot be applied with success, as have been applied to the marketing of the produce on the American Continent. Just a moment, Mr. Speaker. I do not want to delay the House, but I would just ask your permission to read a few paragraphs from a speech delivered by this gentleman, on the subject of co-operative marketing.

(Reads)

It is not necessary to dwell upon this any longer, as I feel that it is only necessary to make the suggestion and the matter will be given consideration by the Government, and, if it is, I know of nothing that will redound more to the credit of the Government. Six years ago the Advocate published a series of articles in connection with co-operative marketing and covered the ground pretty thoroughly in relation to this important question. I sincerely trust that something will be done by the Government on the lines I have suggested and that my remarks will not fall upon deaf

ears. It is only common sense to think that what applies to the marketing of apples applies to the marketing of any other product. It is a well known recognised rule for business people throughout the whole world to buy in the cheapest market and sell in the highest market; but, apparently, we, in Newfoundland have been doing the very opposite to that. We have been selling to countries where the markets have been very, very low. In the United States the average wage paid to workmen is $5.50 per day; whereas in Italy, where we have been selling our fish, the wage paid is something like 96 cents a day. I think this Government should get in touch with a trade agent and find out what the possibilities are for the market of a considerable portion of Newfoundland fish in the United States, and, while on this point, I may say that I believe that it was a great mistake to dispense with the services of such an efficient and capable Trade Commissioner in the United States as Mr. Devine, and I further believe that the present Government would do well if they engaged the services of that man now with a view to the proper marketing of our products in the States. I have no desire to unnecessarily delay the time of the House, as the debate on the Address in Reply is about now to be wound up. While I am in hearty accord with the Amendment to the Speech from the Throne and give it my unqualified support, I believe that the Government have decided not to vote for the Amendment or anything suggested in the Amendment. At the same time I think it is my privilege to again throw out the suggestion to the Government with a view to having brought here the man I have already referred to in order to have the whole problem of co-operative marketing of our fish dealt with fully. Even, if the cost of bringing Mr. Sapiro here was four or five thousand dollars, I believe the money would be well and profitably spent. He could meet representatives of the fishermen as well as of the trade and give them advice as to the best methods for the co-operative marketing of Newfoundland products. I sincerely hope that the Government will give this matter that serious consideration that it deserves and not continue to pursue that same old policy of indifference, as the suggestion comes from one who represents a very successful fishing district, and I would be very remiss in my duty, indeed, if I did not make some practical suggestion in the interest of that great industry from which my constituents earn their livelihood.

On the motion for adoption of the Report of the Select Committee on the Address in Reply, Mr. Hickman's amendment was read as follows:

That the following paragraphs be added after the word "Legislature" in the Report of the Select Committee appointed to Draft a Reply to His Excellency's Speech:

"That this House notes with regret "that in Your Excellency's Speech no "mention is made of a revision of the "present tariff which discriminates "against the masses and relieves "wealthy persons and Corporations "from contributing their proportion-"ate share to the common burden.

"It is in the interests of the coun-"try that an immediate reduction be "made both in taxation and public "expenditure. A Royal Commission "of a non-partisan character should "be forthwith created to report upon "the best means whereby the present "excessive expenditures of Government "Departments may be materially re-"duced and increased efficiency in "the Public Service made possible.

"This House is of opinion that "prompt action is necessary for the "protection and encouragement of "our staple industry, the Fisheries. "The basis of Newfoundland's pros-

"perity has been and is its fisheries, "and an earnest effort should be "made to preserve and expand them. "At the present moment while your "Ministers are expending millions of "public moneys upon a visionary Tour- "ist Policy, the basic industry of our "country is permitted by them to "languish and decay.

"The Income Tax, and Bank Tax "should be re-imposed and the Rev- "enue resulting therefrom devoted to "the payment of a bonus to fishermen "upon Labrador, Shore and Bank fish.

"The extra taxation placed by the "Budget of 1925 upon butterine, tobac- "co, lines and twines, and clothing, "works great hardship upon the fish- "ermen and labouring classes of this "country. In justice to them, an im- "mediate repeal of this excessive "taxation should be effected.

"We deeply regret that in the "Speech from the Throne Your Ex- "cellency has not seen fit to make any "announcement with respect to filling "the vacancy in the representation of "St. John's East in this House which "vacancy has now existed for over a "year. In view of the Constitutional "issues involved and of the statutory "duty cast upon Your Excellency by "the law of the land, this House is of "opinion that the prayer contained "in the petition signed by nearly 5,000 "electors of the said District and pre- "sented to Your Excellency in Octob- "er last, should be at once acceded "to."

Whereupon the House divided and there appeared in its favor:

Mr. Hickman
Mr. Halfyard
Mr. Hibbs
Mr. Grimes
Mr. Scammell
Mr. Brown
Mr. Randell
Mr. Duff
Mr. Godden
Mr. Ashbourne
Mr. Cashin
Mr. Warren 12

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
Mr. Moore
Mr. Lake
Mr. Sinnott
Mr. Chambers
Mr. Power
Mr. Little
Mr. Puddester
Mr. Cahill
Mr. Linegar
Mr. Browne 18

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. Cramm
Hon. Mr. Bradley
Mr. Moore
Mr. Lake
Mr. Sinnott
Mr. Chambers
Mr. Power
Mr. Little
Mr. Puddester
Mr. Cahill
Mr. Linegar
Mr. Browne 18

and against it:

Mr. Hickman
Mr. Halfyard
Mr. Hibbs
Mr. Grimes
Mr. Scammell
Mr. Brown
Mr. Randell
Mr. Duff

Mr. Godden
Mr. Ashbourne
Mr. Cashin
Mr. Warren 12

so it passed in the affirmative and was ordered accordingly.

Pursuant to notice 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 Sec. 4 of Cap. 1, Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Promulgation and Construction of Statutes.'"

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 notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 11 George V, Cap. 37 entitled "An Act further to Amend Chapter 35 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Postal and Telegraph Services.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—Mr. Chairman, the amendment is a very simple one. It is in connection with Section three of the act. In this section three the amendment is that we are striking out the word five and substituting, ten which will give the department an increase of revenue.

Section three of the act reads:

(Reads)

The substituted word is ten instead of five on dutiable goods.

MR. HALFYARD—Could the Hon. Minister give us an idea as to the amount of revenue that would be collected in this way?

HON. THE MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—It will give an increase of three thousand five hundred dollars. That will make a total revenue of seven thousand dollars.

MR. BROWNE—I would like to ask the Hon. Minister if this is in addition to the sales tax. Books have to pay the sales tax and it would be a big increase.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—This is another tax altogether. It is a postal tax.

MR. BROWNE—Books have to pay a sales tax and in this case it might be a large amount in comparison to the value of the books if you increase the price from five cents to ten cents.

MR. GRIMES—I can quite understand the point that Mr. Browne has raised. Suppose a number of books come into the country, and to come in complying with the postal rules they have to come in eleven pound parcels. And in a parcel of this weight the books may not be valued at more than fifty or sixty cents, and ten cents on every parcel would mean a lot to some of these people.

HON. THE MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS — When these parcels come they have to be distributed. It is going to bring us in an extra revenue and that is why we are going to do it.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Hon. Minister of Posts and Telegraphs if his department is considering repealing the law taxing local newspapers. I would suggest to the Minister that now that he is going to get thirty five hundred dollars, as a result of the present bill that his Department

can afford to dispense with the two thousand four hundred dollars that is collected from the Local Newspapers that are circulated around the country.

It was during the late Government's tenure of office that the tax of half a cent per found on newspapers was passed. I never agreed with it; speaking as one who knows something of the needs of the outports in this respect, as well as from the standpoint of a newspaper man. I am sure that Mr. Puddester if he were not in the chair would support my suggestion.

Mr. Chairman it is a mistake to tax local newspapers, taxing newspapers is a tax on education, because after all it is practically the only source of information from the city, which the people of extern districts enjoy.

What does the small amount of two thousand dollars mean to the Government, in my opinion the end does not justify the means, now that the Minister has been given the means of raising three thousand five hundred dollars from another source let local newspapers go free.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Somebody has to do a lot of work delivering them.

MR. HIBBS—I thought the Prime Minister would agree with me when it comes to the tax on newspapers. He should know that it is economically unsound.

Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity of asking the Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs to take this matter under consideration.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—A few years ago I made the same remarks from the same seat from which the honourable member made them just now. I found myself in the same position as he finds himself to-day, and I find myself in the same position now as he found himself then. I reply to you now as you replied to me then.

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 notice 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 the Taxation and Immunity from Taxation of State Enterprises."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, I do know if any of the hon. members on the other side of the House want to know any more in connection with this bill as I explained it at the second reading, that it was in connection with the Economic Conference, and it has been passed by the other states. Nothing important. Does not effect us.

MR. GRIMES—I would like to ask the Hon. Minister what number of state enterprises we have here?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—If the Hon. Minister of Finance does not mind, at the request of the Hon. Member for Fortune when we were at the second reading of this bill he asked to have some information affecting this matter. This is from the Secretary of State, December 22:

(Reads)

As the Hon. Member for Fortune knows the Economic Conference in 1923 on October 24th adopted the resolution that we have here today. I would be very glad to place the correspondence at the disposal of any of the hon. members on the other side

of the House. It is simply a verbatim copy. Nothing local about 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.

Second reading of Bill entitled an Act further to amend Chapter 35 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Postal and Telegraph Services.'"

MR. SCAMMELL—I would like to ask if the Hon. Minister has any preliminary explanation before the second reading goes through. I do not remember that he has made any previous explanation.

HON. THE MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to do that until the House goes into Committee, but it is simply this that we want to increase our liability on registered letters for which we are now liable for ten dollars and we want to increase the liability to twenty-five dollars. This amendment will give us that power. The next point is that early in the year the Government made a new postal convention with the Postal Office, or the Postmaster General of the United States and agreed to extend the weight of parcels imported into this country by mail from eleven pounds to fifteen pounds. They especially asked that that request be granted and our Government agreed to it. The Hon. Charles Murphy, the Postmaster General of Canada, at Ottawa, also asked the same privilege and we extended the same to Canada, so that for all the parcels that come in by mail will be limited in weight to fifteen pounds instead of eleven as before. In addition to that we agreed to reduce the postage rates on all magazines and things of that kind that come in to this country to one half of the rate of one cent per ounce or four cents per pound, which up to the first of February was eight cents per pound. So that we agreed to reduce the rate just one half. This is where the educational part of it comes in. Now we will be able to get the Canadian and American magazines in much cheaper because the rate is reduced as far as the postage is concerned. If there is anything else that the hon. members would like to know I will be glad to go further into the matter when the House goes into the committee on this bill.

MR. BROWNE—I would like to refer the Hon. Minister to the second page of this bill.

(Reads)

I would like to point out to the Minister that the fifty centimes is a negligable amount compared with the ten cents at the present rate of exchange. It would be no hardship for a person to post a letter and pay fifty centimes because at the present rate of exchange the ten cents would be about five times as much.

HON. THE MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—I did not expect that I would have to satisfy any members on this side of the House. I thought that I would have only to answer the questions from the other side. But now I find that the Hon. Member for St. John's West is trying to tangle me up. I will look this up, and at the committee stage will go into the matter.

MR. HIBBS—I have to say again that it does seem strange that the Minister saw fit to reduce the postage rate on foreign matter and is not able to reduce the rate on the local papers. Charity should begin at home. Why cannot you reduce the taxation on local papers when you can reduce the taxation of foreign papers. Surely that is a matter that should be given some consideration.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend Chapter 35 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Postal and Telegraph Services,'" 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.

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill to Amend the Act respecting the Seal Fishery.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, March 26th, 1926.

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

Petitions were presented by:

Mr. Warren from Grole re: Coastal Service.

Mr. Warren from Corbin re: Mail Service.

Mr. Warren from Sagona re: Wireless Station.

Mr. Hibbs from Carmanville re: Public Wharf.

Mr. Grimes from Lawrenceton re: Public Wharf.

THE HON. THE COLONIOL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker: I beg to lay upon the Table of the House a pamplet that has been compiled having reference to the changed conditions of the electoral districts of the Colony, under the Redistribution Act. It will be remembered that last year several members of the House expressed a wish that some sort of a guide be prepared so that candidates for the next general election could acquaint themselves with the boundaries of the different districts which they may be going to contest and also with regard to the population of voters in different parts of the districts. I gave the assurance to the House at the time the request was made that this work would be prepared, and, if possible, have the necessary data put in the hands of members before the House would sit again. After taking up the work I found that it required a considerable amount of research and checking up so that it is only to-day I find myself in the position to table the result. It will be appreciated that this work was an important one and had to be gone into very carefully and very thoroughly so that no discrepancies or anything misleading might be found at any time an election is to be held under the new Election Act.

We have given the place of honour to White Bay in the front of the book and it will be found that it starts there and finishes with district of St. Barbe on the other side of the Island. There is a note in the beginning of this book and which, with the indulgence of the House, I would like to read, and, perhaps, to make a brief explanation of some of the terms, which may appear to be somewhat ambiguous.

(Reads Note).

After taking the lists from the List of Voters and the Census of 1921, we have had those lists submitted to Magistrates and Justices of the Peace and other competent persons over the Island and we asked them to check them over and see that the boundaries were properly defined. I may say that we received replies that they were entirely in order, and, I think, therefore, that it can be taken that the figures given are critically correct. We do not presume to say that this is a perfect compilation, however, and we would be very glad to have any errors that may exist corrected. It may be found that, perhaps, a small settlement may be included, but that does not materially affect the list of voters

because the inhabitants of that settlement may be embodied in a settlement next to it; but it would be found very awkward if, in the district of Bonavista say, a small settlement was included in Bonavista East when it really should be included in Bonavista West, and if any discovery is made showing a settlement is under the wrong heading we shall be very glad to have the Department notified and have the error rectified. It must also be appreciated that since the Census were taken five years ago that the denominational aspect of sections of the country has materially changed, particularly in the Humber region. The Humber has only started to grow in population the past few years, whilst we have only the figures of the Census for 1921 to go by.

I may say that there is another important feature in connection with the Redistribution Act and which is impossible to cover now in this guide book and that is that for the next general election the compilation of the list of voters for the ladies, who will have to be included, will have to be undertaken. However, before the next general election we hope to be in the position to have that list for women compiled.

I wish to draw the attention of the honourable members to the description at the top of every district of what the district contains, its boundaries and so on. I feel sure that this book will be found very useful; it is concise, and, with the figures it contains, makes a handbook that we have not had before. It is a most useful document and will greatly help candidates for election and others during the coming General Election. I may say this work has been compiled under the management of Mr. Stirling in the Colonial Secretary's Office, who has worked at it very assiduously. It has taken practically the whole of last year, and with the Deputy Minister, Mr. Mews, he has checked the entire figures, and I feel sure that the work will be found as a general rule correct. Copies have been placed on the desk of every member, and further copies will be available. Pamphlets of each district separately have also been prepared and may be obtained.

MR. WARREN—Apropos of what has been said by the Colonial Secretary I want to say that I agree that this will prove a very useful pamphlet. I wish that a copy of the edition of the map that is being prepared for the Government showing the various districts accompanied it, and perhaps a smaller edition of the map might be had. I understand a new map has been prepared for the Government showing the new districts as made by the Redistribution Act of last year. I would like to ask the Colonial Secretary if it is possible for members to receive that map, or what chance there is of a smaller edition of the map being made and being available.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—I would like to congratulate the Colonial Secretary. I think this is one of the most useful pamphlets we have had placed on our desks in this Assembly. Judging by this I think it ought to be possible to compile a map also. Every member by this pamphlet can make himself acquainted with his district and know where it begins and ends, and what he has to canvass, so even without the aid of a map this is a very useful document. This voter's list, I may remark, is only male voters, but I suppose if we multiply by two we will get a pretty nearly correct voter's list. I appreciate very much this copy from the Colonial Secretary I think it a very good thing that the Colonial Secretary thought of compiling this work.

MR. SCAMMELL—I desire to associate myself with the congratulations of Mr. Hickman to the Colonial Secretary, and I feel that he has done a

great service to the members of the House. I agree with Mr. Warren with regard to his reference to the map, showing the electoral districts which the Government has prepared, and I think the honourable members are entitled to see it or have a copy of it. I cannot too sincerely express my gratitude to the Colonial Secretary for his kindness in supplying this pamphlet which I feel sure will serve a very useful purpose. I feel somewhat flattered that the district I represent has been made the Alpha and Omega in the arrangement of the districts beginning as they do with White Bay and ending at St. Barbe.

MR. GRIMES—I wish to express my appreciation of the Colonial Secretary for his excellent compilation in connection with the various districts showing the settlements in each district which will be handy for reference. Letters have been coming in to me from Twillingate from different people asking in what District they were placed under the new Re-Distribution Bill. I was not able to give them the information, as I did not know, and this will prove a very great convenience in supplying such information as asked for.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY —In reply to Mr. Warren's question concerning a map, I might say that it is very true that the Government has secured a map which will serve as a future map of reference fo the new districts. The Government have decided to allocate two hundred of these maps each to the three largest denominations for educational purposes. Six hundred schools at least will have one of these maps and the schools of other denominations will have their proportion also. These will serve the purpose of educating the future voters. It was suggested that each member have a copy of the map and to me personally this is very acceptable, and I think everyone in this House instrumental in bringing about the new conditions under the Re-Distribution Act should have a copy. If any member desirous of having one will send the address where he wants one forwarded, the Colonial Secretary's Department, we will be glad to oblige him.

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow move the House into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Reslutions dealing with an agreement entered into between the Government of Newfoundland and the Dominion Iron and Steel Company, Limited, and the Nova Scotia Steel Company, Limited.

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill respecting Civil Service Protection.

Mr. Cashin gave notice of question.

Mr. Warren gave notice of question.

Mr. Grimes gave notice of question.

Mr. Hibbs gave notice of question.

Mr. Hickman gave notice of question.

Mr. Scammell gave notice of question.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill to amend the Act Respecting the Sealfishery, 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 Justice the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Sec. 4, Cap. 1, Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of the Promulgation and Construction of Statutes," 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 the Taxation and Immunity from Taxation of State Enterprises" was read a third time, and passed, and it was ordered that the aid Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legilative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Replies to the following questions were tabled with exception of Numbers 1, 4, 5, 6, which were deferred.

(1) MR. BROWN asked the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the Table of the House returns for the amount of $600.00 allocated to Kenneth Farwell, Eastport, B.B., September 11th, 1924, for Roads and Bridges; returns for the amount of $300.00 to Arch Davis, Templeman, B.B.; returns for the amount of $1200.00 to George Davis, Newtown, B.B., October 7th, 1924, for Roads and Bridges; returns for the amount of $1800.00 to Harold Rowsell and Albert Reader of Bonavista, October 7th, 1924, for Roads and Bridges; returns for the amount of $400.00 special, to Harold Rowsell of Bonavista, September 1st, 1924, for Roads and Bridges; returns for the amount of $35.00 to Sydney Hill, Wesleyville, December 16th , 1924; Returns for the amount of $27.00 to Baxter Kean, Brookfield, B.B., October 7th, 1924, for Roads and Bridges; returns for the amounts of $250.00, to William Sainsbury, Wesleyville, September 8th, 1924, also for $250.00 and $300.00 on September 11th, 1924; also $250.00 on October 6th, 1924, for Roads and Bridges; also for $100.00 on August 19th, 1924, for Repairs to Water Pipes; returns for the amount of $300.00, allocated to Hubert Blackmore, Pinchard's Island, B.B., October 7th, 1924, for Roads and Bridges; returns for the amount of $150.00 to Joseph Stagg, Cape Cove, Cape Freels, October 6th, 1924.

(2) MR. BROWN asked Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs who is the Telephone Operator at Southern Bay, B.B., what is his age and is he capable of doing this work; why do the public of Southern Bay have to travel to Princeton to get a Money Order; did not Alfred Quinton, former Postmaster, issue Money Orders and if so why the change and to state who recommended Mr. Quinton's dismissal.

(3) MR. BROWN asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing the names of all persons employed by the Department of Marine and Fisheries last season as Fishery Inspectors or Fishery Statisticians and to show amounts paid each as salary and travelling expenses.

(4) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay upon the Table of the House the following particulars with respect to the charge against one James Griffin, of Colliers, for defrauding the Highroads Commission, which charge was summarily dismissed by Judge Morris in December 1925: (1) At whose instance were the proceedings initiated; (2) What was the amount paid for (a) expenses and witness fees, (b) legal fees; (3) Who was the Solicitor engaged on behalf of the Righroads Commission; (4) What was the amount actually involved in the charge heard before Judge Morris; (5) Has any representation been received from James Griffin protesting against the treatment accorded him at the hands of the Highroads Commission by the Government or any Department thereof; if so, table same, and the reply, if any, by the Government thereto; (6) Does the Government contemplate any payment by way of restitution to Mr. Griffin for the treatment experienced by him at the hands of the authorities.

(5) MR. MOORE asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the Table of the House the following information: (1) What firm performed the plumbing contract in connection with the Normal School; (2) Were tenders asked for; (3) If tenders were asked for, to lay same on the Table of the House; (4) What was the price paid for work; (5) Was the lowest tender accepted.

(6) MR. MOORE asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the Table of the House the following information: (1) What firm performed the heating contract of the Normal School; (2) Were tenders asked for; (3) If tenders were asked for, to lay same on the Table of the House; (4) What was the price paid for work; (5) Was the lowest tender accepted.

MR. CASHIN—I received a reply from the Prime Minister to a question on the Order Paper of March 18, which does not exactly answer my question. The question was with regard to officials employed at the Railway at salaries over $2,000 dollars and the Prime Minister's reply gave number of officials but no names. I want to get the names.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—We came to the conclusion that it is not advisable to publish the names of those at the Railway getting such salaries.

MR. CASHIN—The Railway is a Public Department owned by the Government just as much as any other and there is in my opinion no reason why we should not get this information. The people of the country have to provide the revenue that supports the Railway. They have to pay the loss and it is considerable. We were given a statement of names and salaries last year, I think. Furthermore, the Auditor General's report recommended the estimates of the Railway be brought into the House.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—It is the intention of the Government to bring the estimates of the railway before this House. I only wish to say that it is not in the general interests to publish a detailed statement of the salaries given to the railway officials at the present time.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker, do I understand that it is the intention of the Government to bring the estimates of the railway before this House, and have them voted upon. Well then that will serve my purpose just as well.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker I did not say that they would be voted upon. I only said that they would be brought in and laid on the Table of this House.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker, do I understand from what the Prime Minister has just said that each job on the railway will not go into the estimates in the same way as each job in the Custom House, or the Marine and Fisheries Department or any other of the Government Departments. Well that does not give me the information that I require. And if the Government take that position I can only say that I have asked for the information and been refused. But I submit Mr. Speaker, that that is not wise. We are here representing the taxpayers of this country. We are here as the Board of Directors of that railway as it were. We are representing the shareholders in that company, and therefore we are supposed to know what is going on up there. And if not it is just as well for us to go out of this House altogether. Surely we have a say in what happens with regard to the railway. I am not asking anything extraordinary. I do not want to know who gets the salaries. But I do want to know the names of those who get over two thousand dollars. And I submit sir, that I am entitled to an answer to that question. It looks sir, as if the Government was playing hide and seek with the public funds. If they carry on in that way

it would be just as well for them to tie up the Custom House and not bring in any estimates of that Department either. It would be just as logical. I am not asking for the name of any one individual, but I am asking for the names of all those railway officials who are getting over two thousand dollars, and I submit sir, that I am entitled to that information.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I would like to state that the position taken up by the member on the other side is really ridiculous. The Canadian Government are sinking yearly as everybody knows, at the rate of $120,000,000 in the running of their railway. There was a question somewhat of the same nature asked in the Canadian Parliament the other day. And the question was refused to be answered. A Railway Commission is appointed by the Canadian Government. There is a Minister of Railways, who does not even sit on the Commission. He has nothing whatever to do with the expenditure. The Railway is managed by a Commission under Sir Henry Thornton, who has a salary of $65,000 a year. Fifteen others get two thousand a year. Those men manage the railway and everything connected with it. We take the position that while there is not any particular objection to publish the salaries of officials, there are some of them who are getting a little bit more than somebody else in the Civil Service, and on account of that perhaps if we published the names it might create a disturbance. That is the principal reason why we are not making public a detailed statement of all the salaries paid in connection with the railway.

MR. CASHIN—I may say that I was never one of those who advocated that. My argument this afternoon, sir, was that if in publishing the salaries of any of the railway officials would make the officials in the other departments jealous, the very fact of seeing that in the House would set that abroad. I am not asking this for the sake of publication. I want it for information. . As a matter of fact, I was one of those who was in favour of cutting large salaries. But I contend, sir, that my question was quite in order. Same applies to the other departments. If there is a deficit in any department the people have to pay the deficit and if on the other hand the department makes money the revenue of the country gets the benefit of it. I submit, sir, that we are here representing the shareholders of that railway. Now if I was talking from a political point of view I would not say that. But as it is we are here as the representatives of the shareholders of that railway and we are entitled to get that information that we seek especially information which is not of a nature to hurt the railway or anything like that. It is a public question, the railway, which in my opinion has to be solved in Newfoundland in the future. I admit that at the present time it is a great drain on the revenue of the country. It costs one million dollars a year to operate the railway at the present time, and surely to goodness when Newfoundland as a whole is paying one million dollars to the railway, surely members in this House be they Government, Independent or Opposition, when they ask a question in connection with the operation of the railway, surely they are entitled to that information. Otherwise I submit, that my seat here is a joke.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker I want to say that we have nothing to hide in connection with the salaries paid to the officials of the railway. The only reason for refusing is that I don't think the publication of these salaries would be beneficial. I have no special objec-

tion to handing them over to Mr. Cashin.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker I do not want those salaries to be published I only want them for my own private information. And I think that I am entitled to that information when I ask for it.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — Then you shall get it.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words. I think that the hon. member has made a statement here this afternoon that is capable of being misunderstood. Now the insinuation is that the Railway Commission have something to hide. Now I think that the hon. member was for a time on that Commission. And he therefore will not dispute these facts, that the present Commission have endeavoured as far as possible to reduce expenditure on that railway. We always called for tenders for the different contracts and tried to get the best possible returns for our expenditure. He knows also that recently a considerable reduction has been made in the salaries of the principle officials. He knows also that the railway when we took it over was in a deplorable state. He will also admit that the past year a considerable amount of improvement has taken place in connection with the railway. It had been necessary to draw on capital expenditure to build the line from here to Clarenville. The figures that I presume have been submitted to the House by the Manager of the Railway, show a large expenditure away above the average with regard to additional sleepers and ballasting. 500,000 sleepers had to be bought. The average for the past ten years was about 250,000. This meant an additional expense on current account. The ballasting was four times as much as it had been in any year since 1920. Of course all this expense in connection with the railway has meant that it has been much improved. It is not without the bounds of possibility that our railway may be taken over by some private company or corporation. I hope that time is not far distant. It will be a great relief to the country. This Government does not want to go on managing the railway longer than it can help. It is a very responsible position, and we have got to take our share of the blame. I think that the hon. member, sir, does not want to insinuate any desire on the part of the Government to hide anything in connection with the operation of the railway. I think that the Minute Book of the Railway Commission was put on the Table of this House. It was a most unusual proceeding. This shows that we are prepared to lay our cards on the table. Therefore I make these statements so that this House or the public may not think that there is any grounds for suspicion.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Hon. Colonial Secretary, I may say that I was on the Railway Commission, and I don't think that any of my remarks even suggested that the Government had anything to hide in connection with the operation of the railway. My question was precise and to the point, and I consider that I am entitled to the information which the Prime Minister has gladly consented to give me. We all know the capital expenditure of the railway. We all know that it is costing this country a million dollars on capital account. I appreciate the position that the railway is in, and I know that the Government is up against it as far as the railway is concerned. But the point that I want to make is this that if we ask any question of the Government with regard to a public department we as members of this Legislature are entitled to an answer. And when the Government refuse to table that answer the insinuation is that they are

trying to hide something. Anyway I understand that I am getting that information from the Prime Minister.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Speaker, may I direct the attention of the Colonial Secretary to the fact that on the 8th inst. I asked a series of questions in connection with the Highroads. I asked about fourteen questions. But I have got no answer than this report. I take it for granted that the Colonial Secretary thought that that report would be sufficient. So I would suggest now that I may be permitted, sir, to put another question on the Order Paper.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, for the information of the hon. memter, may I say that I thought that that report would cover everything. But if there was any discrepancy it could be answered afterwards.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Speaker, with your permission I will put another question on the Order Paper.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Speaker with reference to the question which I asked the Honourable Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, he comes back and says that the age of the telephone operator at Southern Bay, Bonavista Bay,, is fifteen years. Now, sir, is that allowed? Is a man under fifteen years of age allowed to do this work?

HON. THE MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—Well, he seems qualified to hold the position.

MR. BROWN—Well, according to that, you will soon be getting babies to do this work. I also asked the Hon. Minister of Posts who recommended Mr. Quinton's dismissal, and he says that the Government recommended his dismissal. I don't think that the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, with all due respect to him, is conversant with the state of affairs that exists from Southern Bay right down to the south side of Bonavista Bay, and, if he does not know about conditions there, I would like to tell him a few things. I would like to tell the Minister that I am to-day in receipt of four very important letters that were mailed to me on March 4th from King's Cove, and it took 22 days for this mail to get from King's Cove to St. John's. Now, sir, I consider that that is not good enough. We have had all kinds of trouble regarding mails. How this came about was through the appointment of Mr. Prince who contracted to convey the mails. Mr. Prince is a man 72 years old. The job was taken from a man Mr. White, who is about 45 years old. This man could go with the mail at any time and in all kinds of weather. When the present Government came into power, Mr. White lost his job, and it was given to Mr. Prince. This man is absolutely incapable of carrying this mail.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I want to say that he is capable. I have known Mr. Prince for a very long time.

MR. BROWN—Well, I have known him for twenty-five years, and I doubt whether the Prime Minister has known him as long as that. Moreover, I have known him intimately for that length of time, and I repeat, sir, that he is not capable of carrying the mail. When a younger man can get out and do the work, he has to stay in his house. Now, Mr. Prime Minister, you might know a lot about Bonavista Bay, but you don't know everything, and what you don't know would fill a big book.

MR. SPEAKER—Now, gentlemen, I think that those remarks are out of order.

MR. BROWN——Well, Mr. Speaker, I submit to your ruling. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that in December of last year, the mail that was intended for King's Cove, and containing parcels, Xmas presents, etc., was put off at Princeton. The Mail Courier took the lighter parcels and left the most im-

portant mail to Princeton, and there it remained until the Malakoff came down and took it, and even then she made two trips to Wesleyville before she reached Princeton at all. Now, I submit, Sir, that is not good enough. The contractor is supposed to take this mail, and, if he likes, he may employ two or three of five horses to carry it. In the instance I am citing, half the mail was left at Princeton, and consequently we have had to wait weeks for it. When the Christmas mail was sent north, I wanted to telegraph to the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs and apprise him of the fact. I tried to send out a collect message to him, as, of course, it was the business of the Post and Telegraph Department that I was wiring about, and if they could not look after their business I thought it was my duty as a member of a district to look after it, then why should I have to pay for this message? The Operator told me that she could not accept this message unless it was collected. Now, sir, since you have the information, I hope that you will see into this matter, and have the mail attended to and sent in at the proper time.

Second Reading of Shipbuilding Bill.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, in explaining this Bill I may say that it is only a measure to enable us to give a bounty on vessels of twelve tons, whereas nothing less than fifteen tons was permitted under the Act. I also said the other day that there was a question as to whether these vessels ought to be registered or not. As there may be one or two other points in connection with this Bill which may have to be discussed, I thought that we might have a select Committee on this with Mr. MacFarlane, Lloyd's Surveyor, who has one or two suggestions to make. Rather than have them made to me or one or two members on the Gov't side I thought that we might put a Select Committee on this. I understand that Capt. Randell has some propositions to make and I thought that it would expedite matters if this Bill was referred after its second reading to a Select Committee to discuss it and then bring it back to the House again.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move that this Bill be read a second time and referred to a Select Committee.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 16, Geo. V., Cap. 23, 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 Select Committee of the House.

Mr. Speaker appointed the Select Committee as follows: Hon. the Prime Minister, Mr. Chambers, Hon. Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Randell, Mr. Ashbourne.

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

The House then adjourend accordingly.

MONDAY, March 29th, 1926.

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

Mr. Speaker announced that His Excellency the Governor would receive the Address in Reply at five o'clock.

Petitions were presented by Mr. Walsh from Arnold's Cove re Road.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—I beg leave to lay on the table of the House the Report of the Newfoundland Savings Bank. In tabling the Annual Report of the Cashier of the Newfoundland Savings Bank for the year ending 31st December, 1925, I would like to draw attention of the House to the fact that this Bank for the past year has shown a very much more creditable standing

than for many years passed. The total amount of deposits is over Two Million Dollars, this Two Million Dollar mark being passed by the Deposits last year exceeding the withdrawals by practically one hundred thousand dollars. This would indicate more prosperous times for the Colony and also that the Newfoundland Savings Bank is about to come into its own in securing the Deposits of the people.

In the years succeeding the War, there were heavy withdrawals each year, with the result that the Deposits went well below the Two Million Dollar mark, and it was only in 1924 that the Deposits showed a surplus as against the withdrawals, which was repeated last year by the actual increase of Deposits over Withdrawals by $98,468.10.

I would like to point out to the Legislature, and through this House to the people of this Country, the claims that this Bank must necessarily have upon the people. It is the property of the people; it is run entirely on its own earnings with no expense whatever to the Government. Its profits do not go to swell dividends to shareholders, either local or foreign, but are put to a Reserve Fund, which Fund was increased last year to the amount of about Thirty Thousand Dollars, and has swelled the Reserve to the handsome amount of $395,603.00. This I submit, is ample proof of the absolutely sound financial condition of the Bank, for even in its darkest days, it was able to pay dollar for dollar, and has never in its long history, been stronger financially than it is to-day.

I trust, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that in view of these facts the people of the country generally, and particularly those who have trust moneys in hand, will recognize the first claim that our only local monetary institution has upon their consideration. By increasing the business of the Bank, we will increase its earning power, and by increasing its earning power, we will still further increase the absolute security of the institution. Nowadays people are attracted to the other Banks doing business here owing to their location generally, and the activity of the Managers and Staffs in securing Deposits, but I lay claim that there is no institution, no matter how extensive or large in this country, that offers a more staple security for its depositors than the Newfoundland Savings Bank.

I would also like to correct an erroneous idea that exists among people, that this is a Government Bank and the Government have the handling of its funds; also that the amounts to the credit of depositors are known by members of the Government. This is absolutely wrong. I have been connected with the Bank for many years, and at present am Chairman of the Directors of the Bank, and I have not the faintest idea of who the depositors are or what amounts are to their credit, and there is no possible way of being able to know. Therefore I feel sure that the public at large will realize that their moneys are absolutely secure in the Newfoundland Savings Bank, and free from any interference or curiosity on the part of the Government or anybody connected with it. I trust, that the coming year will be one that will mark a new era in the activities of the Savings Bank, and that our deposits next year will give a greater showing, and hence a greater profit to the credit of the People's Bank.

1925——ANNUAL REPORT OF THE CASHIER

I have the honour to report as follows with regard to the business of the Newfoundland Savings Bank for the year ending December 31st, 1925:

DEPOSITS

Amount of Deposits on December 31st, 1925	$2,014,155.55
Amount of Deposits on December 31st, 1924	1,915,695.45
Increase	$ 98,460.10
Amount deposited during the year 1925	$ 616,069.87
Amount paid out during the year 1925	517,609.77
Deposits over Payments	$ 98,460.10

INTEREST ACCOUNT

Amount received from all sources for interest, etc., durnig 1925		$ 103,097.21
Which account is closed as follows:		
Interest paid to Depositors	$57,935.56	
Disbursements St. John's	13,288.44	
Disbursements Harbour Grace	663.15	
Disbursements Bay Roberts	423.73	
	$72,310.88	
Balance to Reserve Fund	30,786.33	
		$ 103,097.21

RESERVE FUND

Balance from 1924	$ 364,817.19
Profits for 1925	30,786.33
	$ 395,603.52

ASSETS

Newfoundland Debentures	$ 962,500.00
Victory Bonds	355,000.00
India Consols	485,000.00
United Kingdom Gold Bonds, (1929)	100,000.00
United Kingdom Gold Bonds, (1937)	300,000.00
British War Loan	28,000.00
Eastern Trust Company	60,000.00
Bank of Montreal	32,625.98
Cash	16,073.09
R. C. Episcopal Corporation	20,000.00
St. John's Municipal Council	1,600.00
Harbour Grace Water Company Stock	15,400.00
Carbonear Water Company Furniture	12,460.00
Bank Furniture	1,000.00
	$2,409,759.07

LIABILITIES

Deposit Account	$2,014,155.55
Reserve Fund	395,603.52
	$2,409,759.07

ACCOUNTS AND DEPOSITS

Branch	No. of Accounts	Deposits
St. John's	3621	$1,818,057.38
Harbour Grace	418	127,357.53
Bay Roberts	245	68,740.64
	4284	$2,014,155.55

AUDIT

The securities of the Bank have been examined and checked by the Auditor General. The books for the year have been audited and found correct.

R. WATSON, Cashier.

Approved by the Directors:
J. R. BENNETT, Chairman.

Mr. Cashin gave notice of question.

Mr. Scammell gave notice of question.

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 dealing with an Agreement entered into between the Government of Newfoundland and the Dominion Iron and Steel Co., Ltd., and the Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Co., Ltd.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MR. SCAMMELL—If I am not out of order, I would like to ask the Prime Minister to defer this Order.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I intend just to have the Committee meet and rise for the purpose of having the Bill distributed so as the members may have the opportunity of considering it.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—As I said just now, I simply want to move the House into Commtitee to present these resolutions that the members may have an opportunity of considering it. To-morrow I will have a statement to make as to the position of the Government with regard to these Resolutions.

MR. SCAMMELL—Is it to be taken for granted that the agreement is back from Montreal and signed.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Yes.

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.

Notice of Motion

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER asked leave to introduce a Bill respecting the Civil Service Protection.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I would like to ask that this Order be amended to a Motion that on tomorrow I will move the House into Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions with regard to Civil Service Protection. I make this

Amendment because it is a question whether this Bill will affect the general revenue of the Colony.

Replies to the following questions were tabled, with the exception of numbers 5, 6 and 7.

(1) MR. BROWN asked the Minister of Public Works to lay upon the Table of the House returns for the amount of $600.00 allocated to Kenneth Farwell, Eastport, B.B., September 11th, 1924, for Roads and Bridges; Returns for the amount of $300.00 to Arch Davis, Templemen, B.B.; Returns for the amount of $1200.00 to George Davis, Newtown, B.B., October 7th, 1924, for Roads and Bridges; Returns for the amount of $1800.00 to Harold Rowsell and Albert Reader of Bonavista, October 7th, 1924, for Roads and Bridges; Returns for the amount of $400.00 special, to Harold Rowsell of Bonavista, September 1st, 1924, for Roads and Bridges; Returns for the amount of $35.00 to Sydney Hill, Wesleyville, December 16th, 1924; Returns for the amount of $27.00 to Baxter Kean, Brookfield, B.B., October 7th, 1924, for Roads and Bridges; Returns for the amounts of $250.00, to William Sainsbury, Wesleyville, September 8th, 1924, also for $250.00 and $300.00 on September 11th, 1924; also $250.00 on October 6th, 1924, for Roads and Bridges; also for $100.00 on August 19th, 1924, for Repairs to Water Pipes; Returns for the amount of $300.00, allocated to Hubert Blackmore, Pinchards Island, B.B., October 7th, 1924, for Roads and Bridges; Returns for the amount of $150.00 to Joseph Stagg, Cape Cove, Cape Freels, October 6th, 1924.

(2) MR. CASHIN asked the Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the Table of the House a detailed statement showing: (a) The total expenditure on account of the Four Million Dollar Loan raised in 1924, together with the balance remaining from that Loan; (b) A detailed statement showing the total expenditure from the Two Million Dollar Loan raised in 1925 as well as the unexpended balance remaining to the credit of that Loan; (c) Also a detailed statement showing the various balances to the credit of the various other Loans raised on the credit of the Colony during the years 1922 and 1923.

(3) MR. CASHIN asked the Minister of Public Works to Table the following information arising out of Question No. 4 Order Paper March 15th: (1) Table Original Invoices submitted by Mr. J. A. Gould, covering the amount of $188,781.33; (2) What business is Mr. Gould in; (3) Where is his place of business; (4) Is Mr. Gould a Member of the Board of Works.

(4) MR. WARREN asked Hon. the Prime Minister if it is the intention of the Government to make a "highroad" under the provisions of the Highroads Act between the bottom of Fortune Bay and Bay d'Espoir.

(8) MR. HICKMAN asked Hon. the Minister of Justice if the Government paid over to the Royal Bank of Canada the $50,000 borrowed by the Dominion Co-operative Association; if so, was the Bank also also paid interest and how much.

(9) MR. HICKMAN asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay upon the Table of the House a full explanation as to why the expenses of Railway operation for the year 1924-25 were $350,000 more than the preceding year.

(10) MR. HICKMAN asked the Hon. the Minister of Justice what is the present position of the claim of one Rogers against the Government for non-delivery of pitprops.

(11) MR. HICKMAN asked Hon. the Prime Minister what steps the Department of Marine and Fisheries is taking to get returns for the allocation of $28,000 for which no returns have been sent to the Department.

(12) MR. HICKMAN asked the Minister of Public Works what steps are being taken to get the returns for $60,000 sent to people in the different Outports and still outstanding.

(13) MR. SCAMMELL asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the Table of the House a statement in answer to the following questions: (1) Were any boats built by order of the Department of Marine and Fisheries last year for use at Light House Stations, and if so, state how many such boats were built, and to what stations they were sent; (2) At what places were these boats built and what are the names of the parties who built them or who were ordered to have them built; (3) To lay on the Table of the House a copy of all bills and expenses incurred in connection with the building of these boats, including labour and material, showing what each boat cost to build; (4) Were any of these boats subsequently found unsuitable for the purpose for which they were built, and were they refused as such by the Lightkeeper; if so, what became of them and where are they now.

(14) MR. SCAMMELL asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing how the vote of $20,000.00 taken last year for fishery improvements was expended.

(15) MR. SCAMMELL asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries: (a) If there was any form of contract entered into by the Minister or the Department with the owners of the S.S. "Earl of Devon" in relation to the Lower Labrador service for the season of 1925, and if so, to lay a copy of such contract on the Table of the House; (b) If any instructions were issued by the Minister to the Captain regarding ports of call, and pointing out to the Captain any special duties in connection with the service, and if so, to lay a copy of such instructions on the Table; (c) Was the Captain instructed to call at every port where there might be a schooner or schooners fishing; (d) Was the Minister or the Department in receipt of any complaint from fishermen or schooner owners or were any representations made to the Department by Officers of the "Earl of Devon" that the Captain neglected his duty and refused to call at Harbours where schooners were seen when the steamer was passing; (e) How many trips did the "Earl of Devon" make, and how many days was she lying up at her upper terminus awaiting the arrival of the Upper Labrador mail boat; (f) Was the Minister at any time obliged to issue special orders to the Captain that he was not to pass any ports, and did the Minister consent to pay the steamer the same subsidy when she was lying up at terminus as when she was operating; (g) Did the Department place on board the "Earl of Devon" or order to be placed on board the "Earl of Devon" such things as gasolene, butter, sugar, tea and other articles to be disposed of to the fishermen in case any schooners were found short of these goods, from whom were such goods, if any, purchased, and how much of such goods, if any, were disposed of fishermen and what prices were charged, particularly, in the case of gasolene.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER— Mr. Speaker, I might say that we are pushing the dock construction all we can in order to get the "Kentucky" on. I would like to say that when the steamers Lintrose and Bruce were running the service between Port aux Basques and North Sydney we were getting a subsidy from the Canadian Government of $35,000 per steamer or $70,000. To-day we are not getting

one cent subsidy for the "Caribou." Since we came into power we have pressed all we could to get that subsidy continued, but the Canadian Government tell us that they are not in a position to allow it.

Second Reading of Seal Fishery Bill.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I would like to give a little explanation of this Bill. I would like to draw your attention to Sub-Section 7 of Section 2, and Sections 9 and 10, of the Sealfishery Act are hereby repealed. These sections referred to the carrying of rifles on steel ships. It has been proposed by this Act to permit steel ships to carry rifles as wooden ships are permitted to do.

(Reads)

There was a different clearing date for steel and wooden ships, which is now wiped out. Section No. 2 covers that. In this Section the 5th day of March should read the 4th; you will please make that alteration in your copies. If the ships are to sail on the 5th, we have got to let them clear on the 4th.

(Reads)

Section No. 4: By this Section we are repealing the 1920 Act so that seals can now be killed on or after the 13th of March. The question was whether the killing of seals on the 13th was legal. We had in the Act last year that seals could not be killed before the 13th of March. I think we put that in, without noticing it, that ships could not kill seals until the 14th. So this year the sealers went out a little uncertain as to whether they were permitted to kill seals on the 13th or not. They did kill them on the 13th by arrangements with the owners, and we want to legalize that position now. Section 5 amends that, subject to the revisions of the Sealfishery Act.

(Reads)

Also the date of the termination of the voyage was the 20th of April. We have cancelled that, and now there is no date of termination.

HON. THE MINISTER JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, I would like to say, and probably this will be appreciated by every member of the House, I don't suppose there is anything more involved than the position as regards the sealing laws. Almost every year for the past twenty-five years some sort of Sealing Act has been put on the Staute Book. What happened this year was that the question was raised as to whether the killing of seals on the 13th might not raise some possible action. The decision of the Government had been that the whole sealing laws required to be codified and brought up to date. To-day I think that if these laws were to be amended, it would almost take the Privy Council to decide what course was to be taken. Take the question that we are just discussing. In 1920 an Act was passed, section three of which says:

(Reads)

Side by side with that the law read that no seals should be killed before a certain date in March nor after the 20th of April. That defined the killing season. Last year the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in introducing the Bill in connection with this matter, as the reference to the debate will show, that the object of this section of the Bill was to enable the ship to remain out after the 20th April. Section 2 of the 1925 Act says:

(Reads)

It baldly stopped there. Then the question arose and the opinion that was given as far as our department was concerned was, that the killing of seals on the 13th day of March was illegal. There were different opinions held at first, so I understand by other people. But apparently some doubt has since been expressed about the matter. And as it was regarded here that as this kill-

ing had taken place by the crews on the 13th, and as there was very justifiable reason for their construction of the conglomeration of the law in that way, the only way that the matter could be justified and legalised to-day, was to come in here and make this act retroactive. Of course, I don't say that I am right. I am only giving my opinion. Now here is the Hansard. It is very seldom that anyone reads the Hansard,, and how I happened to know this was here, was that when the matter arose at the time, it was intimated to me by someone, as to what was the intention of bringing in that bill. Now on the second reading of the Bill, last year, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is quoted as saying:

(Reads)

That is the principle that was laid down and which was confirmed again later on in Committee. Mr. Scammell also took part in the debate at the same time.

(Reads)

Here is what Capt. Randell had to say:

(Reads)

I take the liberty, Mr. Speaker, of quoting from the Hansard, only for the purpose of explaining the Hon. Member's intention. In reference to this Hansard, sir, I may say that this Hansard has been very well done, and it is very much in order.

I would like to say to the hon. member that the explanation then given as to the confusion that arose regarding this paragraph of the Bill, the explanation given by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was that this Bill was not made to alter the killing date as to its commencement, but the purpose of the Bill was to change the limitation of the killing date with reference to its finish. The wording of last year's bill was that you could not kill until after the 13th of March, and hence all the confusion arose. As a matter of fact to-day the main reason for passing of the Bill would be this, that in any year the seals could commence to be killed on the 13th of March and if seals could be found, up to midnight on December 31st they could be killed. You can't go beyond the 31st of December as there is only one March in the year.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Speaker, it looks to me that the sealing laws are like every other law on the Statute Book. They are not worth the ink that is used to print them. The Minister of Justice has just told us that in his opinion, the killing of seals on the 13th of March is illegal. A crime has been committed and the Prime Minister has brought a bill in here to legalise that crime.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Do you want me to prosecute all the men.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Not at all, that is your business. I am only referring to the law. It is like the law in reference to the bye-election and the law in reference to other things.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —The bye-election is not half as important as a load of seals.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—It is not right for the Minister of Justice to talk like that. The seals could be had on the fourteenth just as well as on the thirteenth. While I know nothing about the seal fishery, what is good for it and what is bad for it, because I have never been in that business; but the Minister of Justice has pointed out that the law upon the Statute Book says that the seals are not to be killed until after the thirteenth of March. Then the steamers go out and break that law. And after that the Prime Minister introduces a bill to legalise the breaking of that law.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —I only gave it as my opinion. I don't say that my opinion is right.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Well you would not like me to say that your opinion is wrong, if you gave a legal opinion on anything. I am taking your opinion now as being a very good opinion on this. That is the only point in this Bill that I have to object to. I don't see why it should be retroactive.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Speaker, I have some interest in the Bill now before the Chair. I presume the Prime Minister has moved the second reading of the Bill, but whether we have come to the second reading or not, I would like to make a few remarks. I am not going to speak particularly on the Bill now before the House, but of the Act, on the sealing laws in general. It is true that the sealing laws of the country have been the subject of more legislative criticism than any other law on the Statute Book. I do not think that since I came to this House in 1919 that there has been a year but some legislation has been brought before this House amending some particular section of the sealing laws. I rather agree with the Minister of Justice when he says that the sealing laws ought to be codified, but I do not agree with him when he says that they should be wiped out.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Speaker, what I meant was that we ought to repeal all the existing enactments, and introduce fresh legislation composing laws which would be more in accordance with the purpose of these amendments.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice when he uses an expression such as "wiped out," should be more careful in what he is saying. I may say, sir, that there was not in the breasts of any of us over here when we were writing these sealing laws, the thought that they were only fit to be wiped out. We did say so at the time that the main sealing laws of the country were introduced by Sir William Coaker, the Leader of the F. P. U. wing of the Opposition of that day, and they were supported by the Government. There were, sir, extenuating circumstances to justify the introduction of the laws. Take the question of rifles being permitted on steel ships, and also the question of the wooden ships being permitted to leave for the seal fishery before the steel ships. I shall show you that that law was quite justifiable. Before this law was passed the steel ships could get away ahead of the wooden ships and without giving the wooden ships some kind of a handicap, the men on the wooden ships would be left in the lurch. Therefore there were extenuating circumstances on that account. Since then there have been many sufficient reasons for laying aside some of these regulations although the methods adopted may not have been quite in order. Consequently we are obliged to go ahead and amend the act.

The Minister of Justice got the Hansard and read out for us some of the remarks of Capt . Winsor, last year, where he stated that for the past four or five years certain things had been done by the Executive Council, and in collaboration with the owners and the captains of the ships. In any case, Mr. Speaker, I am of the opinion that there are still certain things that ought to be done, in connection with this question. And one point is as to just what provision should govern the prosecution of the seal fishery from the standpoint of coming in, going out and killing seals. We are faced with an extenuating and perhaps different set of circumstances every year. I think that the better way would be to codify the present sealing laws to have them more elastic in that respect. The clauses that were inserted from year to year were no doubt thought the best under the circumstances. I cannot therefore agree with the Min-

ister of Justice that the sealing laws should be wipe dout. However, the only reason I have for speaking this afternoon is to show that at the time when these sealing laws were enacted, there were extenuating circumstances and that there was great reason for every clause inserted in the sealing act. The Government of that day no doubt took into consideration every aspect of the case, and I believe that what was done at the time in connection with the sealing laws, was done only after careful consideration. These laws, I may say, emanated from the Opposition of the day, and the Government of the day supported them, and no doubt that that was the reason why it was permitted to go on the Statute Book as it did. I am of the opinion, however, that there has been much justification of recent years for the amendment of the Act. And if any codification should take place I believe that the act should be elastic in respect to what should be done in regard to the prosecution of the voyage, that is as regards the time of killing going out and as to termination of the voyage.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Speaker, I fear that the hon. member must have misunderstood the explanation which I gave out. My point is this that as a matter of fact to-day if the opportunity were offered to start a debate in any of our local institutions as to just what are sealing laws in some respects, we would have a very interesting argument only because of the jumble of amendments that have been going on from year to year. There should be a complete repeal of the Sealing Laws as they stand at the present time, and enactments in connection with the sealfishery put on the Statute in such a way that those interested, the owners and masters in patricular should know what the law is. But certainly it would be a very poor compliment to pay those who were interested in the introduction of the sealing laws, to say that they are of no value, and the whole thing be dismissed.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker, with with regard to this Bill I would like some further information. If this Bill passes to-day do I understand that the ships can keep killing for any unlimited time.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER— Mr. Speaker, that is the law at the present time.

MR. CASHIN—Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that while we are on this subject of the seal fishery that there should be some limit to the killing time. Of course I merely express an opinion, and while I have no interest in the seal fishery I think that it is our duty to see that it is protected to a certain extent. If the Government are going to make some kind of law let them make one that is going to last. Really, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, these laws are just brought in here to accommodate the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. He brought in a law here last year and and then he went out and broke it this year. I am not going to express an opinion as to whether he should or should not. But I feel that there should be a time limit for the seal fishery. For argument's sake, today if the Beothic comes in here with 45,000 can't she go out and get another 45,000. I don't think that is protecting the seal fishery. I was out in the Florizel when she got 49,000. We were in on the first of April. I am of the opinion that a clause in the act should read that no ship should be allowed to bring in more than 35,000 to protect the industry.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Speaker, it is amazing what interest the seal fishery has for the entire population of this Island, from the legislators down to the man on the street. The codfishery is our main industry. The seal fishery is only a flee bite to that. But

for some reason or other the entire population of Newfoundland is more interested in the seal fishery than in the codfishery. As soon as the steamers begin to get ready for the ice, interest is immediately awakened. Every man wants to invest five or ten cents or a dollar, in an endeavour to get $100,000 for nothing. Every man begins to tighten up his belt and to look forward to his first meal of flippers. People that never get out of bed before ten o'clock in the morning, in their lives, get up at six o'clock and go up to Signal Hill to watch the sealers go out. And as soon as the word is passed around that the first ship is on her way home the place is filled with excitement, and there is great disappointment when their hopes are dashed to the ground as in the case of the Sagona a week ago. To some the seal fishery has an interest only for a time, but in this House it might be called the "hardy annual."

Year after year we come into this House and proceed to alter the sealing laws. And when I look around this House, and see all of the 35 honourable members, all so well versed in the habits of the seal (with, I expect, one exception on this side); when I look around and see these gentlemen so anxious about the seal, I am not surprised that this is not also called a "hardy annual."

The Hon. Minister of Justice makes the statement that the laws ought to be codified—I presume he means consolidated, into one law. Does he mean to infer that after this is done, and one law exists, that this cannot be amended. Surely he doesn't mean to suggest taking away the ancient privileges of this House—are we not then at liberty to come in and amend it again next year. Now I go further and say the whole thing should be taken away. There is only one man in this House that I know of who knows anything about the seal fishery —I know nothing about it, and I am going to propose that it be taken away from those who know nothing about it. In our codfishery we have taken the trouble of leaving questions as regards nets, size of mesh, and other such questions to a board of supposed experts, but when we come to the seal fishery it is altogether different. Look around, Mr. Speaker, at the crowd of experts in the seal fishery here in the House, to say nothing of when the Bills go to the Upper House. And look at what is done there again—

HON. MR. SPEAKER—I wish to draw the honourable gentleman's attention to the fact that this House is to meet His Excellency at 5 o'clock, and it is almost that time now.

MR. WARREN—I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. I intended to speak for another hour. I move the adjournment of this debate.

Debate was adjourned.

At five of the clock Mr. Speaker and the House proceeded to Government House to present the Address in Reply to His Excellency the Governor, and being returned Mr. Speaker reported that His Excellency had received the Address and had been pleased to make the following reply:

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.

Government House,
St. John's, Nfld.,
29th March, 1926.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, March 30th, 1926.

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

Petitions were presented by:

Mr. Warren, from Bay D'Espoir, re Timber Limits.

Mr. Lake, from Lamaline, re Dredging.

Mr. Moore, from Mobile, re Wharf.

Mr. Halfyard, from Gooseberry Cove, re Ferry.

Mr. Halfyard, from Southport, re Road.

Hon. the Minister of Justice, from Wabana workmen, re Legislation.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Speaker: I have a very important petition to present to the House and I am going to ask the indulgence of the House while I take a little longer than usual in dealing with it. For some years past there has been a considerable amount of friction and trouble in Bay D'Espoir in my constituency, and, I understand, the trouble, to a great extent, has been caused by the holding of timber land for speculative purposes. Now whether it was done by mistake or not, Mr. W. F. Lake was granted the ownership of a part of the three mile limit up in Bay D'Espoir, which is essentially a lumbering community and supplies virtually all the lumber for shipbuilding and ship repairing purposes for the whole of the South Coast, and nothing should be allowed to interfere with the supply of wood at Bay D'Espoir for shipping purposes.

Now a curious position arises with regard to Mr. Lake. Some years ago his father, Mr. John E. Lake, operated three mills at Bay D'Espoir and showed great business acumen when he anticipated that the day would come when he would obtain from the Government a grant of timber lands; but he also showed acumen by supplying the three mills by cutting on the three mile limit and still kept a reserve in his son's name. Since then other mills started up there, such as Roberts Brothers and Kendall Brothers, and these people are now unable to get any wood at all. Mr. John E. Lake has been cutting on the three mile limit and keeping in reserve a large block of timber land and the people up there believe this is against the law. A couple of years ago some of the men supplied by Kendall Brothers went in on Lake's land on the three mile limit and cut some timber. It is useless for me to tell the people that it is contrary to law for them to do so. Up in Bay D'Espoir the ordinary man thinks it is all right for him to go and cut timber where he pleases on the three mile limit with the result that Lake takes proceedings against them and bring them to Hr. Breton and then attached their houses. It is very difficult, Mr. Speaker, to control oneself when one thinks of the injustice meted out to these people up in that Bay where they are absolutely dependent upon the wood that they cut for their livelihool. A short time ago I was in communicatioin with the Minister of Agriculture and Mines about this same matter with a view to bringing a test case to a head. A Special Commissioner was sent to Bay D'Espoir to report on the conditions up there and the Commissioner, Mr. Thistle, reported as follows:—

"I have just returned from Bay D'Espoir where, at your request, I have been to investigate lumbering conditions, and beg to report as follows:—

"I find that the residents of the Bay are entirely dependent on the woods for their livelihood. Poverty and destitution are rampant. The people are willing to work but none is obtainable because of the fact that the areas around that locality have all been granted to private individuals and firms, non-residents of the District,

and who are not conducting any operations. It is my firm opinion that, unless these areas are made free to the residents of the District, the people will have to seek elsewhere for a livelihood. They are a most industrous and law-abiding people, but it is putting a very severe tax on human nature to ask them to be idle and to starve whilst what they consider their rightful heritage is held for speculative purposes.

"I would strongly recommend that if it is at all possible, the Government cancel outstanding grants within an area extending thirty miles back from the waters of the Bay."

What this report says is exactly what this petition asks for. This petition is signed by every resident in Bay D'Espoir, with the exception of two and those two had particular reasons for not signing it. I am not going to take up the time of the House on this subject any longer at the present time, as I purpose dealing with the matter in detail when the Agriculture and Mines vote comes up in the House; but I would urge upon the Government the necessity of seeing what can be done now so that these people referred to will not be left to starve, and that all timber within 30 miles of the coast should be reserved for the public.

MR. LAKE— Mr. Speaker: I think the report of Mr. Thistle is not a true one, and that some people held the land for speculating purposes only is altogether false. These mills were established over twenty years ago. Two of the mills were since locked up; but to my knowledge one of Mr. John E. Lake's mills continued operating. Mr. Freeman Lake who owns that block of land has been cutting wood on it for many years and the information stated by Mr. Warren that he heard from his constituents is altogether wrong. If the Government is going to take away the rights To my mind I think it is another atlawfully, why not they go and take away other rights also. Mr. Freeman Lake is operating his mills in strict accordance with the law and is supplying quite a lot of people in that Bay and I don't think that Mr. Warren can bring proof to the contrary. To fy mind I think it is another attempt being made to bring in legislation against the business people of the South West Coast. I repeat that the report of Commissioner Thistle is incorrect, and I say this without fear of successful contradiction.

THE HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, a petition I have to present to the House has, on this particualr day, a special connection. It is from the Wabana Mine Workers Union, of Bell Island, respecting the matter of what is ordinarily known as the Besco Contract and concerns the matter of the Resolutions which are now before the House for consideration.

The petitioners set out that they are an incorporated body on Bell Island and they ask two things: (1) that due recognition be given to the union as the representative of the workmen of Bell Island in any negotiations that may be pending between the Government and the B. E. S. Corporation or in any agreement or contract that may be submitted to this House for consideration and (2) they ask to have this principle embodied in the contract and request that such legislative action be taken concurrent with the adoption of the agreement in question as will recognise the right of the workmen employed in and about the mines at Bell Island to collective bargaining through their Union with the British Empire Steel Corporation in connection with labour and wage conditions at Bell Island. There is no law against collective bargaining in this country. The Union can make their own ar-

rangements; there is no law against it; and there is no need for legislation in that respect; but I wish to point out in presenting this petition that the fullest informaion and the fullest opportunity will be given all sorts of people—those who know all about Bell Island, those who knew nothing about it and those who are fairly cognizant with conditions over there of discussing the contract so that every interest will be considered. A Union has got the right to exist and the right to support provided its affairs are properly conducted and provided a certain number of conditions prevail in the conduct of its affairs, particularly in a place like Bell Island where all interests should be embraced. I woud like to see industrial conditions in this country to day such whereby labor would be at a premium and the Union could be able to dictate its own price. The unfortunate position in Newfoundland at the moment is that there is more demand for employment than there is employment to offer. On Bell Island during the past month, despite the fact that sixteen hundred men were employed there, there were still daily applicants looking for work and I merely want to say that when the House is dealing with the Besco contract I have some thoughts to offer. Because the fullest consideration will be asked to be given this question does not mean there is anything novel about it; on the contray, the point of introducing it is to give the entire House an opportunity of knowing what is being done. I hope that the day will shortly arrive at Bell Island and elsewhere when Unions and labor will be able to not alone demand recognition, but demand its own terms. I trust that the petition will receive the sympathetic and earnest consideration of the Government.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—I have very much pleasure in supporting the petition just presented by the Honourable Minister of Justice, and I might offer the honourable member any support we may be able to give to have the prayer of that petition carried out. Could not a clause be inserted in the Bill before the House that Union workers on Bell Island be recognized. Besco recognizes Union workers in Canada, in fact they employ their men through the workmen's union and they even go so far as to collect fees and deduct it from the wages and pay them into the Union. If this recognition is given in Canada, there should be no reason why it could not be given in Newfoundland. The Newfoundland workman is worthy of his hire every bit as much as the workman of Canada or any other country.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —We trust conditions will come which will bring this about.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—I am very glad to hear the honourable member say that, and if the Government desires to carry out the prayer of the petition they have the support of this side of the House. Could not a clause be inserted in the Bill before the House as I have suggested, and could not Besco be made recognize the Unions on Bell Island?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —I have to remember that I represent the whole of Bell Island.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—I appreciate the fact that the representative of St. John's East, the Honourable Minister of Justice, is the representative of all of Bell Island, and as his colleague, the honourable Speaker, cannot very well take part in discussions such as this, he alone represents the interests just now of all the people of Bell Island and of all St. John's East. The reason I support this petition is because the workers on Bell Island are not prop-

five or twenty-five and a half cents an hour is not sufficient for a man to support himself and his family, whether he is working at the mines or anything else. Any industry in any country that cannot afford to pay the workmen a living wage is no good except for the shareholders, who are probably making profits out of the workers. I have very much pleasure in giving the petition my support.

MR. CASHIN—This petition was sent me and I was asked to give it my support, which I gladly give, and when we get into Committee on the Resolutions before the House I propose to express my views in connection with these matters. I propose then to lay down certain propositions in connection with Unions and the companies that the Unions are dealing with. I give the petition my heartiest support and reserve any further comments until we get into Committee on the Resolutions now before the House.

MR. WARREN—I beg to support the petition which has just been read, and while I am in favor of it I must add that I fail to see how what is desired can possibly be carried out. I think Unions are recognized pretty well the world over, but I think they have to make themselves recognized. I don't think recognition is acquired merely by legislation. I shall reserve further comment until the Resolutions come before the House. The Leader of the Opposition says that Unions are recognized by Besco in Canada but that recognition is not gained by legislative enactment. I am in sympathy with the object of the petition and I reserve what I have to say in this connection until conditions make it possible to introduce into a contract what has been asked and to see that it is carried out.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I beg to present a petition from Mr. Harry J. Crowe of Hampden, in the Colony of Newfoundland. I shall ask the Clerk of the House to read it and I shall then make a few remarks upon it.

(Reads.)

There are some Resolutions being printed in connection with this which will be at the disposal of the members of the House to-day so that they may be fully acquainted with the position of Mr. Crowe and those things referred to in the petition. Mr. Crowe is very anxious to have this legislation go through the House as quickly as possible; his interests in White Bay, provided this amendment to his agreement is ratified, are to be taken over by the Canadian International Paper Company. The International Paper Company are very anxious to assume work at White Bay before the driving commences. Whether we can get this legislation through before the Easter holidays or not is a question the House must decide for itself. I suggest a Select Committee be appointed, and it might possibly be able to report to-morrow and the business then might possibly be proceeded with. At present it is somewhat doubtful if it can be got through before Thursday. The member for White Bay is absent to-day, and in deference to him we would not like to rush anything. I suggest that he be on the Committee and we may have his views before to-morrow.

The legislation proposed by Mr. Crowe asks nothing, or at least very little new. No extra grant of timber, no extra rights are asked. In a former agreement he had the right to export from the entire area of seven hundred and twenty-five and a quarter square miles for ten years without erecting a pulp mill, and if he erected a pulp mill anywhere in Newfoundland, not necessarily at Hampden or White Bay, he could export for a further fifteen years. Now it is proposed that he shall export from the Hamp-

den limits, seventy-five square miles, for fifteen years, and with regard to the Sop's Arm limits for two years without erecting a pulp mill, and if ten thousand dollars has been expended by 1928 on a pulp mill he can export for a further four years from Sop's Arm.

I think when we consider the resolutions it will be found that very little if anything in the way of concessions is being given to Mr. Crowe by this new proposition. The contract of 1923 gave a right unlimited as to quantity to export wood for twenty-five years from these six hundred and eighty-two square miles, but it compelled him to export twenty-five thousand cords per year. The 1923 Act required Crowe to construct a mill by 1933 or forfeit right to export. All the wood could be cut before 1933. The mill could be built anywhere in the Colony; Hermitage Bay was intended, and the wood from White Bay might never have been used there but have been taken abroad. This new contract gives right to export wood for fifteen years over the Hampden limits, seventy-five square miles. -snoɔ ɥɐǝ ʎɹnʇuǝʍ ʇɐɥʇ ƃuıʇʇnɔ sɹǝpoɯɔ ʇı and cords but permits Sop's Arm manufacture in effect. There is therefore a reduction of time of ten years, and a possible abrogation of export wood as regards Hampden portion. It gives a right to export for two years over the Sop's Arm area, six hundred and seven square miles; right to export during four years, if $10,000.00 is spent on pulp mill; right to export during six years, if pulp mill constructed by 1930; right to export for twenty-five years, if mill constructed by 1932. The amount of wood which can be exported from Sop's Arm until the pulp mill is built is limited to twenty-five thousand cords per year. The result is this: under the 1923 arrangement the quantity of wood which could be exported be exported is only unlimited (until 1938) as to 75 square miles. There is a real limitation by reason of the size of the area which would be wholly cut out by a very large cut in a few years. Now the amount which can be exported from 607 square miles is limited to twenty-five thousand cords —until 1928. And, then, very little export of wood is to be expected, either from Sop's Arm or Hampden areas. By 1928, when an expenditure of ten thousand dollars for a pulp mill is required, the question whether such a mill will be built will be settled, so that either the expenditure will not be made, and the right to export from the Sop's Arm portion will be forfeited, or the mill will be a certainty, and in such case the wood being required for the mill will probably not be exported even to the permissible amount. If the pulp mill is not built by 1932 the right to export wood from the Sop's Arm area will lapse. It is probable that the mill will be ready for operation by 1930, if at all. It is clear therefore that this new contract has either secured the construction of a pulp and paper mill in White Bay, or has made impossble the export of wood from the Sop's Arm area except for a limited time and a limited quantity. It has therefore made it impossible to denude this great area without the establishment of a pulp mill, as was quite possible under the 1923 contract.

The people who gave rights to Mr. Crowe under the 1923 contract have been proved justified, for Mr. Crowe has established an important industry. When operations were first started by Mr. Crowe people came in on him looking for employment and he had no place to house them. These people are earning good money now and have been housed. Perhaps their circumstances could be better, but they are comfortably situated. And now we have to consider the advan-

tages of bringing into Newfoundland a great concern like the International Paper Co. We consider it a very great feature to have such a company as the International Paper Co. come in to start operating here. It will have a very good effect on the Gander proposition. The very name of the company and the rumor that they are to come and operate in Newfoundland is the best advertisement we could possibly have.

I suggest, therefore, that if these resolutions can be got through so that there be "no slip between the cup and the lip" we shall do a very good thing for the country, and it will be well, by waiving formalities, to get this legislation speedily passed to enable Mr. Crowe to telegraph the International Paper Co. that we are agreeable. The matter is entirely up to the House and I move that a Select Committee be appointed to consider and report.

Mr. Speaker appointed the Select Committee as follows: Hon. the Prime Minister, Hon. Minister of Justice, Hon. Colonial Secretary, Minister of Agriculture and Mines, Mr. Hickman, Mr. Hibbs, Mr. Scammell.

Mr. Duff gave notice of question.

Mr. Grimes gave notice of question.

Mr. Hibbs gave notice of question.

Mr. Cashin gave notice of question.

Mr. Halfyard gave notice of question.

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 Civil Service Protection.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — Mr. Chairman, the Resolutions being brought before the House to-day in connection with the Civil Service are of great importance; this is possibly one of the most important pieces of legislation coming before the House this year. The Government has realized that the pensioning of the Civil Service has been costing a huge amount. It has increased from eleven thousand to ninety-five thousand dollars.

Something has to be done. If we go on in the way that we have been going, pensioning off men after ten or fifteen years in the service at two-thirds of their salary, we will soon find that we are swamped altogether. So the Government has taken the bit in its teeth. Possibly we may find that this Bill is unpopular in some quarters, but we have taken the only course possible under the circumstances in this suggested Bill.

I would first like to point out that the last section of the Bill, under the heading of Insurance, is separate from the other resolutions; it has no bearing on the pensions. There may be some members on this side of the House who do not approve of an insurance scheme. We are not proposing to make a party measure out of the whole of these resolutions. We are making the portion concerning the pensions down as far as the insurance scheme a party measure, but I would like to get the views of the whole House as far as the insurance scheme is concerned, and to be governed entirely irrespective of party on that question.

I do not propose to-day to enter into the particulars of the Bill, because the members will want to take a little time to consider it, and I am going to suggest that the Committee rise to-day without coming to any conclusion, or possibly without debating the Bill very far. Roughly speaking, the Bill provides that any man that has served ten years in the Government service is entitled to a pension. The pension is made up on the basis of two and one-quarter per

cent. of his salary that he has been getting, and is multiplied by the number of years that he has served for. Let me illustrate that to make it easy to understand. Suppose a man had been thirty years in the Civil Service; suppose his salary was $3,600, which is the salary of the Deputy Minister to-day. Now if his stipend was $3,600, and he got two and one-quarter per cent. of that per year, he would get $81 a year multiplied by 30, and making $2,430. Now if he had been pensioned last year on two-thirds of his salary he would get $2,400, so that man is well protected. Now take the case of the man who is getting $1,000 a year, and has only served ten years. He gets $22.50 a year for ten years, or $250.00, whereas before he would have got two-thirds of $1,000, or $666.00. Now we thought that some members of the Government, while favouring this insurance scheme, might think that the insurance was very little for a man who had been only a short time in the service. In the meantime our feeling, or at least my feeling, is that this insurance scheme is a particularly attractive portion of the proposition, because if a man dies who has served his country faithfully for 29 years, he gets nothing and his family get nothing. But if this insurance came in it would be a certain satisfaction to his family. The man that dies in the service of his country, and may have served his country well, does not benefit by this proposition, unless he benefits through the insurance scheme. for that reason I favor the insurance proposition which we will discuss later on. We will submit these resolutions to the consideration of the House to be debated when the matter comes up again. I do not know if anybody wants to ask any questions to-day. If he does, I will be very glad to reply to them.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Prime Minister a question about this insurance clause at the end of the Bill. Does that affect every Civil Servant all over the Island? Does it include the railway?

HON MINISTER OF JUSTICE—The railway is insured already.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, why I asked that question was that I understood from the Prime Minister the other day that group insurance had been cut out altogether.

(Reads)

That means that the outport Civil Servants are affected just the same.

MR. GRIMES—Does that cover the Postmistresses in the outports.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—The ordinary Postmistresses would not be included in that. They would not be considered to be exclusively occupied in the service of the country. Of course, it would be a matter of circumstances. The Postmaster of Harbour Grace, perhaps, might be regared as a Civil Servant, whilst the Postmaster of Flat Rock might not be regarded as a Civil Servant.

CAPTAIN RANDELL —Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Prime Minister if this Bill has reference to pensions that have already been granted.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — No, it does not affect them at all.

MR. CASHIN—Is there any idea as to how much this insurance scheme is going to cost the country?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — Roughly speaking, as far as I can judge, it will cost about $15,000 a year for the Government, and the insured themselves will pay $15,000, that is if the scheme goes through. But, this is only in case the Government is given the right to do this, and I take it, before anything will be done, we will probably get an acturay or somebody from Canada, or somewhere else to come down here and give us an insurance scheme, because it takes some

expert to give us the best possible scheme for covering these people.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman, might I ask if it is the intention of the Government to have any Civil Servants not yet in receipt of pensions come under this Act.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—We have not been holding up anybody waiting for this Bill.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman, my point is this are those who are to be pensioned this year; are they coming forward under this Bill or the two-thirds Bill.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — They will be retired under the old conditions.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE — Mr. Chairman I am availing of the opportunity here to refer to a point arising out of the remarks of the honourable member for Ferryland. As the Prime Minister has said, these resolutions are almost of a revolutionary character in the sense that they are an attempt to cure the cancer that has grown to an alarming degree. But he also states, they are separate from the main part of the Bill, and we have here two distinct branches. The main evil that has been complained of for years is in the pensions proper. The pensions of Civil Servants forms that portion of the Bill up to the end of Section 14, and, on that point, as I have stated, it is a matter of a Government attempt to rectify matters, and in that sense it may be regarded as a party measure. So far as the insurance scheme is concerned, the object in having this prepared as part of the present proposition is, that it comes in the nature of a recommendation. And as the member for Trinty, Mr. Halfyard, said the other day, it is practically co-incident with the idea of efficiency in the civil service, to give the civil servants some sort of encouragement. And as a matter of fact when the Hon. Member takes his pencil, and starts to figure out the way in which compensation is going to be made, he is going to be disappointed under the present propositions. Because the Hon. Member will find that these resolutions make a very marked change in the matter of the payment of the pensions. Up till now that did not matter at all. There was no regard as to when a man got a pension. After four or five years in the service a man got a pension just the same as a man who was forty years in the service. Now that was manifestly unfair. It was wholly improper and did not encourage a man to keep in the service. This is bound to have disadvantages. One is this that in the civil service to-day there must be of necessity a certain number of men who would be retired in a couple of years time, and they would perhaps naturally be expecting to be retired on two-thirds of their salary, as had been the experience. But they are not going to get any such pension. Take for example the case of a man who is seventy years of age and who has been in the civil service for twenty years. He is going to get twenty times two and a quarter per cent, which is quite a difference from the rating that has been going on for some time past. Now as regards the insurance idea the part that I would invite consideration to is this, that this insurance scheme is an offset to the practice that has been going on with regard to pensions, and it is practically a return given to the men who have been a number of years in the civil service in this country. Today a man who is sixty five years in the public service and is getting on to middle age, if this scheme goes through he can get any advantages of group insurance and protection which because of his age, he could not otherwise afford, and because of his health he might not be able to get at

all. As far as the present proposals are concerned in the case of a man passing out after being in the civil service for twenty years, those who were depending on him would get the benefit of his insurance policy, which would make a difference in their situation in the event of the breadwinner's death. However, this Bill will be debated on by the members and I only thought that I might explain a few points arising out of the remarks made by members on the other side. But I wish to say that the money that will be paid for this insurance will come back to the country again in the saving on the pensions. And it will relieve the position that has been going on for years. It is principally for the man who gets suddenly stricken down in the service and I feel that it is worth considering as to whether or not this would be a good thing to embark upon.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, I can't say, from what I have seen and heard that these resolutions please me altogether. I quite see the advisability of these regulations as to the distribution of pensions to the Civil Servants, but I must say that I don't quite understand this, and I would like to ask the Prime Minister for an explanation. The Government say that they are not going to give a man two-thirds of his salary as a pension, but they are going to cut that down, or bring it up according to the length of time he is in the service, not exceeding thirty years; in other words, the man who has been only ten years in the Civil Service is not going to get anything like two-thirds of his salary, but I understand, to offset that, the Government are going to give him a chance to insure; they are going to give a chance to the Civil Servants to participate in group insurance. I would like to know what use it is if my pension is going to be cut $500 that I am getting an insurance policy. You have got to be dead to get your insurance. I cannot see, for the life of me, what benefit it will be to a man to give him a smaller pension in the future, and, after death, give his wife the proceeds of an insurance policy. It is when he is alive he wants his pension.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, with reference to this matter, my interpretation of it is this: insurance and pensions are two distinct things. We have had in this country, for the past ten or twenty years, entered into a practice of retiring a man in the Civil Service on two-thirds of his salary, irrespective of the time that he has put in the service. Now the anomalies that have taken place on account of this are absolutely absurd. A man two or three years in the Public Service is retired on a pension of two-thirds his salary the same as a man forty years there. I think this anomaly should be corrected. I don't know of any other way to correct it but by pensioning people in proportion to the service they have put in in the country. That is the whole ground work of this pension scheme. A man enters the public service; if he is ten years there, he gets a pension in proportion to the amount that he has earned for the ten years. I think that is all these resolutions are intended to do. The same principle exists in other countries. In the Army and Navy, men are pensioned according to the time and service he puts in.

That is the principle that should be adopted in this country. We are getting into an alarming position as regards the pensions to civil servants in this country. We are paying practically $100,000 a year for pensions; there are people retired from the Civil Service who are getting $100 a month and doing nothing for it. There are many cases, of course.

where people are incapacitated through age, but there are many others walking around this town to-day who are not incapacitated but they are still receiving pensions. I think it is about time that this should be erectified. The Government can lay claim to a sincerity of purpose in bringing in a Bill of this kind and laying it before the House, because the man who enters the Civil Service early in life will be properly treated and will get his pension in proportion to the time he has put in in the Service, but the man who enters the Service late in life should not have a claim as good and great as the man who spends a lifetime in the Service. These are the troubles we are up against, and I say that we should make a hard and fast law so that nobody would have a come-back, so that people in the Civil Service in the future would enter it under conditions that are laid down there, and nobody would have any grievances. Now as regards the insurance side of it, the only point raised in connection with insurance is as to whether it would commend itself as regarding the retiring allowance.

For instance, you take the case of a man in the Civil Service and by some unforeseen accident perhaps he may not have been there very long, a young man with a large family, something happens, an accident or sudden illness, or some peculiar circumstances, he dies, and leaves his family absolutely without protection, absolutely destitute. I don't think that it is at all fair if a man happens to be suddenly cut off and has no other private means that his family should be left destitute. Now, then, to-day, through an insurance company, every member of the Civil Service in this country can participate in insurance at the expense of $15,000 a year for the whole country. Of course, the employees themselves have to contribute a like proportion, and therefore it gives them a funded interest.

The principle of Government insurance has been adopted by every large corporation and every large concern that employs a considerable number of people. By co-operation the insurance premium is made very cheap. And in particular the older officials get a great amount of benefit. For the greater number of young officials there are the less the premium that the older ones will have to pay. Therefore, the main advantage is for the man who to-day is in the civil service and has got a family and dependents. He is living from hand to mouth and I don't believe that many of them have one cent of insurance. And it is very questionable whether he could get insurance through some physical defect. But under this scheme every man in the civil service if he agrees to subscribe to the general scheme, will benefit by the insurance. And that is another aspect of the case which should commend itself to the House. And I believe that the country will be money in hand, as there will be less calls upon it for relief of those who have died. I can tell you one case where widows of deceased public officials have been receiving thousands of dollars for several years. That will be obviated in this case. I think therefore, Mr. Chairman, that if we are going to consider this thing, let us have a certain set procedure laid down, and let us work out all the details. And I think that we should not start with the wrong impression. The principle of the pension should be according to length of service and the principle of insurance should be one that should receive the favourable consideration of this House.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPOPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, I may say that I agree with the principle of this Bill. But I have not yet had time to go through it very carefully.

I agree with what the Minister of Justice has said that the system of Pensions has been more or less of the nature of a canker in this country. And I also want to say that the present Government is in part responsible for the growth of that canker. Last year some estimates were brought in here, and an allowance had to be made for a lot of new pensions that were not in the estimates. This year the same thing will have to be done. Now this is a great mark against the present Government or any other Government. However, I believe in the Bill. But there are certain things in reference to this insurance that I would like to have some information on. Perhaps the Prime Minister might be able to give us this information.

In reference to this insurance scheme, has it ever been thought that the Government might take up this insurance itself. The total cost would be about thirty thousand dollars to insure the civil servants, fifteen thousand of which would be subscribed to by the Government, paid out of the Minister of Finance and Customs Department, and fifteen thousand would be collected from the insured. This is a system which would bring better returns than going to some insurance company and paying that amount to be sent out of the country. It looks to me as if thirty thousand dollars is a lot of money to be paid out each year. It is a question as to whether it would not be just as good a risk for the Government as for any other company. Another thing that I would like to know is whether it is optional for the employee to take insurance or not. Is he compelled to take it?

HON THE PRIME MINISTER—He will be compelled to take it under this Bill.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Then you will find that there will be many employees of the Government who will have about all the insurance that they can carry, with other companies.

There is another point that I would like to have some information on and that is as to the beneficiaries in case of death. Must the insurance go to the wife or the children, and in case of an unmarried man must it go into his estate. I understand from this that he hasn't that right.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I think you will find it contains adequate provisions as to that.

MR. HICKMAN—Well, we would like more information on this question.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, in speaking on the resolutions now before the Chair re pensions, I may say that I am absolutely in accord with the part as to pensions. With regard to the Insurance part, I take it from the Colonial Secretary that we will have to insure approximately $30,000, half of which is to be paid by the Civil Servants themselves. Now, there are Civil Servants in the country, but there are others who also deserve to be provided for, and I haven't seen anything to provide for these other poor people. Look at the old and helpless fishermen in this country, there are lots of them, and other old people who are not getting anything for their support, and don't you think that the Government ought to adopt a scheme whereby any Civil Servants who wished could insure themselves at their own expense, and devote this $15,000 to old age pensions in the country. Then we will be fair to the people who put us here —at present we are only piling it on them, and are going to put more on. I am certainly going to have more to say when this resolution comes up in debate.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman, I rise to endorse what the Leader of the Opposition has said with regard to the allocating of this Group Insur-

ance. We should start this with our own people. I don't see any reason why this money should go out of the country. I think that the Government who formulated this policy should give the people of the country a chance on it—it will do us no good if the money goes outside. Regarding Major Cashin's suggestion, that the Government ought to formulate a scheme for other people—this is worth the consideration of the Government. They have it in some form in practically all other parts of the Empire, and there is no reason why it should not be here.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I presume you have State Insurance in mind.

MR. GRIMES—Yes. I think it is a matter the Government ought to investigate. As the member from Ferryland has said, they are all necessary for carrying on the country, and the Civil Servants are not any more important than they. They should have some consideration.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I should like to say, in reply to the Leader of the Opposition and to Mr. Grimes that this Bill, or these resolutions, if they become operative, would only give the Government the power to effect insurance. If they get this power, they may consider if they can work out any such group insurance scheme locally. As regards enriching other people, I can say that taking on a group insurance scheme wouldn't appeal to me. I can't see how Insurance Companies ever make any money out of it. I have seen its operation at the Railway, and the claims have always exceeded the premiums, and I understand that in the Post Office under the scheme it was the same. I am not surprised that Mr. Halfyard was attracted by it at the Post Office—it is extremely low insurance. I can't see how any one would be anxious to take the risk on 2000 persons in the Civil Service for $30,000, which is of course only a rough figure, at amounts ranging from $500 to $2000. We have based that figure on what one insurance agent has told us—we shall of course have to get more definite information. This kind of insurance is done without reference to the particular age or condition of the individual, and if we can enrich our own people we shall do so, but frankly I shouldn't care to have the risk of insuring 2000 people per year. I think it will be alright for the committee to rise now and sit again. I do not want to deprive any member of the opportunity of speaking, but I move that the Committee rise and ask leave to sit again.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, I strongly endorse the policy of Insurance, especially Group Insurance. I would like for the Government to introduce a scheme of Insurance that would embrace every man in Newfoundland, 21 years of age and over, who cared to become insured. If as stated the new Pension Bill will greatly decrease the amount that is now being voted for Pensions, the total amount to be found by the Government for Pensions and fifty per cent. of the Insurance premiums may not be in excess of the present Pension vote. In my opinion any servant whether employed by the Government, by a business firm, or by a private individual, who finds that his employer has interest enough in him to help provide Insurance that will assist to some extent his dependents, in case of death, will be happier, and render more efficient service.

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 recieved and adopted, and it was ordered that

the Committee have leave to sit again on to-morrow.

Second Reading of Posts and Telegraphs' Bill.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, in connection with the third reading of this Bill I may say that the Minister is absent from the House, and I move, as he requested me, to have this deferred, together with the next Bill. The proposal is to incorporate the two in one bill. The question was raised as to whether this was not a money bill, on the first day, as it had to do with rates, and ought to be by special resolution. And so, as the Minister is not here, I merely give the House notice that if he were he would ask these bills to be deferred.

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 dealing with an agreement entered into between the Government of Newfoundland and the Dominion Iron and Steel Co., Ltd., and the Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Co., Ltd.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair , of Committee.

Committee of Whole on Besco Resolution.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, in introducing these resolutions regarding the Besco agreement, I would like if possible to begin at the beginning, and read a letter which the Government received from Mr. Wolvin, after he visited here in August last. We had a preliminary interview with the directors when they were down here, and we asked them to put the situation in writing. I cannot do better than to read the letter received from Mr. Wolvin containing these proposals.

(Reads letter)

Now I want to mention the conditions because this is a pressing question. We started negotiating an agreement last July and only came to an agreement last month. I may say that I wrote or rather I had written at least eleven agreements during that period. We changed them from time to time as we got the company to concede to points raised.

(Reads)

Now you will naturally say that they asked for enough while they were at it. We discussed the matter fully with Mr. Wolvin and his directors and we were inclined to say to them "What proof can you show us that you have not been making money?" "A lot of people say that you are making money and big money and are charging up big expenses and salaries of Mr. Wolvin and others, and this apparently wipes out the profits that you have made." They gave us this statement. It is not signed but they gave it to us with all the directors of the companies sitting around the Executive Council Board.

(Reads)

Now that is a very broad statement. From 1900 to 1925 without taking in the charges of expenses outside of Newfoundland, that the Wabana operations showed a loss of 31c. per ton. But I think gentlemen you should consider that statement whether you believe it or not. I do not want to go through this agreement to-day. I have spent a good many hours at it during the last six months, and I am fairly familiar with the contract by now but as we will take the agreement section by section going through it, we can discuss it then. There is one point that I would like to make clear. It would seem that this was an agreement for fifty years. As a matter of fact it is only for twenty five years, because at the end of twenty-five years it merely provides for a further 25 years that ore going to Great Britain and her dependencies will not pay a royalty of more than twenty-five cents a ton. I do not

think that there is any gentleman in this room that does not feel that if at the end of twenty-five years, for the next twenty-five years this country was getting twenty-five cents a ton on all ore sent to Great Britain, and the people of Bell Island were happy, we would want to take any more of the Company's profits away from them.

MR. CASHIN—Did they want that put in?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—They were particularly anxious that that should be included. There was nothing that they were more anxious to have included than that. Their claim is that the ore masters of Great Britain would not change their furnaces and that they would not go to a big expenditure on all their properties for this particular work unless they could see fifty years ahead. And they say that unless they got that they would not build big steamers for this particular work and arrange for the very expensive discharging facilities for this work that would be necessary. First they wanted it in respect to the ore that might be shipped anywhere. But finally we got them down to the ore that would be shipped to Great Britain and her dependencies, and that is a point under which I think that we are not conceding them very much. If it were my business I would not think that I would be conceding them anything, if I were getting twenty-five cents out of the ore and the people of Bell Island were happy. We were willing to agree to that in order to give some encouragement to the iron masters of Great Britain to put in the necessary equipment. How long are we going to have Germany to consume our ore? And do we want to be dependent on Germany to consume our ore? Quite on the contrary I think that we want to see the ore consumed within the Empire. I want to see England consuming the Wabana ore. I want to see the ore consumed in Great Britain and her dependencies and I believe that it is quite possible that it can be done, and anyhow I feel like giving them every opportunity to do it. I do not want to see the ore going to Germany for longer than necessary if there can be found markets in the empire for it. Sir Newton Moore was over in Germany and from his recent letters he is not very hopeful of being able to place ore there. But I do not want to go into the details now. No doubt there will be a good number on this side of the House and on the other side who will think that all these contentions must be taken with a grain of salt. But there it is. I think that the statement made by Sir Newton Moore cannot be reasonably contradicted. He states his facts. He states the price of the ore that the other markets are prepared to sell for, and he states his difficulty in being able to place any of our ore over there at present. At the same time there is hope that they may be able to do something with smaller quantities than last year, and there is also hope that Britain may be able to take perhaps a hundred thousand tons this year.

I do not propose to-day, unless the House is ready for it, to go into the details, but I want to say that taken on the whole that the agreement is the best kind of an agreement that we could arrive at. We have done everything that we could to improve upon it. We gave them three years free duty as against the expenditure of the seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars, which they expect to expend in three years although they have a longer time to do it in. They have to expend it in five years from January 1st, 1926, and it is in consideration of this expenditure at Bell Island, and their distressed financial condition, that we permitted them this three years free entry.

Now the taxation on the ore speaks

for itself. There is a preference to Great Britain. We have looked out for the rights of the people of Bell Island to the best of our ability, and on the best terms that we could arrange. The price of coal is taken care of for the people who live on Bell Island. On the whole I submit Mr. Chairman, that while this contract is not all that one could desire, it is the best arrangement for everybody, that could be arrived at, without actually running the risk of having them shut down the mines at Bell Island altogether. I have been considering all along, supposing we did not come to an agreement with these people, what would happen? If they were to close down the mines would we soon be going to them with our hat in our hand asking them to come back and keep the mines open at any price?

I want to say that we consulted the Bell Island miners about- this because we felt that it was more a matter for them than it was for us. We were anxious to get their views and personally I would have done away with every bit of export duty to get the men a better wage. The company would not guarantee any wage and I do not know that we can altogether blame them for that. I have all along claimed myself that wages are fixed by supply and demand, and if the labourers can be got then the general tendency of the employer is to get them if he can. We did our best in the interest of the labourers and we asked them if they would call a meeting of the representatives of all the grades of labour at Bell Island and asked them if they would give consideration to the whole situation and advise us whether it would be better to call the bluff and say that we were not going to make any agreement at all. A meeting of the workers was called at Bell Island and the reply that we got was that they did not want to advise us in the matter at all. We took it that they were leaving it to us to do the best that we could do. They told us in so many words that if we could make a better agreement they would be pleased, but they did want the door left open. The fact remains that we have not been able to make a better agreement. That is all that I have to say about the resolutions at the present moment and I submit them to the House.

MR. CASHIN—I wonder if the Prime Minister could let us have a copy of the letter from Mr. Wolvin that he has just read here this afternoon. This is a very important occasion. I take it that the Government is going to take suggestions if they are offered in connection with this agreement now before the House. There are a lot of clauses in it that are none too good. These people are claiming poverty and in clause 4 of the bill they want to be exempt from income and the business profits tax. If their poverty is so great what do they want this clause in at all for. And there is nothing definite about the housing scheme. With regard to the seven hundred and fifty thousand that is to be spent, that is merely an ordniary expenditure and charged up to ordinary account, a hundred and fifty thousand a year. Some of the firms on Water Street spend that in a year. The last clause, eleven, says in the "event of the cessation of operations." If this agreement is passed we cannot say but they may not close down the mines in six months or not. And there is two months to get the commission and that makes nine months. I believe that it is time to call their bluff, once and for all. They are earning enough money to pay the income tax and the business profits tax to this country. There is another clause that may be local. We cannot buy coal in Sydney and bring it here to sell, at least no business man in St. John's. Do not you think

that this kind of thing could be stopped. I have it from their own vice-president. I asked him last summer to sell me a load of coal and he said that he could not. Is not our money good enough.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—They were anxious to sell it to the railway.

MR. CASHIN—Ah, yes they were anxious to sell to the railway. This bill is talking about the British manufacturers. Is there anything in this bill or this agreement that says that they will change their furnaces. There is nothing to show that there is any negotiation. And we do not know but that they will go out to-morrow and sell out to somebody else. They might sell out to a German firm.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Some people would rather the Germans than the Besco.

MR. CASHIN—We should make some provision whereby they would not be able to sell out to anybody else they like. I think that the Prime Minister will agree with me, and that everyone in this House will agree with me, that this is a very poor agreement, from the point of view that we are getting nothing and that they are getting all.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Suppose they did sell out.

MR. CASHIN—It might not be to British people. People have been sold before by the Besco. They sold the grain in Western Canada, and they might just as well sell the miners of Bell Island.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—There is just one point there in connection with clause 4. It does not mean that they are free from income tax at all. It merely says "Not of General Application." It merely means that if the Income Tax and the Business Profits Tax go on in Newfoundland they go on them too. All it means is that we could not put the tax on them and on no one else.

MR. CASHIN—The Income Tax is not on the Statute Book, and I suppose if we put the Income Tax back again it would go on them also. Now about this ten thousand dollars?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—That is a different matter entirely. The companies have the benefit of Bell Island, and if there is a council there they can tax the companies to the extent of ten thousand dollars, and with the permission of the Governor in Council up to twenty thousand, so that hon. members can see that is simply for the benefit of the island itself. It was felt that it was but right that they should contribute their share to the Bell Island taxation.

MR. CASHIN—We have nothing here that is going to fix the housing situation.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—To-day the boarding house is the evil on Bell Island. The people from around Conception Bay come over there for temporary employment, and it will be noticed that provision is made for those who work on the island in (Reads)

And the point about that is that no man on Bell Island dreams about boarding except the outside miner, and if a man goes there and takes his family there he becomes an islander in the strict sense, and that is the class of a man that wants the house. And that class of man is provided for and the man can pay for the house out of the rental charges.

MR. CASHIN—Suppose the seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars are spent in the five years and there are no houses.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Suppose they had spent the seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars and had not put up the houses—clause eight is applicable in a sense that it might be one of the means on which they would spend the seven

hundred and fifty thousand dollars. But if they spend the seven hundred and fifty thousand and do not put up the houses the point is that they will still have to comply with clause six.

(Reads)

As a matter of fact over there now there are people who have purchased shacks and have let them out as a business proposition, and the men in order to get them at a cheap rate have been living under conditions that certainly could be improved. And a clause of this kind will enable the miners to get some sort of boarding accommodation that will do away with that condition that we have referred to.

MR. CASHIN—With regard to Clause 8, that $750,000 that they're going to spend. I take it that that may be alright, if they don't charge it to overhead, as may be expected from them. I have never been on Bell Island, but I think the overhead there, such as elevators, wharves etc., is very considerable. And that $750,000 is really of no advantage to Newfoundland, for they're really improving their own property anyway.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—They can't begin to hope to make Bell Island pay unless the present system of transportation is corrected.

MR. CASHIN—That may be. Now look at Clause 11 (Reads). Well, I take it if I read the clause correctly, that if I am the Besco people and say to-morrow "Shut down the works," the Government can't turn around and say "Open up again." They have got to wait six months and then appoint arbitrators, and there is nothing to prevent their being shut down 11 months.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—And then we can't say whether they were justified or not.

MR. CASHIN—Of course you can't. The whole thing is one-sided. Then look at Clause 12. Is that the famous agreement we have heard so much about; they should be made carry it out.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Regarding Clause 11, this is but a shadow of what we endeavoured to get. What we should like to be able to incorporate into an agreement would be like this—"The Company shall operate continually, and in default of doing so for more than 10 days, shall forfeit the contract," but we can't do that. The only point of value in Clause 11, frankly, is that a reason will have to be given. I don't attempt to say that the reason is bound to be satisfactory, but it is impossible to do more. For all purposes Clause 11 is only a step forward; the company can still close, and Clause 11 says that if they do the Governor in Council can have an enquiry. It is practically folly to attach too much importance to it; it is only an approach to a prevention of their closing down. It is only a check.

MR. CASHIN—I appreciate the explanation of the Minister of Justice. This Company seems to want everything and give nothing. Look at Clause 5, which exempts them from paying duties on supplies, etc. Now I asked a question to-day to find out what duties they have been paying during past years. The fact of their being a tax of 10 cents a ton on ore is counter-balanced by the taking off of duties on other things. If they do pay us a tax of 10 cents a ton, and we get a hundred thousand dollars that way, but lose it in our revenue, we are as badly off as ever.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—They never paid a tax on coal.

MR. CASHIN—I am not speaking of coal. I am speaking of mining equipment.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Well, you know, the more mining equipment the more labour.

MR. CASHIN—If they bring in mining equipment that will mean less

manual labour, so it is a loss to labour.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—There has been no duty on explosives for many years.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman, regarding clause 6, which refers to the building of new houses; will this apply only to houses built in the future, when the employees want to get them to own? But there are many there already who might want to buy, and I don't think it would be fair to so restrict this against the men now employed, who certainly ought to have the same privilege of buying.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I presume that they will be all under the same arrangement. I may say that what the Company would like to see is to sell all their houses, for the main reason that a man who takes his own house and lives there is a man who is going to work there steadily, and not be a casual worker. You will find to-morrow, I think, that they hope to have all men working there live in their own houses.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman, my reason for asking that question was this. It has been the practice elsewhere to have a certain number of Company houses, and in the event of a dispute the Company is in a position to evict the tenants. And the Besco Company might take advantage of that.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—One advantage the strikers on Bell Island would have would be that the whole water front is available to them. The inhabitants of the wholefront part of the Island would be glad to accommodate the strikers. That couldn't happen on Bell Island, for there are four-fifths of these houses privately owned.

MR. CASHIN—Did the Company during their negotiations with the Government, produce their books to show that the Dominion Iron and Steel Company made any dividend during the past few years, or were they asked to do so?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—It wasn't necessary.

MR. CASHIN—I say that the Dominion Iron & Steel Co. paid a dividend of 15 p.c. or 16 p.c., and I am able to produce proof of that.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The whole question for us here was that the Bell Island operations did not pay. Without any charge against them from the Head Office, it was shown that Bell Island had sunk $30,000 in operations.

MR. CASHIN—Then that might make my argument more striking, Mr. Chairman. They might easily make their books to show that Bell Island was a losing venture—that has happened before.

I beg to move that the committee now rise, and may add that I should be very pleased if the Prime Minister would let us have copies of Mr. Wolvin's letter which he has read.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I suggest that Mr. Cashin take the letter, and have it published so that everybody can see it.

MR. CASHIN—That will be just as satisfactory.

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 Seal Fishery Bill.

MR. WARREN — When previously discussing this Bill and the subject of the Seal Fishery, I spoke of the feeling abroad in Newfoundland with regard to the seal fishery. For some reason or other, to, it has always been necessary for this House to dispose of anything that has to do with the

seal fishery. The Bank fishery, the shore fishery and various other fisheries may be discussed by the Fishery Board, but the prosecution of the seal fishery, it seems, must be discussed in all its various details and legislation passed as to whether the boats shall sail at seven o'clock or at eight, on the first of the month or the last, whether feather beds shall be changed for air mattresses. All these things surely, can be handed over to a Board like the Fisheries Board, and perhaps the Fisheries Act might be amended to effect that. At the present time, it is really nothing more than a joke.

A sealing bill has to pass through this House and through the Upper House and it is discussed therein, by the selected wisdom of the country and goes into force. Time passes and we find that we did not know what we were doing and another Act has to be brought in next year to amend what has been done. This House is not qualified to legislate on the seal fishery, and the regulating of it ought to be left to those with some experience of it.

MR. RANDELL — It has always been a mystery to me to understand why this Legislature or any other should legislate as to sailing or time of sailing of ships to the sealfishery. I have never had it explained to me how it matters if a ship sails on the first, fifth or fifteenth of March. Of course a ship could sail too late but she certainly could not sail too early. What does it matter to this country if the sailing date is the first, middle or last of the month; it is a matter solely for the owners. I do not see why we should legislate in the least with regard to that. I never could understand it, and I never had it explained to me. Of course with regard to the killing date, that is a different matter; that should not be left to the owners and masters. But it should certainly be agreed on what date to kill seals and it should be made a hard and fast law. Personally I am not in favor of setting the killing date as early as the fifteenth. I think that later than that would be better. Of course I have not had a long and varied experience at the seal fishery, but from what little I have seen I have never seen seals in their prime on the fifteenth of March, and I have never met an old sealer that did, except perhaps in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, where seals are said to whelp earlier. They are commonly said to be in their prime on the seventeenth of March. Many old sealer could tell you of years that the seals were very small on the seventeenth, and to say that the whole herd is in their prime on that date may have happened one year in ten. Now to have the killing date stipulated so early to my mind is a mistake. A farmer or anyone having cattle for sale generally waits until they come to maturity or at their best weight before he sells them. I claim that thousands of dollars are being lost to this country because of seals being killed too early. I have seen as great a loss as ten per cent. from the seals being killed too early.

I want to make myself very clear respecting a fixed date for killing. As I said before, the date of the sailing is immaterial; surely the owners should be allowed to use their own discretion as to when they shall send their ships out. If a man wants to send his ship out on the first of March, I don't see why there should be any legislation to interfere with his doing so. With regard to his killing seals of course there should be legislation. I do not altogether disagree with the Bill, but I hold that the date of killing should not be earlier than the fifteenth. There has been one argument with regard to setting it so early. I have heard it said that the earlier the seals are disturbed during the year the earlier

they will breed and have young the next year. I think that is a mistake, because some years ago when the seals were killed very early the following year the sealers got small seals very late too. I know of one case when it was almost a close season, the whole catch being only thirty four thousand, and the following year they struck the seals late and still they were small, so I don't think that has very much to do with the size of seals, and I think the fifteenth of March early enough. As I said, I think the sailing date is immaterial.

MR. ASHBOURNE—I have not heard any logical argument why the Government, after introducing a Bill last year making legal the date of killing as the fourteenth, should this year change the Bill and make the thirteenth the date. They may have a reason for doing it for this particular year. If so, honourable members may agree to it for this year. As far as I am personally concerned, I am against the principle of making it the thirteenth for every year.

It seems to be the concensus of opinion that seals are in their prime on St. Patrick's Day. I was rather surprised to find that the fleet were sailing so early in the season, this year. It seems they really should not have killed until the fifteenth, so I fail to see why they should sail on the fifth. According to the wireless messages, reports seem to indicate that the seals are of very small size this year. This afternoon's paper expected them to average 48 lbs. Now I think a few years ago the Florizel brought in a large load averaging 54 lbs. I do not see why this early date for killing seals should be made permanent simply because the ships have killed this year on that date, on instructions from their owners. I do not know if this was by agreement with the Government or not. The seals are being killed before they are in their prime, and though it may be alright to legalise early killing for this year, I would like to ask their serious consideration to the fact that at the present time the Minister of Marine & Fisheries is not here in this House, and if you want to legalise the killing of seals for this year, why then let it go at that. But do not place on record that in any year on or after the 13th day of March seals may be killed. Now before last year, before that Bill was introduced into this House authorising the killing of seals after the 13th of March, I would like to ask the Minister of Justice, what was the former date for the killing of seals.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Before last year it began on the 13th.

MR. ASHBOURNE—When was that Act passed? I have not been able to find the Act. I would like to see it because I understand that it stipulated after the 13th. It was so according to the 1922 Act.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—It appears to me possibly that this might have been one of the things that was done by Minute of Council. If necessary I will have that information to-morrow.

MR. ASHBOURNE—I would like to have it understood definitely, Mr. Speaker, because last year when the bill was put in the Committe stage, so the Hansard says, the Prime Minister expressed a desire that since His Excellency was coming down that afternoon and as at that time there were certain other bills that were going through, that the Sealing Bill be passed by this House, be referred to the Upper House and receive His Excellency's assent the same afternoon. So that Bill was virtually rushed through this House and not only that, but last year, the 14th happened to be on a Saturday, and that was the first day that they could kill. The 15th was on a Sunday and there-

fore they could only kill on one day before the sixteenth, as they could not kill on Sunday. I think that last year the fact that many of the steamers that were at the seal fishery were wooden with the exception of the Government steamers and the Seal, that that was why the Bill passed through this House and received Capt. Winsor's consent. It is rather strange to hear about action being instituted against the members of the crews, because surely it would be rather ridiculous to think that a man would be prosecuted when the Minister of Marine and Fisheries put his own men on the ice and told them to go ahead and kill the seals.

Now as regards the date of killing, and the termination of the voyage, I would consider that that is not essential, because if a ship has a certain number of seals aboard, she is not going to stay out for any great length of time, because sooner or later the seals will begin to run. And not only that, but the ships will probably get short of coal and they will have to come in. Last year Capt. Winsor said in this House that he considered "the 13th early enough. And I don't think that the 14th or the 15th would be too late." Now on account of the importance of the sealing industry and because we do not want to kill out the herd of seals, that we have on our coasts here, I should think that this House would be well advised, to defer the making of any date for the killing of seals in future years until Capt. Winsor comes in from the ice. There are one or two other things that I would like to mention. I notice that in Section two:

(Reads)

Now, sir, it seems reasonable to me that the Gulf steamers should be allowed to sail before the others, and if the idea is that this Bill should apply to steamers only, I think that the word steamer should be inserted there, rather than the word ship. There was another thing this year, Capt. Kean of the Terra Nova was late in sailing. If the seals had not been killed until Monday, the 15th, surely it would have given him a longer time to get down, and who knows but that he might have got to them on Monday, whereas he could not get to them on Saturday. In conclusion I want to say that I have not heard a plausible reason why this date should be altered from what it was last year, when this Bill was passed through this House.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER— Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say one or two words in explanation to Mr. Ashbourne. It was not the intention last year when passing this Bill to alter the date of sailing for steamers. The intention was to alter the date as regards the limitation of the voyage, so that ships could clear. It was intended to get rid of that clause by which ships could not kill after the 20th of April. Legislation was hurriedly put through and nobody noticed an error. Whilst it was legal last year to kill on the 13th by putting in "after the 13th" this year we practically made it peremptory to kill on the 14th, without any intention of doing so whatever. Sealing ship owners were never approached in the matter at all, and they never suspected that there was any change in the killing date. They ordered their captains to kill on the 13th. It is always a matter of dispute as to the proper date to allow seals to be killed. And this year I know that when Capt. Winsor got out on the eve of the killing day he telegraphed in to prevent the seals from being killed on the 13th. Mr. Job telegraphed back saying "No. He had given instruction to his captains to kill on the 13th and on the 13th they would kill." I also know that Capt. Winsor telegraphed back to him and said that "It was the greatest crime

that was ever perpetrated in the annals of the history of Newfoundland." I think that the whole Sealing Act should be revised, and if you let the Sealing Bill go through for this year, and cover the points necessary to be covered, the whole bill could be revised before another year comes around, and we might leave it till then.

The Bill makes it definite that seals can be killed on the thirteenth. Some persons say that you can kill on the thirteenth now, but my interpretation is that you cannot kill before the fourteenth. It would take a Solomon to tell what really is the date for killing. The Act of 1921 states it shall not be lawful until the thirteenth and the Acts of 1922 and 1925 state that it shall be lawful after the thirteenth.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—I would like to express my opinion here for I was present in this House during most of its legislation on sealing. The necessity for legislation on sealing is entirely a matter of prevailing conditions. The reason for changing the date last year was because of the inability of the steamers likely getting to seals after they left last year before the thirteenth. Circumstances were such that it was impossible to kill on the thirteenth. This year there was a possibility of getting seals on the ninth or tenth. I consider that the killing of seals on the thirteenth this year was illegal. I find nothing to warrant the killing of seals on the thirteenth. It is known that the owners instructed the captains on that date to kill. Another feature to be considered is the addition of a powerful steamer. This fact should somewhat alter the attitude of the Government with regard to the killing date. With a large powerful steamer there is no trouble in getting through the ice, and the different capabilities of a steamer like the Beothic and the old ships have to be considered. It would be unfortunate, I think if the captains of the ships could be sued for having broken a portion of the Act and committed a technical offence, especially in view of the fact that the thirteenth fell on a Saturday and they would have had to wait until the fifteenth, and may lose a big part of the voyage. As far as the Act before the House goes, it is retroactive and one of exoneration. That is the Bill as I see it. Another year I think we ought to consider the sealing legislation further.

MR. BROWNE—I don't profess to know much about the sealing industry except in a technical way, and I just want to make a suggestion with regard to the date set for killing. The thirteenth is going to be fixed. This year the people complained because they were not allowed to kill on the thirteenth, but they went out and broke the law. Supposing that in 1928 this law is still on the Statute Book. There will be an extra day in February and the thirteenth falls on a Sunday. The seal on its day for killing will then be two days older than it is to-day. It will then be said that this being the case because of the Leap Year the seal is as nearly in its prime as any other year and should be killed even contrary to law, and somebody will want an Act passed that year also. I think all this legislation is somewhat in need of reform concerning the killing of seals. Someone has spoken of the constant recurrence of legislation on this point and called it a hardy annual, there ought to be some other word invented to describe it properly.

MR. ASHBOURNE—I think that cognisance should be taken of Capt. Winsor's messages. I think that this should go through only on mature consideration.

MR. HALFYARD—I think that if we are desirous of making any

amendment it might be done when in Committee on the Bill. I think we might accept the second reading now.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Seal Fishery Act, and other Acts relating to the Seal Fishery," 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.

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, and with leave of the House, the Bills "An Act to Amend the Act 11, George V., Cap. 37, entitled "An Act Further to Amend Chapter 35 o fthe Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Postal and Telegraph Services,'" and "An Act further to Amend Chapter 35 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Postal and Telegraph Services,'" were discharged from the Order Paper.

Hon. the Minister of Justice, on behalf of Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraps, gave notice that he would on to-morrow move the House into Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions respecting "Charges and fees upon mailable matter."

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday, at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, March 31, 1926.

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

Petitions were presented by:

Hon. the Minister of Justice from Bauline re Road.

Hon. the Minister of Justice from Tapper's Cove re Road.

Hon. the Minister of Justice from Bell Island re Road.

Mr. Hickman from Shoe Workers, Hr. Grace, re Taxation.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—I wish to present a petition from the shoe-workers of Harbor Grace requesting that some consideration be given to the application of the Customs Dumping Acts and the reduction of tariff on raw material. The petition is largely signed by the shoeworkers and they are in real earnest. There are three shoe factories in Harbour Grace, one of which I understand is closed down entirely. One gives one or two days work out of a week. The workers find it impossible to exist on the pay from these industries. The managers of the industries are very much interested in keeping them going and will do all possible to keep the men at work, but competition is rendered difficult by reason of the low price shoe brought in from Canada and the United States. It is argued by some that people should be permitted to buy shoes as cheaply as they can, I grant that it is poor argument, as the consumer does not get the benefit of the low prices. An article brought in at low price gives the retailer an opportunity to make larger profits. It is on the Statute Book at the present time. It asks too that some consideration be given to the importation of raw material. As far as I have been able to find out about two hundred and fifty thousand pairs of leather shoes are imported from the United States, and Canada and other places. This is a commodity that can be manufactured here, and when we import foreign manufactured goods we import foreign labour, for the imported article is manufactured by foreign labour. Shoe manufacturing has not been a very profitable industry in Newfoundland; I don't think any shoe manufacturer in the country has large reserves

built up out of manufacturing of shoes. You might find one that is an importer and retailer of shoes as well as manufacturers in a good financial position, but the shoe concern that is not a retailer as well as a manufacturer has no big reserves, and they have much difficulty in making two ends meet. Other industries have been helped during the last session of the Legislature.

The Ropewalk with its big reserves equal to its capital has had further protection by increased duties on lines and twines which does not give any more employment.

The Tobacco Factory with its large profits and big dividends every year to sharesholders has received further protection without giving further employment. The bulk of shares in the concern being held outside of the country the dividends are sent out of the country.

The Butter Manufacturers with the enormous yearly profits of hundreds of thousands of dollars received further protection by having the duty increased on butter and creamery imported into the country.

The Prime Minister is interested in the three very profitable industries and the Minister of Finance owns a butter factory. It is a great pity that they are not shareholders in the boot and shoe factories, particularly those of Harbour Grace, and I think the Government should listen to the prayer of this petition and do whatever possible to assist those people who are looking for employment in this manufacturing industry. Harbor Grace is so situated that manufacturing can be carried on, and an essentially manufacturing city if it were possible. Work has to be found for the people some way. They cannot get more work at road building as soon all the roads that are necessary will be built in Conception Bay. The Government will have to take up this thing and see what can be done for the people, at Harbour Grace and throughout Conception Bay the fishery has not been prosecuted lately as it was years ago in the days of the old fish firms. The fishery is falling off there very much. There is on the whole very little in fishing for the Conception Bay people, and these people have to depend on industrial work that it has is of the utmost importance to it. The petition is worthy of the consideration of the Government and it should see if something cannot be done for the shoe workers of Harbour Grace, and of any other town of the country where shoe manufacturing is carried out. I give the petition my heartiest and most serious support, and I trust the Government will receive the petition in the same spirit and give it the fullest consideration.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—I desire to support the petition presented by the Leader of the Opposition, and I endorse every word he has said with regard to its importance.

There has been a great deal of controversy in reference to this matter during the last six months. We have endeavoured in every way possible to meet the wishes of the Harbour Grace shoe-workers as far as our influence in the Government could be exerted to that effect. Unfortunately the dumping clause in the Customs Act is not sufficiently elastic to meet this contingency. At the last conference between the shoe workers, Customs authorities and members of the Executive Government no decision was reached as to a workable remedy as the Customs it seems have not been able to see their way clear to put the dumping clause in operation.

Harbor Grace, it is true, stands in an unfortunate position with regard to its past. Those of us who knew Harbor Grace in the days when it flourished will remember its very large sealing interests and large in-

dustry of outfitting for the fishery. Now, Harbor Grace is dependent on minor industries. Something should be done to revive trade and industry in that quarter. The shoe workers are deserving of every possible assistance. They are a hard working and industrious people and manufacture a product that is a credit to them. The firm of Archibald Bros. whose exhibit many members of the House have seen at the Industrial Exhibition have shown by it what these workers are capable of doing.

The industry is greatly handicapped by competition of cheap American goods, dumped here, obtained at very small prices and paying an ad valorem duty which is consequently very small. The quality of the goods so imported is greatly inferior to the local made article, in fact certain firms importing these goods sell them only in summer, and when the wet weather comes they are put back in reserve stock. If these cheap shoes were worn on a wet day the wearer quite likely would have to go home without the soles. The value of such goods cannot be compared with the home made article. Certain shoe manufacturers in town have gone out of business and are importing because there is more money in that. I do not see that the consumers are considered or are getting a great benefit from the importation of cheap shoes as the profits made by the retailers are large.

This matter is of importance in St. Johns as well as in Harbor Grace. When the Budget comes in I hope and feel that proper provision will be made for stopping the importation of undesirable cheap stuff from the United States and Canada. Importation of this kind is not allowed into Canada from the United States. There seems to be some technical difficulty in the Customs Act to prevent enforcing our dumping laws. I don't know what the trouble is, but it appears to be very difficult to get the Customs to put into force some machinery for protection of these people.

I have much pleasure in supporting the petition, and I hope that when we get into committee on Ways and Means we will devise ways and means to do away with this unfortunate and unfair state of affairs.

HON. THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—I wish to associate myself with the Colonial Secretary in supporting the prayer of the petition just presented. As my colleague has stated, as representatives of the District of Harbor Grace in the Government, we have been giving this matter fullest consideration and have been dealing with it for over twelve months. In fact, this very same petition was in our hands for some time. We have been dealing with the matter and had been successful to a certain extent. I was asked to return the petition so that it might be placed in the hands of some member of the Opposition. We impressed on the Executive Government the need of doing something to bring about a change in favor of the shoe-workers of Harbor Grace. The whole trouble is not, however, with the Dumping Act. A lot of the trouble is that people will not ask for and demand the local-made article. Until local manufacturers of Boots and Shoes can interest the people of Newfoundland sufficiently in the local-made article so as to induce every one of us to ask for and demand local-made goods, I do not see that much improvement can be made. Meanwhile, I give the prayer of the petition my hearty and cordial support.

Hon. the Prime Minister presented the Report of the Select Committee appointed to consider the petition of Harry J. Crowe, as follows:

> The Select Committee appointed to consider the petition of Harry J. Crowe beg to report that they have considered the matter to them re-

ferred; that they find the Rules of the House have not been complied with as regards sufficiency of notice, but they recommend that the Rules in this respect be waived, and that leave be granted for the introduction of the accompanying resolutions.

(Sgd.) W. S. MONROE,
A. E. HICKMAN,
R. HIBBS,
J. H. SCAMMELL,
W. J. WALSH,
J. R. BENNETT,
W. J. HIGGINS.

March 31st, 1926.

On motion this Report was received and adopted.

Mr. Ashbourne gave notice of question.

Mr. Randell gave notice of question.

Mr. Cashin gave notice of question.

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow move the House into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions respecting an agreement between the Government and Harry J. Crowe.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—On behalf of the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, I beg to move that the motion that this House go into "Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions respecting Charges and Fees upon mailable matter," stand deferred, in the absence of the Minister.

Replies to the following questions were tabled with exception of Nos. 1, 2, 8, which were deferred.

(1) MR. DUFF asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to lay on the Table the report of Mr. Chambers (from British Columbia) in reference to our salmon fishery, canning industry and other work in reference to our fishery products.

(2) MR. GRIMES asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the Table of the House: (a) The number of wardens, watchmen and other officials employed at the Penitentiary for the past ten years, giving the number year by year and the daily hours of work; (b) How many have left the service during that period and why; (c) How many were pensioned during that period; what was the length of service of each and state the reasons for pensioning in all cases.

(3) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the Table of the House statement showing the amount of Duty paid at Bell Island on explosives, mining equipment and mining supplies, for the fiscal years 1922-1923, 1924-1925; also what was the total amount of Export Tax on iron ore collected 1915, 1916, 1917, 1918, 1919, 1920, 1921, 1922, and 1923.

(4) MR. HALFYARD asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the Table of the House a detailed statement of the extra amount of $310,000.00 said to be spent on Maintenance of Way and Upkeep of Equipment of the Railway over and above the amount spent for the year 1923-24.

(5) MR. HALFYARD asked Hon. the Colonial Secretary if it is the intention of the Highroads Commission to build or repair any roads in Trinity District during the Spring, Summer or Autumn of 1926; if so, please state the proposed roads or localities.

(6) MR. HALFYARD asked Hon. the Prime Minister if the Government authorized any person at Winterton, Trinity District, to cut timber during the present winter, to the value of $1,000.00, for the purpose of building a Government wharf at Winterton; if authority was given, by whom or what department, and to whom; if payment has been made give name or names of parties to whom payment was made and vouchers.

(7) MR. HIBBS asked Hon. the Colonial Secretary: (1) If the High Roads Commission are occupying

rooms in the Nail Factory, and if so, for what purpose; (2) The names of those who are employed there during the winter, the salary which they are receiving and to state the nature of their work.

(8) MR. HIBBS asked Hon. the Colonial Secretary to lay on the Table of the House the following information with respect to the operations of the Highroads Commission: (1) To state the names of all Superintendents appointed to supervise the work of ordinary foremen and working gangs, other than Mr. Cochius and their rate of pay; (2) To state the names of all timekeepers employed by the Highroads Commission, from the beginning of operations to date and the salary paid to each individual timekeeper; (3) (a) To state the names of all foremen who were placed in charge of gangs, and their rate of wages, (b) the number of pit bosses and their rate of pay, (c) the number of dump bosses and their rate of pay; (4) To state the salary paid to Mr. T. A. Hall, Government Engineer, as Chairman of Highroads Commission, and what increase in wages, if any, over his former salary as Government Engineer; (5) To state if the salary of the assistant Government Engineer, Mr. Robinson, has been increased on account of any services rendered by him to the Highroads Commission, and if so, to state the nature of services rendered and the amount of increase; (6) To furnish a detailed statement of the total cost of: (a) Mr. Hall's travelling expenses during tours of inspection, etc., for motor car hire and cab hire from the 1st day of May to 31st day of December 1925, together with vouchers; (b) Mr. Robinson's travelling expenses when inspecting work on roads and bridges during the same period, together with vouchers; (c) Mr. Cochius' travelling expenses in the performance of his work, from the time he took up his duties in Newfoundland, to December 31st, 1925, together with vouchers; (d) The travelling expenses of all other Superintendents during tours of inspection of road work from the 1st day of May to the 31st December, 1925, together with vouchers, (e) to state the amounts paid to the Hon. W. J. Ellis, Hon. Samuel Milley and Mr. D. M. Baird, members of the Highroads Commission, for travelling expenses by motor and other vehicles, also all other expenses from the date of their appointments to February 28th, 1926, together with vouchers; (7) To Table a statement of all road making machinery imported by the Highroads Commission, together with the cost of same; the name of firm or firms from whom said machinery was purchased and if machinery was purchased or ordered through a local agent or agents; and if so, to state the name of such agent or agents.

In reference to No. 3:

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—The reply I am tabling answers the question in part. I will table the rest later. I beg to table also answer to Mr. Cashin's question in reference to the contingencies account of the Customs' Department and answer to Mr. Ashbourne's question in reference to the number of vessels.

In reference to No. 5:

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—The Governor in Council has power to designate certain roads as highroads. This year as far as I know none have been designated. Last year they did.

In reference to No. 6:

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I have made enquiries from the Departments of Agriculture and Mines, and Fisheries, and they know nothing of any such authorisation.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I beg to table answers to questions numbers 1 to 7 on the Order Paper of yesterday, and to question asked

by the Leader of the Opposition in connection with the conducting of transportation.

MR. HALFYARD—Arising out of the Prime Minister's reply to my question, No. 6 on to-day's Order Paper, my reason for asking that question was that I was informed by Capt. Bishop, Inspector sent to Winterton, that a certain man of Winterton had been given that authority, Mr. Piercey was the man he mentioned, and I asked Mr. Goodridge at the Fisheries Department, and he said that he knew nothing about it, so I put the question on the Order Paper.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Permission was asked at Heart's Content and the Government refused to allow it: the wood was on the three mile limit.

Besco Resolutions.

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 dealing with an agreement entered into between the Government of Newfoundland and the Dominion Iron and Steel Co., Ltd., and the Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Co., Ltd.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—I think that the continuation of the debate on these Besco Resolutions should be postponed for the present. It is not important that they be got through in a hurry, and I would ask that the House rise and have this come up for discussion at a later date. The matter needs a lot of consideration and should not be rushed through the Legislature. It is a public bill, I think you might call it a public bill being one of interest to everybody. I think it should be given the fullest consideration before being taken up.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—We have no object in rushing the Bill. If the Opposition want further time for its consideration, there is no reason whatever why it should not stand deferred.

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.

Civil Service Resolutions.

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 Civil Service Protection.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, the point raised by Mr. Halfyard brings to my mind the fact that there are some outport postmasters and some outport officials, particularly in places where the postal and telegraph work is combined, who do considerably more work than eight hours a day. I have particularly in mind the case of Port Union. The operator there is also the postmaster. The mail handled there is tremendous, and in addition he has to handle on Fridays a newspaper with a considerable circulation. I know that Mr. King, the operator, has discharged his duties conscientiously and well. He has got to meet all the requirements made upon him, and he has to work sometimes as late as nine or ten at night, to get through all this work. I admit that strictly speaking the rules and regulations of the Postal Department do not require him to do so. But you can appreciate the position he would be placed in if he refused to do the work. He is a first class man. He is a first class

postmaster and a first class operator. The volume of business that he has to do and his manner of dealing with that business, is in itself sufficient evidence of the man's capabilities. But to-day he can't get any overtime. He gets a straight salary of course, but that does not compensate him for the work that he does and for the courtesy that he extends to the people at Port Union. Sometimes we have that harbour full of vessels. There is a tremendous business outside of our own. But Mr. King can't come up to St. John's, and if he asks for any overtime does he get a satisfactory answer? I refer to this because I want the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs or somebody with authority to look into this case at Port Union. There is a newspaper published there, and we pay the regulation tax. Mr. King has to do a tremendous lot of overtime. But he naturally would ask whether any special recompense might be given. I would like this matter to be brought to the attention of the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs. This particular case that I have cited goes to show that if you are going to come in here and lay down certain general principles, you are going to exclude many extenuating cases. You can't take every efficient official in the Postal Telegraph Service at Port Union or Grand Bank or any other place and say that he shall not get any overtime, when you are making a regulation here, that if a man works over eight hours a day in the city, he is entitled to overtime.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I quite see the force of Mr. Scammell's remarks. There is no intention to lay down hard and fast rules. A department is authorized to give a little overtime, if it is found necessary in certain instances, and subject to confirmation by Governor in Council. I don't suppose that it will apply to postal clerks; I don't really know what does actually take place, but I don't suppose that the postal clerks will get any overtime except in very special cases, when they have to work all night. I think that this bill will be more applicable to the Telegraph service, which is naturally work that requires a great deal of concentration. A man finds it difficult to stick at that kind of work for more than eight hours at a time. I quite see the point taken by Mr. Scammell, but I think that it would be establishing a dangerous precedent if we talk about operators and postmasters in the outports. We don't know just where it would end.

MR. DUFF—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words about the matter now before the chair, that is outport postmasters and telegraph operators. In the outports this work is just as constant as here in St. John's. There is one point that I would like to be brought to the attention of the Government and that is this: In St. John's the telegraph offices remain open until 7 at night. In Carbonear they close early at great inconvenience to the people. Now I can't see for the life of me why the Carbonear telegraphs office should not have the same hours as at St. John's, if they have the interests of the country at heart. I don't see why you should give our operators a day of eight hours while the Western Union and the Anglo American keep open until 7 at night. I think this should receive the attention of the Government and it should be changed. Then take again Sundays. We can get in to the Anglo American Telegraph Office in the morning and the afternoon to do any special wiring that we may have to do. There is no reason why the Government offices should not be open also. In case of disaster of storm or anything of that kind it is

necessary that we should get access to that office.

I would ask the Prime Minister to consider this. There is no reason why the men in the Government service should not do as much work as the ordinary man.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman, in reference to this matter I want to say that I do not see why the outports should be discriminated against. There are certain times during the year when the outport offices are open after tea. The operators go to work at nine o'clock. They work until one. They go to lunch and then work till six; thus they work for eight hours, and if they come back after tea they work another hour. But the man in the outports does not get any extra pay for this. The man in St. John's does. The outport man earns his salary the same as the man in St. John's and why should he not be paid. Generally in St. John's a man gets a bigger salary. I am of the opinion, sir, that the words St. John's should be stricken out.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, may I ask does this apply to the railway employees? Does it apply to the police force?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—No. The police are not appointed by the Governor in Council.

MR. WARREN—Then I think it is due to the House that some explanation should be given as to why the difference is made. If there is a deficit on the railway it has got to be paid and the taxpayers have got to pay it. I don't see why there should not be some explanation given as to why the railway employee is in a different position from any civil servant just because he does not happen to be appointed by Minute of Council. I know that he gets it from the railway. But in the same way every Customs official gets it from the Custom House because it is collected down there. I contended last year, and I have yet to be convinced, and what is more, you can't convince me that the money that any man pays into the railway in that way should go into the consolidated revenue fund. Now as far as the police are concerned I think that they have a pension scheme of their own. Still they are being paid by the taxpayers, and I think that the House is entitled to some explanation as to why the difference is made.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, the hon. member will probably be inclined to agree with me when I say that there is a dividing line between the two cases. The police are always on duty. Absolutely always. Except he is given a holiday and even then his time off duty does not permit him to go anywhere. He can't move outside, as the hon. member knows, without reporting, and being practically within call. In other words, in St. John's, and it may surprise members to learn this, we have had fewer policemen than we have had for some years.

As regards the outport constable, he is in the position that he has no hours at all. He is around the place all the time. The railway man is in a worse position. You can't have any hours for the railway men. They get calls at all times. But as a matter of fact as the Prime Minister has pointed out, the police have their own separate provisions for retirement, which is arranged for in the regulations governing the service. And the railway officials are not civil servants at all of the same class as these belonging to the regular departments of Government. And I personally can't see how you can put him in the same class as the ordinary civil servant who is appointed by the Governor in Council.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, because one of these men happens to be appointed by the Governor in Council and the other is not, therefore you

propose to make a difference between them. As far as the police and the firemen are concerned, I quite agree with what the Minister of Justice has stated. Their liberties are considerably curtailed, and besides they have their own pension scheme. But I would like to know how you are going to convince me. Take a place like Bay of Islands for instance. The Customs Official there is appointed by Governor in Council. He is bound under the clauses of this Act. But the station agent is not. I just don't know what his pension is, it may be two-thirds. Perhaps a member of the Railway Commission may be able to tell us. But anyway the Customs Official, if he has been in the service for ten years and is getting a salary of $1000 a year, he is entitled to $225 pension, and if the station agent has been equally as long in the civil service, and if he is an employee of the railway he will probably get a pension of five or six hundred dollars.

Now Mr. Chairman, this bill is a move in the right direction to try and do something with the present state of affairs. And I say that there is going to be jealousy. But if you put the railway under this Bill, there certainly will not be any jealousy.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, while we are on this matter, I have heard what various members have said in connection with the Postal Telegraph Operators. I would like to say a few words. Take for instance a place like Corner Brook, which is the biggest business centre, outside St. Johns,' in Newfoundland. Take the case of this place during the past twelve months. The Telegraph Company have had to move into a new building and even then you can't get a message through inside of 15 hours. That is through Corner Brook. Now I would like to point out and to make suggestion, and that is that they should work sixteen hours at Corner Brook with two shifts. They should have two operators from eight to four and two more from four till twelve. That would expedite matters considerably.

Now over there all during the Autumn, the office was closed at seven or eight and you could not get a message through. Anytime that my Company wanted to send a message there, we had to pay the operators out of our own pockets. I think that they should have two eight hour shifts on there, because the business demands it. And with shifts during the day time much more business could be done and the messages could be got through quicker. We were doing a small business at Corner Brook, and a message that was sent by our agent in Corner Brook at nine o'clock in the morning, did not get to us until six or eight at night.

Now with regard to this pension scheme. I think that the scheme in vogue with regard to the railway employees and the civil service, is something similar to the scheme on the Canadian Pacific Railway. A man enters the service and in order to be eligible for a pension he has got to be some special age. I don't think that thare is anything about that in this Bill. The Canadian Pacific lays it down at forty-five years. When a man is sixty-five he is eligible for a pension. And I think that there should be be some age specified in this Bill. According to this Bill a man who has been in the service for thirty years comes in for about sixty five per cent. of his salary. Under the C. P. R. system his average salary is divided by twenty and then his pension is made up accordingly. But here it is different. This bill gives him more money under this system, than under the Canadian Pacific System.

But now with regard to the contractors on the railway. They are not paid on the mileage basis to-day. They get paid 115 or 125 dollars a

month. The engineers and the firemen are paid on the mileage basis. Possibly they make two or three hundred dollars a month. Their pension would be made up under the C. P. R. system just the same. Their average wages for the number of years that they are employed in the service and divided by twenty and then they are paid on the percentage basis.

But if as Mr. Warren thinks that this is going to create jealousy between the civil servants in the Customs and the other departments, and as the railway have also got an insurance scheme which is costing the colony ten thousand or twenty thousand a year, and when a man dies he gets two thousand dollars provided he has been there a certain number of years, then I think that in my opinion the railway should be considered as a branch of the civil service. The deficit of the railway, which is considerable, is being paid out of the revenue of this country, therefore these pensions will be paid out of the railway directly, but out of the revenue of the country indirectly, and this should be inserted in this Bill. Then you have got to be in the civil service 10 years before you get a pension.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Why is the word "may' here instead of "shall." Should it not be "shall"?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I think it is wiser to keep it as it is there. To-day the Government can't be forced to grant a pension, and here it is provided that Governor in Council can enforce this power under certain conditions only. The honourable member will notice the reason for this. At the end of 30 years a man may be only 48 years old and most valuable to the service, and he ought not be able to demand that he get out under pension. I think that only when he is 65 or his physical condition or infirmity is such that he cannot go on ought he be able to demand a pension. If a man goes into the service very young, he ought not be able to demand a pension when in the prime of life.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—He cant demand it until 65 years old.

MR. CASHIN—Suppose a man goes into the service at 18; when he is 65 he has been in the Civil Service for 47 years, and at the end of that time he gets $3600 salary. He can't get any more pension than if he had been in the service for 30 years?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—No, but he will probably get a higher pension because he has a higher salary.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Then the argument of Mr. Higgins falls flat. The man can't demand until 65.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—What I meant was this. Some of the best men in the service are those of 65 years and over; they are better men than those of 25 because of their valuable experience. Our object is to keep valuable men in the srevice.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I think the hon. member has the wrong conception. It is not the intention to retire a man at 65. Some men at 65 are old men, and the Governor in Council has a discretion to retire such men. This would not apply to a man of 65 who is in good condition.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—The danger to avoid is that of pensioning able bodied men.

MR. CASHIN—Here is a point arising out of that argument, Mr. Chairman. Take a man who is 65, and has worked long and hard for the Government. He may want to spend the rest of his life in ease. Can he demand to be retired, or if he can't ought he not be able to.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—That should be at the discretion of the Governor in Council.

MR. CASHIN—I think it should be at the discretion of the man himself.

Take a case in point for example—that of Mr. LeMessurier at the Customs House. If he wanted to be pensioned, and as he is 65, he should be able to demand it. He has worked long and well, and if he wanted to spend the rest of his life in ease—it may be 15 years or may be more or less—he should be able to do so after such service.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—One of the things we had in mind when we decided to leave it in the discretion of the Governor in Council was this. Take the following case: Here is a man who goes in the service at 30 years of age, and at the end of 10 or 15 years he decides, "I can do better at something else"—he ought not be allowed to do this sort of thing to suit himself. And very often a man is at his best at the age mentioned. Taking the case of the gentleman mentioned, I have no doubt that if he went to the head of his Department and said he wanted leave, the Governor in Council would grant it. And it is generally the other way—a man of 65 or 70 doesn't want to leave. That happened last year, and the sad thing now is that these men won't do as well as they would have done then.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The thing aimed at is that men who are not well at 65 go out. If a man is capable he is likely to stay on, for no one else will want a man of that age.

MR. WARREN—I quite see the point raised by the Attorney General. But it is not doing much for old Civil Servants. Take a man who goes in at 18—at 48 he is in his prime. He has to wait another 17 years to get a pension, which is no larger than it would have been at 48 unless the Government raised his salary, and there isn't much chance of that. I consider this was aimed only at the indiscriminate giving of pensions. The man who reached 65 in harness in his prime—as a matter of fact the gentleman whose fertile brain is responsible for this is 69 to-day, though no one would believe it. There are many men of 65 who would refuse to be pensioned for the reason stated by the Attorney General. They will stay in harness.

CAPT. RANDELL—Mr. Chairman, I have just a word to say, not for the purpose of prolonging this discussion, but to expedite it. As I see it, a man of 65 can go to a doctor and say he has rheumatism, and get a doctor's certificate, enabling him to retire.

MR. SCAMMELL — Mr. Chairman, may the Governor in Council only grant a pension as provided for in this section.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—As regards Civil Servants, there is no other provision.

MR. SCAMMELL—They can grant superannuation only to some people then. Suppose a man goes in at 35, and leaves just before the end of ten years.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—That is quite clear—he gets nothing.

MR. HICKMAN—I was out of the House, and do not know if the question has been asked as to whether this applies to the Railway employees.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—They are not included in this scheme. They are insured in a scheme similar to the C. P. R., which is very similar to this.

MR. WARREN—I haven't studied this bill very thoroughly, but I would ask the Attorney General if the Governor in Council has any discretion in special cases. I would like to point out that I know of a Civil Servant in my constituency getting $1200 salary. He is just able to do his work, and is 65 years of age. He has two children in a Sanatarium in Nova Scotia, and other troubles at home. The Government proposed to pension him at $800, but he couldn't

afford to go out and do nothing. The circumstances were distressing, and I interviewed the Government on his behalf, and he is kept on. Under this scheme he gets much less, and it is going to be a hardship to this man, but I can't see how under the Act the Government can do otherwise.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—No matter what scheme you put in operation someone will be hurt by it.

Sec. 6 (3).

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, as regards this section. (Reads). Take that point about the efficiency of the Civil Service. Don't you think that if there is a change the incoming government will think it in the interests of the efficiency of the Civil Service to dismiss some men—wouldn't you think it wise to remove the proviso regarding that. And if such happened you would have to grant an allowance. How would "may grant" be there.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—He wouldn't get any more pension than he would have got otherwise. If a man was efficient in the Service it would be difficult for a Government to discharge him for political reasons.

MR. HALFYARD—But you must admit that changes have been made in that way whether the man was efficient or not, and if it happens again by an ensuing Government what will be done. They will have to be paid a pension.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I suppose if that happens in a particular office, and the man goes out through no fault of his own, he must be pensioned; this gives a power to give him something.

MR. HALFYARD—That part of the Bill is alright. But the part I object to is "to promote efficiency of the Civil Service." I think that clause should come out.

MR. HICKMAN—I agree with Mr. Halfyard there. If you leave that clause in the Bill you leave it open to an incoming government to dismiss a man.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Your suggestion is to leave out the words covering "efficiency" or "economy"—that clause.

MR. BROWNE—I think another question has been raised by the member from Trinity. Suppose a man is in for 10 years and has been removed—he is 28, and can do better outside. Would it be wise to continue the superannuation allowance to men of that kind? If he is removed for the efficiency of the office should he get a pension?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—That is covered. There is a provision that we can order him back in the service or he will forfeit pension.

MR. BROWNE—But that doesn't cover the point. If he gets more salary, should he also get a pension.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—No. 3 will be left in abeyance for the present. The suggestion is that we drop the words "or to promote . . . or for econmy." This will come before us again.

MR. BROWNE—Wouldn't it be better to say pay pension "until such time as Governor in Council deems fit"?

Sec. 6 (4).

MR. RANDELL—Regarding clause 7 referring to notice in writing. Shouldn't there be a set time of notice.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—You mean a month's notice, for example?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—There is a provision for a month's salary to be given.

MR. SCAMMELL—Yes, but you may notify a man to-day that he is dismissed, but that does not compensate a man for dismissal. Such a proviso doesn't encumber the bill, but in fact makes it clearer. When he is to be retired, why not let him know a month ahead?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—You want that when dismissal is being considered one month's notice in writing shall be sent. That is reasonable, and can go in.

Sec. 8.

MR. RANDELL—Does this mean that a man who is employed in a technical or professional capacity will have ten years added to his superannuation period?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The point covered there is this. Suppose such a man—let us say for example a geologist—comes in at 40 and serves this country for 15 or 20 years—this would give the Government the power to add to his period an extra ten years if they wanted to. I mentioned "geologist" because a short time ago, in communication with a geologist in England, and the Governor heard of a man who had served in the Falkland Islands, and who has many degrees, and is now teaching school, and who is in the position where he would like to get in active life again, and who wrote to the Governor sending a summary of what he had done, and stating that he felt there ought to be much of interest in Newfoundland. This happened at the same time as we were discussing a geologist, and we were ready to take the matter up with him. We telegraphed him, and he said in reply that he would only come if he were assured that he would get in on an equal pension plan with other Civil Servants. This sort of thing would only happen once in a lifetime—it may never happen again.

MR. HICKMAN — This section doesn't give any years of service as necessary.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—No, but under the Act he wouldn't be entitled to pension at all unless he were in the service ten years.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Take the position such as that of Superintendent of the Hospital. That man would necessarily be well up in years. That sort of thing is what this covers.

There is a case in point that illustrates this particular case. Mr. and Mrs. Winslow were running the small-pox hospital.

This hospital was closed down. Now these people had been running that hospital for a number of years, and now they are receiving their pension under the condition that if an opportunity occurs they are to come back to the work. I think that is a very useful clause myself.

MR. DUFF—At the present time there are people in Canada who are receiving a pension from the Government of Newfoundland. Over there in Carbonear there are two men who were looking after a public building. They have been pensioned and the man doing the work to-day is the worst of the three, at least he is the deafest. This kind of thing is going on and I feel sure that the government is anxious to do something about it. And we would be very glad to help them. We want to see things done properly. Now in connection with this geologist, I do not know very much about the minerals of this country. But I had twenty years experience on the Labrador. It is not so get-at-able at the Newfoundland Country. During that time I have seen many geologists down there looking for minerals. And there must be the same thing in this country. The Reid Newfoundland Company must have mineralogists out looking for minerals and now we are giving this man a big salary to do this work. I think that the idea is ridiculous. Man schoolteaching.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I would like to call Mr. Duff's attention to the fact that it is no disgrace to be a schoolteacher. This man has the very highest degrees in geology,

The Government was also in communication with a man who was with the Everest expedition. He was out of a job. And this other man was schoolteaching. But it does not prove that because the man was schoolteaching that he was not so good as the man who was out of a job.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Duff made a statement that he knew of two persons getting pensions that were quite able to perform their duties. The same kind of a case occurred during the last month, which would explain it. About eight or ten years ago Nurse Cashin was the matron of the Nurses' Home and she was retired on a pension. She was sick and unable to perform her duties, and was retired. That was quite a number of years ago. She was a rather young woman and evidently got back her health. About a month ago the present matron of the Nurses' Home decided to go away and resigned her position, and very much to the credit of Miss Cashin be it said that she applied for her old position. And she has been reinstated in the position again by the Executive Government. If her health breaks down again she will go back on the pension. But that is a case in point. There is no reason in the world why they should not be compelled to go back to the work again if their health recovers. Now in reference to the point raised by the Hon. Minister of Justice. Mr. and Mrs. Winslow were conducting the smallpox hospital. They are competent people, and the position is that they became no longer necessary. But at the same time they could not be thrown out on the street. For some time they were on full pay. The Minister of Public Works knows that because they were paid through his department. There is no doubt that that is a condition of affairs that should not exist for all time. Now they are pensioned and the conditions are that if there is ever an outbreak of fever or smallpox they are available for the work right away, and I think that should be the case in connection with all pensions.

MR. DUFF—In reply to the Hon. the Col. Secretary, I may say that there are a great number of names of persons who are receiving pensions that are able to perform their duties. And if the Col. Secretary would like to have a list I will take care to prepare it and bring it with me at the next session of this House, as I think that it would take a long time to prepare a list of the names of people receiving the pension capable of doing their work. There are people struggling along in this country trying to earn a living and men and women too are receiving pensions, big pensions and are having a good time, and some of them have other jobs, and I think that there was a nurse in charge of a hospital pensioned some time ago, I understand, that she is a very wealthy woman. The late Sheriff Carter was getting a pension from this country and he was also a very wealthy man. That is the kind of thing that is going on, and it is our business to straighten the matter out. A thing like that should not go on. There is no reason why the Government should waste money like that. We want to preserve the rights of the people, and this government should do things in a commercial way, and if the Hon. the Colonial Secretary desires a list I will be very pleased indeed to furnish him with one.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—I think that it is a very good point that has been made by the Hon. Member for Carbonear. There is on the pension list to-day a large number of people who can work, and some of them quite glad to work if they were given the opportunity. This bill is going to protect this Government and future gov-

ernments from imposing upon the revenue of the country by pensioning people who should not be pensioned. Mr. Bennett knows of a case in the district which he represents and which I represent in which the present Government pensioned a man who should not be pensioned and appointed another man in his position, and when this law is put into force the Governments will not be able to do this. This law protects every other government that may come into power. There are men who had appointment in lighthouses on the Labrador for a year or two, and the Government wanting to give somebody else a place, and then they give the man a pension of six or seven hundred dollars a year, after he has been working only two or three years. There are men of this kind on the pension list, and I suggest that something be put into this bill that will apply to those who are receiving a pension today from the Government. I think that if there are people able to work, and receiving pensions from the Government that if there are positions to be filled that they should be called upon to fill them.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—This act only provides for what will occur after its passing. There is no reason why it should not include those who have received pensions before the passing of the Act. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, to the Prime Minister that section should also be left over.

MR. HALFYARD—I think that it will be so difficult to commandeer the pensioners under this act that it is hardly worth troubling about. . If a pensioner is out under the old Act let him consider himself lucky. As suggested by Capt. Randell it is very easy to get a doctor to certify that there is some reason why a pensioner should not be doing any work.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—I quite agree with Mr. Halfyard. What is past is past. In the case of the Winslows that was the stipulation with regard to the pension. But you could not put them in the same category. With regard to what Mr. Duff has said, in alluding to a certain person awarded a pension. I have very clear memory of that. I think that it is a scandal perpetrated on this country, in which the person pensioned is a very wealthy woman. It was done from the point of view of expedience, and not because the person was not able to perform her duties. I had the same position put up to me last year. A person who was a certain official in the government came to me, a lady, and she wanted to be pensioned. She said her health was breaking down, state of nervous collapse, and wanted to know if we could not get her a pension. I said "To pension you would be a public scandal. And you must go to the extreme and see if your health cannot be restored. And if it is not possible for you to do that," I said, "ways and means will be provided to do it." She came back fully recovered after eight or nine months and the result is that she is doing her duties as well as ever today. There are cases like this, where if the pension is awarded this country would be paying the pensions for the next forty years.

CAPT. RANDELL—I made the statement that it was easy to get a doctor to give a certificate that a person was not fit to work. I did not mean by that to cast any reflection upon the medical fraternity in this country, but what I had in mind was that there are possibly very few of us that may be considered physically fit and that is why I made the statement.

MR. CASHIN—I would like to ask the Colonial Secretary a question. He said a few moments ago that Nurse Cashin was going back into the Nurses' Home. She happens to be a

relative of mine and this morning I received a telegram from her saying that she had received a message from Mr. Rennie that the job had been cancelled or some words to that effect and she asked me to find out something about it.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—The case came before the Executive and it was decided to have Nurse Cashin reinstated in her old position. But since I made the statement the Minister of Public Works informed me that the Board of Governors had decided that the job would not be filled. That was something that I did not know about. I only know that she was appointed by the Executive.

MR. ASHBOURNE—I would like to draw the attention of the House to the matter of the mailmen who carry the mails. I am sorry that the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs is out of the House. I understand that these men get the contract for the carrying of the mails and do not come under this class of civil servants.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—They are contractors.

MR. ASHBOURNE—The reason that I bring this matter to the attention of the House is that a couple of years ago two men were drowned while carrying the mails. These men were engaged by the Posts and Telegraphs Department and were drowned in the pursuance of their duty. And I think that there should be some stipulation to take care of this class of man, in case they should lose their lives, so that some gratuity should be paid.

MR. BROWNE—There is another consideration. How long are you going to pay this amount to the wife and children. I would suggest that this be until the children become fifteen or sixteen or until the wife marries or dies. The Governor in Council has to take in the whole scope of the activities of this country and will not have time to think of John Jones down there in the West End who has three children. There is nothing definite there.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—If you lay down a standard it might be alright in one case and all wrong in another. Take the case of a man who died in St. John's the other day. He had thirteen children, the eldest twenty years. Surely you cannot apply a standard to this case which does not permit of the youngest of the children coming to a certain age. I think that the Hon. Member for St. John's West agrees with me that it is best that the Governor in Council should take each case on its merits.

MR. BROWNE—I think that this is a very important point and deserves some consideration.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that the next clause, the insurance clause, is not a party measure. The Government members may give their own views on the matter. And I would just like to get the views of the House as to whether it would be advisable to add these clauses or not.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, are we going to consider this insurance clause this afternoon. It strikes me as being a very important part of this Bill, and I was just wondering whether we were in a position to go on with it this afternoon.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that there may be a little more information got with regard to the number of employees there actually are, and we will not know until the scheme is adopted what it is going to cost. But I take it that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is not in a position to go on with it to-day. He wants some information which might be got in the meantime, though I don't know what further information there could be got

except in respect to the general nature of the scheme. I think that it will be in order to defer the resolutions.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, may I ask if the Government has taken into consideration the idea of insuring the civil servants themselves instead of going to an insurance company.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—We will take that into consideration in the meantime.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had 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 Tuesday afternoon next, April 6th, at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, April 6th, 1926.

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

Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs tabled Report of his Department for 1924-25.

Mr. Cashin gave notice of question.

Mr. Godden gave notice of question.

Mr. Cashin gave notice of question.

Mr. Halfyard gave notice of question.

Notice of Motion

Resolutions re Taxes on Mailable Matter.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the House into Committee of the Whole on these Resolutions. As is known, it is necessary to introduce a Money Bill in the form of Resolutions. The two bills which were already before the House and explained are embodied in these Resolutions, and, as the Members of the Opposition are aware of the meaning of the Amendment, there is no necessity for me now to say anything further with reference to same.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions respecting Charges and Fees upon mailable matter.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, if I remember correctly, a public press notice stated some time ago that the Department of Posts and Telegraphs had a scheme of insurance against loss or damage of mailable matter. Would the Minister be able to give us an outline of that scheme of insurance?

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS — Mr. Chairman, we propose to insure all parcels so that no person would be at a loss if any parcel was mislaid or went astray. We have not definitely arranged the fees yet, but the scheme we have in view we hope to have matured very soon, and which we feel confident will be satisfactory to the public.

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 a Bill be introduced to give effect to the same.

On motion this Report was received and adopted. Whereupon the Bill "An Act respecting Charges and Fees upon Mailable Matter" 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 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 Harry J. Crowe.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Before entering upon the actual reading of the Resolutions I would like to make a little explanation, to the Whole House, as I have already done to the Party, with respect to the drawing up of the Resolutions. There has been some comment with regard to a Member of the Executive acting for Mr. Crowe. In justice to Mr. Morine I want to state that I was largely responsible for that. Mr. Crowe wanted these Resolutions brought before the House and wanted it done in a hurry.

He, and likewise the International Paper Company were desirous of having the matter finalised so that they could take possession before breaking up of the ice in the streams near White Bay and before driving operations began. Mr. Crowe, being anxious for a speedy settlement asked that the Resolutions be got ready. We have a lot of work on hand at present and the Justice Department are very busy. The Attorney General suggested that if Mr. Crowe were anxious to have the Resolutions printed immediately he had better get his own lawyer to prepare them, as it was a private Bill. Mr. Crowe telephoned me later and asked what had been done and I told him how matters stood and said that he had better get his own lawyer. On asking me whom he might get, I suggested that Mr. Morine was familiar with the matter and his knowledge of both sides would be of great assistance in speed if he wanted the resolutions ready for the following day. Mr. Crowe then went to Mr. Morine and asked him to act for him. Mr. Morine then came to the Executive and told us that he was acting for Mr. Crowe and would have nothing further to say in connection with the matter; and he did not. It has been suggested that Mr. Morine did wrong in accepting a retainer from Mr. Crowe. If he was wrong I was equally wrong in advising Crowe to go to him, and I want it explained from that standpoint.

I think that I have already explained most of the details in this connection. There are a few other things I want to refer to. In connection with Mr. Crowe's operations in Newfoundland I may say that Mr. Crowe has never to my knowledge got any land from the Government, or if he has it is a very small grant of land. The limits he has at Sop's Arm and at Hampden he has bought from private parties. He has not received a grant from the Crown. It will be remembered that when Mr. Crowe's agreement was before the House on a former occasion it was argued against him that it was not apparent whether he was going to do any good for the country. Dr. Mooney was dealing with the Government at the same time and he got 2,000 sq. miles for nothing. It was claimed for him that he was going to do great things for Newfoundland and he has opened up nothing. Without any personal interest in Mr. Crowe I claim for him that he has done a lot. He is responsible for the development at Hampden where there are some fifteen hundred persons employed—four hundred families provided for.

There is so small a difference between this new agreement and in the rights given to Crowe before that it would appear hardly worth bringing in a Bill about. Mr. Crowe, however,

has fallen down on his contract in two respects. Firstly, under the old concessions he was compelled to cut twenty five thousand cords of wood per year and he has not fulfilled that part of his contract as only fifteen thousand have been exported. Those who speak against the exportation of wood, will say that no great injury has been done to the country by that. On that account he might be indemnified, we thought. He did not fulfil his contract either with regard to a saw mill, but that is erected now. He claims, on the other hand also, and I think with a good deal of justification that at Hampden he has provided families with houses, schooling and various other things that he was not called upon to provide for at all. There are now about five hundred houses, down there. Those people arrived at White Bay when Crowe started his operations. Men arrived with their wives and families, and though quite unprepared Mr. Crowe accepted and provided for them. Though I hold no brief for Mr. Crowe, I do claim that he is justified in claiming some credit in respect of that. The position I think has now been explained as regards the Resolutions coming before you, and I think we are prepared to go into Committee and discuss them further as we go through. The general position is this Crowe has twelve years more to cut on the Hampden limits, and two years on the Sop's Arm area. As regards the Hampden area, it consists of seventy five sq. miles, and on that seventy sq. miles Mr. Allan Long of the Department of Agriculture and Mines reports that a large portion of the wood has been blown down. The West Virginian Paper Co. who were the buyers of wood from Crowe were persuaded to come down and look over this area with a view to taking it over. Such a large quantity of timber had fallen that they decided to have nothing to do with it. The International Paper Company intend cutting up this wood as quickly as possible. I think it a good thing to have somebody come and cut it, otherwise it is going to rot and be no good to the country. Efforts have been made by Crowe to sell this wood to the A. N. D. and to the Corner Brook companies, but without success. They can provide themselves more cheaply from their own areas therefore it did not interest them. Without some company taking this wood from White Bay it is very likely that an amount of wood would perish on the Hampden limits. As far as Sop's Arm is concerned, that area is bigger, some six hundred sq. miles. Crowe or his successors get the right there to cut for two years. At the end of two years they are called upon to spend ten thousand dollars towards the erection of a pulp mill and after that four years more in which to complete the mill, and at the end of six years if he has not completed the mill all his rights cease.

I should like to dwell for a moment on the history of the International Paper Company. At the end of this year, or very shortly they will be producing 28,000 tons of paper per day. That is the biggest production in the world. They are interested in this proposition and propose to start operations at Hampden with a view to seeing what timber is on the Sop's Arm property, and if they find timber there in a sufficient quantity, and if they find the proposition at all feasible they are going to put up a mill. I suppose we may say that if the proposition is not feasible we are not going to find anybody else to put up a mill. Five years ago the International Paper Co. got all their timber in the United States. Now nearly half their timber is procured from Canada. At Three Rivers they have put up a mill cutting 750 tons per day, the biggest paper mill in the world. Another to be erected on

the Ottawa River will be of the same class. Their object is to erect their mills alongside the timber and so save money. If that is their policy in Canada, is it only reasonable to think that it would be their policy here? If they can save twenty dollars a ton by manufacturing in White Bay they are going to do so rather than take the material to an American or Canadian mill. I think we can assume that they are going to put up a sulphite mill at Sop's Arm if it is feasible at all.

So, I would suggest that the Resolutions be read and as we go through, I shall try to explain further, if any comment is made.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, I think that the Government, of which I had the honour of being Leader, put through the original legislation with regard to Mr. Crowe's relations with the Government in this matter. Dr. Mooney was given certain concessions at the same time. I would like to ask what position that contract is now in; if Mooney has done anything whatever towards carrying it out; if the contract is still valid or is the Government considering getting back what was granted him.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I will table exact particulars tomorrow. I do not suppose it particularly effects this present legislation.

MR. HICKMAN—I understand from what the Prime Minister has said that Mr. Crowe has no contract with the Government; that he has broken it by not fulfilling it.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—If you like to interpret it that way, strictly speaking he has not.

MR. WARREN—May I ask if the Government have any report as to the water power available at Sop's Arm; as to the possibility or probability of procuring sufficient power to run a mill of a hundred ton's capacity?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I understand that a sulphite mill is largely run by coal power. They are going to run this by coal power and bring the coal down there for it.

MR. DUFF—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask if the Government are certain that the area under discussion have sufficient timber to build a pulp mill. If the A. N. D. and Humber Companies don't want and can't afford to take any timber from White Bay, the International Paper Company can't want to ship to Quebec, where there is any amount of timber. The duty on pulpwood from Nova Scotia is $2 per cord. From what the Prime Minister says, these people apparently have not surveyed the ground sufficiently to know if it would support a pulp mill, but have sufficiently to know whether they can buy the timber. Are they likely to cut the timber first, and then build the pulp mill? I doubt if the areas are sufficient to support a pulp mill, and would ask the Government to go slowly in making the agreement.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say in regard to what the Member for Carbonear refers to, that he will perhaps see on reflection that the Government have given that very same point he has in mind some consideration. It is a matter of making the best possible arrangement and I commend to his consideration the improvements made over the former contract. Under the old contract over an area of about seven hundred square miles exportation of timber could go on for 25 years if a mill was erected anywhere in Newfoundland. There is at least this improvement under the present agreement. Provision is made that steps have to be taken before 1928 to do something on Sop's Arm towards the erection of this mill and if ten thousand dollars have not been spent on the erection of a mill the right to export ceases and the mill itself has

to be completed in the time specified in the original act. The present resolutions provide for what was not in the Original contract. They provide that the mill must not alone be erected but operated continuously. Otherwise the right to export ceases. There has been then some improvement in that connection.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a few remarks in connection with these resolutions. I take it that there are two ways in looking at these resolutions. One is from the point of view of the labour that is going to be given in that section provided the resolutions go through. Another point of view from which these resolutions could be regarded is this: Are we doing the right thing by allowing the exportation of the raw material from this country at all. On the one hand I don't want to put myself on record in this House or anywhere else, as being opposed to any legislation which is going to give labour to this country, and on the other hand, I don't want to put myself on record as being in accord with any resolutions that are going to affect in any way the future of the paper industry in Newfoundland. Therefore as I look upon these resolutions I think that some sort of investigation should take place. And I just want to point out to the Prime Minister the fact that whilst Mr. Crowe was not able to make any negotiations with the A. N. D. Co. or the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company, regarding the sale of this wood, have the Government entered into any negotiations with these companies, asking their advice in connection wtih the allowing of wood to be exported in the raw state to foreign countries, to the United States for example, for manufacture, for that is where it is all going to end. Has the Government asked the A. N. D. Co. what they think of it, or the Newfoundland Power and Paper Co., both of which companies are doing business in Newfoundland. We have in view another industry of this nature on the Gander. Three mills will be operating here or at least we hope so, within a very short time. These three mills will manufacture approximately eleven hundred tons of paper a day, thereby consuming an enormous amount of wood, about 300,000 cords a year. Now after these companies start cutting up wood at the rate of 300,000 cords a year, and this company here exports 25,000 cords a year, we will soon find ourselves in the position that we are going to be short of wood. Now is it right for us as members of this legislature to come in here and allow a company like the International, or any other company to come in here and take our raw material to Newport News or Hampton Roads, there put on a train and sent to certain sections of Virginia, there to be made into the finished article. This very company has built mills in Canada because the Canadians have put themselves practically on record as being opposed to the exportation of the raw material to the United States. And looking upon these resolutions in that light I think, and I would make this suggestion, whilst not wishing to delay anything, but I would suggest that we should consider these facts before allowing such legislation to go through. It is true that this company intends to build a pulp mill, in two or three years time, but a pulp mill does not cost an awful lot of money. A paper mill would.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—It will cost about one million dollars

MR. CASHIN—Well I just want to point this out, Mr. Prime Minister. I don't want to stop any legislation that is going to give any labour to the people of this country. But looking at this proposition from another standpoint you are going to use 300.-

000 cords of wood a year, and that is a lot of wood.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, we are not unmindful of the situation. We have taken cognisance of the point raised by the Member for Ferryland. But we seem to have been largely influenced by the fact that this wood is reported to be blown down, and we thought it would be better to have it cut up and utilised than to have it lying there and rotting. We have fairly good evidence from the Corner Brook people that the Armsworth Whitworth Company are not prepared to buy it.

We have not asked them the question as to whether they are opposed to the wood being exported from Newfoundland. I don't know whether that would after all be a fair question to ask them. They might play the dog in the manger, if such a question were put to them and say: "As we can't use it ourselves we are not going to allow anyone else to use it."

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, the Newfoundland Power and Paper Co. are purchasing wood from outside people at the present time. They have also entered into a contract to buy wood around St. George's. What I object to is a man coming in here, and bringing up a bill giving two or three days' notice, and then demanding that it be rushed through for his convenience. I don't agree with that kind of legislation at all. This gentleman arrived in this country the other day and the next thing that we know is that we have these resolutions before us with a request that they be put through at a moment's notice. This same man got certain concessions from the Government of 1923 and he broke his contract. I think, sir, that we are too easy with people breaking their contracts. The sooner we stop this sort of thing the better.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, I agree with what has been said by the Hon. Member for Ferryland. Judging by a remark of the Prime Minister the chief desire is to keep employed the people now living in Hampden. Of course that is one thing that is very serious, to have these people thrown out of employment. But I think that some information should be had from some other source as to whether some one would not be able to take over this area and employ these people. We are giving Mr. Crowe the right to transfer something that he does not own. He has nothing to transfer since he has broken his agreement. The Government are under no obligation to Mr. Crowe. Or if he still owns the wood he has now no right to export it, because he has broken his contract. The only good thing that I see in this is the giving of employment to the people now residing in Hampden. I think that some due consideration should be given to this area, to find out whether there is not someone who is willing to take over this area, and have the timber manufactured in this country instead of having it exported.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Chairman, I assume that one of the chief reasons why the Government is prepared to give these concessions to Mr. Crowe is because it is hoped that the International Power and Paper Company will undertake operations in the country. I consider that that would be very desirable in the interest of all concerned. I would like to know if the Government has any guarantee that they are coming in, or are they just hoping that they may be induced to locate here.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—We have seen the messages that have given instructions to their agents to take stock with a view to taking over this area as soon as the necessary legislation is put through.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Chairman, then

you are pretty well satisfied that they are coming. And I take it for granted that this will be a good thing for the country. The International Paper Company are paper makers. And this is the first advent of paper makers into Newfoundland. Of course we have the A. N. D. Co. and the Newfoundland Power and Paper Co., but they are not experienced paper makers. This concern is one of the largest paper companies in the world, or at least they are credited with being so. Now that we know that the Government have satisfied themselves that these people are really interested places a different complexion upon the whole matter. The fact of these people starting operations here is to my mind the only redeeming feature of the whole situation. I understand that there are certain parties at present in New York trying to raise capital for the Gander enterprise, and that they are finding some difficulty in selling their bonds. The entry of the International Paper Company here may be the means of giving an impetus to the Gander movement that would be helpful. I would like very much to see that Gander proposition materialise. And we have also got to take into consideration the conditions facing us at Hampden. If Mr. Crowe is not able to carry on we are confronted with the problem of taking care of the people who are depending upon this industry.

But all this, Sir, is not a sufficient excuse for giving Mr. Crowe more concessions than were given to him three years ago if he has failed to carry out his contract. If there are no other considerations the one thing to do is to ask him to live up to his agreement, or to get out. But I appreciate the position of the Government, and I think the most attractive feature of the whole situation is the hope of the International Paper Company coming in here. That is my reason for not raising stronger objections to these resolutions.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, I want to suggest that in that section:

(Reads the section)

I suggest that that be made a dollar a cord. If these people are coming down here and they want the use of our raw material, the least they might do is pay for it. They are getting it now practically for nothing. The Hon. Member for Carbonear has just read a cutting from a Halifax paper showing where these people are endeavouring to get two dollars a cord for their wood.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, in answer to the hon. emmber for Ferryland, I may say, that we have got to take into consideration the fact that it will cost them nine dollars to get the wood up there. I can't tell whether they can afford to pay the extra half dollar. Perhaps it would not matter, but on the other hand it might be the last straw that would break the camel's back. Anyway the Government who entered into this agreement before would probably have taken the dollar a cord if they could have got it.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, I think that these people should pay a dollar a cord. It is a well known fact that the United States are short of raw material to-day, and they are endeavouring in every possible way to get that raw material. They want us to give them our raw material but they are doing nothing for us in return. They come in here and they take our raw material; they manufacture it into paper, and they put it on the market in competition with our own paper that is being manufactured in this country, and then they only pay fifty cents a cord for it. I am looking at this now from a business standpoint. Now it takes three cords of wood to make a ton of paper. That would be a dollar and a half a ton.

We are getting a dollar a ton from the Humber people to-day.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—But we are guaranteeing their bonds for that.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, those people are not coming in here just because they are getting the wood for fifty cents a cord. They are coming in here to manufacture paper and to make large profits on paper. They are hungry for paper, and fifty cents more for a cord is not going to make or break them.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, I just wish to call the attention of the Members to an interesting fact in connection with the point being raised. According to section 10 of the present agreement, it is now provided that a straight fifty cents a cord be paid throughout. It is rather interesting to note that that is even a little better than the present position, wherein under clause three, it says:

(Reads)

We see here that under the original contract it was to be free for one year, twenty-five cents for five years and fifty cents for the remainder.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Prime Minister where he got his information that the freight rate would be nine dollars to the mills in Canada.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — Mr. Chairman, I only got it from Mr. Crowe.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Well, Mr. Chairman, I know that pulp wood has been taken out of Hampden and White Bay and taken up there for $6.50 or $6.75.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — Mr. Chairman, these are the figures that were given to me. I can bring them up to the House to-morrow if necessary.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, my point is this: that if Mr. Crowe has given figures showing a freight rate of nine dollars, and in the face of that the wood has been carried there for $6.50, then his information is not correct.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — Mr. Chairman, perhaps what the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is referring to is the seaboard freight. What I am speaking of is the freight first from port to port and then inland, right up to the mill. I might also add that while most mills are situated on the seaboard, this mill is not. It is situated inland.

MR. GODDEN—Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that while various kinds of wood are mentioned upon which fifty cents a cord royalty has to be paid, there is no mention of rough wood. Now if rough wood is not stipulated in this agreement it gives shippers a chance to say, if they wish, "It is not stipulated in the agreement, therefore we are not going to pay any duty on rough wood."

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say for the information of the hon. member that rough wood is not allowed to be exported at all by a law of the land.

MR. GODDEN—In spite of that the hon. member knows as well as I do that rough wood is being exported.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION — Mr. Chairman, before that section is passed I would like to support the hon. member for Ferryland as regards the rate of export duty. I understand that the price of pulp wood at the present time is from 18 to 20 dollars a cord. Under these circumstances I think that the company could well afford to pay a dollar a cord export duty.

MR. HALFYARD — Mr. Chairman, would it be alright for that section to stand over so that the matter could be taken up by Mr. Crowe, and he could find out from the principals whether they are prepared to pay any

more. It could also be impressed upon Mr. Crowe that this is a section that is not likely to get the unanimous approval of the House unless they can see their way clear to raise the royalty.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — Mr. Chairman, in reply to the hon. member I may say that I will put the matter before the principals and see what can be done in the way of putting a dollar a ton on the wood. I will take up the matter with them and we will see what can be done with it when it comes into the bill stage.

Clauses 11 and 12.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, while on this clause I would like to say that this is a provision that nearly every company of this sort looks for, that everything be brought in duty free, and I would suggest that the Prime Minister point out to Mr. Crowe that if he had building material brought into the country worth a million, the duty would be considerable, and we ought to hear further about this. Mr. Sullivan, I believe, knows more about this matter than anybody else. I understand that Mr. Crowe has been exporting rough wood; if he has done this it is against the law, and why should he come in here and take the law into his own hands. I know a thing or two about his—a gentleman in the north lost $6,000 or $7,000 through him, and we cannot come in here and let matters like this slide. I feel that if a pulp mill will be put up under this it will do as has happened before, it will fade away and come to nothing. I do not think that these people ought to be able to come down to Newfoundland and pull the wool over our eyes. It is granted that he has fallen down, and he is likely to do so again. I am no archangel, but it is time to stop Mr. Crowe and those other adventurers coming into the country and making money at our expense. I don't want to go on record as opposing anything that will give employment or labor to the people, but I should like to hear what Mr. Sullivan has to say about the thing. He knows more, or is said to know more, than anyone else about it, and I believe he does.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Mr. Chairman, I may say that I am in favour of export of our wood only after it has been manufactured into pulp, except under unusual circumstances or in urgent cases. In this case there are two or three reasons which we have to consider. One is employment —a thing that is certainly needed very badly in Newfoundland at the present time, and I have been guided by that consideration more than anything else in supporting this measure. I consider that a paper mill is not feasible in White Bay. I do know the Hampden limits but do not know the Sop's Arm portion. I know that there is sufficient growth to cut a limited quantity for 1 or 2 years on the Hampden limits. I know that there is a certain amount of pulp wood on the Sop's Arm portion, but I do not believe that Mr. Crowe has enough money to finance it—or the Hampden limits. We must remember that Mr. Crowe has helped us in our unemployment during the past few years. I don't believe half of the fairy tales we hear. We know that Mr. Crowe is looking after his own interests as well as of the people of White Bay, and is down here to make money if he can. It has been said that Mr. Crowe has not lived up to his contract; I know that that is the general impression, and it was mine, but I am informed that technically he has done so; the matter of the saw mill was not a breach that amounted to anything. If we can give labour, to my mind we are doing the right thing. The International Paper Co. will have to export 25,000 cords of barked wood

a year, and they also have the right to export not more than 25,000 from the Sop's Arm area. The cutting of 25,000 cords means the expenditure of $200,000 or $250,000 in the Hampden area each year, and that certainly means something. And I think personally that it is timber that does not warrant a mill being erected, but it will certainly give labour, and that is my reason for supporting it. At the same time I think we should wherever possible not permit the export of pulpwood, as it is in the best interests of the country that its products should be manufactured in this country. Another thing to consider is that the International Paper Co. have stated that they are not prepared to bind themselves to build a mill at Sop's Arm. They are not as yet familiar with the limits—they have Crowe's report and would have to cruise for themselves, and after they get the Hampden limits operating I believe that they would examine Sop's Arm areas, and if found satisfactory they would erect a mill and start manufacturing. That stands to reason, for if the difference, and the saving would be $14 per ton, as we have heard, between the pulp and the raw material, or even $4.00 per ton, it can readily be seen that a concern like the International Paper Co. would hardly refrain from doing so.

MR. CASHIN—At any rate, the Prime Minister has said he will take up the matter of the $1.00 royalty with Mr. Crowe.

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. Whereupon the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting an Agreement between the Government and Harry J. Crowe" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received the following message from the Legislative Council:

The Legislative Council acquaint the House of Assembly that, in response to its request, they have appointed, in connection with the Bill to Amend the Workmens Compensation Act, the following Select Committee to co-operate with the Committee of the House of Assembly on the said Bill, namely: The Honourables Messrs. Morine, Alderdice, McNamara, Davey, Sir M. G. Winter, Bishop and Gibbs.

NOTICE OF QUESTION.

Answer No. 1 tabled.

Answer No. 2.

THE PRIME MINISTER—In response to part one of this question I may say that no appointment has been made of a Government director for the Nfld. Hotel Facilities Co., Ltd. With regard to part 2 I may say that a bill will be introduced purely as a private measure. The solicitors for the Company understand that they can't get money until this is done. Re part 3, the Government have decided that it is not necessary to bring in legislation for this purpose, but they do propose to bring in resolutions asking this House to approve of what they have done in that connection. I might say with regard to this that in answer to the Leader of the Opposition I placed on the table certain correspondence that had taken place between the Government and its London solicitors respecting this, and all the correspondence with the exception of one letter, which I told Mr. Hickman was confidential, but which he might read if he wished to do so. This was a communication between

the Government and Mr. Carter, the solicitor for the Treasury, who had expressly stated that it was confidential. I didn't feel like placing this on the table without the consent of Mr. Carter, and wired him asking if I had his permission, which I got today, and now will table it. I should also like to say that I notice that certain gentlemen are calling a public meeting to discuss this affair. (Reads advertisement). When this House is in session, I do not see any reason why these gentlemen need to use such devices—all they have to do is come before this House and ask for the information. We haven't anything to hide, but have already tabled all except this letter which I propose to read and lay on the table.

(Reads letter of Mr. Carter.)

That letter, of course, couldn't be tabled without Mr. Carter's permission to do so. It will be seen that the position of debenture holders is in no way weakened actually by this, and that actually the country is no worse off than before. I admit that it is not a pleasant thing to have to do, but as the Leader of the Opposition himself said, the only thing that could be done was to accept the alternative suggested by Mr. Carter. The Company have already spent eight million pounds, and by even committing ourselves for another five millions of dollars over the ten million liability I can't see that our security is gravely affected or that we are in danger of losing the ten million. I would like therefore to table this letter, and hope it will be of some assistance at the public meeting.

CAPT RANDELL—I should like to say that when I asked that question six days ago, I had no knowledge of any sort about any public meeting, and I should like to say that I am not in any way connected with the meeting. I just asked for information.

MR. HICKMAN—I think the meeting must be the result of the list of amounts paid the legal gentlemen the other day, judging by the names.

Question 3.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—I wish to say that the subject matter of this question comes under the work of the Government Engineer, who has the authority under the Act. He advises me that it will take an immense amount of typewriting, but if Mr. Cashin wishes, he may see the papers at the department. Otherwise, if he insists, I shall get the information for him.

MR. CASHIN—May I ask if I am to get an answer to my question of March 31 of the Finance Minister?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—That is being prepared, and will be tabled.

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 Civil Service Protection.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

MR. BROWNE—I should like to ask if the Prime Minister has considered the suggestion that I made the last day in connection with this Subsection 3. If a person is employed in the Government service and later leaves the service through no fault of his own and then is employed by some outside business there should be some clause to cancel the obligation of paying the pension. There is no reason why he should receive a pension from the Government when he is receiving a salary for a job outside the Government. I do not think that there is any provision relating to this subject except by recall to the service.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I think that if a man leaving the service were a young man we would probably arrange to pay him

a lump sum instead of the superannuation. But I do not think that there is much occasion for that because there is much more chance of his being transferred into another department.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—I quite agree with the Hon. Member for St. John's West.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY —Since the matter came before the committee it has been drawn to my attention the fact that this bill will have a material effect on soldiers and sailors who went overseas from the civil service. There is no provision made that these men who have gone overseas should have this time included in the period in making up the amount of the superannuation. I think that it is necessary to give some consideration in this connection. Men have been overseas for four or five years and then they came back and took up their jobs again and there is nothing in this act that would give them the advantage of the time that they were overseas. I understand the Prime Minister took a note of that matter the other day and I think that before the committee rises that they should insert some clause to provide for this. I suggest that the Attorney General and the Law Clerk might form a clause now.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I think Mr. Chairman, that that is a clause that will require some thinking out. It has to be considered whether a man should get a civil service pension when he is getting a soldiers pension. I think that it would be a mistake to rush that clause through right now and I would suggest that it be allowed to stand over.

MR. DUFF—In connection with that Clause B. I understood from the Prime Minister the other day that this bill is to take care of the Geologist from the Falkland Islands.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I merely gave that as an instance. We do not know but that the man may come from Carbonear yet.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —That was just a case in point. Take the physician in charge of the Insane Asylum. I do not mention that because the Hon. Member for Carbonear introduced the subject. It may be frequently necessary to get a man of considerable technical experience and in that case it usually has to be a man of forty or more, and it is to take care of men of that class that that clause is inserted.

MR. DUFF—I would like to say that there has been a discovery of valuable mineral resources made for the Reid Newfoundland Company or the Newfoundland Government. I think that the Government would not be making a mistake if they left this teacher down in the Falkland Islands. You might as well send to the North Pole for a Geologist so I suggest that the Government leave the school teacher down there to teach the young ideas.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER —Mr. Chairman, With regard to the Insurance section of the Resolutions, the Leader of the Opposition has asked if the Government would be prepared to consider the taking out of Insurance. The Government would have to get a comparative statement from outside insurance companies first before they would be able to decide as to whether the proposition was a good one and before it could or could not be taken up by the Government. I should like to know what the other companies have to offer first, then, if the offers are not favorable, the Government will consider the underwriting of the proposition themselves; but I do not know whether the House is ready or willing to leave it to the Governor-in-Council as to what is to be done. However, I do not expect the House to decide on anything more to-day in this connection than to admit the

principle of the thing. As to the absolute cost of policy or detail, it seems to me that it has to be left to the Governor-in-Council to determine, because I do not see how we can do anything at the present juncture. Has the House sufficient confidence in the Government to have the insurance put into effect by the Governor-in-Council? I would like to have an expression of opinion from the members of the Government side of the House as to the advisability of the insurance scheme because the Government is not wedded to the matter, and, as it is not a Party measure, I will leave it to the whole House to decide as to whether we should put this insurance scheme into being or whether we should not.

I hardly think that it is likely to be imagined that because an outside insurance company is doing business with the Government that Company must of necessity make a big profit that the Government might have made.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, I would like to put myself on record as being totally opposed to any insurance of any kind for civil servants, because a lot of them are getting good salaries and this insurance would be great protection for them; furthermore, I am teetotally opposed to allowing the Governor in Council such power. From the beginning to the end of these Resolutions—in almost every clause of them—you will find, sir, the Governor in Council given power to do anything it likes. I feel like asking myself as an ordinary individual and as a member of this House are we all serious here or are we going mad? Not so long since we talked a great deal about retrenchment, and here the Government comes in to-day and is prepared to spend $15,000.00 on insurance policies for civil servants. Now that $15,000.00 is public money and it could be devoted to a lot of other good and useful things in the country. There is a crowd of poor people in this country who do not hold down Government jobs, and we have a considerable number of aged and toil-worn people in this country and from whom, I venture to assert, every member in this House is in receipt of scores of letters asking for the old age pension. If it would be in order to put an amendment, I would ask to have that $15,000.00 devoted towards the further paying of old age pensions to the worn-out fishermen and toilers of Newfoundland, because I recognise and realise from experience in my own district—and representatives of other constitutncies in this House must also know—the trying situations and conditions that those poor people are confronted with. Still we came in here as representatives of the people of this country and don't even stop to think about voting away $15,000.00 to pay for insurance policies for men who are already receiving good salaries out of the country. I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that is consistent with the policy of the Government; certainly it is not consistent with my own policy as a representative of the common people of this country. Now I could put a lot of constructions on that insurance scheme if I like. Surely goodness I hope that no member in this House will say that it is not a party measure. If there is to be an insurance policy put into effect for two thousand civil servants, I would suggest that it be put to them in a business-like way and as a business proposition at say $15.00 per year. Besides some of those men to-day are paying premiums two or three times a year on straight life and twenty year endowment policies, and still the Government is going to force this scheme upn them.

MR. CAHILL—Employers pay part of the premiums.

MR. CASHIN—Well I consider the Government of this country have no right to pay part of the premiums in view of the stream of applicants that are looking for the $50 a year old age pension and you cannot get it for them. I know my colleague and myself have been unable to get the old age pension for fishermen in our district who are needy and beyond their labour, but we are asked here to conform to the idea of voting $15,000.00 for insurance for civil servants. I am going to fight this measure now before the House tooth and nail from the standpoint of the fishermen of the country and the common people of Newfoundland. I care not what curses it brings upon me at the hands of civil servants, I am prepared to stand or fall by my attitude.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out first that this is not a matter for members to become heated over, but rather is it a matter on which we can quietly express our own private views. Secondly, we have to consider the man who enters the civil service at the age of 18 and who, after 20 years' excellent service to the State, dies at 38, possibly leaving his wife and several small children in a destitute condition. He has got nothing in the way of a pension, but has nearly lived to see his full term out. Surely that man's family is deserving of something from the State, and under this insurance scheme his family would be partly provided for. I think that that class of man is worthy of as much consideration as the one who has entered the service at the age of 35, and who, at the age of 65, gets out with a pension and when he has possibly nobody to provide for because his family are, in most cases, grown up and married. That is the particular point that appeals to me.

I do not want the honorable member for Ferryland to mix up old age pensions with the matter we are now considering. They stand absolutely separate and apart. As a matter of fact the Government, at this moment, are giving consideration to a proposal to increase the amount for old age pensions. Most of the party are in favor of it, and if it can be managed at all the vote will be increased. When Mr. Cashin speaks about another extra $15,000.00 expenditure for civil servants, I want to point out to him that this insurance scheme really means retrenchment, because we will not be called upon to pay in future anything like the pensions that have been paid out in former years, so that the insurance premiums will come out of this saving. In other words, out of the reductions in pensions in the civil service there will be sufficient to pay the insurance and probably a great deal more.

Therefore I would like, on general principle, to have this matter of insurance thoroughly discussed by all members of the House and to determine as to whether an insurance scheme should or should not be adopted. The public may have the benefit of members' views in this respect.

MR. CASHIN—I fully realize a man entering the Civil Service at the age of 18 and then after working for a salary for 20 years dies; I also realize the fact that the man starting to go fishing at the age of 18 at one-quarter the other man's salary and dies at the same age with nothing for his dependents, except when his widow gets about $7.50 every three months.

Now, I contend that $15,000.00 a year that is proposed by the Government to be spent on insurance premiums for civil servants would be more wisely and properly used if it gave out old age pensions of $50 a year to 300 worn out fishermen and toilers, who are now beyond their labor. I ask

you, Mr. Chairman, which are we justified in doing first? That is the main point. A man who insures his own life is insuring out of the money that he is saving. Therefore, under the Pensions Bill now before the Chair, that man will now be insured out of the money that the country is supposed to be saving. And, if the country is making money, the Government should devote that $15,000.00,—not to men who are paid substantial salaries out of the country's money already,—to the paying of further old age pensions, as I have previously pointed out. And, again I ask, who is most entitled to it and to whom do we look for the future of the country?

MR. BROWNE—Mr. Chairman, On the Insurance section of the measure now before the House I should like to make a few observations. While I agree with a great deal that the Hon. Member for Ferryland has said, yet I think that the Government should set a good example to other employers of labour by providing for employees, who have given years of good service, when they are too old to be of any value to the country. I also think that by providing for the widows and orphans of the families of civil servants the Government is beginning a good movement, which, however, is not a new movement, because it was started in England immediately prior to the War by Mr. Lloyd George, who was responsible for putting into effect a scheme of National Insurance for that great country.

I wish to say at the outset that I am not in favour of the Governor-in-Council making a contract with an outside insurance company and I say that on principle. Some time ago a Select Committee from this Chamber and the Upper House was appointed to consider the amendment or repeal of the present Workmen's Compensation Act. I gave that matter a great deal of study and I advocated the principle of having the dependents of employees compensated out of a separate fund, and for that reason I cannot consistently do anything else now but advocate that the dependents of civil servants of long standing should be provided for out of a state fund, but I do not advocate nor do I agree with the handing over of a large sum of money to an outside Insurance Company, who are certainly operating for profit. It is obvious that no insurance company is going to consider for a moment any proposition which does not ultimately result in fairly good returns. The Prime Minister has suggested that the risks of insurance companies are spread over the whole world and that they cannot afford to take too many risks. Now, I submit, Mr. Chairman, that that is not so. They cannot afford to take permanent risks and they will not take permanent risks. Sometimes in taking risks there may be a certain number of people of advanced age upon whom they lose a certain amount of money; but eventually they will make their profits; otherwise they would not undertake the risks in the beginning. Insurance Companies have shareholders, have large office staffs, they advertise extensively and pay substantial dividends. Therefore, they are not going to consider anything that does not tend to augment their dividends and increase their prestige and advance their business. I believe that it would be an opportune time for the Government to start a national insurance company and do the insurance business through such a reliable institution as the Newfoundland Government Savings Bank, which, through the Hon. Colonial Secretary here, has shown such creditable returns for the past and previous years. By administering a national insurance scheme through such an institution as the Government Savings Bank we would save expense. For instance, people who deposit money in any bank in

this country get three per cent. interest on their money. By a very simple process that money is transferred from the banks into bonds at the rate of five per cent. That is the kind of venture, sometimes with a little more risk, but usually with much better returns; that is done every day amongst the banking communities. Supposing the Government made a deposit in a separate account of $15 for 2000 employees or a total deposit of $30,000. Well, whilst the officials in that Bank might have very important work to do, still I believe, if they were asked, they would look after this scheme of insurance. I think, Mr. Chairman, that there could be found a very simple and economical scheme. There would be no overhead expenses, such as advertising and no dividends to pay. The only expense incurred would be in the matter of bookkeeping. Personally, I do not think the insurance scheme could be simpler than it is. I understand that for the past two and a half years the employees of the Newfoundland Government Railway have been insured with the Sun Life Insurance Company, who are receiving a large amount in premiums. I understand also that during these two and a half years the Company paid out in losses $1500.00 more than they collected in premiums. Well that is a small loss because railway operations are a very risky business and very different from the civil service generally. But, let me point out to the House that although the Insurance Company paid out on the one hand, they have gained considerably more on the other hand through interest on the money collected and invested elsewhere. In other words, if we administered this insurance scheme through the Bank ourselves we could easily afford to pay out more than we collected to the extent of about $500 a year and be money in credit afterwards because of the five per cent. interest on the money collected in premiums. Once money is paid out to an insurance company they make money, otherwise they would not think of entertaining the proposition for a moment.

Of course you would not reasonably be expected to insure a man past the age at which he might be retired. We have men in the civil service to-day over eighty. I do not think that it should be necessary to insure a man who has been in the service forty or fifty years and has his family grown up, and has grandchildren or great-grandchildren for that matter. It should not be necessary to insure a man who has no one to protect when he dies. All these are things to be considered and should be considered in a proper light if the Government is going to undertake this kind of thing of itself. I think that the Government should have been able to come in here before this and be able to tell definitely what propositions the Government might undertake, what is going to be the cost, and what are the details of the insurance, and then we would be able to debate this subject in a better manner. I think that it is difficult for me or for anyone else to criticize a matter of this sort unless we know the terms the Government has been offered. If we had this information then it would be a very simple matter to decide whether the scheme considered by the Government was a good one and the adoption by it advantageous to the country.

I pointed out a matter which has probably been overlooked and to which I have drawn attention on several occasions and to which very little attention has been given. It is in reference to this condition. There is no provision for the person in the service as to the amount of gratuity to which a disabled person is entitled, nor is there a provision as to whether he would also be entitled to

insurance. I think that these are matters that should receive the attention of the Government.

These, Mr. Chairman, are a few of the ideas that have occurred to me in connection with this matter. I must say that I am in favour of the insurance scheme. I would even be in favour of a much wider extension of this scheme, if it could be extended to the various firms by some compulsory form of insurance. That is a condition that will probably come in time. Take any two employees. Two men of the same stamp. Both are trying to earn an honest living, trying to bring up their families and educate them. One man is employed in the civil service at sixteen hundred a year and another is in the employ of some commercial firm or business, at the same salary. Both are white collar men, trying to live respectably. The man in the city firm will be probably carrying a hundred or a hundred and fifty dollars worth of insurance himself. The man in the civil service will probably have his insurance paid for him by the Government to a certain extent. How is that going to strike the man in the city firm. Is he going to say, "Alright that is a fine thing to get insurance from the Government, and I am quite satisfied to go on paying my own premiums," or on the other hand will he say "That is alright but I am not satisfied unless I am insured myself, and I have to carry on until the crack-of-doom before I get a pension, and there is nobody worrying about my family if I should die." These are points that should be considered, and I would suggest, Mr. Chairman before I sit down, that the Government should give further consideration to the suggestions that have been made by the Leader of the Opposition. They should have been considered before, and I believe that if they were given that consideration which they deserve it will be found to work out very well, and I believe that it will be a scheme that will meet with very much more favour and with very much more approval than that of handing over to outside companies such a large amount of money as thirty thousand dollars.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I beg, Mr. Chairman, to move 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 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—Mr. Speaker, with your permission I would like to say a few words in connection with the editorial in the "Globe" of to-day. It deals with a matter that is probably of public interest, and therefore I should like to say a few words about it.

(Reads)

And I suppose that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is not a merchant. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say on the floors of this House, that Sir Edgar Bowring, according to the judgment of Mr. Justice Kent, should pay to this colony the sum of one hundred and twenty five thousand dollars. But for some reason or other, of which I know nothing, it now is found that Sir Edgar Bowring owns no property or shares or anything else in Newfoundland. As the Head of the Department of Finance I was not satisfied with that, but we intended to attach Sir Edgar Bowring's property on the other side, but the Government lawyers over there advised us that we could not do that, so we could not collect it, and no Mr.

Monroe or no Mr. Morine, nor anyone else, made me eat crow. I want to tell this House and the country at large that if there were the slightest possibility of collecting this amount which Justice Kent decided Sir Edgar Bowring owed the country, and I think that he honestly owed this country, it would be collected. I would like this House to know that Sir Edgar Bowring sent out twenty thousand dollars to this country, and this is all that we could get, as we could not attach any property of his in Newfoundland, and Mr. Monroe or Mr. Morine or anyone else did not interfere with me in carrying out the duties of the Finance Minister of the Crown. I am glad, Mr. Speaker to let the country know the exact position in which Sir Edgar Bowring is in today with this country. As Finance Minister I say that Sir Edgar Bowring honestly owed this country one hundred and twenty five thousand dollars and the most that we could collect was a cheque for twenty thousand dollars.

MR. CASHIN—I would like to ask the Minister of Finance if that twenty thousand dollars was in full settlement or how it was received. If it was not what will the Government do when he comes here again.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—I think that is something that we will leave until he comes back here this summer.

MR. CASHIN—If he comes back will the Government take action?

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—I don't know.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—There is one point that perhaps is a little misunderstood. As the Minister of Finance stated, when he took office these proceedings were undertaken; took the case before our local court and the judgment for this amount was handed down by Judge Kent. The position as the Minister of Finance says is that on attempting to put the judgment into effect on the other side the Government's solicitors, Messrs. Burn and Burridge, advised the Government that it would be impossible to enforce the judgment. So far as the judgment locally is concerned, as the Minister of Finance just stated, that we could attach no property beyond the bungalow at Topsail, and he sent over twenty thousand dollars in lieu of that property, and as a matter of fact more was received by the colony than if the place had been put up for sale.

MR. CASHIN—Then we are finished with it now?

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that that is the first that I have heard of it. I have not read the "Globe" and I did not know that there was a settlement, and I did not know that the Minister of Finance had been made to eat crow again. All that I have got to say is that it is a pity that Sir Edgar Bowring should be placed in the position that he is in. The Government has pursued Sir Edgar Bowring and driven him out of Newfoundland. It is well known that Sir Edgar is a man of considerable means, and a man who is devoted to Newfoundland, and who knows but that at his death this country would have benefited by large amounts, and indeed he might have given further large amounts, before his death. Now the Government have driven him from his native country, and got nothing from him.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—We got $20,000. I suppose that's a mere flea-bite?

MR. HICKMAN—It's nothing at all. And the fact remains that it is responsible for his leaving.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—I should like to ask the Leader of the Opposition if it is the policy of the Opposition that if a man is very

wealthy, and builds a park or two, he should be left alone?

MR. W. BROWNE—I should like to ask the Hon. Minister of Finance that if Sir Edgar Bowring had sufficient property to gather $100,000 taxes, what happened to it? Where has it gone?

HON. PRIME MINISTER—It wasn't in the country. It was mostly property outside the country.

MR. W. BROWNE—Then it was partly on property within the country. What happened to that?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—That is what the Minister of Justice has just spoken about.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—We have legal opinions of which I spoke, and which you may see if you wish.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, April 8, 1926.

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

Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs gave notice that he would on to-morrow move that Supply be granted to His Majesty.

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 143 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled of the Keeping of Dogs."

Hon. the Minister of Justice gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to secure the better training of Midwives and to regulate their practice."

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 125 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Trusts and Trustees.'"

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

Mr. Duff gave notice of question.

Mr. Hickman gave notice of question.

Mr. Ashbourne gave notice of question.

M r. Halfyard gave notice of question.

Notice of Question

Replies to the following questions were tabled, with the exception of No. 7, which was deferred.

(1) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the Table of the House the following statement: (a) Total Revenue from all sources from July the 1st, 1925, to December the 31st, 1925; (b) Total Expenditure from July the 1st, 1925, to December the 31st, 1925; (c) Total Revenue from July the 1st, 1924, to December the 31st, 1924; (d) Total Expenditure from July the 1st, 1924, to December the 31st, 1924.

(2) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the Table of the House the following information: Who framed the Resolutions now before the House knowns as the Besco Contract.

(3) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister to Table all accounts in connection with the operation of the Highways Commission.

(4) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in his capacity as Chairman of the Raliway Commission, to Table a Statement giving the following information: (a) Total Expenditure for the Railway per month from July the 1st, 1924, to December the 31st, 1924; (b) total Revenue per month from July the 1st, 1924, to December the 31st, 1924; this information not to include the Steamship Service.

(5) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister, as Chairman of the Railway Commission, to lay on the Table of the House the following information concerning the operation of the Railway for the year 1925: (a) Total locomotive mileage; (b) Passenger train mileage; (c) Freight train mileage; (d) Mixed train mileage; (e) Cost per mile of trains; (f) Revenue per mile run; (g) Expenses per mile of line; (h) Revenue per mile of line; (i) Passengers carried; (j) Average Revenue per mile; (k) Tons of Revenue freight hauled; (l) Tons of Revenue freight per mile; (m) Average Revenue per ton per mile; (n) Tons of free freight hauled; (o) Cost of discharging coal steamers, per ton; (p) Number of tons of coal used by Railway and Steamship Service; (q) Cost of coal per trains.

(6) MR. GODDEN asked Hon. the Colonial Secretary to lay upon the Table of the House copy of agreement between the Government and the Marine Agencies, Ltd., in reference to lease of the King's Wharves, St. John's, and in relation to Gill's Cove.

(7) MR. HICKMAN asked Hon. the Prime Minister how much money spent on the Dock to date.

(8) MR. HICKMAN asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay upon the Table of the House all correspondence between the Newfoundland Representatives at the British Empire Exhibition at Wembley and the Committee of the British Empire Exhibition here in St. John's, and the Government here.

(9) MR. HALFYARD asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing the monthly catch of fish in each fishing settlement of Trinity District, during the fishing season of 1925, up to November 10th, 1925; the names of the parties who supplied the statistics of the monthly catch and the remuneration paid each party for the whole season.

(1) In reference to Question No. 1.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FIANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the reply to that question. I also beg leave to table the answer to question of Major Cashin's on the Order Paper of March 31st, and also a reply to Mr. Power, the honourable member for St. George's.

(2) HON. THE PRIME MINISTER —Mr. Speaker, in reply to that question, I may say that the final draft of this matter known as the Besco Contract was made by the Justice Department, and it was subject to deliberation by the Government, and there were no less than about ten or eleven contracts drawn up, and we amended them as we went along.

(3) HON. THE PRIME MINISTER —Mr. Speaker, I have not got that reply, as I had no time to see the Chairman of the Highroads Commission, but it appears to me that the accounts of the Highroads Commission have all been tabled, and if the honourable member were here now, I would ask him what particular information he wants. If any member wants any particular piece of information, I think he should ask for it. I do not think it is fair to ask the officials of the Government Departments to go making out reports of a whole year's work to give a little bit of information that would probably be secured by putting the question in another form.

(6) HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, in reply to the honourable member, I may say that the same question was asked the Prime Minister on the Order Paper of March 10th, and the answer was tabled.

(8) HON. THE PRIME MINISTER —Mr. Speaker, I have asked Major Outerbridge, the Chairman of the

Local Committee of Wembley Exhibition, to give me all the correspondence there is in connection with that. There is no official correspondence in the hands of the Government.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday last, when we met, I promised the Leader of the Opposition to lay on the Table of the House the Report of the Liquor Control. I regret that I am not able to do that now, but I spent some time this morning going over some of it with the Auditor and the Controller, and Mr. Mews, the Auditor, has this to say:

(Reads)

and Mr. Mifflin says this:

(Reads)

Answer to Question

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the answer to a question asked by Mr. Grimes on the Order Paper of March 31.

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 Civil Service Protection.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, in connection with these Resolutions, I might say that I don't want to pass them through the House to-day because we have not correctly drafted the Amendment yet, which was suggested in connection with the Civil Servant Soldiers' Pensions. I think all the clauses of these resolutions have been passed until we get down to the Insurance Clause. I am perfectly willing to hear the views of members to-day on the principles of insurance, if anybody feels like expressing himself on them. This matter of insurance is not a party matter at all, and I would like to know the views of the House as far as this is concerned.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, respecting the suggested addition or consideration of the terms of service for men overseas I have had an insertion prepared for Section 8, Sub-Section D. For the information of Mr. Scammell, who was not present at the last sitting of the House, when the matter of soldiers who had been in the Civil Service, and who enlisted in the Army or the Navy, their time should be taken into account from the time of their enlistment up to the time of demobilisation. That should be taken into consideration when the present matter is being adjusted, and, with that purpose in view, I suggest that, after the word "case," seventh line, Section 8, Sub-Section D, we add the words:

"And in case of a person who has "served in the Great War, and who "is not in receipt of a War Pension, "or is in receipt of one in amount less "than that to which he should have "been entitled by reason of this, add "the actual number of years during "which the person has served as a "Civil Servant, the period from the "date he enlisted up to the date of "demobilisation."

To illustrate what I mean. Supposing a civil servant who has served five years in the war, army or navy, was pensioned aften ten years in the public service. He would be entitled to fifteen years adjustment of his pension instead of ten years as the section now reads. Here is another instance. A civil servant left his position in August 1914 to go Overseas and remained for four years. Prior to his enlistment he might have been two years or more in the civil service. In twenty years time he comes up for a pension. Under ordinary conditions, a twenty year allotment would be given to him; but we think that he is entitled to consid-

eration for the number of years of his war service in addition to his period after rejoining the service, and the couple of years prior to his joining the regiment.

This is done purely and simply with one object, namely, to give those who served in the war credit as if they served continuously in the civil service. The method submitted to the House may not be clear, but if any honourable member has any suggestion to offer to make this matter more explicit, I shall only be too glad to accept it. This particular section has been gone into very carefully and very thoroughly, and we have found it rather difficult to draft a clause to meet the contingency. It has just been pointed out to me, and we might as well have the words inserted in the first line of the amendmend after the word person, "being a civil servant at the time of enlistment." That would make it more explicit. Again in the third line cut out the words "one in amount" and substitute therefor "a pension." The last words of the amendment may be explained this way. Supposing a man has been twenty-eight years in the civil service when he comes up for pension and has also served four years in the war. He has really thirty-two years of service put in, but as thirty years is the maximum to be paid a pension he would be only entitled for a thirty years pension.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, the amendment for the consideration of the Committee.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, the suggestion of the Colonial Secretary the other day when this matter was introduced must have occurred to us all as being a very proper suggestion, I am sure, it is one that when we decide to avail of it we ought to see that the proper spirit was lived up to, and for that reason it occurred to me that some difficulty would be experienced in framing an amendment that would meet the view exactly that he had in mind. I think that the point he had in mind, and we all agree with it, is to see that civil servants, who left the service, should not suffer by reason of his absence overseas. That is the point of the whole amendment. What I would suggest now is that, as the matter is of much importance, the amendment submitted be left for the consideration of the entire House, as there are a number of aspects to be coverd. For that reason I think we ought to give thought to the point of the Amendment, and, as the Colonial Secretary has properly suggested himself, to fit the words that will cover the idea he has in mind. I do not think that honourable members disagree with the principle in the words submitted, but I would suggest to him that, having laid the amendment on the table of the House, it be deferred for the moment, and that the final wording of it be stayed for the present. The idea is not the intention to have two pensions, one as a civil servant and another as a soldier, because that would put a man in the position of profiting by the enlistment. The idea is to see that he is not wronged by his service abroad. I would suggest now that if it meets with the approval of honourable members on the opposite side of the House, after getting their views, to have a wording incorporated that will leave the amendment beyond any doubt.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, I agree with the Honourable Minister of Justice to have the suggestion to this amendment stand over so that honourable members can have an opportunity to think it over and have it put in shape and cover everything we want to have covered. If it is put through hastily there might be something in it that would not cover exactly what we need, and we might have cause to regret it afterwards.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, first of all I would like to refer to the particular amendment which the Colonial Secretary has submitted, and, having in mind the principle which he seeks to embody in his amendment, I do not think that there can be much difference of opinion on it, because, as the Minister of Justice has pointed out, we are all desirous and anxious to see this amendment put in in its proper wording and so that there will be no overlapping as regards pensions from the standpoint of the Civil Service as well as from the standpoint of the war. Personally, I am perfectly clear that he does not want to see any overlapping take place in the matter of pensions to Civil Servants. I think we all agree to that. But I have something more than that in mind. I have many amendments to suggest to the Resolutions now before the Chair and I want to know from the Minister of Justice, whom I am going to put on his honour, where I can move the amendment that I have in view with regard to these Resolutions. On Tuesday we got as far as the Insurance clause, but you had not got into debate on it. Now the Colonial Secretary has already set a precedent. He has moved an amendment to a previous amendment.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—That is in a state of abeyance and the whole section to which it refers is in abeyance.

MR. SCAMMELL—We have some amendments to make from this side of the House and I would like to know now the most opportune time to make them?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—You could make the amendments now, although you would not be debarred from making them at the Committee stage of the Bill. It has been intimated by the Prime Minister, in the absence of the honourable member for St. Barbe, that the first sections of the Resolutions up to the Insurance section were introduced as what is known as a Party Measure. The Insurance part of it has been left stand to be considered by the whole House to find out the best that can be done. As regards the powers of the Opposition side, when money Resolutions are being considered, as the honourable member knows, the Opposition always got the right to make a motion to reduce; they cannot make a motion to increase.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I am perfectly satisfied to go back over the Resolutions again from the beginning, although the different sections could be reconsidered when the matter comes before the House as a Bill.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Of course we can refer back, but I think it would be much better now, if the honourable member for St. Barbe, in a general way, would state what he has in mind.

MR. SCAMMELL—The first objection I have to make by way of amendment is in Section 2, Sub-section (b), which says "Provided that in either exception extra payment shall not be made unless the head or deputy head of the department for which the work was done recommends such payment, etc." I would suggest that the words "head or deputy head of the department" be stricken out and that the words "Auditor General" be substituted therefor. If the intention is to bring about economy in the civil service and to prevent waste, it would probably serve the purpose better by having the Auditor General recommend payments for overtime.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Chairman, I would like to record my objection to the suggested change in that section of the Resolutions, and I will give my reasons. If you go on much further with this Auditor-General business, you are going to

reduce the heads of departments to mere machines and you are going to place upon them no responsibility whatever. As representatives of the people they are directly responsible to the people for their actions, but the way we are going now in connection with the running of Government departments you are going to take all the responsibility out of the hands of the heads of departments and make them mere servants, and have Auditor-Generals, Auditor-General's clerks, Commissions and Boards to reign supreme, so that by and by heads of departments will be reduced to mere servants, and I, for one, as head of a department, strongly object. Heads of Departments are either honest or they are dishonest; they either represent the people or they don't; and they are capable of being in charge of departments or they are not. If they are not capable, they should not be there; and if they are capable, they should be wholly responsible to the people and the Government. I claim, as head of one department, that enough authority already has been taken out of their hands, and it is high time that this sort of thing was stopped. I, therefore, Mr. Chairman, disagree with the amendment.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, following the remarks of the Minister of Public Works, I think it will be found that the amendment suggested by the honourable member for St. Barbe does not make much improvement, as it would not work out in practice. Supposing, in the Public Works Department some official is detailed off to work for a week after hours, apart from ordinary routine work. The head or deputy head would know about this person, but the Auditor General would not. Therefore, in common justice to that official, who must be paid for his overtime, you got to trust the head or his deputy, whose recommendations the Auditor General would take and sanction, and, if he did not do that, he would only harm the civil servant, who would probably be deprived of the extra pay that he was entitled to. Furthermore, it practically amounts to an expression of opinion that the head or deputy head of a department could not be trusted. It seems that the head of a department is humiliated enough when he has to put his recommendations to the Governor-in-Council. Consequently, I think the suggested amendment is not worth entering upon.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment suggested by the honourable member for St. Barbe would complicate matters. The audit system that has been operating in the Posts and Telegraphs department for the past few years is a most satisfactory one. Every bill is audited and every cheque is initialled by the Auditor, Mr. Howley. Now with regard to the question of overtime. Overtime in the telegraph department is made up by the chief operator and submitted to the Superintendent, who in turn submits it to the Auditor so that there are two or three checks on it. If we had to appeal to the Auditor General and he happened to be out of the country, what would be the result? With reference to the remarks of the Minister of Public Works, I think he threw out the hint that possibly there may be some people under the impression that some grafting was going on. Of course, we all know that the present Minister of Public Works would not attempt to take any graft in his department. Perhaps, I may not be trusted; but, everybody knows he is an honest man and all the other departmental heads are like Caesar's wife—above suspicion. As the Prime Minister stated in answering a question, we keep nothing from the people and I think we are going a little bit too far. Of course,

it is necessary to throw all the safeguards possible around the different departments so as nobody will be tempted to graft or steal any funds from the public service.

As I have already said, Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment too complicated and that is why I cannot agree with it.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—Mr. Chairman, I am, perhaps, differently situated to the Ministers of Departments who have just spoken, in as much as I find that during the past two years since I took charge of my department I have not had any occasion to ask any officials there to do any work after hours, so for that reason the amendment of the member for St. Barbe would not materially affect the operations of the department. Nevertheless, I see the justice of the objection raised by the Minister of Public Works and the Hon. Minister of Posts and Telegraphs. For the life of me I cannot see the reason, if necessary work is to be performed in any department, why the Minister in charge of any particular department is not sufficiently trusted to O.K. or otherwise, a bill for work performed. In my opinion, Sir, it is a serious reflection on the ability or honesty of the head of a department, and for that reason, if for no other, I must enter my objection also against the amendment.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that not only has payment for extra work done to be recommended and passed by any Minister of any Department, but it has also to be ordered by the Governor-In-Council. As matters stand at present, it does not require to be passed by the Governor-In-Council and the section undre discussions gives more protection.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I made was merely a suggestion because I wanted to get an idea as to what views the Ministers and Government members generally held, and, I have made up my mind that in future we are going to have a full and frank discussion on all matters that come before this House. We are paid to come here and pass legislation and we are responsible to the people of this country for what we do here. Now some of us may have had suggestions to offer that may or may not have met with the approval of some members of the Government or of members on this side of the House; but the crossing of the ways has been arrived at and we have got to a point where all members, conscious of the duties they have to fulfil to the people who have sent them here, must demand that in future every clause and every single iota of a clause of any Act is thrashed out to the utmost limit. I had no idea, Mr. Chairman, when I suggested this amendment that I was going to touch the susceptibilities of certain honourable members. They were evidently under the impression or under the suspicion that charges of graft were going to be levelled against them. There was no such suspicion or no such charge intended, let me say. Now there is one thing the Government has not shown very plainly and that is why they brought in this brand of legislation at the present time. It struck me forcibly that it did not tend to economy in the public service and that is why I suggested the amendment. Apparently, the Minister of Justice does not think it necessary to carry the point further and I will therefore, pass on to Section 5 of the Resolutions. With regard to Section 5, it is only a minor point, but it may carry some weight or importance, and having no intent to injure the susceptibilities of any members, they may be inclined to take it from a favourable view point.

"The Head of a Department, and, in his absence, the Deputy Head may—

(a) suspend from the performance of his duty or from the receipt of his salary any officer, etc."

Why not substitute the word "And" for "Or?" The idea of suspension is to punish. An employee has been guilty of some insubordination or lapse in duty, of some offence in the opinion of the Head of the Department meriting suspension, and the suspension is intended as a punishment. If the Head of the Department should afterwards repent and allow him to come back and pay him his money, there is really no punishment. He has not been punished. The intention of the section is to do that, and, if so why not put it down straight and have no more nonsense about it? "No person shall receive any salary or pay for time suspended, and the Head of the Department shall suspend from the performance of his duties and from the receipt of his salary any officer, etc."

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—A man might be suspended from his salary and not from his office.

MR. SCAMMELL—We should have an assurance that the right thing is done. When a man is suspended, he should be punished and get no salary. Every Sub-section of the Section should be binding.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Does not the next section cover it?

MR. SCAMMELL—Yes; but why have a loop hole in (a)? The Minister of Justice has raised a point that a man might not be suspended from his duty but be suspended from his salary and get no salary for time of suspension, two weeks or ten days as the case might be.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —What I had in my mind was a case such as this. Let us assume that a man has been in the service twelve, fifteen or twenty years, and suppose he does something, perhaps not of sufficient importance as to merit the public humiliation resulting from his non appearance at his office, he can be suspended for a week or ten days or as the case may be without salary, but attends at his office without pay and has not the degradation that would accompany suspension that would be publicly known as would be the case when suspended from duty and pay for some more serious offence. The next sub-section goes on to say that where a person is actually under suspension the head or deputy head may remove such suspension, but no person shall receive any salary or pay for the time during which he was under suspension. That clearly covers the case of a man suspended absolutely from his duty and he is not to be paid. I think the other section allowing him to be suspended from salary though not from his duty gives an equitable corrective.

MR. SCAMMELL—Can a man come back and get his back pay?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—That is covered now in my opinion.

MR. SCAMMELL—I understand that there were some substantial alteratione made to sub-section 3, section 6. I wonder if we could have that from the Prime Minister.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—(Reads sub-section with amendment).

MR. HALFYARD—I must admit that the first two portions of that clause did not favorably impress me as to the effect they were going to have. Any body of men forming a Government, no difference how good their intentions may be, will have pressure brought to bear on them by the official who thinks he is not being treated exactly right, and by his numerous friends more or less as the case may be. No time is given as to how long the office must be in existence, and it may be only some months and a person employed in that office would have to be compensated although when the office was started

it may not have been regarded as permanent but to be closed up after a year or two. It is a mistake not to define the time the office should be in existence before the official or officials should receive compensation.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Such a man is not entitled to get a pension unless he has served ten years. "The Governor in Council may grant him such superannuation allowance as will fairly compensate him for his loss of office, not exceeding that which he would have been entitled to if he had been retired in consequence of mental or physical infirmity." But a man can only be retired by reason of mental or physical infirmity after ten years in the service. It is governed by Section 1. Section 1 says "The Governor in Council may grant an annual superannuation allowance to any member, etc., who has served as such for ten years or more, and has attained the age of sixty five years, or has been retired by the Governor in Council for incapacity through mental or physical infirmity." The ten years minimum applies to sub-sections 1 and 3.

MR. SCAMMELL—I hope the Hansard records the Minister of Justice as interpreting the Act as applying to Section 3.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Without relying on the Hansard, I think I would be borne out in a Court of Law.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Do I understand that a person could be retired even if he had not served ten years?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—No, only if he has served ten years.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—What of the case of a man who has been in the service only five years and meets with an accident that disables him, and leaves him unable to earn money to provide for himself? You certainly cannot throw that man out on the street. The Bill certainly means that for in section 10 it says gratuities may be allowed by the Governor in Council in respect of any Civil Servant retired by the Governor in Council by reason of severe injury received without his own fault, in the discharge of his public duty, or of any such person who has died by reason of such injury.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Gratuities are totally different from superannuation allowance. If a man is injured in the service, power is given to handle those cases. Gratuities are given calculated on a different scale, and are in lieu of Workmen's Compensation Act. If a man should be injured in performance of his duty, he would be recompensed, as he would come under the Workmen's Compensation Act even if only two years or twelve months. But if ten years does not apply to physical infirmity and to section 3 the whole point of the Bill is meaningless. In the case of a man being injured so as to be incapacitated, in the performance of his duty, though he has only been employed a short time something has to be done for him, but physical infirmity is different; a man does not grow old because of service but because he goes into the service too old. If you are going to recognise physical infirmity the same as an accident, everybody is going to have hump backs inside of six months.

MR. GRIMES—I would like to ask what is meant by 'severe injury.' Supposing a line repairer while out on his work along the line gets a heavy cold which may bring on eventually pneumonia and incapacitate him as much as if he had met with an accident in the performance of his duty, is his injury to be considered an injury to entitle him to a pension, or must he be incapacitated by an actual accident?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—It must be conceded that to be

publicly asked a question such as that as to how we are going to interpret injury received in performance of duty, is by way of setting something of a poser. I should think it would work on the same principal as pensions for war services. If a man can show that he has received an injury due to the war though not necessarily an actual wound he should get his pension, and if under this act a man claims as in the case Mr. Grimes has given, I think a genuine case ought be treated the same as a man who falls and breaks his leg and that discretion should be allowed in the giving of gratuities.

It is doubtful enough to have a test case on. The point, however, that I want to repeat is that sub-section 1 is intended to govern and does govern sub-section 3, and in the interpretation of the Act subsection 3 is going to be governed by 1 which says in effect ten years.

MR. SCAMMELL—That has been made clear, but why not so state it in subsection 1 as to make it clear.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —That could very easily be done. Is this form of wording too cumbersome.

Subsection 1, Section 6, inserting words "or one who having served for ten years or more."

That is Subsection 1 and makes it clear that it is necessary to serve at least ten years.

"Or who having served for ten years or more."

MR. ASHBOURNE—Is there anything to prevent the Government from giving a pension then if a man has not served ten years?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Nothing except an Opposition like you coming along and bringing them to book for doing it, that is all. This is supposed to settle the principal on which pensions are to be granted, I take it that that principle is naturally going to be followed. The Government is not going to start right away and break that law.

MR. SCAMMELL—We have a case in mind. There is in St. Barbe a Customs' House with a Customs' officer, and in the interests of economy that office should be closed and the salary saved to the country. If you decided to close that office, and if it has been open only two or three years, can the civil servant there then claim a pension? There would be no question about the matter if you struck out sub-section 3 altogether. As it stands I fail to see where our guarantee for that is found. A man should not be able to go into the Civil Service for two or three years and then claim a pension.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Take the case of Mr. and Mrs. Winslow who looked after the smallpox hospital which was discontinued. They have lost their jobs through no fault of their own and they are certainly entitled to some consideration. It simply amounts to the Government doing what would be done by an ordinary employer. If he gives up a situation for the Government and then loses his position with the Government through no fault of his own the Government ought to have power to consider his case. A man is practically thrown on the rocks through no fault of his own and the Government ought be empowered to consider that.

MR. HICKMAN—The necessity of ten years should be made clear. I know what Mr. Scammell the Member for St. Barbe has in mind. There are a great many Customs' offices throughout the country where the amount collected is no more than the salary of the man in charge, and if the offices are abolished as they should be in the interests of economy, should these men be entitled to a pension if they have not served ten years? There is one town in this country where there are forty-eight

Government officials and one official could do the work of the whole lot. I heard a man make a statement the other day that he was on a steamer there, under charter to the Government, he was told to wait at Placentia for the mail by the train. The train came in and there was no mail brought to his steamer. The mail was at the station but could not be had. One man was employed to bring the mail to the S. S. Glencoe; another man to bring the mail to the S.S. Portia, and because his steamer was neither the Glencoe nor the Portia there was nobody to bring the mail. If economy is to be introduced and practised that sort of thing has to be looked into. There are a crowd of detectives connected with the Finance Dept., if some of these are done away with, are they to come to the Government and demand a pension for an office temporarily created? If the Government want to have this so, it should be in sufficient words to make it clear and plain in the Bill. There should be sufficient words in the Bill to make it plain so that the Honourable Minister of Justice and others will not be able to make a case out of this.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I can quite see the point of the Leader of the Opposition and Mr. Scammell, and want to say that I appreciate the efforts of the Opposition to make the Bill binding in every possible particular and in all points, but I may say that this clause has been provided for a purpose. As the Attorney General has said, this clause is to apply to a case such as that of Mr. and Mrs. Winslow; if it is not there we cannot deal with them, and they have been valuable and diligent in service.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Your point is that even if the Governor in Council wanted to provide for a case such as this, that it couldn't do so?

MR. HICKMAN—But isn't the point this—that you claim they can't get a pension unless they have been in the service 10 years.

MR. SCAMMELL—What about a man who is not continually in the Civil Service; what about if he gets sick? If a man is dismissed and has not been in for ten years surely he can't get a pension. We don't want to give him a pension.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—At first blush how does this read for a re-draft of that section? I should like the Hon. Member for Fortune to check me. "If any person to whom this applies, and who has served ten years or more is removed from office in consequence of the abolition of his office." It seems to me at first blush that it meets the point. The thing is only a limitation.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Does that meet the approval of the members opposite?

MR. HICKMAN—It looks alright from a layman's viewpoint.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Well, we have had four lawyers working on it in the Executive Council, so it ought to be alright.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Chairman, there are two distinct classes of civil servants—the class who devote all their time to the service, and those who get $100 or $200 per year to perform their services. Are these to be in the same class?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—No, there is a difference in the classes. Take the case of the outport postmasters. In certain cases in large outports these might be included in the list—the others would not be. I don't know if my amendment meets the approval of the member for Fortune?

MR. WARREN—Yes.

MR. SCAMMELL—Now, Mr. Chairman, in Section 7, when it has been decided to retire any such person, one month's notice in writing has to

be given the person—I understand that the correction of the insertion of "one month" has been made. Well I have just been noticing that the Ministers opposite are very keen to see that their privileges should not be encroached upon,and I suggest that after the word "person" these words be added: "Such intention shall be sent to such person by the Head of the Department employing him." I think that it should be stipulated that it is to be the head of the Department who is to give the notice. The Ministers were fighting for their privileges, and personally I think it only right and fair that the Ministers be the ones to give the notice," and so I suggest this amendment.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Who else would give the notice but the Head of the Department?

MR. SCAMMELL—Now, Mr. Speaker, I hope the Prime Minister doesn't want us to get up here and go into the niceties of politics. That question is a pertinent one and an innocent one, but why not go farther and make it clear that no one else can do it.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—No reason at all. It can easily be done.

MR. HALFYARD—Take the Custom House as an example. No one could dismiss anyone at the Customs but the Minister of Finance and Customs. Not even the Deputy Head could do it.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Except in the absence of the Minister.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—And this doesn't refer to superannuation at all.

MR. SCAMMELL—well, the Head is the proper person to do it, and let him give authority to do it.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—You are giving the Head the right to retire a man whenever he wants to, aren't you?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—No.

MR. HALFYARD—The right of retirement is or ought to be in the Governor in Council.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—In future it is going to be an unpleasant job anyway. In the past it has been a nice job to retire a man, but will be much more unpleasant after this.

MR. SCAMMELL—I am not going to suggest an amendment here, but I don't see the force of the words "Treasury Board." After all the Board resolves itself into the Government.

MR. HIGGINS—It is really only a sub-committee of the Council.

MR. SCAMMELL — And eventually the thing always gets into the Council.

MR. HIGGINS—Well, that may be so. It is a sort of superior court of appeal, which the person may use.

MR. HALFYARD—I think it is proper there, to give a fair trial. All Department Heads are not so fair as the Minister of Posts and myself. It will bring justice to all.

Section 7 adopted.

MR. SCAMMELL — Mr. Chairman, we are now coming to a clause which is I think going to cause more criticism than any other part or any other suggestion. Now we come to the point where we are to compute the basis on which the Civil Servant shall be given an allowance, and according to this section we are to take into consideration not only the salary of the servant, but also the perquisites of his office. Now I ask Mr. Chairman in all fairness, what man here is able to stand up and say what a civil servant may consider as his legal emoluments of office, and where is the line to be drawn. We have civil servants drawing salaries as high as $2000, from $1200 to $200, and if we are going to give pensions from perquisites enjoyed as well as salary we are likely to find that a man will

receive a pension larger than his salary. Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to submit, and to place myself on record as saying that this clause should not be embodied in the Bill. As it stands I think that if a man gets $2000 you should pension him on that basis. If you feel that there are some men who are not getting enough salary, increase them, but cut out the emoluments absolutely and entirely. Let us have done with this farce of emoluments. I accuse no man here of wrong doing, but I submit that this leaves the way open for wrong doing. I do not think myself perfect, but I submit that this is wrong in principle and practice. Give the man at the Penitentiary or the Hospital, or wherever he may be, the salary he deserves; then we will know what salary he is getting. To-day with the system of emoluments we have men getting money, and don't know what they are getting. I am going on record as opposed absolutely to this, and I am going to fight it, and I suggest to the Government that if they have a vestige of respect for the people and their wishes, that they cease this farce here and now. But for Heaven's sake cut out these emoluments, at least in calculating pensions. I challenge any member of this House to stand up and tell what are the emoluments enjoyed by any member of the civil service. You have no criterion and cannot tell. I for one, representing a working and fishing district will not stand for it, and expect that other members will join with me in this viewpoint.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, I take the liberty of replying to the hon. member. I quite agree with the position he has taken, which is, I take it, to do the best he can for the country in this matter. I feel that he hasn't said what he wanted to say, or would like to have said; what he would like to have said is that there shouldn't be any pensions at all. But he cannot advance that because he is living in a country where two things bind us and make that difficult if not impossible. He has suggested that the pension be based on the needs of the individual case—that is alright, but unfortunately the civil service as a whole is grossly underpaid. Now it is all very fine to get up and say (as he indicates) that emoluments shouldn't be allowed, but he asked a question, and I am going to answer that question. And I am going to refer to a case—take the policeman who gets a mere uniform as an emolument—are we going to say that he shouldn't get it? I mention him merely as a type. Take the men who work in the Hospital, the Penitentiary, the Insane Asylum or other places where unfortunates are looked after—these men are underpaid, unfortunately. And what are their emoluments? The miserable bit of grub they eat. And are you going to increase the salaries of all these men. I quite agree with the Hon. Member in principle, but is it going to work out in practice? Take these men—are you going to take away their emoluments and charge them for their food, adding the price to their salary and run a sort of restaurant? It amounts to the same thing then as now. But emoluments "legally enjoyed" are such as are recognized by the Governor in Council, acting honestly—that is what "legally enjoyed" means. And I should like to say that this very point was discussed, and we tried to reach a remedy. Take the case of men who get their house rent—they regard that as part of their salary, and that is why they take such a low salary. And I go so far as to say that not a single pension has been granted in Newfoundland for years in which this element has not been considered. And I say that I know of a case during the administration of which the hon. mem-

ber who has just spoken was a emmber, in which clothing, rental, and even the profits of the garden were taken as emoluments. I have that case in mind, and it was remarkable to see the profits of that garden. And he was allowed so much for clothing, and so much for his garden.

MR. HIBBS—Who did the Hon. Minister of Justice say that was?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I did not say who it was. I said that it was a distinct case which I had in mind. I do not quote names in this House; it is improper. And I admit that it was justifiable; I know the man worked hard, and he counted it all as really part of his salary, and really these Government servants have been getting larger salaries because of the addition of these emoluments. We are then in this position: (1) that we have been doing this thing all along, and each successive government; (2) We have to ask ourselves what are the emoluments which can be called "legal." Take as an illustration the case of the Supt. of the General Hospital, the present occupant of that position, who is I believe, without peer in his profession. One of the things he naturally accepts and regards as part of his salary is his house, fuel, etc. The honourable members want their attention drawn to that point; in computing pensions the only fair thing to do is to assess the value of such things and value accordingly as part of the salary. Let us follow that thought out and take the case of the gentleman who is in charge of the Hospital—a man, as I said, probably without peer in his profession—if we were to approach him with an idea of finding the value of his emoluments he would probably say: "I don't want a $1000 house to live in" and would probably pay $200 a year for a small place in which to stay. And this would happen in many instances and you would probably find a great many houses and buildings vacant. So you cannot do that, but can only say what would be a fair amount to allow. You can only say that a man is living in a house the rental of which would reasonably be $400 per year, and add that in your calculations. That is the principle of emoluments. The nearest you can get to it is to say that the men in enjoyment of these things have got to be considered.

The hon. member's point was the protection of the person under pay, the man with the smaller salary. I would like to say now that I have in mind a class of people who get no emoluments at all, but get good salary. And these are people who would benefit by emoluments not being considered. But on the other hand the consideration of emoluments legally enjoyed is but a levelling up of the salaries of that portion of the civil service. I am sure that the hon. member himself will upon second thought agree with me on that point himself.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—I think that the point that the Hon. Member for St. Barbe has made is that the system is all wrong. The Hon. Minister of Justice says that the system is in vogue for a good many years, and they are still going to carry on although the whole scheme should be changed. I quite agree with the Hon. Member for St. Barbe. If a man is retired he rakes up everything that he possibly can out of which he got a dollar during his service and puts it in for the emolument. I know of the case of a lighthouse keeper who was pensioned and when he was making up his pension and putting in for the emoluments one of the things he put in was that he had a man to row him out to the lighthouse every day, and he wanted that considered in the amount of the emolument. His pension came to more than his salary.

Something can be done to remedy this condition. Take the system in St. John's. There is the gentleman who occupies the position of the physician to the General Hospital, and the Inspector of Police, these men are occupying dwellings that were built by the Government, and they should never have been built, but they should have been paid sufficient salary to warrant doing away with this giving fuel and light and house. Instead of a person in the employ of the Government valuing a house at two hundred a year, if it is a house worth five hundred dollars a year he is going to value it at a thousand dollars a year. In regard to the policemen in the service whom he has referred to as getting an emolument in the way of uniforms. I think that it would be a very easy matter to put the cost of the uniforms on the salary and let him find it himself, if that is one of the drawbacks in doing away with this kind of thing. I do not think that the Member for St. Barbe thinks that the men in the civil service up to the age of sixty five should not get a pension. He thinks that they should get a pension, but he does not think that he should be getting more than his neighbour who has been catching fish all his life while the other fellow has been walking up and down the bank with his brass buttons and looking at him.

I would say that something should be put in so that the pension would not exceed so much at the expense of the colony, if he has to have an emolument. In that case a man could be pensioned without some emolument. Now that the Government is changing the old order of things and bringing in this bill I think that they should try to introduce something more beneficial and not continue what has been in vogue for the last fifty years. This act was brought in with a view to economy and to protect future Governments. When the future governments of the country get applications for pensions and emoluments the course would be mapped out for them. It should be properly thrashed out and put on the statute books of this country for many years to come. I would suggest to the Hon. the Prime Minister and to the Minister of Justice who is the legal mind behind the Prime Minister that they should consider something of that nature, and if necessary let the thing stand over, and when you are ready put into effect something that will be of benefit to the country.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I may say in response to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that I do not think that we can consider any change in that. There are many members of the civil service receiving pensions under these arrangements and we have to give them some consideration. The Hon. the Leader of the Opposition just quoted the case of the man in charge of the Poor House and said that we would have to take care of him and that is the position in a great many cases.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—I said that it should not exceed a certain amount. Take the position of the hospital. When the proper time comes and he puts in for his emoluments his house will be valued at a thousand dollars. It will be very difficult for you to prove that his house is not worth that amount.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—If you put in a clause like that and make a minimum you will have everyone looking for that. I think that it would be very much better to fix the case as it arises. A man will make his claim and put it into the hands of the Governor in Council, but if you fix an amount you will find every one looking for it.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—I think that the temper of the House has a tendency to move along the wrong lines. Those of us

who have had the opportunity and know what these applications for pensions have been in the past, can realise what emoluments really mean. Under this act only the emoluments that are legally enjoyed can be considered. Perhaps some will remember the case of a famous clerk of this House. He was told that his emoluments were going to be removed and he said "Oh, don't do that. Take the salaries but do not take the emoluments." That is what has been happening in the past. Emoluments have exceeded the salary. But it is absolutely impossible to do away with the idea altogether, but as explained particularly by the Minister of Justice this afternoon only those emoluments legally enjoyed are to be taken into consideration. And there are several very marked cases in this respect. Take the case of the medical superintendent of the General Hospital, the Medical Superintendent of the Lunatic Asylum, and the Superintendent of the Penitentiary, although that is not so good a case in point. You have in the civil service in these cases men who are very able and capable physicians, and they have accepted very small salaries comparatively speaking, when you come to consider that they could probably earn as much in in the general practice of their profession outside in two or three months as they get in a whole year from the Government. And they accept these salaries because of the emoluments that can be offered, and it is absolutely absurd to think that you can disassociate the Lunatic Asylum, the General Hospital and the Penitentiary from them. Of course the Penitentiary is not so marked. But you must have the superintendent of the Hospital within call of the institution at all times. How would it be if Dr. Keegan, the General Superintendent of the General Hospital, were wanted in the middle of the night and you had to go outside and find him. Is not his proper place adjacent to the hospital? The same thing applies to the Lunatic Asylum. How would you find the Doctor if he were down on Water Street or some other street and you had to go there to locate him. If you had to pay them cash it would cost you more than it is costing you now. We have the buildings and the houses and everything else of that nature, and it is absurd to say that we should do away with them. This bill, I contend, Mr. Chairman, is going to save thousands and thousands of dollars annually for this country, because that time is gone when a man can after a few years in the service and because he has pull, or has some friend amongst the powers that be, come along and get his full pension, after I say, a couple of years' service. Numerous cases have arisen in which the Governments could not help themselves. Here there is a legal enactment and nothing like this can occur again. It is against the law to pension a man to-morrow after this bill is passed except he has put in the requisite service to warrant the pension. I think, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that this bill as it stands, there may be some amendment as experience will teach, perhaps some improvement or alteration in the future, but on the whole, I think that we may justly claim that we have made a long stride in the starting of a practice that will be of great good to the people of Newfoundland. The pension list has grown to an alarming extent. It is over a hundred thousand dollars to-day. Men have been securing jobs in the civil service after their usefulness is over and then after a few years because they are incompetent they are pensioned. Not long ago, during this session of the House, I cited a case that had come before me, in which the person had asked for a pension because of a temporary

disability. There are cases where people are earning a good living, perhaps a better living than their neighbours of equal ability, and they are also securing pensions from the Government. They have not fulfilled the time of service, but because of some circumstances or other they have been granted a pension. But this cannot happen under this bill.

It is absolutely illegal to pension a person unless the person is entitled to the pension under the bill. It is satisfying a long felt want. I cannot see, Mr. Chairman, how any section of the community or the community as a whole can argue against the provisions of this bill, when this question of emoluments is subject to this bill. If a man serves his full term and he has a salary of two thousand dollars a year, and his emoluments amount to another thousand dollars a year and his retiring allowance is two thirds of his salary, then he also gets two thirds of his emoluments, and if the total of the two is three thousand then he is retired on two thousand dollars a year. This practice will only apply to those people who have been thirty years in the service. I therefore say that this colony is going to be better off. There is going to be a very much smaller pension bill to pay in the future. The present conditions cannot be changed in regard to those who are already enjoying the pension, but I think that it will be welcome that the old pension granting is at an end. I have pointed out the case of the Hospitals and the other institutions. The officials there accept smaller salaries because they receive the emoluments which make their services sufficiently remuneratvie, and I think that it would be an injustice if these emoluments were not properly allowed.

MR. SCAMMELL—It is waste of time to delay the committee on this bill. The Prime Minister has already told us frankly that this is a party measure, and the Government, no doubt from the standpoint of force, are prepared to stand or fall by it. There will be no reason in my moving an amendment that the words be struck out because we would be defeated on it. I object to the principle. If as much time were taken up doing something for the civil servants we would have some sympathy with the speeches made by the hon. members opposite. There is nothing at all to justify spending an afternoon or three afternoons, or a week or a month taking care of those who are well able to take care of themselves or who have already been taken care of by the Government. But for the man who is struggling along with his toes out through his shoes and slaving from morning to night there is no consideration and no help, and no hope. There is no use moving an amendment to this bill, but I am opposed to the principal of perquisites for civil servants, and I shall continue to oppose it as long as I am permitted to occupy a seat in this House or privileged to speak from a platform in this country. There is nothing that the hon. members opposite have said, least of all the remarks of the Minister of Justice, that can justify the position that the Government has taken. You cannot say what perquisites are legally enjoyed by any civil servant in this country. But when the question of pension comes up the Governor in Council arrogates the right to decide what emoluments are being legally enjoyed. I submit that is wrong. How can the Governor in Council decide what emoluments are being enjoyed? But it is futile to argue, futile to debate and I shall have to let the section go as it is without moving an amendment and content myself in registering my personal vote against it.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I must compliment the hon. member on his delightful change of

heart. When a man gets out of power he frequently changes his views. And it is refreshing to consider that the hon. member was for some years a prominent member of the Government that pensioned many men who had been in the Government service not more than two or three years.

MR. SCAMMELL—And I reply to the Hon. Minister of Justice that henceforth I have my own line of public conduct to determine according to the dictates of my own conscience and reason. And for myself, what is past is past. And I still maintain that the principal of emolument figuring in the pensions of public officials is wrong, and it should not be considered in this case. At the same time I would like to say that I thank the Hon. Minister of Justice and the Colonial Secretary for the courtesy which they showed in dealing with my suggestions even if they did not see their way clear to accept them.

Now you come to Section nine. Why not say "every person now receiving." There are people in this country now receiving pensions from the Government, or your predecessors in office, and they may decide at last to go to work. I have in mind the case of a man in Bonavista. A lighthouse kepeer. He was dismissed from his office by the Government of which I was a supporter on that side of the House. He was hanging around the country for a number of years doing nothing and when the present Government came into power they gave him a pension. You might find it convenient to ask that man to go to work. I should like to see it read "Every person in receipt of a superannuation allowance." I think that in the case of men now on the pension list and able to work, that the Government should put them to work.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I should like to tell the hon. member that that point was thoroughly thrashed out at the last sitting of the House, and I think that the hon. member was not present when we came to the conclusion that what the hon. member suggests cannot well be done because the people who have already got pensions have them with the deliberate understanding that their pensions are permanent, and it would be difficult for us to make them come back to work.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I wish to support the suggestion made by the Member for St. Barbe, and I do say that if it is legal for you to put in these words "now receiving or who may receive" I would strongly support the putting in of these words. But if Statute debars this legislation in this way, of course we will have to submit to it. I understand from the Minister of Justice that the Statute debars us from legislating in this way.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, I merely meant to say that these people have got out under a sort of life contract. The statute does not debar us from legislating in this way, because at all times we can revoke or repeal the Statute. But these people have been sent off on a sort of life contract, they went out under that, and if you attempt to round up or call back these people, you will find that in certain cases they have gone out of the country altogether.

MR. HALFYARD — Mr. Chairman, after all the proper working of this act will depend upon the wisdom and sincerity of the Governor in Council. Well then does it not follow if you put in these words that you will be only calling a few back. There will only be a few qualified to do efficient work. But if you put those words in you can say to those people "if you don't come back and take the position which you can fulfil with credit to yourself and benefit to the country, you shall forfeit your pension." I

don't think that by putting in these words we do an injustice to anybody. It only means that we reserve the power to act in cases where we should act. After all I think that we should put these words in. And then let the matter rest as I said before, on the honesty and the justice of the Government, as to whether they will draft a person into the service or not. I can't see any great objection to it. All it will mean is that we will have the power to do something, which might even be a benefit to the individual himself and would certainly be in the interests of economy in connection with the public service.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Chairman, I agree with what Mr. Halfyard has just said. There are strong reasons why the man who has been pensioned should be placed in the same class with the man who is going to be pensioned in the future. Otherwise you will really be discriminating in favour of the man who might be pensioned after the passing of this act. There are a number of people, perhaps not a large number, but be it small or large, they are a number who have not been pensioned in the past, and I think that they are just as eligible, and they have just as great a right to be included in the service of their country provided they are still under the age of sixty five, as persons who might be pensioned after passing seventy. There are a great many anomalies occurring. That reminds me of the old age pension act. That act that was passed last year pensioning widows of old age pensioners. It is only when we saw the act in practise that we saw the weakness and the injustice of it. In Fogo I had three cases come under my notice, where old age pensioners had died previous to the passing of this act. He left a widow, but because he had died before the passing of this act, the widow was not entitled to a pension. Another person dies after the passing of the act, and his widow, though she may be in much better circumstances, still at the same time she is entitled to a pension. Now that is ridiculous. That is why I agree with what Mr. Halfyard has said, as regards that, and I think that that amendment should be put in and we should use the words now receiving or may receive. I think that you will find that that will work out alright. You may not have to call upon those people, but you will be putting them all in the same class.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, the very trouble that we see about this is that if we now insert into this bill a clause giving the Governor in Council power to call upon certain people, surely that it is going to give rise to the worst possible kind of discrimination. We need not be told what is going to occur. If we want to find an excuse for getting back at any political enemy, all we need do is to call on him and if he refuses to go, cancel his pension. On the other hand we will not call upon our political friend who is getting a pension, and is able but too lazy to work when called upon. Now the difference in the two cases is this. So far as this is concerned now it merely deals with those people who have not yet come into existence, under this new scheme.

The weak part about the other is that there are a certain number of people drawing salaries. Now how are you going to get that particular man for instance, to go and man a lighthouse. The Government have taken into consideration that very point. That very point has been thrashed out, and after the matter was considered we came to the conclusion that it was impracticable. It would be interesting to-day to take the pension list and run through it as we did. You will be surprised to find how many people there are on whom you cannot put your finger at

the present time. They have gone abroad. They got their pensions and then they got out.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I quite agree with the remarks made by the Hon. Minister of Justice. The cases may be few and far between. But the case of the lighthouse keeper has been mentioned here. Suppose a vacancy occurred in a certain lighthouse by death or removal. You will have to make a new appointment, to fill that vacancy. Suppose there was a man living there, retired. And if there was no body fit to fill the job why not ask him.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, don't you think that that man would be delighted to go back to his old job, and take an increased salary, than to lie down like an old fossil in the community. If that was the kind of man that he was I would not trust him to take charge of anything. The hon. member has suggested the case of a lighthouse keeper. Supposing now there is a particular light vacant. There is a man near there drawing a pension, and the Government ask this man to take the position. If that man was worth his salt he would take it. But if he refused and you had to force him back, on the style of the press gang in times of war, you would soon have to dismiss him from the position, because the light would be out.

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 Posts and Telegraphs, the Bill entitled "An Act to Further Amend Chapter 35, of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Postal and Telegraph Services,' and the Amending Act 11, George V. Chapter 37 (1920)" 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 Crowe Bill.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, before moving the second reading of this bill, I want to say that when these resolutions were before the House there was only one matter that was particularly objected to by the Opposition, and that was the suggestion made by the Hon. Member for Ferryland and supported by the Leader of the Opposition, that we should try and increase the export duty from fifty cents to a dollar, on wood from that particular section. I undertook to ask Mr. Crowe if that could be done, and I sent the following message on the day after the matter was brought up.

(Reads the message)

Mr. Crowe is now down in Hampden and from there he sent this reply.

(Reads).

And in view of that the Government does not think it wise to press the matter further.

MR. SCAMMELL—I would like to ask the Hon. the Prime Minister whether Mr. Crowe has made any arrangements in the interval, believing that this bill is going to be ratified.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—If he did it is at his own risk.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Cap. 111., 14 Geo. V., entitled 'An Act for the Confirmation of an Agreement between the Government and Harry J. Crowe, Timber Merchant, and for other purposes,'" 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.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like that these two questions be added to the order paper.

MR. HALFYARD—I would like to draw the attention of the Prime Minister to the reply given me to question No. 9 of the order paper. I was hoping that I might get more particulars, whether it would be of much use or not I don't know, but I asked for the statement showing the monthly catch of fish from the various fishing settlements during the season 1925. I was given the catch on the north side of Trinity Bay, but the settlements are not named. I also asked for a statement showing the amount paid each party for the whole season. I should be very pleased if the Prime Minister would take a note of it and ring up, and say that Halfyard did not get the particulars he was looking for, and he would like to have them if they have them on file in the office of the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, April 9th, 1926.

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

Petitions were presented by:

Hon. the Minister of Justice from Torbay re Well.

Hon. Mr. Cramm from Lower Island Cove re Breakwater.

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

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the Bill entitled "An Act to Secure the Better Training of Midwives and to Regulate their Practice," 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, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 125 of the Consolidated Statutes, (Third Series) entitled 'Of Trustees'" 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, the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the Apportionment of Periodical Payments," 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, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 143 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Keeping of Dogs,'" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

MR. CASHIN—I would like to ask the attention of the House to an answer given to a question yesterday while I was out of the House, and an article in the editorial column of the Daily News which appeared this morning in reference to that question. It reads as follows:—

(Reads)

That is the article, and the answer to the question asked by Mr. Power appears in another column of the Daily News showing the duty and sales tax paid. I would like to ask the Finance Minister to explain that answer to the House, as the Daily News evidently takes a crooked view of it.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—I do not know if there is anything to explain. The answer to the question asked by Mr. Power was laid on the

table of the House, and it is as it is in the Customs House.

MR. CASHIN—Since the Minister of Finance won't explain, I will have to explain it myself. Under the new revenue act, brought in last year by the present administration the sales tax is chargeable at cost of goods at point of origination. Under the old Customs' charges sales tax was chargeable on cost plus. Someone comes out in the paper then and tries to give a misleading statement that someone is cooking invoices. It is a crooked view and it only could originate in a crooked mind. Furthermore the information is incomplete. They should go and prove that the information from the Customs' Dept. is correct. I know for a fact of another cargo of coal imported that is not in here at all. It was on April 22nd, 2145 tons and imported by Cashin and Company. I say this for the information of Mr. Power who asked the question. Furthermore when Cashin and Co. got the contract last year to supply the Railway, arrangements were made at $5.65 a ton, but in paying duty of only 5 p.c. at point of origination the Railway made an extra 20 cents a ton. The publishers of this article are crooked, so crooked that they would walk over a wharf and think they were going on a straight path, and I trust that tomorrow they will be good enough to publish a straight explanation.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—I shall have much pleasure in laying on the table of the House to-morrow the invoices. The invoices explain themselves and the Daily News can explain after that.

MR. CASHIN—It is a pity that you did not give them to the News before they published this article. Should there be any further debate I am perfectly satisfied to take part in it. I am not going to have any paper say that we or anyone else are crooked. They themselves are crooked.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Scammell asked a question some time ago for a copy of a proposed agreement submitted to the Government in 1923 by the Dominion Iron and Steel Co., Ltd., and the Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Co. Ltd. I have been endeavouring to get a copy of this agreement and succeeded in finding one among some other documents, and I have much pleasure in laying it on the Table of the House.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Some time ago Mr. Cashin asked a question concerning the penitentiary. The question was read to the House at the time and as the matter is one which is of unusual importance, particularly that the penitentiary is now acquiring some notoriety in poetry, I shall ask permission to give an oral reply and shall table the report as sent by the Superintendent of the Penitentiary. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think it right to-day to say as one who happens to be responsible in this House for any information as to the conduct of that Institution, in justice to the families of any persons who may happen to be confined in that institution, that I don't think the opportunity ought to be allowed to pass without my stating, both officially and as a person who has gone frequently to that place for the past fifteen or twenty years, and who has gone there at all hours, that there could not be found any public building anywhere that is more cleanly kept and better looked after than the Penitentiary. The building is old, of course, and old fashioned, but by reason of the cleanliness and seeing how things are done by those who are superintending it, I think it will be found; and I am not speaking now from the reports of the Grand Juries, which might be termed formal visits, but I say this that I don't think it is at all fair, and I think it is distressing to any person

who might have those near and dear temporarily incarcerated there to be put under the suggestion that it is anything but a properly conducted prison, and I want to say, in justice to Supt. Parsons that I have ever found from him, not only what one would expect from an intelligent man, but a kind hearted Christian man. I do not want to let the occasion pass, and I don't say this in criticism of the questions so far as being called upon to give information, but I do say that it is hardly good enough to have the impression carried abroad more for the purpose of humouring the vagaries of some irresponsible person that this House of Assembly here to-day ought to do anything but have absolute assurance that there is no occasion to worry about the conduct of that institution. As a matter of fact the other day, as an instance of the point I am trying to make, a release order was sent down from our Department to a man who had served a three months' sentence. The release order was sent down by His Excellency the Governor at the start of the winter. The man came and asked not to be turned out on the street. He asked to be kept down for the balance of his sentence. This is not an unusual request. I have been in the Court House several times when the stock crowd would ask Judge Conroy, looking into the calendar and seeing that the winter was not far away, to be given a long sentence. To-day we have a number of people who have gone down there sometimes, as a matter of fact, because they were glad to get there for shelter. I don't think we ought to adopt this idea and convert it into a second tourist hotel. It is filled at all times, and it can't accommodate any more. I do not think we should convert it into a place that is going to be attractive to go to. There is just one point more, and I may as well deal with it now. The question has raised the point about the matter of provision for the families of those in the penitentiary. I think that is a question that has been discussed down through the years, but unfortunately those who suffer are not those who go down, but those who are left behind, who receive nothing in the way of compensation except what may be doled out in the form of poor relief. But when that question was raised, it was suggested that the prisoners be put to work, and get paid for it, and what they earned would be given to their families, but, if you start trying to put on public works, convict labour, you are going to be confronted with objections by the ordinary labourer looking for work. If these men be paid for public work, these prisoners, you certainly have got to bear in mind that there are many men not in prison at all who are trying to get an opportunity to get employment on public works. I beg to table this information, and will be very glad to give any more information that the honourable member may require.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that I am the individual that asked this question, and seeing that I have evidently given the House five or six minutes pleasure this afternoon, I want to state here that I did not ask that question having in mind that the officials of that institution were or were not carrying out their duties. I merely asked for the information, and not to give out the ideas of any irresponsible individual that may be going around the country, as suggested by the Minister of Justice. Now, I think that I am a half responsible person myself, and I know that there have been one or two persons sent down to that institution, who were unfortunate enough to be diseased, and then when they were only down there two or three, or four months, and, in the same place with healthy persons, they were allowed to

go forth again. Now I don't see that there is any joke about that. I think there was a public petition sent to the Executive Government in connection with this matter. I saw one that was sent to me some time ago. Now, I don't think there is any laughing matter attached to this at all. The whole House is in an uproar because some poor unfortunate creature may be sent down to that institution tomorrow, diseased, and after being there a short time, is allowed to go forth again. Now, who is responsible for this? Not I; someone is. There have been people sent down to that institution during the last six months who should never have gone down there. They get a short sentence, and then they are pardoned and vindicated in the public courts. I did not ask to give an afternoon's entertainment to this House. If matters in the Penitentiary are in the state that we are led to believe they are, we want them fixed up; if they are not, we ought to be told so.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest, to the report read by the Hon Minister of Justice. If the report which he has just read is the report that has been prepared by the man in charge of the Institution to which he has referred, then I think that it is high time that we replaced him. There have been a great many reports around the street that he is being pensioned and that so and so is going to take his place. Well I think that it is now time that something should be done. I do not think that it is a proper report in view of the statements that have been made by certain people. I was present at a function one time and I listened to Mr. George B. Ayre give a two hours' speech on the conditions down there, and I am sure that what he said was quite different from the report of the Superintendent. There is a society in St. John's called the Industrial Home Association. They make some statements which they claim are facts. They submit the following facts. At least they call them facts and I suppose it is up to the Minister of Justice to decide whether they are or are not. Some of these facts are that there are persons sent down to that penitentiary, afflicted with venereal disease. Now I think that these facts do not fit in with the report as given, and that a further investigation should be made.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition, raises a different question altogether. That is a matter for the Health Department. And you can't always take statements of fact as being statements of real fact. I had the privilege the other day of being called upon by a number of ladies belonging to the Women's Franchise League. Amongst other things they stated that there were 28 houses of ill fame in St. John's. I frankly told them that I thought I knew St. John's pretty well, and I did not think that there were eight. But at any rate I told them that if they would give me the names of the persons to whom I could look for the information, the twenty-eight houses would be raided on the following day. I have heard nothing about the matter to this day. Now it is just as well not to go into hysterics about statements that this is a terribly immoral country. Like all ideas, sometimes it is just a case of over enthusiasm. It is the same with all other questions. It is like the Liquor question. Sometimes people get a distorted view of the case altogether. Now speaking from the standpoint of professional knowledge I want to say that so far as immorality is concerned it is not to be found only among the lower classes of the people.

HIS HONOR THE SPEAKER—This discussion is entirely out of

order and it must cease.

Answers to Questions

The answers to the following questions were tabled with the exception of No. 3 which was deferred.

Notice of Question

(1) MR. DUFF asked Hon. the Colonial Secretary what was Mr. Patrick Mahoney, Conception Harbour, paid for work done for Highroads Commission during 1925; was he paid by days work or by piece work.

(2) MR. HICKMAN asked Hon. the Colonial Secretary to lay upon the Table of the House a copy of Report of John Forbes, to the Governmnet, re Bell Island matter.

(3) MR. HICKMAN asked Hon. the Colonial Secretary to lay upon the Table of the House all correspondence between the Government and the British Empire Steel Corporation, the Dominion Iron & Steel Co., Nova Scotia Steel Co., and the Dominion Coal Co. since 1920.

(4) MR. ASHBOURNE asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay upon the Table of the House a statement showing the amount received as the Colony's share of profits on the manufacture of seals landed by S. S. Prospero and S.S. Sagona at the Sealfishery in 1925.

Replies to Questions.

No. 2.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member I discovered in the Department of the Colonial Secretary a document, being a report made by Mr. Forbes in 1920, on the proposed taxation of the Bell Island ores. This is rather an important looking volume, and as it is the only copy we have in the department, I would be glad if the hon. member would return it after he has perused its contents.

No. 4.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member I may say that we have not yet received a statement from Murray & Crawford. As I said in reply to a question asked a little earlier in the session by Capt. Randell, we have received an amount on account, but no statement of actual returns has been yet furnished by Murray & Crawford, as they tell us that there are some matters outstanding and they have not yet got their accounts adjusted.

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 Civil Service Protection.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether the members of the Opposition are ready yet for these resolutions. I don't want to press the matter, or use any undue haste in respect to these resolutions regarding the civil service. We have thrashed out all the clauses with the exception of the insurance clauses. Two or three times I have invited the House to give their views on the insurance clause as to the principle of insurance. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition the other day asked the question as to whether the Government was prepared to consider the underwriting of the risks themselves. I think I explained before, and I certainly feel now that looking at it from the business standpoint, I would like to have the views put forward by the insurance companies themselves, and consider after receiving their tenders as to whether it would be advisable for the Government to take the risks themselves.

I do not feel inclined to decide whether the Government should take that risk themselves, without seeing proposals that may be put up by competing underwriters. I have claimed that events go to show that the railway people since they adopted group insurance have benefited by not being

their own underwriters. Furthermore I claim that the Government insurance that was arranged by Mr. Halfyard, when he was Minister of Justice, for the Post Office, and later when he was Colonial Secretary, for a few other departments, has proved as far as I can see, that there was no money in the proposition for the insurance companies. We know, however, that insurance companies are not philanthropic associations. They distribute their insurance all over the world, and by this general distribution, they may get stuck in one place but they can make a profit in another, and after all taking it on the average, they find it very good business. I doubt whether it would be good policy for the Government to adopt this insurance business as a Government measure, unless we saw that the premiums asked were very much bigger than what appeared to be a possibility of arranging. Some gentleman has said "Look at this thirty thousand dollars going out of the country." But you would have to expend that on the very insurance scheme that you propose. You would have in the first place to establish an insurance office. You would have to start a regular insurance business to take care of it. The regular insurance companies have actuaries. They have a system. Branches only appeal to the head office to tell them what to do. In this case I am afraid, in case of death or disability, you would have a great deal of difficulty in countering the claims that would come into the Government. So I think on the whole that it would be a very expensive matter.

One gentleman speaking on this matter the other day, I think it was Mr. Browne, member for St. John's West, suggested that we have the insurance scheme administered through the instrumentality of the officials of the Newfoundland Government Savings Bank. Now, if depositors at that Bank knew that there was any risk going on with their money, what would they think?

MR. BROWNE—We might deposit the money there that would be collected on the premiums; but that would have nothing to do with the Bank deposits. I simply made the suggestion because the officials there are by no means overworked.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER —It seemed to be the suggestion of the honourable member that that office would be prepared to conduct the work, but if they could not conduct the work, it would mean building up a new department at considerable expense. I very much doubt if any officials of any department in the civil service would care to take upon themselves the work of this insurance, in addition to their own work, if the insurance was underwritten by the Government. For that reason I say, if we could get insurance done by an outside company and at such rates as have been suggested then we ought to do it. There are large concerns in this country that have group insurance in effect with Canadian and American companies because it is found to be advantageous to do so, and, as I have said before, we should, at least, get quotations from outside companies before undertaking a scheme ourselves. What I wish to impress upon the whole House again is the desirability of getting the opinions of all honourable members as to the rightfulness or wrongfulness of a group insurance scheme covering the civil service.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, with reference to the Resolutions before the Chair I may say that we have not yet finished with the sections preceding the insurance clause. Yesterday there was a clause proposed by the Colonial Secretary and which was let stand over for some alteration and approval; but as we are dealing with the insurance part of the Resolutions,

I propose now to make some comment. As I have previously stated, insurance of any kind is a good thing, especially life insurance for the surviving relatives of any deceased man who have no other means of income; but this scheme outlined by the Government is such a vast one that it should be given a great deal of consideration, and it is a scheme that would be very beneficial generally, if it included others as well as Government officials. Now I have the same opinion at the present time as I had at the beginning, namely, that this insurance should be underwritten by the Government instead of by any outside company or companies. We all know that no insurance company is in business for the good of its health; rather is it in business to make money. I know that upon a certain class of insurance from fifty to sixty per cent. is paid out in Commission, and which would mean that if a life insurance company collected a thirty thousand dollar premium on certain class of insurance they would pay away fifteen thousand dollars or more in commission to their agents, but, if that insurance was handled by the Government themselves, they would have that amount of money to put by as a fund to start with.

THE HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—The commission is nothing like that for group insurance.

MR. CAHILL—Group insurance is on an entirely different footing to the ordinary individual applicant, as is also the commission paid on the premiums collected. As a life insurance man of some experience, I cannot understand how companies quote the low rates they do on group insurance. The only reason as has been pointed out by the Prime Minister, that they undertake such business at all is because of the large area that their risks take in. It is a fact, however, that it is only the larger and well established companies touch group insurance at all.

MR. HICKMAN—I thank the honourable member for his information, but that does not enlighten us very much. I said that fifty to sixty percent. commission was paid on a certain class by Life Insurance Companies and that if they took in thirty thousand dollars in premiums on group insurance on the same basis would pay away fifteen thousand dollars or more to their agents in commission the first year.

MR. CAHILL—Specifically they do not. The commission paid on group insurance is very small, and nothing like fifty per cent.

MR. HICKMAN—For the following years after the first agent is paid ten per cent. for collecting that thirty thousand dollars and which commission would go a long way towards paying clerks and actuaries, if the insurance was underwritten by the Government. Howvere, I think the thing is very important and I think that, if possible, we should see that other people are covered as well as employees of the Government. It was pointed out by the Hon. Member for St. John's West (Mr. Browne) the other day how a big scheme of this nature could be evolved and availed of by all classes. It is easy enough for the Government to arrive at how this could be done. They could get an actuary to straighten out the whole thing at the start and outline to the Government a system, which could be thought over afterwards and accepted, if thought advisable. Now I am going to make this suggestion—not that the Opposition members as an Opposition are opposing the resolutions—that this matter be referred to a Commission to consider and to report back at the next session of the Legislature, after they have thoroughly gone into this insurance scheme, with a view to introducing something feasible into the House

next year whereby group insurance could be taken out protecting Government and other employees as well. This is a very important matter, Mr. Chairman, and I do not believe that we can discuss it intelligently in a short time. The information we have is not very much and the members on either side of the House have no time to go thoroughly into the matter for information. The suggestion I have offered is made in all seriousness by me and not in any way to impede the progress of the Bill.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman, it was rather interesting to listen to the Minister of Justice this afternoon deploring the fact that some persons are alleging that the people in this country are morally worse than they are in other countries. In that I agree with him; but when we come to the question of what the Government can do in the way of State Insurance or any other undertaking that would be beneficial to the people as a whole he takes a different view altogether. Now, if we go across to Great Britain we find an insurance scheme administered by the British Government. In Australia and New Zealand the Governments do the same and with profit; and I cannot see why the Government of this country are not just as capable to carry on such a life insurance scheme. The Governments of the British possessions I have mentioned have their own employees to look after the insurance work, and as has been pointed out by previous speakers, there is no reason why the profits that would go to an outside insurance company could not be devoted to paying the salaries of persons identified with a department that would be created, if the Government here did their own insurance. I submit that this is a question that merits serious and mature consideration on the part of the Government. But to bring in a measure of this kind with so little consideration given to it and expect it to be rushed through at this session shows that the Government have not taken the matter seriously, and I think that the suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition that this matter be referred to a commission to deal with in detail is a wise one.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER —Mr. Chairman, may I call the honourable member's attention to the fact that it is only proposed to give the Government power to put a scheme into effect, after they get the facts. There is no desire on the part of the Government to rush this through now. We are only proposing to put the same power in the hands of the Governor-in-Council, as the Leader of the Opposition proposes to put in the hands of a Commission. The only difference is that in the one case after the Governor-in-Council get the power and the information they require, the insurance would be affected.

MR. GRIMES—I think that a Commission comprising men from both sides of this House, some of whom having expert knowledge of the insurance business, could advise the whole House far better than the Governor-in-Council, and I think that it would have more confidence from the country. I trust, therefore, that the suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition will be accepted by the Government.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is no question whatever but that we have arrived at a stage when not alone must civil servants be considered in this insurance matter, but all persons, whether they belong to trades, professions or any other class. If this scheme of insurance that we are discussing in the Resolutions was approved of to-day, it would be voting money for one particular class, and no consideration for the producing classes of the country. What about the fisherman, the miner, the laborer and the mechanic? Are not they entitled

to as much consideration at the hands of the Government, as are the civil servants. Personally, I consider that the fishermen, who bring wealth into the country, are, at least, entitled to as much consideration as those—the Life Insurance Companies—who bring wealth out of the country. There is no member, I care not on what side of the House he sits, can defend the proposition that we have before us now and dare he show his face in any constituency next election, if that was put before the people. Whilst I think that civil servants should be given the benefit of insurance, I also think that any other men of any other class should be given the same opportunity. I, therefore, support the amendment.

MR. CAHILL—Mr. Chairman, I should like to make a few observations on this matter of insurance in connection with the new Pensions for Civil Servants Bill, and I do so for two reasons: first, because the Prime Minister has invited into this discussion a free expression of opinion, having announced that the Measure is not a party one, and secondly, because I am very much in favor of the inclusion in this Pensions Bill of a life insurance scheme. In conversation with a friend of mine yesterday this matter came up casually. He had a different view to myself and he asked me if I was going to speak on it and I said I did not know. He thought it a mistake for me to speak on it and he suggested that I remain silent because if I spoke favorably of it it would be suggested I did so because I was personally interested. Even if I am closely connected with a life insurance company, I would be more or less disloyal, I think, to that profession if I did not speak on this question now before the Chair, and it would certainly show a lack of moral courage on my part if, being conscientiously and genuinely in favour of this insurance scheme, clear altogether of any personal interest, I fail to express that favourable opinion on an occasion like this merely through fear of having my motives misunderstood or misrepresented.

I think that the life insurance clause, irrespective of whether the insurance is going to be effected by an outside company or by the Government, is a valuable part of the pensions to Civil Servants Bill. I think it a sort of supplement and rounds off the Bill. One particular case that it meets is that of a man who enters the civil service in early life and is cut off suddenly in middle life. Under this scheme his widow and children get this life insurance. Now what will this life insurance mean to civil servants generally? First of all we are discussing a special kind of life insurance, known as group insurance, which has features entirely different to the ordinary policy that an ordinary individual man buys. Group insurance can only be got by employees through the fact that they are members of the one organization and that the organization itself pays at least fifty per cent. of the premium. A man can not get it himself. In other words a civil servant then will be able to get, under the scheme before the House for discussion, life insurance that possibly he otherwise could not get at all, and he will get it at an infinitely cheaper rate than for what he would get an individual policy outside. Having dealt with insurance from the point of view of the civil servant, I shall deal with it from the viewpoint of the Government with an idea of improving the civil service. What is the effect of an insurance scheme of this kind? It will have the same effect as it has on commercial organizations. It will establish a better feeling between the Government and the employees and make for a better esprit de corps, and all this means increased efficiency in the civil ser-

vice. We have heard a lot recently about improving the morale of the civil service. Well, the morale of the service will be considerably improved with the inauguration of a scheme of this kind. By the way it must be remembered that the money that is going to be paid out in premiums on a scheme of this kind will occasion no extra expenditure by the Government; but rather a saving, because it is money that is going to be saved by the new pension scheme. It is precisely for the reasons that I have just mentioned that large commercial corporations effect this group insurance. They do not take it out for sentimental motives, they do it with a view to get their returns in dollars and cents, and which they get in the way of increased efficiency on the part of their employees that a scheme of this kind promotes. It has been said in this House that this insurance is no benefit to the man anyhow because he is dead when it is paid to his dependents. But that argument surely is not serious, because any married man who takes out a life insurance policy usually takes it out partly at least for the sake of his wife and family in case anything should happen him. Surely any civil servant presented with a life insurance policy which guarantees to him that should he die his wife and family will be provided for to the extent of a certain amount of money will have a certain amount of worry taken off his mind, and it will be a valuable consideration to him and he will appreciate it. But I am quite satisfied to emphasize this point, that it is not to the civil servant himself that the money will be paid, but to his wife and family when he is gone; for no matter how much he may have enjoyed or possess the good things of this life, by reason of having received a fairly good salary, still he may not leave his dependents very well off, particularly if he is taken away suddenly, and this insurance money may make a material differnece to the family in many cases, making the members of that family better citizens through providing for them a better education, or a better environment, and generally the comforts and advantages which money can provide. These would be indirect results, but I have an idea that the results will come back directly, as well as indirectly, because it is known that in many cases where civil servants die leaving large families the Government of the country is called upon to make a monetary contribution to families of civil servants who have been left not sufficiently provided for, and that means money taken from the general funds of the Colony to meet these cases. Now with this life insurance plan in force the Government will have no such calls upon it in the future.

Another one of the objections to this scheme that I have met with in discussion is that the civil servants are already well paid enough—that statement has been deliberately made on the floors of this House. I cannot agree with this, as I was certainly under the impression that the general run of civil servants are not overpaid. And I do know that civil servants living in this town particularly on comparatively small salaries have to meet calls and expenses that perhaps they do not have to meet in other places, and with the small salaries paid they must have a hard time to get along.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Hasn't the fisher man got a hard time to get along?

MR. CAHILL—I am not discussing that just now; I am dealing with the point that civil servants are not now sufficiently or too well paid. It does so happen that there are excluded from the operation of this scheme two classes of civil servants who are certainly not too well paid. The first is the police, but they are excluded

precisely because they already have an insurance scheme of their own—no one would say that a policeman is overpaid. The second is the Railway employees, and the same reason applies to them, but in their case it was in effect when the Railway was a private concern. And personally I think that if these get it, the other branches of the civil service are justified in demanding that they who have not this protection should be put in on a similar scheme. They can claim I think it unfair to give it to the police and the railway and not to the others. One of the proofs adduced to show that civil servants are well enough paid is that there are so many applicants for the positions. Of course that is not a real argument at all. If there are numerous applications it is because people are underpaid in other occupations. And two wrongs do not make a right.. The Government should treat its employees justly irrsepective of what outside organizations are doing.

Now another reason that has been operating is that possibly members have looked at it from the standpoint of political expediency. In other words the thought that among some of the people of this country, notably in the outports, there would be the feeling that we are doing nothing for the general people of the country, and that the civil servants are getting everything, and they wouldn't like to go to a constituency where that feeling existed. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to pose as a political purist, but I certainly do not think that any member should take that position. The feeling ought to be that this can be done for the civil servants in fairness and propriety, and that it would have quite an effect on the efficiency of the service. And perhaps it may be the prelude to others; I say that in answer to Mr. Grimes—that it may be but the prelude to similar schemes in other directions. But I do the hon. members of this House the justice of believing that they will not vote on the basis of this argument, but will vote as members of this House, and that if they think it is for the good of the civil service and of the country generally they will vote for it, irrespective of political considerations.

Now I have considered the general question or principle as to whether we should have this insurance at all, and the only other point is as to the form it will take. Whether it will go to outside insurance companies or be taken up by the Government, that, however, is only a detail; all this House is asked to do is to give its approval to this scheme. I entirely agree with the Hon. Leader of the Opposition when he says that we ought not put this in effect until we get all the information possible, and certainly if it were given to an outside company the lowest tender could be accepted; we should get the best bargain possible—in that I entirely agree with him. Personally I have no hesitation in expressing my opinion that the Government after investigation will decline to accept the risk of handling the insurance itself. You must remember that the Government would be dealing with a comparatively small group, and if anything happened, such as an epidemic, they would lose heavily.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Wouldn't Railway employees come under that.

MR. CAHILL—No, they are already insured with a regular life insurance company.

I have only one other thing to say. I noted recently that the Bank of Montreal has insured 4000 employees under group insurance with an insurance company. That may be of interest to members, and bears out my argument, I think, for it shows: first, that if such a concern as the Bank of Montreal, who could well handle

it, hand it over to an outside concern, there must be little possible profit in it, and on the other hand too much risk; secondly, that it is done purely as a business proposition which it is known will return good dividends. There are many other phases of this question I could go into, but don't think it advisable just now. I will say that as far as I am concerned I honestly think that it will be of benefit to the whole civil service, and that it will be of advantage to the country at large, and the country will get good value for the comparatively small expenditure involved if not directly, as I think they will, they will certainly get it indirectly. I give the pension scheme my hearty support, and also intend to give the Life Insurance part my hearty support, and intend to vote for them.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that I think the time of this House would be much better spent in efforts to reduce taxation which is already too great a burden on the people, rather than trying to increase this burden. I have as yet heard no argument which would justify us to authorize the Executive in spending this money. My contention is that if the civil servants want insurance they should be called upon to pay, not 50 p.c., but 100 p.c. of the premiums. They, or their dependents will get 100 p.c., so why not pay it. If that were the argument I should be certainly in favour of it, as I like other speakers, favour insurance as a protection.

MR. CAHILL—The employer must pay half the insurance in this case.

MR. ASHBOURNE—I understood Mr. Cahill to tell us that the employer could pay all. As far as I am concerned, I cannot give my vote to this. Why should 2000 people receive a benefit, and the remainder of 250,000 pay for that benefit. It may be argued that the civil servants are underpaid, but I say that others are also underpaid—the fishermen, the loggers, the farmers, but we are leaving them alone. Take the ordinary fisherman who has a family to support, and has to insure himself if he wants to get protection and who probably gets $400 or $500 a year. Let the civil servant go and take out a policy on his own life—the civil servant has ready money, and it is not so with many of the producers of this country. Furthermore, take the case of old age pensions; a fisherman who toils up to the age of 75 years, is given $50.00 a year. And then you come in and talk about giving $15000 to provide for civil servants. I consider that this House should be taking more time in talking of reducing taxation, so as to allow people in our outports to live, rather than be considering ways and means to increase it. Mr. Hickman suggested this afternoon that the matter should be left to a commission—I think that is a good idea and heartily endorse it. As I said before, if this is effected for the civil service, it must be effected for all classes, and all male citizens, and perhaps female, should be allowed to participate, but particularly the producers. I just want to say that I consider I have voiced my sentiments strongly enough, and don't think this House is in any doubt about them.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, I did not propose to take up the time of this House for long, as I am somewhat in accord with the idea. But I have one or two observations to make, and shall do so as briefly as I can. In the first place Mr. Cahill has this afternoon given us a dissertation on life insurance that I feel no one will disagree with. We all approve I believe, of the group insurance scheme. But that is not what is agitating my mind—I quite agree that we ought to have more group insurance in Newfoundland; the only think that is agitating my mind is as to how far we

should go with the matter. This occurs to me because of the constituency I represent in this House—and it is because I think of my constituents that I speak here now of that. We have in that district especially since they are nearly all the bank fishermen, the Bank Fisherman's Insurance Act, and last year the Government collected the sum of $500,as premiums—what they paid out I do not know. But I do know that if a man is lost the most he can get under that is $80. The way it is done is that every man contributes 50c. and the owner of the vessel 25c. That is a small contribution, and in the event of death, all the dependents can get is $80—it is true that the State has stepped in to help the Bank fishery. I hesitate to vote for this unless I see that there is some other scheme for the insurance of the Bank Fishermen. I don't care whether it is by the Government as a Government, or the State as a State, or by some outside company, but here we have the Bank fishermen getting only $80.

MR. W. BROWNE—And then it must be the result of an accident at the fishery.

MR. WARREN—Yes, actually at the fishery. Until that is discussed I hesitate to vote for this Bill for the reason that some other scheme ought to be evolved. Even if they have to pay for it themselves it ought to be established somehow. My only reason for speaking at all is that I feel the men who sent me here would be disappointed if I let this go through and left out the Bank fishery altogether.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—Mr. Chairman, one would take it from the debate that this is the first time a Government of this country have attempted to deal with such a question. Now it must be within the knowledge of many members of this Assembly that although it is the first time it has come up for discussion in this Assembly, the revenue of this country has been called upon to pay insurance for civil servants. I remember that one of the first things I was called upon to do as Minister of Agriculture & Mines in 1924, was to pay a premium of insurance, and I understand that the former Minister of Posts, Mr. Halfyard, who effected group insurance, was also called upon to do the same. As far as I am concerned, and I want the House to clearly understand that I should be the last to hesitate to discriminate against the men whom I represent, I am one who advocated old age pensions—I have been interested in and favoured them since I entered this House. I remember one time when in opposition there was a considerable vote asked for for the Mounted Police, $20,000 I think, and Sir Michael Cashin moved as an amendment that it be given to old age pensions, I seconded the motion. It was debated, but members of the Government saw fit to vote it down. Some time after the member from Fortune came into office and one of the first things he did was to increase the vote by $15000, and his action was appreciated, and I personally gave him credit from every platform I could. And when this measure was brought in I made enquiry of the Prime Minister and have the assurance that these men will not be forgotten, and a substantial vote will be made so that these men will be attended to. Further, there are a number of widows of old age pensioners unprovided for. Last year the Act was amended so that the widows can get the advantage of the pension, but widows of pensioners before that cannot do so. Let us hope that the Government will see that these are provided for.

Now with regard to the bill before the House. At first blush when the matter was mentioned to me I saw in the insurance clause a means of

offsetting what in my opinion and which I am now convinced was a very considerable reduction in the emoluments that would accrue to the civil servants under the old system. It is a matter of common knowledge that men in the civil service, during the past four or five years, for only a few months or one or two years occupying some position, have been retired under big pensions, sometimes amounting to as much as two hundred dollars a month. It is an injustice. It is not of our making. It is a heritage. It is not the making of our predecessors in office, but has been handed down from time immemorial until the Government found as stated by the Colonial Secretary the other day the pension list had reached alarming proportions, and the Government was faced by the fact that something had to be done to reduce the expenditure. It is a hundred thousand dollars a year at the present time. The present Government under the leadership of Mr. Monroe has prepared and brought in this bill and it is felt that sufficient money can be saved by the introduction of the civil service pension scheme to cover the cost of the insurance provided this House decides upon the adoption of this scheme.

I have given the matter serious thought since the matter came before the House and have listened to the different speakers with considerable interest, and have discussed it with those outside the House who have read the reports of the debates and I want to endorse the suggestion made this afternoon, and also made three or four days ago by the Leader of the Opposition that serious consideration should be given to the suggestion that the Government itself should find itself in the position to handle the insurance itself. Life insurance companies make enormous profits. In the Prudential Life ten thousand per cent. was made on the original investment. The New York life is similar. And it is a fact that it is almost impossible to buy stock in these companies. All I know is that the Sun Life and the Canada Life and Mr. Cahill's Company, I don't know what the name is, are not here for their health. They are not philanthropists. They are not going to take over this business as a charity proposition. And if these people can see money in it, why not the state. I have very much pleasure in supporting the motion of the Leader of the Opposition that the committee be appointed. There is no serious objection to a year's delay. At most there may be one or two members of the civil service drop off and you may have to go to the extent of making a special provision for the families of these men if they should be called away. I have personal knowledge of cases where men have died and for as long a period as five years a thousand dollars per year of the public moneys have been paid to the widows and the orphans of the civil servant. If there should be one or two deaths and the families left destitute there is no reason why the Government should not take care of them. And during the recess the commission may have an opportunity of getting down expert advice, and when the House meets the committee may be able to submit to this House a proposition. I merely want to make these few remarks so that there will not be any misunderstanding with regard to my attitude. I have always assumed a sincere attitude in connection with any increase that may be had in our old age pensions and whether I sit in this House for one year or ten years my voice will always be raised in favour of that deserving class of Newfoundland.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—I think that this debate has gone so far that it is not a difficult thing to see the attitude of the House

with regard to the matter of insurance. You will remember on the opening day when this bill was first debated the Prime Minister intimated to the House that the question of insurance would not be a party measure. I think that the wisdom of this action has been borne out by the variety of opinions that have been expressed with regard to the matter not alone on the principal of insurance, but on the methods to be adopted whereby the insurance may be effected. The Government has not been unaware of the importance of this matter, and as some of the hon. members stated this afternoon, it has been given considerable attention for the last four or five months, and it is because we saw the difficulty of this very nature that we did not feel inclined to go to the party and coerce the party to vote for a scheme so replete with difficulties, and I think that the wisdom of the Government in bringing in a non-party measure has been justified because of the difference of opinion that exists in this Legislature. I think that the principal of insurance will be admitted by all. I have not yet heard one member in this House since the debate started oppose the principal of insurance, whether it is state insurance, or group insurance by the Government or group insurance by companies. The whole difficulty is to find out what is best to be done, and not to do something that may down the whole scheme. Before we came into office the Post Office had a system of Government insurance. The premiums for the insurance were paid entirely by the Government, and the money taken out of the contingencies of the Post Office. Mr. Halfyard was the Minister of Posts in 1923 and I do not think that he had the authority of the Government. Mr. Halfyard did it on his own responsibility and did not get the approbation of the Government, and introduced a system of insurance like that which we have been debating only in this case the premiums will not all be paid by the Government.

MR. WARREN—I did not know of it until a long time after. Mr. Halfyard was the Minister of Posts and inaugurated the scheme. They asked the Auditor General if they could pay the premiums out of the contingencies of the Department without letting the Government know. The Auditor General told them that they could and the Government did not know anything about it until long after.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—I think that the explanation given by the hon. member was quite correct. That was my impression. That is the information that we got about it. It went on for practically three years and the last premium was paid last January. Since that the insurance scheme has been cancelled. Now we find another group, after the Post Office had been so successful in getting their insurance scheme through without any interference. Another little group had a little scheme of its own. That was in effect for twelve months before it was discovered by the Government. Certain negotiations took place between certain civil servants and certain deputy heads of departments, and it went so far that we had to pay a whole year's premiums. But the insurance company did not make very much out of that because Mr. Donnelly happened to die two or three months before the expiry of the policy and his executors practically cleaned up the whole of the premiums collected. But the Government has been made to realise that a certain section of the civil service has been looking for something of this nature, and hence this system of insurance, and we thought that this system of insurance was a sound one. Evidently many thought it was, and what we are asked to do is to give the matter con-

sideration. We are not asking to-day that the State pay the whole premium. We are making the man insured participate in the insurance. Whether the insurance is held by some insurance company or whether it is held by the Government that it is a very vicious principal for the Government to take up the business of some private person or corporation. I do not believe in any government entering into any business transaction. I do not believe in the principal. Suppose that two thousand persons in the civil service were to ask the government for group insurance and the Government took it up. Immediately we would need an insurance department that would cost thousands of dollars a year and would have to get an expert to take charge of it who would understand the conditions, etc., of the insurance policies. Before you would know it,it would cost us perhaps fifteen thousand dollars. On the other hand these companies are organised and have their long years of experience and have got the matter down to a science and can take one survey of the situation and can tell what it is going to cost. These are big monetary institutions with tremendous financial backing. No matter what occurs nothing can happen to make the policy valueless. But what position would the Government be in if it took up the two thousand civil servants and insured thier lives and an epidemic occurred. We might have to pay out fifty or a hundred thousand dollars in a year. The insurance had to pay on account of the railway six or eight thousand dollars in one month. If you were to take it as an average of six thousand dollars a month that would be seventy two thousand dollars a year. And the liability is there all the time. You must have some money behind it to pay your insurance claims or else it is not insurance at all. The Treasury must be prepared early to set aside so much for the insurance scheme. The Railway pays twenty thousand dollars a year for insurance premiums. I have just been handed a statement by the Prime Minister in regard to this subject.

(Reads statement)

The premiums paid in two and a half years amount to $57,500.00 that is over twenty thousand dollars a year and the claims paid for the same period, from July 1st, 1923, until Mar. 1926 amounted to $69,400.00. In other words the insurance company paid the railway twelve thousand dollars more than they received in premiums. Now take this Post Office matter. My friend, Mr. Halfyard, over there, was enthusiastic over it, and I think that these figures will justify his faith in what he was doing.

(Reads)

The premiums paid were $9,569.39. The claims paid during the same period from December, 1921, to December, 1925, were ten thousand dollars. In other words the company paid the post office five hundred dollars more than the premiums that were paid. In the case of the Railway this insurance does not protect the Government against death by accident. It is nothing but life insurance. The Government is still liable for the fifteen hundred dollars in case of accident. Now this group No. 2 was in effect for the short period of one year. The premiums were $4,432. The claims paid were eighteen hundred dollars, and then the policies were cancelled, as well as the policies at the post office. Now, Mr. Chairman, I think that these figures are sufficient to show what liability the Government would be incurring under these conditions. This scheme as far as I can understand from the insurance companies is so comprehensive and covering a long period of years that it works out that the company finally makes something out of it. But as I said it is amazing what a small

amount of premiums these companies will accept for the amount of the insurance effected. I suppose that it is worked out on a scientific basis. And there is another thing that we can consider right here. There are many men in the civil service who cannot get insurance. But these men are not exempt from insurance under this group insurance. They can get this insurance and you can appreciate what a great consolation that is to a man when he knows that if he dies that his money will be left to his dear ones. Many cases arise in which the families of civil servants have been left absolutely destitute as the late Minister of Justice knows, and if they were not practically supported by the Government they would be thrown out on the street destitute. This scheme of insurance is submitted to the House in all honesty and fairness. The Government is not looking for any prestige on account of it. I think that it would be a great thing if to-day we were bringing in a bill insuring every fisherman and labourer of this country, and I hope that the day is not very far distant when we will be doing so.

But I think, Mr. Chairman, that the suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition has merit because in any case we cannot run this thing through the House hurriedly. This bill contemplates giving the Governor in Council the authority to negotiate and arrange some scheme to put the thing in operation. I do not think that the Hon. the Prime Minister and the members of this House are very emphatic in putting this thing into operation immediately, but I think that the debate that has taken place is ample evidence that the House is at least in sympathy with some system of insurance. I do not want to delay the House any longer, Mr. Chairman, and I feel that perhaps the Prime Minister may wish to give the House some ideas about giving the Governor in Council authority in respect to this bill. The pensions part of the bill is partly adopted, and I hope to see the scheme go into effect immediately. In regard to the insurance I feel sure that the Government will be glad to co-operate with the House in evolving some scheme that will be agreeable to both sides.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I was going to suggest that the Committee rise, report some progress and ask leave to sit again, as Mr. Hickman says that they propose some amendment in connection with the soldiers under the act. I do not know as to whether the hon. members would like to have these resolutions printed again. There is only one clause uncertain.

(Reads)

Now as regards the insurance scheme I move that that passage be inserted in this section and when the resolutions come before us again in the form of a bill they will be amended. We will leave the insurance out of the bill at the present time. The intention is to get the views of the House as to whether an insurance scheme would meet with approval or not. We are not pressing the matter at all, but we feel perfectly satisfied to have the matter stand over until next session of the Legislature as suggested by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. I do not see much sense in a committee sitting on this and going into details about the various schemes only to find that the House wants to vote it to old age pensions and not to insurance for the civil servants at all. I think that we might get the opinion of this side of the House and Mr. Hickman might convey to us what their opinions are, and we would then have the necessary data to bring in a bill at the next sitting of the legislature.

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 amendments, and recommended the introduction of a Bill to give effect to the same.

On motion this Report was received and adopted. Whereupon the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Civil Service Protection" 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 Posts and Telegraphs, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Further Amend Cap. 35 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Postal and Telegraph Services, and the Amending Act 11, George V. Cap. 37 (1920)."

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 Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Cap. 111, 14 Geo. V., entitled "An Act for the Confirmation of an Agreement between the Government and Harry J. Crowe, Timber Merchant, and for other purposes."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—We have already passed this Bill through the House in its "Resolutions" form and there is only one other point raised by the Member for Ferryland. In reference to that I undertook to telegraph to Mr. Crowe, not having any connection with the International Paper Company. I read his message to the House yesterday on the second reading of the Bill. I think that the members of the Opposition will probably agree with me that Crowe takes a position, a very reasonable one, that these people should not be approached, having been assured that the Act would not be interfered with. Conditions of contract might be improved on, on a good many grounds if we could get them improved. It is possible, I almost think it is probable that Crowe, being a very able arguer in his own interests, has interested these people, and it might put them right off to suggest any amendment to the Resolutions as they understand them. For that reason, I would like to have them put through without further alterations, except one. That is in Clause 12, in connection with Customs' dues payable. The words, which have been used before in such agreements and appear in the Besco contract "not including hand tools" should be inserted. This will ensure payment of duty on axes, picks and shovels and such tools. Is it the desire of the Opposition to have the Bill read through again? There is no other alteration and the Bill appears as in the Resolutions.

MR. CASHIN—I am not going to oppose anything that is going to give labor to the men in the North. I can bear out that by saying that if I wanted to be cantankerous objection could have been taken to the form of the Resolutions. They were brought in in a wrong manner. They were framed by a Member of the Executive Government. They could have been objected to and thrown out as probably they should have been. We want to get the best possible agreement for the country, but I don't see why Crowe or anybody else should only

pay fifty cents a cord on wood. One dollar should be paid. I wanted a royalty of $1.00 instead of 50c., which he has refused, and I can see his way of thinking, for he has us on the jump. The resolutions were drawn up by a member of the Executive Council, and which he admitted in a gentlemanly enough way was wrong. I think that is enough to show that it is not intended to alter them. It is not my intention, nor has it been to hold up these—it is true that some created a furore when they appeared. But I still contend that the royalty should be $1.00 on the cut. If the Government assures us that they have done the best they could I will let it go, but Mr. Crowe holds us in the hollow of his hand, and we have no guarantee that the International Paper Co. will come in here at all. Just as often before, our peculiar position is being taken advantage of—our people are poor, and that condition must be considered. It is high time for us to cry "halt," and we must realize that if the country is to develop this as an industry, the exportation of pulp, we must stop this sort of thing. Are we going to let this thing go, either members of the Government or on this side of the House? No member will let any chance slip to benefit his country knowingly, but are we doing it, Mr. Chairman? The same thing will apply to the Besco resolutions. The argument will be that we are poor, and something has to be done, and someone take the initiative. Let us try to get rid of adventurers coming into the country and exploiting it; men without any interest in it—their only interest as far as we are concerned is in their pockets. The International Paper Co. and Mr. Crowe are here just to clean up. They will pay Newfoundland 50c. and we are getting $1.00 for export of pulpwood from the Humber—and there was a general election fought over that. All I can say is that I really don't know whether we are doing right or wrong; I know it concerns the industrial life of the country. Are we doing the right thing by letting this go through. There is one thing, and that is that only a small part of the country is affected.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I don't want to tax unduly the courtesy of this House or of the Prime Minister, but I wonder if this could be deferred until Mr. Scammell comes—he made some remark yesterday about having some amendments to make. I merely make that as a suggestion. Let us look at Sec. 7, although no remarks have been as yet made. Here we are giving Mr. Crowe under this 3 years to export hand peeled and drum-barked wood, if he has expended $10,000 on that portion. That is a mere nothing for the right which he gets. It has been suggested since the bill was introduced that this amount be made $50,000 — I don't know what attitude Mr. Crowe would take to that, but we do know that he objected to making the royalty $1.00 instead of 50c. However, if as he says, it would interfere with the arrangements, we should have to forego it, I suppose, but I can't see what great change it could make to them to make it $1.00 instead of 50c. As has been pointed out by the member for Ferryland, that amount is about the same as we get from the Nfld. Power and Paper Co.

As regards Sec. 12, it has been suggested that this be amended by putting in the words, "not including hand tools." I do not know, but presume that loggers and employees buy their own hand tools.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—That is just to provide that the Company can't bring them in. It removes the doubt.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—We were just afraid that that might be done. And this would then cor-

respond with other Acts.

MR. HALFYARD — Nothing has carried greater weight in this House than the possibility that the International Paper Co.—that has weight in our approval of this matter. But I notice under Sec. 13 that Crowe has the power to transfer his rights to anyone else he pleases.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—That is so. We have no guarantee that they are coming in.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Unfortunately that was in the old contract, and as he has not forfeited it had to be put in this Act.

MR. HALFYARD—The position in this is as it has been in other matters. The Government has to take whatever Mr. Crowe says. If he says he can give $100 or $50,000 instead of $10,000, we have to submit. That is all.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, I should like to be permitted to say one word. Whether this thing be for better or worse, it is done with the best desires for the country. And if the International Paper Co. come in, the results will undoubtedly be good; if they don't we are in no worse a position than we were or than we are today. With regard to Clause 7, this is just a little bit of improvement in the agreement—it means that a start has to be made, and there is no difference otherwise in that clause. There is a dividing line between the two, and the old agreement is on the Statute books.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Regarding that point of the export duty being increased to $100,000 I should like to say that in my opinion this contract has been made as it has because it was absolutely necessary to provide work for people who needed it, and in the best interests of the country. Another reason is that Mr. Crowe hasn't forfeited his rights under his old contract, and so can demand that this be embodied.

MR. CASHIN—One other question. Supposing they do export that. What duty do they pay then?

HON. PRIME MINISTER—The same as other people pay for pulp wood.

MR. SULLIVAN—There is no export duty on pulp or paper exported from Newfoundland. The Newfoundland Power & Paper tax is merely as a quid pro quo for their privileges and security.

MR. CASHIN—If they build up this mill, it means that they have fulfilled, and can export an amount of wood. What duty will there be on that?

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—There will be no duty.

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 to Amend Cap. 111, 14 Geo. V., entitled "An Act for the Confirmation of an Agreement between the Government and Harry J. Crowe, Timber Merchant, and for other purposes," was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Mr. Cashin gave notice of question.

Mr. Duff gave notice of question.

Mr. Grimes 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 Monday, afternoon, 12th inst., at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, April 12th, 1926.

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

Petitions were presented by

Mr. Ashbourne from Carter's Cove re road.

Mr. Hibbs from Fogo re fishery regulations.

Mr. Lake from High Beach re breakwater.

Mr. Halfyard from Britannia re ferry.

Mr. Little from Port Blandford re road.

Minister of Fisheries from Newtown re coastal service.

Hon. the Colonial Secretary gave notice that he would on to-morrow move the House into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions respecting an Agreement between the Government and the Marconi Wireless Telegraph Company of Canada, Ltd.

Mr. Cashin gave notice of question.

Mr. Hibbs gave notice of question.

Mr. Ashbourne gave notice of question.

Mr. Halfyard gave notice of question.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — When the Crowe legislation was going through the House the other day, some members expressed a doubt as to whether Mr. Crowe had really established any connection with the Intetrnational Paper Company, and it was suggested by some members on our own side of the House that I should telegraph the International Paper Company and ask them whether they had any such connection with Mr. Crowe in connection with this proposition. I didn't feel justified in doubting the honesty of Mr. Crowe, and I did not do it. Since the legislation went through the House, I sent this message to Mr. A. R. Graustein, the President of the International Paper Company, Pershing Building, New York:

(Reads message.)

I immediately got back a reply reading as follows:

(Message read)

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Before the House proceeds I want to be put on record as having corrected a statement made by me the other day when tal ling the Penitentiary report in connection with a matter that is of public importance and interest. I have to correct the statement that I was told there were forty-eight houses of bad repute in the city. It should have been twenty-eight. I have nevertheless much pleasure in repeating my statement that there are not in the city one-third of twenty-eight that suspicion attaches to sufficient to warrant raiding them.

The police would be very glad indeed to be informed of any such places and will be glad to see to it that the best measures are taken to remedy such evils. It will, however, be understood by the public that there cannot be any haphazard visiting of homes by the police and they must have something more definite to go on than a mere statement.

Replies to the following questions were tabled, with exception of Nos. 1, 2, 3, which were deferred.

(1) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister, as Chairman of the Railway Commission, how many tons of coal was used by the train service and what price was charged per ton for 1925.

(2) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister: (a) How many men are employed by the Railway as section-men and foremen thereof; coalers, round-house men and wharf men; (b) how much per hour each class of worker is paid; (c) how long this rate has been paid; (d) how long this rate is intended to be paid.

(3) MR. DUFF asked Hon. the Min-

ister of Public Works to lay upon the Table of the House list of expenses, travelling, etc., of Mr. Josiah Gosse, of Spaniard's Bay, Road Inspector.

(4) MR. ASHBOURNE asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay upon the Table of the House a copy of the Report which he had recently compiled showing the number of persons employed in the Civil Service and the number belonging to each religious denomination and the total amount paid in salaries according to denomination.

(5) MR. GRIMES asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to lay on the Table of the House copy of Report showing the quantities of fish taken in each settlement in the District of Twillingate during 1925; also the names of persons employed, together with the information and the salaries paid to each.

(6) MR. GRIMES asked Hon. the Prime Minister to table information regarding the group insurance of Railway employees, showing the total amount paid in premiums and paid out in benefits each year since the scheme was commenced under the Reid management.

In reference to No. 4.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — In reply to the honourable member, I would invite him to come down to my office, where I have the only copy of that document. It is not for publication, and I have not yet submitted it to the Executive Council, and it will therefore be understood that I do not care to table it. The information is available for the benefit of any member who may want to get any statistics from it. I shall be only too glad if Mr. Ashbourne or anybody else should care to get that information in the Colonial Secretary's Office from Mr. Mews.

In reference to question No. 6.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — I cannot give any information except that provided by the Colonial Secretary when addressing the House last session.

(Information read and tabled.)

If there is any further information that I can provide I shall be very pleased to do so.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, the Bill entitled "An Act to Further Amend Cap. 35 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Postal and Telegraph Services' and the amending Act 11 George V., Cap. 37 (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 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 the Seal Fishery Act, and other Acts relating to the Seal Fishery."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — The Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Captain Winsor, comes back rather fresh to the Legislature and did not have time to consider the Bill before he came in. We have gone through all the sections, and I trust have considered the Bill in all its details. Its main object is idemnifying the killing of seals on the 13th March this year. A mistake arose from putting in a clause last year allowing the killing date as "after the 13th," when it should have been on or after the 13th. The clause is inserted this year for the sealers' indemnification for having killed on the 13th, lest somebody should take action

against them. As I stated to the House, Captain Winsor was very strongly of the opinion that seals should not have been killled. A misunderstanding arose from there being two laws on the Statute Book, one which was not repealed, stating that you could kill on the 13th, and another stating that you could not kill until the 14th. We thought, therefore, they should be indemnified in case anybody should take an action. The other clause is in connection with steel ships carrying guns. The Bill was introduced, I think, by Sir William Coaker, providing that steel ships should not be allowed to carry guns. We thought it advisable now to let them carry guns. Then, again, there was a rather peculiar position as regards the clearing date. The law read that vessels could not clear for the ice until some time after they were permitted to sail for the ice. We have altered the Act so that, if they are going to sail on the 5th, they shall be permitted to clear on the 4th. Should anybody want any further sections explained, we may explain them now that we are in Committee.

MR. CASHIN—I would like to ask a question in connection with this, and now that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Captain Winsor, is here, I want to take this opportunity of welcoming him back and congratulating him on his very successful trip. What I wanted to know is: Did the owners of the ships send instructions to the captains to kill the seals on the 13th, without having previously asked the Government whether it would be permissible or not?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — The position, as I understand it, was that the sealing owners had legal advice that they could kill on the 13th. There seemed to be a question about it. I don't know any more about it, but there certainly seemed to be a question as to whether it was legal or not. As I understand it, being advised that it was legal, they acted on that advice.

MR. WARREN—I understand that this Bill was postponed a few days ago in the hope that the Minister of Marine and Fishereis would shortly be sitting here once again. I am sure we are all very glad that he is back here once again safe and sound to take part in the discussion. We can congratulate ourselves that he has helped to add to the material resources and assets of the country some hundred thousand dollars since he has gone away. I have only to add a few words of congratulation to those offered already by Mr. Cashin.

I would like to ask Mr. Chairman the object of putting in Section 2 during the present year. The vessels have all gone, they are all cleared, and it seems ridiculous to say they shall be allowed to be cleared on the fifth of March during the present year. The ships are cleared and some are back again. So unless there is any object for having these words they might come out or else read in any year.

Having already spoken on this Bill, I have not anything further to say except once again congratulating Captain Winsor, and I feel that next year I am perfectly sure that I shall have another opportunity of discussing the subject.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I was about to say that I was sorry that I was not here when the Bill was brought up first, but I feel rather that I am glad. I was in a much better place and there was nobody growling with me all day long. As I understand this Bill and its connection with the laws on the Statute Book allowing killing either on the thirteenth or the fourteenth, I don't see that there is very much I can say about it. Before sailing for the ice,

after obtaining the opinions of several of the best lawyers, it did not seem to be definitely certain whether it was legal or not. Job's got an expert lawyer and he informed them that they were allowed to kill on the thirteenth, and the captains were instructed accordingly; and other ships got messages to the same effect. I think, as Mr. Warren has said, that we will have the privilege of talking again on the subject next year. The sealing acts have been amended so many times that in my opinion the whole legislation on it needs to be recast. I hope that next year I will also have the pleasure of speaking on the Bill when it is before the House, and I hope that the House is open before the sealers go out and put the Bill through then. Personally I am of the opinion that the thirteenth is too early and I tried my utmost this spring to have the date the fourteenth. I was fortunate enough as it happened to be in the seals two days before we were allowed to kill, and we found the seals very, very small. Some people may ask what is the cause of the seals being small at that time of the year. One time we used to kill on the twelfth of March. I have killed on the twelfth when the seals were not very large but averaged 48 lbs. What the cause of it is I cannot say, but now they are very seldom fit to kill before the fifteenth day of March. We had to pass hundreds that were not fit to touch, and on the thirteenth of March this year I had the pleasure of going out and killing some fifty odd seals, and I had to pass three times that amount that I could not touch that hadn't fat enough to kill.

I understand that this Bill is brought in to offset any trouble that may arise and so that is about all I have to say except to thank Mr. Cashin and Mr. Warren for their congratulations.

MR. HALFYARD.—Mr. Chairman, I ought to join in welcoming the Minister of Marine and Fisheries back to his seat in this House. We are all delighted that he met with such succes, and that he is looking so well after his trip. Now this Bill purposes eliminating the clause which prohibits the use of rifles in steel ships. I presume that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries agrees with that. The other clause has been explained by the Prime Minister dealing with Sections nine and ten. That refers to the steel ships. Of course, when these clauses were put in the sealfishery act we had a number of steel ships. It was thought then that some effort should be made to conserve the sealing industry, and it was thought that great destruction was caused by the use of guns. Now the important part of this Bill is that if we indemnify the killing of seals on the thirteenth of March this year we are also legalizing the killing of seals on the thirteenth of March in any year in the future. Now from those who know, and from the information tht has been supplied by no less a personage than the Minister of Marine and Fisheries himself, it has been stated that the seals should not have been killed this year on the 13th. When this Bill was introduced I asked the Prime Minister, the introducer of the Bill, if we could put in a clause so that we could indemnify the killing of seals this year, and also make provision so that seals could not be killed on the thirteenth of March next year or any year in the future. As has been pointed out by Mr. Warren, if we now pass this Bill through the House without any legislation referring to what time seals are to be killed, we are without any doubt whatever absolutely legalizing the killing of seals on the thirteenth of March any year. I think that is one

point should be considered by this legislature.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, the only point I raise in reply to the honorable member is this, that while the Minister of Marine and Fisheries says we should not kill the seals until the fourteenth or fifteenth, yet I have an idea that when we get the opinions of eight or ten other sealing captains they will all have different dates on which they think seals ought to be killed. It would be rather impossible now to lay down regulations to the effect that we could not kill seals until the fourteenth or fifteenth, because we do not know enough about it. I don't think that the opinion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries should be taken exclusively of everybody else. Last year the law read before it was altered, that you could kill on the thirteenth, this year it reads, that you cannot kill till after the thirteenth. The Minister has said that he will undertake to get legislation ready for the next sesion, and I think we might leave matters stand for the present just as it is.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Speaker, I would like for the Prime Minister to inform the House when the law was placed on the Statute Book allowing seals to be killed on the thirteenth of March.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —The Prime Minister did not altogether mean that. It is only a question of construction of the date that is all.

MR. ASHBOURNE—The honourable Minister of Justice might have his opinion, but I would like to ask the Prime Minister if he did not say that there were two laws on the Statute Book that were conflicting. One allowed seals to be killed on the thirteenth, and the other not until after the thirteenth. I would like, and I think it is due to the House that the Prime Minister should tell us when that law was passed. In view of the fact that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has stated here this afternoon that the killing of seals on the thirteenth is too early, I think we should take cognisance of it. If it is thought advisable to allow this date to be passed for this year, we should learn by it and by the experience gained this afternoon, that it should not be permitted in the future. Seals weighing from thirty to thirty-five pounds would in a few days go up to forty-five pounds. Legislation should be introduced to prevent early slaughter of these seals. Then there is another point, if we legalize the killing on the thirteenth in any year we will find that next year we will be able to kill on Sunday, according to one law, and according to another law we will not be able to kill on Sunday. There we will have further conflictions.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—My intention as I said here this afternoon when I made reference to the sealing law is that I intend to bring in a new sealing bill altogether. As Mr. Halfyard has said, and with whom I heartily agree, the thirteenth of March is too early a date for the killing of seals. I happen to be the only sealing master in this House at the present time, but Capt. Randell and Capt. Little during late years have been connected with the sealfishery. During the late years we have been very late in striking the seals from somewhere between the twenty-second of March to the first of April, and we have not had much chance to say what size the seals should be at the time of killing. During the last few years when we have struck the seals between the eighteenth and the thirtieth of March they have not been of a very large size. This year when we struck them at the regular time

we found them very small. I would not like to suggest that we should make a different law this year to prohibit the killing of seals until the fourteenth of March, because there are other captains going to the sealfishery, and I would like to give them a chance to voice their views, so that it might not be said that I put this Bill through not to kill until the fourteenth, for my own personal reasons. However, I feel sure that if the sealing captains were given a chance they would back up the statements made by me here this afternoon. Not one of these men would want to kill twenty-eight pound seals, because it would be a loss to the men, to the masters and to the country as a whole. Now I think if this Bill went through this year as it is, and a new Bill was brought in next year all these different items would be remedied. As far as Sunday is concerned; if the killing date happens to fall on a Sunday, the seals can be killed on the day preceding. If the sailing date falls on a Sunday, the ships shall sail on the fourtheenth.

MR. CASHIN—I have listened to the various gentlemen expressing their opinions in connection with the sealing bill. We have made, and I feel that we have made in vain, an appeal to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to give us his opinion on the Sealing Bill. He, with the Government, the Minister of Justice and the Prime Minister, have expressed the opinion that we should put this Bill through this House this year in its present form, and possibly it will be revised next year. Now I would just like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that we did not open this Legislature this year until the third day of March, and the following day the Minister of Marine and Fisheries set sail for the sealfishery. We have no guarantee that this House will open before that date next year. I think we all know the object of this Bill, and it is just as well to be plain about it. This Bill is brought in to indemnify the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and every other captain who has broken the law. Some people say in plain language that you are not allowed to kill until after the thirteenth, that is the idea of the whole act. That day was Saturday consequently the following day would be the fourteenth, Sunday, and since it was not allowed to kill on Sunday seals could not be killed until the fifteenth. We all realize the position. I don't need to be a lawyer to recognise that you are not allowed to kill seals on the fourteenth according to this whole Act. Next year we might not have the House of Assembly opened until March again, and we will then be in the very same position as we are this year. I think if you go through the sealing acts you will find that something has been added with regard to the sealfishery every year for the past thirteen years. It is time now to make something concrete, but it is only in keeping with all the other acts of the Government. If they have got to bring in a Bill to indemnify them for every law they have broken, we are going to be here until mid-summer. We have the Election Act, Customs' Act, the Prohibition Act, and now the Sealing Act. We were told, Mr. Chairman, previously that members on this side of the House were endeavouring to hold things up. Now we find that they have not the legislation ready. Besco Bill has been before the House for the past two weeks. The Government is perfectly satisfied in my opinion about this Bill going through. But we are going to have another sealing bill next year, and then we will have the same debate as this year.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say one word for the information of the House. Mr. Halfyard and myself have been endeavouring to learn the history of this sealing legislation. And the more one traces the history of these acts the more confusing it becomes. Now as regards the remarks made about the Government's connection with the sealing industry, it appears that the Government aspect was that you could not kill on the 13th. Those lawyers who advised the owners to the contrary were not members of the Government. So far as this matter is concerned with regard to the present legislation it does not effect the Government nor any member of the Government, or Captain Winsor in any way at all. And it is only fair to say to him that there was never any request made by him to the Government to bring in any legislation in any shape or form. I also wish to state for the information of the members opposite that so far as the bills are concerned legislation is more than ready. But we frequently get requests from the members opposite not to proceed with measures as they have not had time to study them. Now as far as Besco Contract is concerned it is the desire of the Government that it should be digested to the last extent before proceeding with it. We received a request from the opposite side of the House that the Besco resolutions should not be tabled before Easter. They were tabled. And I think that the position of the Government is this, to-day, that these resolutions should be thrashed out and looked at from every aspect, all through the summer if need be. The Government are in no rush about Besco. We are giving the matter every opportunity to be studied. And when the matter comes up for discussion in this House, and the question of a contract is debated, we will be able to lay all possible information before this House. I think it right to say to the hon. member that the legislation is complete, and the estimates are ready to be placed on the table of this House whenever they are wanted. The Minister of Finance gave notice of supply the other day, so I do not think that the hon. member need worry. Any time at all when it is desired we can have an extra push put on. I merely say this in order that it might be clearly understood that certain measures have been deferred at the private request of certain members who are desirous of a further opportunity of looking into the matter.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I think we are all agreed as to what we should do with regard to indemnifying the owners and masters for the killing of seals this year on the 13th. Now the question asked by Mr. Ashbourne was quite in order. Where can we find authority for the killing on the 13th? We have looked through the acts and it clearly states after the 13th. My point is this: Can we at this time pass legislation that the killing of seals next year must be after the 13th. Next year the House may not be opened until after the sealfishery opens. We have good intentions, but something may turn up that will delay the opening of the House. I want to know from the Minister of Justice whether we can put a clause in this Bill so that the killing of seals will not be before the 14th of March.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Chairman, certainly an amendment could be made to this Bill, but I do not presume to say what date it should be. I leave that to the sealing captains. I only like to say that it is really interesting to see the different views you would get as to when the killing date ought to be.

CAPTAIN RANDELL—Mr. Chair-

man, I would like to add a word on the question before the House, and before making any remark I would like to congratulate the Minister of Marine and Fisheries on his safe return after his successful voyage. I am very glad to see him here again to take part in the discussion with regard to the sealfishery, because he is about the best authority that we have. Personally I don't claim to be an old sealer. I don't consider myself much of a sealer, but as far back as I can remember I have heard it said that seals were not in their prime until the 17th of March. I would like to say that my memory can go back 50 years, and I think that I can get many sealers to-day that will back me up when I say the seals are not prime seals on the 17th March; in fact I think that they are in the majority. Therefore I do not agree with the killing of seals on the 13th of March; but with regard to what has been done this year I have nothing to say. At the same time I might say in passing that I don't believe that any master out there wanted to kill seals on the 13th of March. I quite agree with what the Hon. Minister of Justice has said with regard to making it quite clear in connection with this year and indemnifying the masters, and making the date for another year the 14th or the 15th. I rather favor the 15th myself. But I think in connection with this Bill, about which I have spoken before,that is in regard to the sailing date, I would like to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if he considers that it is necessary for this House to legislate with regard to the sailing date of ships for the sealfishery. Surely that is a matter for the owners to contend with. I think that the ships should be allowed to go out whenever they like. The captain can go out and fool around for months if he likes, but he can't kill before the 15th or the 16th. Surely that makes that clear and sufficient as far as we are concerned. I don't see why we should legislate with the matter of sailing at all. I think, sir, it would be a good plan to adopt the suggestion made by the Minister of Justice, that is to indemnify the owners and the masters for what has been done this year and let the matter stand over for another year, and by that time the masters and the owners would be in a position to know how they stand.

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, In reply to the hon. member for Trinity, I want to tell the House that as far as the date of sailing is concerned it is immaterial, because you can't kill until a certain date, and that protects the sealing industry. Now with regard to what the hon. member for Ferryland said about the killing of seals on the 13th, I may say that the captains of the steamers belonging to Job Brothers got the advice of some of the best lawyers in the city and they told them that they could kill on the 13th, and I do not blame the owners and the masters for killing on the 13th. Furthermore, on the 13th day of March I sent several messages into St. John's praying for the seals not to be killed on the 13th. The charge was made against me, or rather against Capt. Abraham Kean, that the reason that he was advocating the killing on Monday was because he was not in the seals. But they could not make that charge against me because I was tied up in them for thirty-eight hours before I could kill them. Therefore, knowing that the owners had told their captains to kill on the 13th, I also in order to protect my own crew put them on the ice on the 13th, and that is the only reason why I allowed my crew to kill the seals on the 13th, and I offer a challenge right here to any man in this House, or in the country

for that matter, that I have ever broken a law of this land. Why I have often sat down in my cabin and saw people killing on Sunday and I would not kill myself. I have been charged with making and breaking all the laws of this country but I defy any man to prove that I have broken any law of this country. I did not go out to the sealfishery together for my own benefit. I consider that I am a Newfoundlander born and bred in this country, and I want to see the sealfshery continue after I am dead and buried. And therefore I consider that any man that goes out and keeps the law has a better chance to go out again when the man that breaks the law is dead and gone. The date of sailing is really immaterial. But I do admit that by sailing four or five days earlier this year we got 120,000 seals that we otherwise would not have got, because ice conditions were such that if we did not sail for two or three days later we should not have reached the seals in time. Capt. Randell has said that on the 17th day of March the seals were in their prime. I agree with him. But times have changed. In my short experience of the sealfishery things have changed materially. Both conditions as far as ice and seal conditions were concerned. Poor weather conditions may have something to do with it , but personally, I have my own opinion as to what has changed the weight of the seals during the last eight or ten years. Now speaking of the matter of guns, I was asked this year by the Governor in Council my opinion as to allowing the Beothic to take guns to the sealfishery, and also the taking of fifty extra men. As a member of the Government of this Colony, and as Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I might easily have taken my own interest into consideration, becaunse I knew very well that if Captain George Barbour was allowed to take those extra fifty men the chances were that I was going to get less seals. But I did not look at it from that angle at all, I looked at it from the angle of the people of this colony. I looked at it from the viewpoint of the hundreds that were seeking berths at the sealfishery and were not able to obtain one. As long as there was only one steel steamer going out I did not think that it was within my duty to prohibit the Beothic from taking these extra fifty men and give them a chance to earn a livelihood for their families. I allowed this solely for the benefit of the country and not for anything that I might get out of it personally. That extra number of men out in that ship got 2,500 seals or fifty seals a piece. Consequently they killed more seals and I am only too glad that Capt. Barbour has brought in the trip that he has brought in. Therefore, I think that in the few remarks I have made in the way of an explanation I have cleared myself so far as having any knowledge of this Bill being brought in to protect me and other sealing captains. I do not think that any sealing captain either at sea or ashore knew anything about this Bill being drafted; I am certain sure I did not know of it, and I very much doubt if there are any captains in this city who knew anything about it.

MR. ASHBOURNE.— Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if there were any telegrams sent in by him on March 12th from the icefields addressed to the Prime Minister or Minister of Justice?

MINISTER OF MARINE AN FISHERIES.—No.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask the indulgence of the House to allow this Bill to go through as it is for this

year. My view is very much like Mr. Warren's that we, as a rule, do not know very much about the situation. For the practical side of the subject it is the captains and owners of ships that we got to look to, and we have to legislate on the suggestions that they give us. If the owners and sealing captains in conference come to the conclusion that seals should not be killed before the 14th, 15th or the 16th of March, it is mighty easy for them to put the regulation into force, because I think that, if we as a Government want to dictate the regulations, the owners would not go contrary to us. I think that we might as well let the legislation go as it is at present for the purpose of indemnification, and if legislation is brought in next year, as Captain Winsor promises, it can cover the whole ground. I may say that I saw the old sealing bill the other day in Messrs. Job's office and there is very little of the original left owing to the way the sealing law has been amended. The whole Bill needs to be rewritten; but before this Bill is consolidated I would suggest that the Bill to-day go through with the suggested alteration in clause two. Captains Winsor and Barbour, whom I spoke to about this matter of sailing, seem to be of the opinion that the 5th of March is not too early to sail. There does seem, however, to be a difference of opinion outside, and some people think that if the steamers get into the seals too early and before they are fully grown, these seals will, when the mothers are frightened away by the ships, not grow as well as if the ships were not there. That is a matter of detail that could be adjusted by the sealing owners and masters, and I think the regulations for next year could well be arranged in good time for the sealfishery.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I presume, from the remarks of the Prime Minister, that next year, if the House is not in session in time for the opening of the sealfishery, the time could be fixed by the Executive Government.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—If we found, after a conference between captains and owners, that a new regulation was desired, we would have same passed in the common interest by Minute of Council subject to confirmation by the Legislature.

MR. HALFYARD—I do not propose to know much about the sealfishery or how it should be conducted, although I suppose it is all only a matter of common sense, but I know from what I have been told that the 13th day of March is too early for the killing of seals, and ninety per cent. of the men who prosecute the sealfishery will bear out this statement, and it is not necessary for me to get any further opinion from anyone else on this point; and it is our duty as legislators to institute legislation that will protect one of the chief assets of the country, irrespective of what owners of ships may think.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman, I am in accord with what Mr. Halfyard has said. We all must realise that the sealing industry is a valuable asset to the country and everything possible should be done to preserve it; and many people are of the opinion that it would be advisable to have rigid rules against the indiscriminate slaughter of the seals or perhaps a close season with regard to the killing of them. Every year the ocean floes are almost swept clean. What hope is there then that this sealing industry may not be wiped out altogether? I think probably a close season would be a good investment; and I think that we should be gathering statistics and data to lay our hands on with regard to this industry. I do not agree with the Prime Minister that the arrange-

ments for the carrying on of the sealing voyage should be left to the captains and shop-owners. The matter should not be taken out of this House and left to any board to decide, because a board is not responsible to the country and has not to answer to the people for any legislation which it thought advisable to enact to protect such an important industry. Last year when Captain Winsor brought in this Bill practically all the steamers were built of wood or not very powerful, but this year we are faced with a large and powerful ship, the "Beothic," prosecuting the voyage and that is the reason why I deem it advisable to ask to have this legislation deferred. If it is thought advisable to let this bill go through in order to indemnify the killing of seals for this year, it may be well and good, but let us beware and not let it go for another year. The House will be in session for perhaps a month yet, and why not let the sealing captains consult together as to the best date for the killing of seals for years to come?

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that every year since I came into this House first there has been a Sealing Bill. That fact may seem to strike many members and others as a bit of a joke, but it is not a joke. The conditions in relation to the sealing voyage have become so changeable and varied that it is almost necessary to have legislation passed every year. When I look back for the past twenty years I can recollect some very interesting and informative debates over the sealing laws and regulations. We merged from a fleet of old wooden ships into a steel fleet of powerful ice-breakers prior to the war. Conditions that existed when all old wooden ships prosecuted the sealing voyage were entirely unsatisfactory; but when the new fleet of steel ships came into being they could get anywhere, and if legislation had not been introduced to keep them back behind the less powerful wooden ships, the entire sealing herd would have been wiped out. Those large steel ships, as soon as they had knowledge of where the seals were, would go direct to the patch and with their large crews would clean up the herd in about a week or ten days. Therefore, at that time it was essential to amend the laws to keep those ships back and not allow them to leave this port for the sealfishery before the 12th of March. In those days there were two sailing days, one for the wooden ships and one for the steel ships. Unfortunately for Newfoundland during the war we had to sacrifice our steel fleet and we have been very badly handicapped ever since, and have had to depend almost entirely up on the old wodden ships. Personally, I consider that sealing owners deliberately broke the law this year because seals could not be killed until after March 13th, but it must be borne in mind that the circumstanecs were peculiar. The 14th of March was on a Sunday and the danger of losing the seals was imminent if they waited until the 15th to engage in the kill, so I suppose they took a chance; and, after all, one could hardly blame them for it.

I think that ships of the class of the Beothic should be specially regulated for with regard to the prosecution of the sealfishery. If the 5th of the month is not too early for the ordinary wooden ships to depart, I contend that it is too early for the Beothic to depart. The Beothic has an advantage over the other ships that will bring it to the ice ahead of the others, and they are going to have their catch, or the best part of it, secured before the others can reach there. If necessary to have a rule to prevent this in past years as with the distinction made for steel ships, the same principle should apply now

and the more powerful ships should leave later.

I would be the last in the House to discourage those who have been enterprising enough to put their money in the Beothic. This shows renewed faith in the industry and is a good sign. At the same time you have to protect people against themselves. We may have two or three Beothics, and the same risk will be imminent as prior to 1914 when it was found necessary to legislate specially for steel ships.

There has been a great deal of comment on the amount of legislation that there has been on the sealfishery. There has been a great deal of legislation introduced in connection with it. There was a great deal introduced in Sir William Coaker's day, and I contend that there was a great deal of good legislation. It has brought about better treatment of the crews, better care and better food, and an improvement of conditions that existed with regard to the sealfishery. That legislation too has been carried out, as far as I know. There is no great charge to the contrary. The amount of legislation regarding the sealfishery is not to be wondered at when it is realised what tremendous differences occur in a short time. Captain Winsor, who is the authority in the House on the subject, has made a statement that seals are not in their prime as early as they used to be in years past. The Eagle, I remember, brought in a load on the seventeenth of March. Those seals, it is true, were not in their prime, but they must have been killed very early that the ship could get back on the seventeenth. However, it is very interesting to hear that seals are not matured as early as in years gone by, and if it is a scientific fact it is well worth investigating. In some respects this industry is a closed book to us. The habits of the seal and when it breeds and so on should be facts known to those engaged in the industry. It seems that the men go to the Funks and if they don't strike them there, God knows where they are. They strike out somewhere else, and if they don't get them one place they may get them another. It is a pity that we have not more information with regard to the habits of the seal, when they go north and when they go south. Those things are matters for scientists and are worth investigating. Those things will give information that rules can be based on. Distinctions can be made with regard to the time of ships sailing next year and in years to follow. Under existing circumstances it seems only right to grant an indemnity for this year as it would not seem fair to hold the captains and owners responsible for this year, and as the date has now been set for the fifth to clear and the thirteenth to kill it seems right to let that go for another year.

MR. HALFYARD — Following the suggestion of the member for Twillingate, I think that it would be a good thing if the Minister of Marine and Fisheries could within the next two or three weeks formulate a sealfishery act. If this could not be done we will have to be satisfied to let the present Bill go through, as it is suitable for present circumstances and we can bring in further regulations next year.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Personally I would not care to attempt it until the other captains get in and I can get their opinions as to what measures would be best.

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.

Second reading of Bill "An Act Respecting the Civil Service."

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—In connection with this Act I want to say that the matter has been pretty well considered already in Committee on the Resolutions and that there is not much more to be said. The different amendments made then are now confirmed in the Bill, the only one I would mention particularly being that in Clause 8, suggested by the Colonial Secretary in connection with Civil Servants who served during the war. This main change is contained in Clause 8, Section D. Again in Clause 2 we have cut out the word "St. John's." I think that most of you have the few alterations made. The only one to be referred to particularly now is Clause D, Section 8. I think the Bill may be left to the Committee stage for any further discussion and we can consider those alterations particularly in respect to that clause.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Civil Service" 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 to Amend Chapter 125 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series), entitled 'Of Trustees.'"

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —I would like to point out to the House that this is a Bill that is being introduced at the request of the Registrar of the Supreme Court, resultant upon his experience of handling estates. In short it provides, as will be observed, that trustees may have the power to invest with regard to stocks whose interest is guaranteed by Act of Parliament to a larger degree than under the law at present. This enlargement of powers I want to draw attention to in particular as to Sub-section 4 of Section 1. At the present moment trustees are only empowered to invest in stocks of the Dominion of Canada guaranteed by the Federal Government. This is to allow investments in stocks whose interest is guaranteed by Parliaments of the different provinces. In subsection 1 of the section which replaces section 6 in the act that is to be amended the trustee's powers are enlarged as regards 'bearer' securities, and it is provided now under this that a trustee may invest in such securities, provided such securities retained or taken as an investment by a trustee (except in the case of a trust corporation or the Registrar of the Supreme Court), shall until sold be deposited in a bank for safe custody. I would like to say in this connection that we will enter into the details more particularly in committee, and I merely want to state now that it is introduced at the request of the Registrar of the Supreme Court arising out of his experience in handling estates.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 125 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Trustees'" 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 Apportionment of Periodical Payments."

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—This bill was also distributed on the last day, if it was not it should have been. It was printed and I asked that it be distributed. This is what might be termed a highly technical bill at first blush in the matter of verbiage, but the best way in which I can ease the minds of the members is to state that it is a recommendation arising from the Court Registrar and

made to meet a situation unprovided for up to now. The act here, on which I have a memorandum from him comprises in a few words what the situation is to-day. There is no apportionment act in Newfoundland to-day. The act is moulded on the English act "The Apportionment of Periodical Payments." The memorandum as submitted to me explains that it is needed to correct a hardship arising out of the administration of estates in connection with final payments of income in connection with life annuities. Suppose that a widow was left six hundred dollars a year, payable half yearly on January first and July first. Suppose that the widow dies on July first. In that case the widow's personal representative will receive three hundred dollars. But if the widow dies on June the first her personal representative will receive nothing. So this is to make the payment of the annuity go on from day to day. And if the widow dies on June the first her personal representative will get five months of the gratuity. The Registrar says that in some cases widows with small incomes anticipate the income and incur certain expenses which they intend to pay out of the installment when it falls due.

The bill that we have here will make our law the same as the English law in the matter. It is taken from the apportionment act of 1807. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that I need say anything more about this bill than to say that it is being put on our statute books for the first time and it is introducing the same practice that prevails in the old country. Therefore I beg to move the second reading.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Apnetitled "An Act Respecting the Apportionment of Periodical Payments" 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 to Amend Chapter 143 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Keeping of Dogs.'"

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—In moving the second reading of this bill, I may say that this matter came up in connection with several petitions which we have received. This amendment is to correct a rather awkward situation that prevails at the present time, and has prevailed for many years. The law in connection with the sheep prerevation is that a proclamation is issued upon the request of a majority of the residents of a district. It is put into effect for ten years and can be only repealed by a petition coming at the end of that period. And if there is no petition at the end of the period then the proclamation goes into effect for another period of ten years, and there is no means of relieving the situation in the meantime. The result has been, as I am sure that many members know since they must have been in receipt of all sorts of petitions in connection with matters of this nature, that some provision must be made to deal with the situations that arise. Every five or six months we find that strong feelings arise because of the necessity of enforcing the law in some section of the country. In Corner Brook and places of that kind that are developing into manufacturing centers they expect to receive treatment of a special kind. In places of that kind, it is decided in the new Municipal Act that is to come before the House in a short time, that they will be able to make arrangements of this sort irrespective of this bill. The object of this measure then is to change this period that I have referred to from ten years to one year. It will be of great assistance in some localities where it is found

that there can be no change in the conditions for the next eight or nine years. Other than as I have outlined this act does not effect us in any way. Therefore I move the second reading of this Act.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 143 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series), entitled 'Of the Keeping of Dogs'" 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 to-morrow, Tuesday, afternoon at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, April 13th, 1926.

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

Mr. Brown gave notice of question.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Colonial Secretary, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions respecting an agreement between the Government and the Marconi Wireless Telegraph Company of Canada, Limited.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, in proposing these Resolutions and asking that a new agreement be made by the Governor in Council and the Marconi Wireless Telegraph Company of Canada or any other Company, for a term not exceeding one year, I would like to point out to the House that on the 6th of April the contract that existed between the Newfoundland Government and the Marconi Wireless Telegraph Company expired. This contract was for ten years from 1916 until 1926. It was the outcome of a contract made ten years prior in 1906 wherein the Marconi Company entered into a contract to carry out certain Marconi Telegraph Services between Labrador and St. John's by way of Fogo and Bell Island and Battle Harbor. In 1912 the contract of 1906 was re-enacted and in that re-enactment provision was made for the extension of the time from 1916 to 1926, the present year, when the time finally expired. Under that contract the Marconi Company were called upon to maintain and carry out service on ten stations, on the Labrador, including Battle Harbor, and also at Fogo. Those ten stations a few years ago included under the contract Bell Island as one of the stations. This station was taken over by the Canadian Government and Battle Harbor was reinforced so to speak to take over the work formerly done by Bell Island. Bell Island to-day is used entirely by the Canadian Government as a direction finding station for the Canadian ships going up the Gulf of St. Lawrence. The main avenue of the Company between St. John's and Labrador is via the Marconi Station at Fogo. Messages are sent by land-lines and over short cable line to Fogo, whence they are wirelessed to Battle Harbor, and thence to the different stations in the different parts of Labrador and vice versa. This service has been carried out by the Marconi Company and they have received a subsidy of one hundred pounds as named in the contract, or practically five hundred dollars per station. They are also in receipt of the tolls collected from the messages, and the total income from the ten stations for the past two or three years has been on the average about ten thousand dollars per year. The tolls for last year, 1924, were about three thousand dollars. A great por-

tion of these tolls were secured by the transmission of wireless messages through Fogo on account of the sealing steamers. In 1924 there was a very large augmentation in the station of Battle Harbor at the time of the all-round world American aerial trip that passed in that direction. They complain that the income from such services is not at all equal to the cost of operation, and the expenditure on stations in order to carry them on. I have been supplied with the statement which shows the cost of operating the stations at Fogo, Battle Harbor, and eight stations at the Labrador to be approximately eighteen thousand dollars, so we were receiving a service for ten thousand dollars which was actually costing eighteen thousand. The contract has expired and naturally they have come back with a request that a new contract be entered into, and that they be given sufficient payment to compensate them for their outlay. The question of wireless telegraphy today is one that is all important and it would take a very wise man to say what would be the advance and development that will take place in this world's miracle, if I might term it such, within the next few years. It cannot be denied that it was right and the House I think will endorse my saying that the Government have done well in going cautiously in connection with taking on an agreement without knowing what exactly are the conditions that exist and what they are likely to be during the next few years. The representative of the Company, Mr. McCallum, a gentleman well qualified in his business, has come here to look after the interests of the Company, and he is of course anxious to enter into a contract over a period of years provided that the subsidy or royalty is sufficient to pay for the cost of maintenance and upkeep. Therefore in submitting the Resolutons to the House, I think the House will agree with me that in doing so we have taken that necessary precaution not hurriedly to go into any standing or lasting contract. Nothing was done of a tangible nature towards the renewing of the contract before it expired. I do not know of any person capable of giving expert advice as to what should be done in this matter. I have had the advantage of discussing the matter with Mr. Veitch, Superintendent of Postal Telegraphs, who is a man very competent in his own particular branch, but would not assume the authority to technically advise the Government in this very important matter. I consider it therefore wise that the Government be given at least a year to investigate and find out exactly what is required, and to see if something of a more economical, possibly a more efficient service can be devised in place of what we have at present. I heard the suggestion made the other day that the service might not be worth what it costs. I was then told by one competent to give an opinion, not necessarily interested, but one whose opinion on the general trade of the country is second to none, that the wireless system is indispensable to the Labrador fishery. That was the answer I hoped for, because it was my opinion and having it so endorsed, I feel in approaching this subject, it is so being approached because of its importance to the great fishery on the Labrador. The stations on Labrador are very rarely used outside of the ordinary business for the information of the people down there and communication with stations here in St. John's and other places, but they are very often of the greatest importance. Thousands of quintals of fish may be sold, or the sale may be lost if they had not this means of communication. Orders for supplies and salt may readily be placed. Reports with regard to fish may be obtained; what part of the

coast they are most plentiful and such information. Therefore we can approach the subject feeling it is one of absolute necessity as far as the Labrador fishery is concerned. Mr. McCallum made the suggestion that if we could not give them the permanent contract that we give them an agreement for two years, but, as I have already said, the Government wanted to move cautiously and we even refused to go so far as two years. We are now asking that the Governor-In-Council be authorized by this House to enter into a temporary agreement for one year with the Marconi Company for a continuation of the service as it is to-day; but we have to pay them the ordinary cost of maintenance and upkeep, plus ten per cent. as a profit for themselves. Perhaps, the House would like to know how this sum of eighteen or twenty thousand dollars is made up. I will read to the House a list of what those stations are costing and where the loss has been really sustained by the Marconi Company. I am sorry that Mr. Halfyard is not in the House, because I think that it was during his term of office as Minister of Posts and Telegraphs that Belle Isle was dispensed with and Battle Harbour station was re-organized and made thoroughly efficient, and I think the Newfoundland Government at the time paid $2500.00 to equip that station efficiently to do the work that was done by Belle Isle. Battle Hr. and Fogo are the two principal and two most expensive because they each have to have more than one operator, and their general upkeep is much larger than the other stations. Battle Hr. and Fogo do the main part of the work; the other stations are more or less local. Battle Hr. station cost $2527.12 per annum; Cape Harrison $738.83 per annum; Domino, $1064.19; Flat Island, $723.63; Fogo, $3211.88; Grady, $1000.79; Holton, $833.15; Makkovik, $833.49; Smokey Tickle, $834.25 and Venison Islands, $762.46. Of course, the one which takes a large amount to maintain, has to have service all the year round. When the sealers are out they have to have additional men employed at this station. Wireless messages are continually coming to and from the sealing ships through this station, which, consequently, has to be manned fully all the time during the Spring period. The total cost of the ten stations makes a direct operating charge of $12,522.79. Now the Marconi Company claim that a proportion of their expenses of their branch office here in St. Johns is chargeable to that service. They have a Mr. Collins, a Mr. Brown and one or two other gentlemen in their establishment here. Of course, all the ships that come to St. John's have to pay their proportion of that expenditure also. Their proportionate charge for their St. John's branch is $2,493.17. They also claim proportionate administrative expenses to the extent of $3,293.60 for the upkeep of a part of their headquarters in Montreal, where they have expert engineers and scientists always at the disposal of the Labrador stations. They estimate a charge of ten per cent. profit on the actual cost of operations, which is a plus cost basis, and two per cent. head office charge at $1831.65, making a total charge of $20,148.21. Against that they also estimate that, out of the $3,000 that have been collected by them in tolls, fifty per cent of it should go to the Government, so that is $1500.00 we would get back for tolls and which would make the net cost to us $18,648.21. That is the figure we have to face at the present time. It may be argued that a great deal more income could be secured from tolls because it does seem a kind of absurd that the Government has to establish and operate a wireless telegraph service between here and Labrador, and a man who sends

a message pays 25 cents just the same as he would pay for sending a message to Carbonear over the land lines. That has been the practice and I submit that 25 cents is altogether an inadequate amount for this service, which is costing such a large sum to maintain.

No person would object to paying one dollar per message, and in that respect we might increase our income from tolls greatly from what has been received in the past. These are matters that have to be gone into thoroughly when all the information is prepared for next year when we come into the House with a properly understood contract for the continuation of this service. There is also another very important matter that should be considered favorably, though not at the present moment, owing to the meagre information at our disposal; I refer now to a central wireless station and which should be situated here in St. John's. I do not say that St. John's should have a claim on it any more than any other part of the country, except that St. John's is the centre of business and traffic and all information could be transmitted from here to the whole country. If we had a central broadcasting station in St. John's that could communicate directly with the Labrador, we could dispense entirely with Fogo as a marconi station and Fogo could be kept on as a local station, and could be used in many other ways.

Now one of the most important questions that we come to is the establishing of a direction finding station in St. John's. A direction finding station, connecting directly with Labrador, is absolutely essential in St. John's and every mariner one comes in contact with asks why there is not one in St. John's. It would be of untold benefit to shipping, especially in the Spring of the year when foggy weather is so prevalent. With an efficiently operated direction finding station in St. John's like the one at Cape Race would mean that any ship approaching this country could be practically piloted in the narrows by the operator. A ship coming on this coast would be able to ascertain exactly her position to a few yards by the process of the direction finding station and one will appreciate what a blessing that would be to mariners and crews of ships particularly in bad weather. A broadcasting station could be used during the fishing season to give out news daily as to codfish and bait fishes, and it would certainly be a great blessing to those who are dependent upon their living from the sea; also the news of the world could be obtained just by the picking of it up. The British Government have a broadcasting station at Rugby, England, where twice daily is sent out all continental news. The small messages that we get from abroad for our papers are not worth paying for; whereas with a broadcasting station in St. John's we would get news from England, the States and elsewhere by the mere picking of it up, and we would be kept in daily touch with the whole world as to the current news of the day, and which would be of great benefit to our people. So you can see, Mr. Chairman, the more one thinks of this whole subject the more it strikes you that it is necessary to ascertain all the information possible before binding ourselves down to a continual contract with that Company. The Marconi Company have submitted prices as to the establsihing of a direction finding station and a broadcasting station. These prices are on their faces rather expensive, but I feel sure that when the matter is carefully and thoroughly considered and the value of these stations properly appreciated it will be seen that they are well worth the expenditure.

MR. HICKMAN—Would the honour-

able member tell us what the estimated cost is for a broadcasting station in St. John's?

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—In round figures twenty thousand dollars would fit up those stations that I speak of in St. John's. Mr. McCallum in referring to the question of cost says:

(Reads extract of cost).

I, therefore, Mr. Chairman, move these Resolutions. I shall be very glad to answer any questions members might like to ask with respect to this matter. I have given it a deal of study and consideration, and anything I have in connection with it I shall be only too pleased to give the House. Mr. McCallum is very anxious to get back again to Canada, and when I told him this morning that we would not give him a two years' agreement he was quite satisfied to go on for one year on the estimate he has given, plus ten per cent. profit on the cost.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Colonial Secretary, if there is any agreement with any telegraph or cable company which prevents the Marconi Company from operating by transmitting and receiving commercial messages, because I remember some years ago when Mr. Marconi was here himself he was not permitted to erect a station because of some contract already entered into between some cable company.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—The Marcona contract just expired on the 6th of this month.

MR. WARREN—The Anglo American Company had a monopoly which expired since.

MR. HICKMAN—If the Marconi Company want to establish a station here now, would they be subject to a tax by the Government?

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Yes.

MR. HICKMAN—I have listened with a great deal of interest to the Colonial Secretary explaining these Resolutions, and I agree with many things that he said. What I cannot understand is that he advocates the establishment of a station here by the Government costing $20,000.00 when three was an up to date station at Mount Pearl advertised for sale and which originally cost three times that amount and could be purchased now at a very cheap figure. The whole thing was advertised by public auction and sold for about $2500.00. I never could understand why the Government did not take over the place, because they must have realised that they would need it some day, and even if they had no further use for it they could sell it as junk and it would fetch more than $2500.00. Of course the machinery was not included for that amount, but all the erections that we see, huge poles, wires, houses, long track of land fenced with iron fence. When the outfit was put up for sale a purchaser could not be found for a long while until one man eventually offered about $2500.00, and this offer was accepted. The Government must have known in advance that this Marconi contract was expiring this month, and I am surprised they did not have the foresight to buy this station. I had a good mind to buy it myself because I knew that I would be buying something very cheaply. That station I suppose can pick up messages from any station in Australia, England or the United States. I agree with the Colonial Secretary that we need in St. John's, a direction finding station, whatever it might cost, and whether Signal Hill or Mount Pearl would be the proper place to have it could be decided upon. Our coast is a fog-bound coast especially in the Summer Season. We have passenger steamers running here on schedule and freight steamers continually coming here, and with a direction finding station in St. John's in conjunction with the one at Cape Race a steamer could be

piloted through the narrows under any weather conditions day or night, because I believe, from what I have heard from mariners, that with two stations of that kind, steamers can pick up their positions within a few yards. Marconi Stations on the Labrador are badly needed and more are needed than what are there now. There are a few places on the Labrador where many of our fishermen go. They are twenty or thirty miles away from present communication and have to wait for messages to be picked up at Battle Harbour and sent to them in the mail. The same applies with messages for them coming from the Northern Labrador. They have to wait to get them in the mail by steamer. There is one thing I do not like about these Resolutions and that is "That a new agreement be made by the Governor-In-Council, etc." Now what is the use of the Opposition voting for Resolutions of that sort? The Governor-In-Council goes and makes an agreement and that is all we know about it, and that is all a great many of the private members of the Government know about the matter until the agreement is sealed and signed. If you are going to make an agreement, bring down your agreement and let us talk it over properly. We got practical men on both sides of the House and who could give information and be of assistance to the Government in drafting up a proper agreement; but I do not believe in giving the Governor-In-Council power to draw up an agreement because that would not be an agreement of the Legislature.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, to me, at all events, the question of a Marconi contract is nothing new. The Squires Government entered into negotiations with the Marconi people, but as I understood it then these negotiations were brought to an abrupt conclusion by the intervention of the Imperial Government. There is a good deal to be said both for and against the attitude that the Marconi people adopt with regard to the proposed new agreement. At any rate, I am glad to see that the Government recognizes the fact that telegraph stations are necessary, even though the revenue derived from operating the station is out of proportion to the cost. That is an admission which is of the utmost importance. I quite agree with what the Colonial Secretary says, that, although there is a loss of about eight thousand dollars upon the operation of the telegraph stations on Labrador, yet in the general interests of the country, it is necessary to keep them going. I quite agree with all that, but I have heard rumours that some telegraph stations around the Island are to be cut out because the revenue derived from the operation of them is only a small percentage of cost. In saying this, I have in mind some telegraph offices in the District of Fortune Bay. About four years ago, the Squires Government decided that they would cut out some of the telegraph stations. Those that were not absolutely essential were cut out, and in some places the telephone was installed instead. As far as I can remember now, they cut out three stations in my district—Little Bay West, Long Harbour, and Anderson's Cove. That was as far as they could go, but I have heard rumours that it is the intention of the Government to cut out further stations along the coast. Now, let me say this, that I see no more reason why the stations should be cut out on the South Coast because of the inadequate revenue produced any more than these Marconi Stations should be cut out on Labrador. I know particularly well that in Pool's Cove, Fortune Bay, the income from the office there is about 50 p.c. of the cost; but what is it there for? It is there for the same reason as these

stations on Labrador. One twenty-five cent. message from Pool's Cove will bring a fleet of bankers in there that will spend more money than many other stations around the place will produce. A twenty-five cent message from Pool's Cove, or any other of the reaches of Fortune Bay would bring a fleet of bankers in there for bait. That is all the station is there for. In addition to the money spent by the bankers, the result is that a catch will be brought into the country, that would not have been brought in if that telegraph station had not been there, and I am very glad indeed to find that the Government recognize that the question of revenue and cost means nothing to them where any operation of the telegraph stations is concerned. The indirect revenue is quite large.

Now, before proceeding with these resolutions, Mr. Chairman, I would like, and I am only speaking for myself, I would like some further information. I would like the Colonial Secretary to table the draft agreement that was negotiated between the Marconi people and the Squires Government about 1921 or 1922.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—I don't think there is a copy around. I have had all the documents looked up in connection with the Marconi for the last twelve years, and I have not seen any documents with regard to a draft agreement.

MR. WARREN—There was almost a final draft, which came before the Committee in Council in 1921 or 1922. Mr. Morse, the General Manager, was down here, and further than that, the Squires Government, when talking about a Directional Wireless Station, had a commission appointed consisting of Sir William Coaker, Captain English and Mr. Collins, who brought in a report to the Executive Government on the question of the erection of a wireless station. I would like to have a copy of that agreement.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—I don't think it is here. Mr. Morse was not with the Marconi Company.

MR. WARREN—Mr. A. H. Morse was the Manager in Montreal at the time. I would like to see a copy of the draft agreement that was submitted to the Squires Government by the Commission at that time. I would like to see a copy of the report on the Direction Finding Station Business that was brought in by the Commission that we appointed. I would like to see the corrsepondence that took place at that time with regard to the past agreement, as well as the correspondence with regard to this agreement.

As far as I understand, or as far as I understood at the time, these negotiations were brought to conclusion by the intervention of the Imperial Government, when Sir Charles Harris was Governor. Apparently the Colonial Secretary has outlined to the House the terms, or the proposed terms which the Marconi people would like to get. They would like to be fully re-imbursed for any loss whatever, and be given a profit of 10 p.c. besides. In one short sentence that is exactly what they would like to get. I can only come to the conclusion that they, having read the Besco agreement, think that the Government is fairly easy, and expect to get terms of that sort. I, for one, would never consent to this. This Island, and its peculiar position in the Atlantic, is of value to the Marconi people. Now, when they made the agreement, first in 1906, and the second time in 1916, they knew perfectly well that it was not going to pay them directly. But, still they entered into the agreement. At that time, wireless was in its infancy, and, as far as I know, they collected little or no tolls. But, apart from that, we have the situation outlined by the

Colonial Secretary here to-day, that the future of wireless is problematical. But its existence is assured, and furthermore, wonderful improvements are being made in wireless from day to day. When, in 1916 a contract was made, the wireless telephone was then practically unheard of. The wireless telephone may have been prophesied and conjecture was saying that some time or other we were going to use it, but, at all events, it was not at that time practically important. I am talking about wireless telephony for commercial purposes. The first intimation that we had of the use of wireless telephony was when the Press Conference passed here on its way to Canada in 1920. A station was fitted up at Signal Hill, and the steamer Victorian was fitted with a special wireless telephone. Now, the Government, in making any contract with the Marconi people, should bear these things in mind, that we have not got to give everything, and get nothing back.

Now with regard to the Direction Finding, we have an exceptional position here in the Atlantic. We have numbers of steamers going past Cape Race day after day, week after week, and year after year, and do you want to tell me that the position there at Cape Race, is no value to the Marconi people? Of course, it is. I dont see, for one, why the Government should pay the cost of two directional stations here in Newfoundland. The benefit we derive is infinitesimal compared to the benefit derived by the steamers going past. Now, they propose to ask this Government to pay $20,000 to build another Directional Station here in St. John's. All this was gone into by the Commission that sat here four years ago. We put it up to Lloyds' Underwriters that it is to their benefit, while we are preparing to give them the advantage of our position here in the Atlantic. After all, the Underwriters, who are served by the Directional Wireless Station, should contribute something towards it and so should the steamship lines. All during the day dircetional messages are going into Cape Race, so it is hardly possible to send a commercial message at all. I remember that when President Wilson was going across to Europe to attend the Peace Conference, they had to stop and veto the sending of directions, messages by Cape Race, because they were joining commercial messages. That will give you some idea of the value of Cape Race to the Marconi people. Now, if they think, or expect that they can come in here and use our peculiar position and just charge us for everything that they use at 10 p.c. profit, without giving us anything in return, they have made a great mistake, if the Government has any backbone at all. As a matter of fact, we have all heard of the rescue of the crew of the Antinoe by the President Roosevelt. Had it not been for Cape Race that rescue might never have been effected. Reading accounts of the enquiry made by the British Board of Trade, I found that the wireless message that was sent out by the Antinoe, was first picked up by Cape Race and eventually transmitted to the President Roosevelt, who at once went to the rescue of the Antinoe. I agree with the Colonial Secretary that the rate should be increased for these stations down there, in view of the benefits that those, who send the messages through these stations, derive. I agree that a broadcasting station here in St. John's would be of value, and I think that a revenue could be derived from that as a wireless station, in addition to the indirect advantage which is outlined here. Now, then, the Marconi people have these contracts with us, but, if they are going to come in here and make a hard bargain and expect us to pay and

make them a re-imbursement for any loss they may incur, and then pay them 10 p.c. profit, then, I say it is up to the Government to tax them the same as any other cable company doing business. It would be interesting to know if the Marconi people want a monopoly. Is any other wireless company allowed to come in here and do business? I say that I object to giving the Governor-In-Council power to make this agreement. I have a little knowledge of this agreement on account of the previous one. And seeing that this Government was elected on a basis of no Government by Minute of Council, surely you don't propose now to come in here, and urge this House to give power to the Governor in Council to make an agreement which the members of this House have never seen. We have already an example of the effect of this. When the Cashin Government was in power in 1919 it took power to make an agreement with a telephone Company. Nobody knew what was in that agreement: what the liabilities were or anything, until the Company started to put up its rates, and the Evening Telegram was sufficiently alive to publish a copy of the agreement. Now this agreement should come before this House and every member should see it, and it should not be left to the Governor in Council to finalise it.

That is all that I have to say at the present time. I am sure that the Colonial Secretary will agree with the statements that we should keep it going for another year; that the Government should take time and consider its position; and with regard to the position taken up by the Marconi people, and from what I know of what went on in 1921 or thereabouts, being a member of the Government and Attorney General at the time. But I do object to this agreement being made by Governor in Council. It may be argued that Mr. McCallum, who ever he may be is in a hurry to get back to Montreal. But I don't see why the legislature of Newfoundland has to be deprived of seeing this agreement, merely because Mr. McCallum is anxious to get back to Montreal. He knew long ago that this contract was going to expire. And I see no reason whatever why the making of this agreement should be relegated to the Governor in Council, merely because Mr. McCallum is anxious to get back, or the Marconi people are anxious to know where they stand.

Now with regard to Mount Pearl. The Leader of the Opposition stated or he rather blamed the Government for not having bought Mount Pearl when it was going for a mere song. Mount Pearl was owned by the British Government, and when I was Prime Minister the British Government offered it to us for nothing and we would not take it, because we looked upon it as a bundle of junk. It was absolutely useless as far as the reports that we could get about it. It was obviously no use to the British Government, for the purposes for which it was built, and the conditions that were to be imposed upon the Newfoundland Government, if they took it over made it absolutely impracticable. I may tell Mr. Hickman, the Leader of the Opposition, that I would not have anything to do with it. We have already received some Greek gifts from the British Government and we looked upon these new ones with a sense almost of suspicion. So I think that the Government were quite justified in having nothing to do with the taking over of that station at Mount Pearl.

Now I think that we would get along much better if the Colonial Secretary had a search made, and if it is found, table the draft agreement that was made, between the Marconi people and the Squires Government, in 1921. I would like to have a copy of that. And also a copy of any cor-

respondence that took place concerning that matter. I don't think that the matter went through the Colonial Secretary's hands except that Sir Richard Squires was Colonial Secretary as well as Prime Minister. I would like to get a copy of that and also of the correspondence in connection with the present agreement, and the agreement that the Government are now proposing to make with the Marconi people.

CAPT. RANDELL—Mr. Chairman, I would like to endorse what has been said by the Hon. Member for Fortune, Mr. Warren, in connection with the measure that is now before the House. There is one thing that has occurred to me in listening here, that perhaps that it may be just as well to remind the House of, and that is this is one of the most important measures that has been brought before this House this year, in my opinion, and I think that when it is given due consideration by both sides of this House it will be considered as such. It is a fact well known to all shipping people that Cape Race is one of the most important stations in the world. All trans-Atlantic traffic we may say passes by close to that station. And considering that we perhaps have the worst coast in the world as far as trade and navigation is concerned; when it is not fog there is sleet and ice and icebergs to contend with, and not only is that station at Cape Race a means of communication with the land, of finding out the news of what is going on, and a means of passing messages from ship to shore; it is also a means of ascertaining a ship's position, you may say from half the Atlantic, to this side and also after passing Cape Race, between there and the shore. As a means of finding a ship's position it is perhaps the most important station on the North Atlantic coast. One of the greatest inventions that has ever been found out for the safety of shipbuilding, is undoubtedly that Wireless Direction Finder. There is a station at Cape Race, of course. It is and has been very useful, more especially to the ships that are running on the regular routes, and are nearing a coast such as ours, where there are about five or six months in the year, when there is danger of a ship running foul of ice or icebergs. As a means of ascertaining a ship's position at sea, the importance of that station is almost incalculable.

Now I quite agree with what has been said in connection with a wireless finding station being established in this country. Perhaps not in St. John's because it might be considered by a great many shipping people that a station at St. John's would be rather too near the station at Cape Race. You would want to be very near the land to get the position as correctly as would be needed, to have those two stations equally useful. Of course I have been given to understand, that the limit of error runs into about two degrees from the station from which the bearing is taken. And that means that a ship finds her position within two degrees, on a line that is at right angles to the line drawn from the ship to the station. Now then if she has a bearing on another station, and a bearing that runs more or less nearly at right angles to the first bearing, she can get her position within a very small compass. And in establishing a direction finding station I should say that the Government would do well to consider the position where a station should be erected before agreeing to put up a station so near to Cape Race, as St. John's is. I think that if they put one up at Belle Isle or at Fogo it would be better than one at St. John's.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—There is a station at Belle

Isle in the Straits if that is where you mean.

CAPT. RANDELL—Yes that is where I mean. There is a station there alright. There is another thing that I would like to speak on, sir, and that is in connection with the doing away with the Fogo Station. I think that Capt. Winsor will agree with me that would be a mistake, because all the ships going to the seal fishery are furnished with very low powered dynamos, and very often although they are able to hear Cape Race, they cannot get in touch with it. And for that reason I think that that station is very essential to the ships going to the seal fishery. And until the ships are equipped with dynamos of greater power, it is very essential that that station should be continued. I also agree with what has been said by the Hon. Member for Fortune with regard to the Marconi Station at Mount Pearl. It is a well known fact, or at least I have been told, that the apparatus that was installed there, has become more or less obsolete. Wireless apparatus have been improved almost from day to day. And I have been told that the gentleman that bought that machinery has been unable to realise on it, because it is absolutely out of date. Therefore I don't agree that the Government should have taken over that station, because as Mr. Warren has said very likely they would have found themselves with another white elephant on their hands. I think, sir, before taking my seat that I would like to impress on the Government, the necessity of giving this measure the most careful consideration, because Newfoundland is in the position which pertains to no other country on this side of the Atlantic. And therefore I want to impress on them the fact, that in my opinion, outsiders, people not living in this country, are going to benefit from any station that is going to be put up as much or more than our people. I would like, Mr. Chairman, for the Government to take this into consideration.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, I think that the remarks that have fallen from the lips of the members on the other side of the House are the best endorsation of the Government's action that one could desire, because every word that they have said points to the wisdom of the Government of doing what they are doing this afternoon. We are not asking to have the committee consider any agreement. We are not making any agreement. We have not very much information on this matter and we have to move very slowly as regards putting the shackles on our hands again as they have been for the last twenty years by the Marconi Agreement. The agreement gave them the exclusive right to wireless telegraphy in this country. The shackles are off our hands to-day, and I would be the last one to put these shackles on again. With regard to the remarks of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition in connection with the Marconi Station at Mount Pearl, I know something about that station. I was very much identified with it in the initial stages. I happened to be the Colonial Secretary at the time when at the request of the British Government we had to make arrangements for the financing and the building of it, and I know a great deal about the operation during the war, and I might say that it was never a success from the first to the last. With regard to the Government going slow. I can say that the Government would not look at it under any circumstances. As the Hon. Member for Fortune Bay said it is a lot of junk and the man who bought it said the other day that the only things any good were the masts. And he said "How am I going to get them down? It would cost me more to get them down than they

are worth." We have discussed the matter of direction finding station at Mount Pearl, and I understand that it is not suitable. It is enlightening to hear Captain Randell this afternoon say that St. John's is too near Cape Race for a direction finding station, and coming from a man of his experience such a statement must have force. I would like to ask Captain Randell what the distance should be?

CAPTAIN RANDELL—About sixty miles.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—That is a matter that I am sure will be remembered in any negotiations in connection with this matter. Mr. Warren referred to the wireless Direction Finding Station at Cape Race that the wires were so busy that they could not attend to any other business. I would like to tell the Hon. Member that I am not familiar with the conditions that existed in 1920, but I would like to tell him that the direction finding is different from the ordinary wireless business.

MR. WARREN—I would like to correct myself there. I meant that the direction finding was interfering with the other waves.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—With regard to the tax. Tomorrow if we like we can put a tax on the Fogo station. It is the only station that belongs to the Marconi Company. They operate and we pay them. We can put a tax of four thousand dollars on the Fogo station tomorrow if we wanted to. I think that this is the open sesame, and I think that we should be very careful before entering into anything that may prejudice the future interest of the country. Our geographical position makes our position invaluable when it comes to a matter of trans-Atlantic wireless service. Newfoundhas a future in this respect that is little dreamed of to-day. I attended a luncheon in London last summer when the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Mr. Amery, made the statement that Ireland and Newfoundland would be the two bridgeheads for the bridge that would span the Atlantic in the aerial commercial service. And if the possibilities are so great there what are the possibilities with regard to wireless telegraphy.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to point out the fact that we are not entering into any agreement. We are asking the House for the endorsation of the expenditure that is necessary to continue the service for one year more. It is going to cost another eight or ten thousand dollars to continue the operation for another year as it has been for the last twenty years. The Minister of Finance in his budget will have to make provision for this expenditure, and the hon. members may make enquiries as to the reason. We are only asking the House to give permission to the representative of the Governor in Council to instruct the Marconi company to continue the operation for another year, and they will be paid by the Government. I would not be party to a new agreement at the present time. And the only thing that we are asking is the sanction of the House to make the expenditure for this year. The offices will be opened. The same operators will be there and conditions will be exactly the same as last year and we are to pay the Marconi Company the full cost plus ten per cent. We expect that we will have to pay about eighteen thousand dollars. Therefore there is no necessity for any anxiety on the part of the members of the House that we are going to do something that is not proper. I have not had an opportunity of seeing a copy of the agreement to which the member for Fortune Bay referred. I have not heard of it. I question very much whether it is in the Department of the Colonial Secretary. It

may be in the Prime Minister's Department. We will be able to find that out to-morrow. But I do not think that it would be of very much service at present. We want one year to make enquiries and find out what can be done. It occurs to me that we may be able to work the whole thing through the Postal Telegraph Department and save ourselves a considerable amount of money. The position is now that we want time to find out what is the best course to adopt. There are other companies that can do this work as well as the Marconi. Mr. Morse was down here last year. He was anxious to know when the Marconi agreement expired as he would like to come in and give an estimate. Whether this is going to be run by the Postal Department or by some outside Company we have to be sure that we do what is in the best interest of the country, and I feel sure that that will be done. I consider that we can charge the Canadian Government four thousand dollars for the direction finding station on Belle Isle. It may be a matter of national interest. It may be a matter of national protection, and it may not be considered advisable. However it is a matter that will have to be looked into. Mr. Warren referred to the attitude of the British Government. I take it that the British Government is adverse to entering into an agreement with the Marconi Co. However I think that I have outlined the position rather fully to the hon. members.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Confirming what the Colonial Secretary has just said, I feel sure that the hon. members on reflection will see that these resolutions are just to let the Government carry on the old condition of things for one year more until they get familiar with the matter. Personally I can see no objection to these resolutions at all myself. It is just entering on the same agreement for another year. Of course it can be changed to read that the agreement of 1927 may be continued for the year, but I think that it is not a matter of any moment. We asked to have the House go into Committee this afternoon that an opportunity might be afforded to put the matter before the House and to be in the position to vote the additional amount that will be necessary. I am sure that the Colonial Secretary has no objection whatever as to wording of the resolutions. It is just put in this form because it was thought that it would most easily express what has to be done. We have to make some arrangements with this company or with some other company in connection without wireless operations.

MR. HALFYARD—I am sorry that I was not here when the Colonial Secretary made his opening remarks in introducing these resolutions. I am speaking from first impressions and from the little that I have already heard of the explanation since I took my seat this afternoon. But I cannot for the life of me understand why the Government is introducing resolutions of this nature which is quite contrary to anything that they said they would do, according to the explanation that has just been given us by the Colonial Secretary. It is not a new agreement in the strict sense of the word, if I understand the remarks of the Colonial Secretary. But he will make some agreement with this or some other company next year on similar lines to what we have at the present time. If it is a new agreement then the Government is presuming upon its authority and contrary to pre-election pronouncements by asking this House to give them the authority to make a new agreement. This legislature should make the new agreement or any agreement. This is one of the most important measures that can be

brought before the House. According to the statute the agreement expires this year. It has already expired. I say that the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs should be prepared to come in here this afternoon and make a two hours speech dealing with every aspect of the wireless business in this country, and at the same time lay on the table of the House an outline of a new agreement. It is not the Colonial Secretarys business and the Colonial Secretary should not be asked to introduce these resolutions. He does not know of or he cannot find a copy of an agreement between the Newfoundland Government and the Marconi Company that was practically finalized. I can take care of any statements that I make. The proceedure this afternoon is most disgraceful in the extreme. One of the most important measures that could be brought down here for discussion is brought in here in the three or four lines of these resolutions asking us to give the Governor in Council authority to make a new agreement for one year. And then we are told that it is not a new agreement at all. If you were making out a manifesto I could understand what you mean. If you had something in your minds that you did not think that men would be able to understand. It is an insult to the members of this House to introduce these resolutions as a new agreement, and then say that you do not mean to make a new agreement. It is illogical and contrary to ordinary common sense. The Government knew the agreement expired in April of this year. Therefore they have been lax in the performance of their duty, in not having any agreement prepared for the ratification of the Legislature. Surely this House is not going to give the authority to the Governor in Council to enter into an agreement with the Marconi Co. without first having that agreement submitted to the legislature. If it only means the extension of the old agreement for one year that can be easily done by just changing the date. Mr. Chairman, the Colonial Secretary must appreciate the mistake that he makes by bringing in the resolutions in this form. I know what I am talking about. What happened is that some one representing the Company, a Mr. McCallum, I think, interviewed a member of the Government, perhaps the Minister of Posts. The man was in a hurry because he wanted to take the first train out of Newfoundland, and as a result someone was phoned and told to put the resolutions on paper, without any consideration. That is the conclusion that we can come to by having this tabled this afternoon. Mr. Chairman, I think that it is in order that the committee rise and give the Colonial Secretary and the Minister of Posts sufficient time to put what they mean in writing in the form of resolutions for submission to this House so that we may be able to talk intelligently on the question. At the present time nobody even if he so desires can speak intelligently on these resolutions because the resolutions state one thing, and the explanations given by the Colonial Secretary are quite different. The Prime Minister laughs. On any question that you have to discuss do you not wish to be informed as fully as possible? So that you may be able to discuss it intelligently. That is what I mean. I trust that the House will not proceed any further with these resolutions, but that an agreement with the Marconi Company be drawn up, and then be submitted to this House for ratification.

MR. WARREN—In view of what the Colonial Secretary said, and as the member for Trinity, Mr. Halfyard, was not in the House when the explanation was made, I think that he rather missed the point. In view of the assurance given the House by the

Colonial Secretary that this is merely that the Government is going to make an arrangement, to operate the stations on the Labrador for one year more, with the Marconi Company, at ten per cent. over the cost I cannot see any objection to it.

THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Chairman, while I am in accord with these resolutions now before the House, I would like to go a step further and have the wording changed so that possibly one or two of the stations on the Labrador may be changed, or perhaps even have one of them discontinued. The wireless station at Cape Harrison has been of no use to the fishermen along the coast of Labrador for a number of years. I understand that the income from that station is only about five dollars a year.

I would like to have the wording arranged so that the proper changes could be made, and that station or any other station that is of no use could be removed. I suggest that to the consideration of the Colonial Secretary. Some of the fishermen and suppliers around Occasional and Fishing Ships Harbour on the coast of Labrador have been asking for a wireless station, and recommendations were made to the Government last year having this object in view. The supplier operating in this section are placed to considerable disadvantage because they have to travel thirty to forty miles to a wireless station every time they wish to send a message, and for this reason a station should be immediately placed on that particular part of the coast.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—I think that the point that the Minister of Public Works makes is a good one. I know something of the matter to which he refers because I had some experience myself in connection with some of these stations. But I think that that is all entirely a matter of detail and does not involve a principal as far as these resolutions are concerned. It certainly would be looked to before any permanent arrangements for the future would be made with regard to the operation of these stations. I think that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries made certain representation to the Government with regard to the change of some of the stations on the Labrador. However, I think that this is a matter that can be taken up without any alteration in these resolutions.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—I have been listening to the various remarks that have been passed in connection with these resolutions and I did not intend to say anything myself, because like Mr. Russell I understand that it is only to be for another year. But I would like to say here that the Marconi stations on the Labrador want to be reorganized. I take it for granted on the word of the Colonial Secretary that these resolutions are only to help the Governor in Council to make an agreement with the Marconi Company for another year, same as we have had for the last number of years. And I think there ought to be something put in this for the aid of the sealfishery. I have been to the sealfishery for 25 years, Mr. Chairman, and could always go without a foreign going captain, and always found my way back too. But now because I have no foreign going ticket I have to take a captain along with me, and while I could always get home before, now we sometimes find it difficult to find Cape Bonavista. I should like to speak of the work of the direction finder—no matter what the weather was, fine or stormy, we were able to pick up our direction, and I do agree that a direction finder ought to be placed somewhere between St. John's and Belle Isle. Captain Randell says that St. John's would be too near Cape Race.

I don't profess to be a foreign going captain, and will take his word for it, but I have also the statements of captains of such ships as the Sachem, the Silvia and other masters. In my opinion the proper place would be Bonavista Cape—but perhaps we think the sealfishery demands too insignificant and that will be paid no attention to. As regards the stations on the Labrador I agree to some extent with Mr. Russell. He is agitating for a station at Occasional Harbor—that may be needed, but I think they are needed worse further North. If this contract was being made for a long time I should have more to say, and would advocate a revision of the stations, but we have the assurance that this is only for one year. I remember that there was a station erected on Labrador for the sole benefit of Mr. Dunn of Harbor Grace, who was carrying on business there. He has now ceased, but it does service for others. When it comes up next year I think I shall have some suggestions regarding stations to make.

MR. HALFYARD—Are you going to alter the words. Are you going to put in what the costs will be for this year.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—That is only for one year, and they will not operate under the old agreement, or on the same terms as the old agreement. The intention is just to keep going for one year.

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. Whereupon the Bill "An Act Respecting an Agreement between the Marconi Wireless Telegraph Company of Canada, Limited," was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Questions

Questions 1, 2, 3, 5.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I beg to answer by laying on the table answers to questions Numbers 1, 2, and 6 of yesterday, and 1, 2, 3, 5 of to-day.

Question 4.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The Hon. Minister is not in the House—he is laid up and will not be here to-day.

No. 6—deferred.

No. 7—tabled.

No. 8.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS — This question is properly within the jurisdiction of the Minister of Public Works and will no doubt be answered by him.

No. 9.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—This has already been answered in the Daily News of this morning by asking for tenders for coal.

MR. HICKMAN—I should like to draw the attention of the Prime Minister to Question No. 8 on the Order Paper of the 8th.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—Is that the question regarding Wembley Exhibition? I got in touch with Mr. Outerbridge only this morning, and he is preparing this information.

MR. HALFYARD—I should like to have an answer from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries as to when I shall get the information I asked for.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I don't know when you'll get it. Probably in three weeks.

MR. HALFYARD — Mr. Speaker, that is not satisfactory. I should not have to wait for three weeks. The Minister had statisticians, or whatever he may call them working, and should have this at hand. No one expects a Minister to answer a question himself. When you were out of the House we got answers, and why

can't we get them now.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I still say you'll get it in three weeks.

MR. HALFYARD—If it will take three weeks to get I don't want it at all.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Oh, sit down. There's no need for you to get saucy about it—I can get as saucy as you, and I want you to know that.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, that is altogether uncalled for. It is better for the Minister to give no answer at all than to be discourteous.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I told you yesterday you'd get it in three weeks, and you'll get it.

MR. HALFYARD—You told me that I would get it in three weeks. You are supposed to have had men making statistics, and you ought to be able to tell what each place turned out.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I didn't send a man to each place.

MR. HALFYARD—It is a wonder you didn't get every old woman to tell what the old man got.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Is that what you would do?

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Seal Fishery Act, and other Acts relating to the Seal 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 House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Civil Service."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

Sec. 8.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, when this matter was first before the House there was some question raised about this section, and reference was made by the Prime Minister to the case of a geologist, and reference was made to the possibility of employing a geologist who is now a resident of the Falkland Islands, and who is, I understand, English by birth. Mr. Duff rightly raised an objection against anyone coming from the Falkland Islands or even the British Isles. What similarity is there between the geology of Newfoundland and that of the Falkland Islands? I do not pretend to know a great deal about this, but my opinion is that if we cannot get a Newfoundlander for this position, and I mean, of course, one who has studied geology in some University and obtained degrees and had some practical experience — If this cannot be done, then we ought to get a Canadian. I do not think we should go further across the water than across the Cabot Straits, and I support the honourable member's standing in that direction; if that is what is referred to here, I take this opportunity to support the stand taken as regards a geologist. If we must get a geologist, let us get one as near home as possible. It is quite probable that the geology of Canada resembles that of Newfoundland greatly, and unless Newfoundland was removed from some place near the Falkland Islands in some remote period and brought here, then it is practically useless to get any person from the Falkland Islands.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I think the geology of the hon. member's mind needs consideration. What has this question under consideration got to do with that of the engagement of a geologist? When this particular section came up first,

someone asked how it would affect civil servants, and I pointed out, as an example, possible cases such as that of a geologist being engaged here. I mentioned a Geologist from the Falkland Islds., because we happened to have at that time a communication from a gentleman who had made a survey of the Falkland Islands and was seeking a position in this country. I cannot possibly see how the poor man can have done himself any harm by teaching in the Falkland Islands or elsewhere. It appealed to me because he is a Doctor of Science of London University. He is a man of forty years of age and having taken this highest degree at London University he must be a capable man. Because he has taught school in Grenada and made a survey of the Falkland Islands does not do him any harm. If Mr. Duff has any man in Carbonear who is a Doctor of Science from London he will have the opportunity of suggesting his appointment. As far as we are concerned all we want is to get a good geologist, and if he is a Newfoundlander, then all the better.

MR. DUFF—I am very pleased to note that my little effort has been of some value. As far as this bill is concerned I think that it is a good step. I thought when the Prime Minister stood up that I might not have been quite right, but now I am sure that I was quite right. We are told that he is a Doctor of Science. Of course I think that Doctors of Science from London are very clever men, but I am convinced that we can get Bachelors of Science from many other Universities that are just as clever as those Doctors of Science from London who have to teach school in the Falkland Islands. Of course I am not fishing for a job for my friends. I would not like to have any of my friends mixed up with the present Government because their term is going to be very short.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, my object in rising is this. The Government under this bill is going to give a man consideration when making up the pension for the light he has been getting, his fuel, house. I would like to get an idea as to how the Government is going to make up the emoluments. Say for the Dotcor at the General Hospital or the Asylum. What emolument will the Doctors get?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—That is easy to answer. If a man is getting a salary at the Hospital. Say for instance the Doctor at the Hospital who is provided with a home. We have to consider what the house rental is worth, and I think that we would have to pay retirement allowance on basis to include rental. I think that it would be better if the Government gave a man a salary and made him find his own house, but this bill is only following what has been done in the past. If a man is receiving an emolument in addition to his salary it is only natural that it will have to be taken into consideration when making up his pension. I hope that the time will come when that will be done away with, and when he is appointed he will get a salary that will embrace his house and light and everything else. It may be argued that in making up the list of the emoluments that a man may be inclined to contend that the value of his house was a great deal more than we might be inclined to consider it. He may say that the House is worth a thousand dollars a year and want his pension on the basis of an extra thousand dollars a year on his salary. This is for the Governor in Council to decide. As I said before, I think the way to correct it is when new appointments are being made to pay them salaries that will pay for the House rent and light and do away with emoluments altogether.

MR. CASHIN—I thank the Prime

Minister for the explanation. There are a few more items that have dawned upon me. If this bill that is before the House is put through there are people who were never paid pensions that will be looking for them. We have lots of people in the employ of the Government for part of the year, such as wardens, customs men, and I presume that from now the Government is going to have its difficulty in dealing with applications from men of this sort who under the old act would never be looking for pensions. Now while the insurance scheme has gone out of this bill I notice in answer to a question of Mr. Grimes which he asked the Prime Minister in connection with the insurance at the railway it has been pointed out in the House the companies have been loosing money on this group insurance scheme; since 1920 according to the information tabled the group insurance at the railway death claims amounted to $92,100, the premiums to $105,586. That does not look as if they were losing money. And I submit, sir, that if the claims equalled the premiums that these companies would still be making money because these insurance companies invest their money and make probably ten or fifteen or twenty per cent. But what I do not like about this bill is that now in looking for the emolument that men will be putting in so many quarts of milk and so many heads of cabbage and the Government is going to pay the pension accordingly. According to the act we cannot stop them. I am quite in accord with the principal of the bill, but you will find that you will save very little money by it.

THE HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE —The members of the police force and fire department have their own separate allowance and regulations. Their own scheme is more for their protection and benefit than this scheme of allowance. To-day when a constable is promoted to the rank of Sergeant his appointment is confirmed by the Governor-In-Council.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and had passed the 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 Chapter 125 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Trustees. "

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, in connection with this Bill, as I explained yesterday in Second Reading, it is introduced at the request of the Registrar of the Supreme Court because of its necessity found in handling estates. If members will keep the Bill in front of them, as it stands now, they will see where the amendments come in. It will be noticed that the only variation made now is an enlargement of the power of investments of trustee and to secure the safety of securities.

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 Respecting the Ap-

portionment of Periodical Payments."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, in connection with this Bill I merely say, as I said yesterday, that it is asked for by the Registrar of the Supreme Court in connection with the distribution of Estates. The Bill is necessary to put in effect a law which has been in effect in England for some years—since 1870, I think the Act was passed. The Bill was personally drafted by the Registrar of the Supreme Court, and the real effect of what looks like a large Bill is simply to provide for the apportionment of rents and other payments accruing from day to day. That is if a person dies before a yearly amount for instance falls due, that part accruing before his death can be recovered; as I understand it if an annuity for example is payable in July, and the person to receive it dies in June, payment for the period up to June could be recovered. It was discovered recently that in connection with a couple of estates this difficulty confronted them, and we are asked to make this change. It is purely a replica of the old English Act.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, the House has been informed that this Bill has been drafted by the gentleman who is the Registrar of the Supreme Court, and as a mark of confidence in that gentleman's ability I move that this be passed without reading, without further delay—and this would save 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 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.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, April 15th, 1926.

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

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, before proceeding with the business of the House this afternoon, I do not think it would be out of order to express sympathy on behalf of the entire House in connection with this disaster by fire which occurred at Mount Cashel yesterday. I feel that the community will extend their sincere and profound sympathy to the Christian Brothers in the loss they have sustained. We hope, however, that means will be provided to continue that Institution which, irrespective of creed altogether, is one that has been a lasting benefit to this community, and which we hope will continue to be so.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker, I wish to support what has been said by the Hon. the Prime Minister. Yesterday when I saw that fire I do not think that I ever saw anything so disappointing in my life. I lived one summer near Mount Cashel and I became well acquainted with the Brothers there. I knew how hard they had to work to keep up that place, and I knew of the large number of boys that they had the care of ,boys who otherwise, perhaps, would be on the street and unable to help themselves. I feel that something ought to be done, and all the assistance possible given in this worthy cause, and anything the Government will do in the way of help will be

supported strongly by the Members on this side of the House.

MR. WARREN — Mr. Speaker, Mount Cashel was an asset to the community, irrespective of the fact that a portion of the community had not the privilege of taking advantage of it. Those in charge of that Institution certainly set the example; the other denominations followed, and I feel sure that from the ruins there now that all denominations will contribute towards putting a new industrial orphanage there, and which will be even of greater benefit to the community than the one destroyed yesterday.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Speaker, I would like to endorse the remarks of the Prime Minister, the Leader of the Opposition and the Member for Fortune Bay. If there is one institution in this country that I am particularly fond of, it is Mount Cashel. I think that the work done by these good Brothers, of whom Rev. Brother Ennis is the superior, is one of the most commendable ever undertaken in this country. Anything that can be done now to help that noble band of workers should be done, and I hope and trust the public will come forward and help them out in their endeavour to put that Institution back again to where it was a few days ago.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the sentiments expressed by previous speakers in connection with Mount Cashel, and I feel that everything possible will be done both by the Government and the outside community to contribute towards the re-construction of that Institution, even to a greater degree than in the past.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to allow the opportunity to pass without re-echoing what has been said already for the good Christian Brothers in the almost irreparable loss they have sustained. As has been intimated by the Leader of the Opposition, it was a sad sight indeed to see such magnificent buildings going up in smoke. I hope and trust that Phoenix-like it will arise from its ashes, and that possibly in the future Mount Cashel will have a greater and more glorious Institution. I, therefore, sincerely sympathize with the Brothers in their loss.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, as one who happens to be by accident connected with the work of the Christian Brothers, I would like to express my appreciation, and to join in the sentiments voiced by previous Speakers. I feel sure that Brother Ennis, and those associated with him, if they were here to-day to speak for themselves, would only repeat that Mount Cashels success in the past will be repeated in the future, just because of the attitude of the gentlemen who have spoken here to-day, representing as they do the general public of all denominations.

MR. MOORE—Mr. Speaker, as one who has been associated with the Christian Brothers for the past thirty years, and as one who has helped them as best he could in the cause of education, and in connection with Mount Cashel Orphanage, I hope with my colleagues here in this House that that meritorious Institution will not be long before it is back to where it was two days ago, when it was overtaken and wiped out by fire.

Petitions were presented by:

Hon. Mr. Sullivan from Tack's Beach re wharf.

Minister of Agriculture from Cape Shore re road.

Mr. Ashbourne from Pilley's Island re wharf.

Mr. Cashin gave notice of question.

Mr. Hickman gave notice of question.

Mr. Scammell gave notice of question.

Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs gave notice that he would on Monday next move the House into Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Answers to the following questions were tabled, with exceptions of Nos. 1 and 2, which were deferred.

(1) MR. BROWN asked Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs to lay on the Table of the House a statement in answer to the following questions: (1) Has there been a Mail Courier's house built at Alexander Bay station since July 1st, 1925; (2) If such house was built, what was the total cost of same; (3) To whom was contract given for building same; (4) Were tenders called for the erection of this building and from whom were tenders received and what was the amount of the tender in each case; (5) To lay on the Table of the House a copy of all original bills and invoices showing how the total cost of the said Mail Courier's house was made up, if such house was built.

(2) MR. BROWN—To ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing the amount of his expenses in connection with his trip to the Straits last Spring in connection with the dispute over trap licenses; also to ask what arrangements were made as regards trap berth licenses on Canadian Labrador.

(3) MR. BROWN asked Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing the number of men who worked on telegraph line between Gander Bay and Horwood, also state names of men and amount paid each.

(4) MR. BROWN asked the Minister of Agriculture and Mines to lay on the Table of the House an answer to each of the following questions: (1) How many logging Camp Inspectors are at present employed by the Department of Agriculture and Mines; (2) What are their names and state the salaries being paid in each case; (3) Who were the Inspectors for the season of 1925, and what was paid them for (a) salary and (b) expenses in each case; (4) To lay on the Table of the House a copy of such instructions, if any, as are issued to Inspectors, in relation to their duties; (5) To lay on the Table of the House a copy of Inspectors' reports on the Camps last year; (6) Have the Camps of the Newfoundland Power and Paper Co., Ltd., been inspected so far this season, if so, by whom, and if any report has been submitted on these Camps this season, to lay copy of same on the Table of the House; (7) Have the Camps of the A. N. D. Co., Ltd., been inspected this season, if so, by whom, and if any report has to date been submitted to lay a copy of same on the Table of the House.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—I beg to table answer to question asked by Mr. Grimes in connection with the Board of Liquor Control, and to question asked by Major Cashin on the 13th.

MR. CASHIN—I would like to ask the Minister of Finance if he is going to table the invoices in connection with the question about coal asked by Mr. Power the other day.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—In reply to Mr. Cashin, I may say that I was merely waiting until the orders of the day were finished, to lay on the table of the House a statement in reply to certain things said the other day in that concetion by Mr. Cashin. I fully intended on Monday to table this information, as I think the country at large should know the facts in connection with this. The position is simply this; on Friday, Mr. Cashin, in connection with this question, stated that the answer given was not correct, like other answers he had received.

MR. CASHIN—The remark made was that the Department did not give

correct information in connection with that report tabled,—that a cargo of coal had been imported during that period, concerning which I gave full particulars, that was not on the report, and, if that was the kind of information that was going to be given, one could not place any reliability on answers received.

MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS — Mr. Speaker, on Friday, Major Cashin rose on a matter of privilege in connection with a question asked by the hon. member for St. George's, Mr. Power, in relation to the import of coals from the United States into this port, from July 1st, 1924 to March 25th, 1926. The hon. member for Ferryland said that the answer given was not correct, like several other answers from that Department which he had received. I, as Finance Minister, took exception to these remarks, and said that the questions had been answered correctly, and I then informed the House that while I was Finance Minister I was not afraid of any question being asked or any investigation of any nature being made in regard to that department.

They show the position to be simply this: The following cargoes were imported in 1924 and paid Sales Tax on the cost, freight and duty:—

On August 29th Miller and Company paid the sum of $988.05 duty and $532.-84 sales tax, making a total of $1,520.-89 on 1411½ tons of coal imported by the schooner Rosemary; invoice of which was furnished by the importers.

On September 16th again Miller and Company paid $886.65 duty and $478.-10 sales tax, making a total of $1364.-65 on 1,266½ tons of coal imported by t e schooner K. May, the invoice being also presented by the importers.

On January 14th, 1925, Cashin & Company paid $2,391.55 duty and $1,-255.56 sales tax, making a total of $3,-647.11 on 3416½ tons of col imported in the S.S. "Brattinsberg." I regret to say that no invoices were presented to the Customs Department then, or since, for this cargo.

On January 14th again, Cashin & Company paid the sum of $350.00 duty and $183.75 sales tax, making a total of $533.75 on 500 tons of coal imported in the S.S. "Bratinsberg." No invoice was presented to the Department then or since for this cargo.

All the above cargoes came under the sales tax that had been in force previous to the amendment of last year.

The following came under the Sales Tax of 1922:—

On May 25th, S.S. "Svartford" arrived with 3,009½ tons of coal for the Nfld. Government Railway and consigned to Cashin & Company. The duty collected was $2,106.65 and the sales tax $300.95. Here again no invoice was presented then or since for this cargo. Invoice was promised but has not since turned up.

On July 14th Cashin & Company paid the sum of $1,730.05 and $257.03 sales tax, making a total of $1,987.08 on 247½ tons of coal imported by the "Sheafbrook." For this cargo, again, no invoice was presented then or since.

On July 25th the "Certo" arrived with 3278 tons of coal for the Nfld. Government Railway and consigned to Cashin & Company. On this cargo $2,294.60 was collected as duty and $327.80 Sales Tax, making a total of $2,622.40. No invoice was presented then or since for this cargo.

On October 28th the S.S. "Certo" arrived with 3,225 tons of coal for the Railway, consigned to Cashin & Company. On this cargo the sum of $2,257.-50 was collected as duty and $322.50 sales tax, total of $2,580.00. No invoice was presented for this cargo then or since.

On August 8th a cargo of 3,644 tons of coal arrived by the S.S. "Thorgerd"

and two days later a Bill of Sight (which is one of the exhibits) was passed at a value of $7,761.72, the amount of duty $2,550.80 and of Sales Tax $388.08, making a total of $2,938.88.

Not until nearly four months later, on December 1st, 1925, was an entry presented for this cargo, and then it showed a value of $2,396.13. This was less by $5,465.59 than the value which the cargo had been entered for in the Bill of Sight. The Sales Tax paid at the time the Bill of Sight was passed was $388.08, and when the entry was made $274.00 was refunded to Cashin & Company as an overpayment on the Bill of Sight.

This entry on December 1st was accompanied by an invoice which exhibited two peculiarities. It was dated September 30th though in respect of coal arriving here on August 10th, or nearly seven weeks earlier, and it was from the Century Coal Company of Montreal, Canada, though in respect of coal brought from Newport News, Virginia. Moreover, it was not handed to us until December 1st, or two months after its date. In addition, it carried no certificate of correctness or other evidence thereof, and it showed the cost of the coals at the mine sixty-three cents per ton, while the freight from mines to the shipping port was shown at two dollars and sixty-two cents; and the freight to St. John's one dollar and twenty-five cents. The Sales Tax was passed as on 63 cents per ton. This invoice was questioned on these various grounds by the invoice clerk, Mr. E. White, but the entry was afterwards initialed by Mr. LeMessurier, the Deputy Minister, although the invoice was not certified and had nothing to show that it was the correct invoice.

When my attention was called to this matter a few days ago I examined the entry and invoice, and sent for the Deputy Minister and asked him upon what authority he had accepted such an invoice. He admitted that it was irregular, but explained that he had made certain inquiries and got information that the invoice was correct (for apparently he had his doubts about it.)

I asked him to let me see this information, which I thought had been got from abroad, and he told me that he had made inquiries in local circles and satisfied himself that the correct price of the coal was about sixty cents a ton.

I did not like the transaction and accordingly sent the Collector of Customs at Newport News the following message:

Collector Customs,
Newport News, U.S.A.

Please cable me collect at the earliest opportunity what Company cleared the S.S. "Thorgerd" with coals for Cashin and Company, St. John's, Newfoundland on or about July 31st, nineteen hundred and twenty-five.

JOHN C. CROSBIE,
Minister of Finance and Customs..

To which I received the following information:—

Sir John C. Crosbie,
Minister of Finance & Customs,
St. John's, Newfoundland.

T. P. Host, agent, Newport News, cleared steamer "Thorgerd" on July 13th, 1925. Coal supplied by Lake and Export Coal Corporation of Norfolk, Virginia.

JOSEPH L. CRUPPER,
Collector of Customs.

The reply speaks for itself as to this transaction and I need say no more.

Again, on October 13th the S.S. "Certo" arrived here with a cargo of coals for the Newfoundland Government Railway, amounting to 3,225 tons. It was entered by Cashin and Company and on October 28th the Railway paid $2,257.50 duty and $322.50 Sales Tax, a total of $2580.00. But

neither then nor since was an invoice presented to the Customs House for this cargo.

On October 23rd S.S. Tosto" arrived with 2,013 tons of coal, and was entered by Cashin and Company, who passed for it on October 24th on Bill of Sight, Number 346, valued at $4,327.55, the duty being $1409.10 and Sales Tax $216.40, a total of $1,625.50 An entry cancelling this Bill of Sight was presented on March 22nd, 1926, five months later, and showed the value of the coals at $4,690.29, duty being $1,409.10 and Sales Tax $234.51, a total of $1,643.61. The Bill of Sight not being sufficient to cover the same, a certified cheque for $18.11 was paid to the Department of Customs.

This transaction is remarkable for the fact that it is the first time in over fourteen months, from June 14th, 1925, to March 22nd, 1916, that Cashin and Company presented a certified invoice, although they had brought in five cargoes in that period. Why they waited until five months after the arrival of the cargo I leave the hon. member for Ferryland to explain, but he can scarcely grumble if this House and the country should see some connection between the appearance of the invoice and the discussions about coal in this House recently.

Again the S.S. "Urter" arrived here on March 22nd from Newport News, and entered to Cashin and Company with a cargo of 2,003 tons. This was passed on Bill of Sight No. 781 the same day, showing a value of $5,067.59, with duty $1,402.10 and Sales Tax $253.38, a total of $1,655.48. Five days afterwards, March 27th, entry was made by Cashin and Company showing a value of $5,037.54 with duty $1,402.10 and Sales Tax $251.87, a total of $1,653.97. A refund of $1,51 was made to Cashin and Company. A proper and certified invoice was also presented for this cargo.

I made a full investigation of this matter and found that, as I have already stated, Cashin and Company secured the passage through the Custom House in the past fifteen months of five cargoes of coal without presenting any invoices whatever and of another cargo on an invoice that was irregular.

I also found that, contrary to my explicit orders in 1924, that any further coals should not be bonded, 500 tons being part of a cargo of 4,416½ tons landed ex S.S. "Brattensberg" by Cashin and Company in January 5th, 1925, were bonded and that on October 10th, 1925, ten months afterwards 276 tons were entered ex warehouse, valued at $1,421.40, with duty paid at $193.20 and Sales Tax $71.07, a total of $264.27. The remaining 224 tons of coal was transhipped to Holyrood and Old Perlican.

As this practice of allowing people to pass goods without invoices is contrary to regulations, is unfair to other importers and is liable to grave abuse and as it was extended to a person for fifteen months, I am having a careful enquiry made and will enforce necessary measures to avoid such occurrence again.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker: With your permission I will reply to the remarks and information just received from the Minister of Finance. I have listened to the Minister of Finance make a statement in connection with these cargoes of coal, and he has not stated that there was a change in the duty between 1924 and 1925. By the Revenue Act brought in by the Government, a difference was made in the Sales Tax payable, changing it from cost plus freight and insurance to cost at point of origination.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.—With regard to that fact that some of the cargoes came under the 1924 and some under the 1925 Sales Tax, I am well aware of that, and Mr. Cashin

need not think for a minute that I did not know all about it.

MR. CASHIN. — This discussion originated from an article in the Daily News which I have before me now, and which would lead the publice to believe that there was no change in the duty; it would lead any ordinary individual to think that it was a statement set out without any change in the duty. Every invoice in connection with coal cargoes, excepting those for the railway, has been sent to the Custom House. The railway invoices were submitted to the Railway Department by Cashin & Co., Ltd. Mr. Watson rang up and asked on what invoice he was to pay Sales Tax. Sir Michael Cashin told him over the telephone what was the rate of freight, and duty was to be paid at cost of article at point of origination. The point is that people have been whispering in connection with this matter, about the street. Even Ministers of the Crown have been whispering that Cashin & Co. have falsified invoices. It is just as well to lay our cards on the table in connection with this matter, and, if there is any charge to make against Cashin & Co. here is the place to make it. No later than yesterday a Minister of the Crown told a personal friend of mine that Cashin & Co. were falsifying invoices, and led that personal friend of mine to believe that this was the case. That member is not here this afternoon, and I want to tell the Minister of Finance and anybody else that Cashin & Co. have paid one hundred cents on the dollar and owe them nothing. With regard to that 63 cents a ton, I want to explain. That cargo arrived in the country not consigned to us. It arrived on consignment, like our merchants send fish to the Mediterranean on consignment. It arrived, sent, as I was told afterwards by the Century Coal Company. We acted as agents and went to the Custom House and had no invoices but knew the cost to be six dollars a ton approximately, c.i.f.; actually we paid less for it, but for dutiable purposes we it figured out at six dollars; $6.00 ton c.i.f., $1.25 ton freight paid at Newport News, $2.62 ton freight paid to bring from heart of Virginia, that leaves a balance of $2.13 for cost at point of origination, and we went to the Custom House and handed them a cheque for $——. Following that we landed the coal and an agent representing them came from Montreal and put up a proposition to us and we bought on consignment at $4.50 a ton and made out invoices accordingly, bringing the price down to 63 cents a ton and we gave the invoices to the Customs and they gave a rebate which we were entitled to, some two hundred and seventy-four dollars. Is there any crooked work about that? Yet the Daily News would lead one to believe that there was something crooked in connection with it. The railway paid duty on coal. If there is any charge I want it to be made openly. We have nothing to hide in connection with the coal business. This article was put out for a purpose and Ministers of the Crown go around and say that Cashin & Co. falsified invoices when the same Minister practically stole ten thousand dollars of the public money to give a contract to somebody merely because of politics. The same Minister who made that remark is responsible for that, for throwing away ten thousand dollars. I am supposed to come in here and lie down and allow any individual or rag of a paper to make false statements with regard to a firm I am interested in, and make political capital of that by insinuating that I am robbing somebody. The man who wrote that is crooked. I could make a charge of that nature in this House but if I have a charge

to make I am going to make it on the floor of the House and not go down on Water Street and make it. I have been hearing of charges that are going to be made, hearing of them every day and I am not going to stand for any more of it. Let them be made, and I am prepared to take all that is coming. I am not going to allow any individual member to express unfounded charges, made deliberately to hurt, against me or any one associated with me.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Mr. Speaker, I ask the indulgence of the House for just one moment. I do not want to pursue the question any further at this present time, but I shall have a few words to say later on. If the Member for Ferryland means any slight on this Minister, I would like to know about it. If you say that you are a man fire it out and let us hear about it. And as far as I am concerned the report of the Customs will be laid on the table in the next four or five days and then we will let the country know what is right and what is wrong about this matter.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker, do I take the Hon. Minister's remarks as a threat.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—Not at all.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the Civil 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 Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 125 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of Trustees," 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 respecting the Apportionment of Periodical Payments" 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 Amend Chapter 143 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of the Keeping of Dogs."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Chairman, in moving the House into the Committee stage of this Bill, I may say that in the first place it must be clearly understood that this is not a matter of Government policy. In so far as both sides of this House are concerned, you may regard it from me as an endeavour to solve some of the tangles, and I may say that I am merely the official representative of the Department that has got to handle all information when the House is out of session. It is not the result of any representation from any section of the House as it comes in here, it is an endeavour to present what I think is a pretty reasonable solution of a difficulty that has prevailed for some time. The keeping of dogs is a very vexed question. There are ups and downs in every district, which at

certain periods want dogs and at other periods do not want them. There are districts of which sections containing a limited number of people require to keep sporting dogs. There are other sections with a limited number of people who require to keep pet dogs, and there are other sections still where the people require to keep dogs for real commercial purposes. But the principle that has prevailed throughout the country has been to allow each district to decide for themselves, by a majority of the people requesting whether or not they wanted dogs kept in that area. And except for those purposes where the dogs were actually engaged in the carrying of wood, or outside the exceptions that were made as regards what are properly called colly, or sheep dogs, no other dog was allowed in that district that had voted against the keeping of dogs. And those of us who are interested in sporting dogs, and those who see the viewpoint of the man who is interested in keeping dogs for sporting purposes, cannot lose sight of the fact that the views of the majority of those people who voted to bring in a provision against the keeping of dogs have been based on the wish of a certain class.

I would like to invite the hon. members' attention to one point, and that is, that it does not vary the principle of popular selection at all. I have had, and I am sure that other hon. members have had, frequent requests from different localities as to the idea of special permission being granted to keep dogs under certain conditions and for certain reasons. And unfortunately we have had to tell them, speaking from the standpoint of the Department, that it would not be right unless an act came in to alter the present provision. We had to say that it simply could not be done, as according to the present act no change could be made for ten years. So nothing could be moved to meet the requests. The object of the present Bill is this, that it preserves the same idea of local option, as regards the keeping of dogs, by allowing any district to change its law with regard to the keeping of dogs without waiting for ten years. I ask the hon. members' consideration of that point, for the reason that I am quite aware of the fact that petitions have come in from certain people in certain districts who want particular concessions, and I trust that the members will take it from me, as an expression of my own thought on the matter, and coming from a member of a district which is not concerned, but looking at the situation throughout the country, and with all due deference to requests of that nature, I think that the House ought to move slowly before departing from the principle that the Bill preserves. With regard to this matter there is another point that I would like to mention, though it seems to us absurd. But around Conception Bay, anomalous as it may seem, a man from St. John's can go there and bring his dogs into the district and shoot there, but a man living in the district cannot do that. This has been the cause of much comment and the cause of considerable amount of bad feeling. To-day I received a letter from Colliers, drawing attention to the same position and claiming that it is an injustice. But I merely want the members to accept this assurance from me, that there is nothing altered as regards policy. It is a recommendation that the Department has made to the Government and the Government are good enough to allow it to be introduced as a Bill. But no member of the party is bound in any way at all to support it. It is merely suggested as a solution of the difficulty that has been prevailing for some

time. One of the places where trouble arose last year was in Conception Bay. There were people there who had a good breed of dogs, and ill-feeling was engendered because we had to put into effect the act. Conception Bay was created a district which prohibited the keeping of dogs, and this act was to remain in existence for ten years, so that these people were bound by this act. This would not be as likely to happen under the new conditions as by a majority of the votes of the people this act might be altered in any year and in any area. I trust that the House will understand that in offering this to the Committee as an alteration of the present act, it is offered as what I conceive to be a fairly good solution of a difficulty that exists to-day, and I trust that before considering the idea as to how far we can meet the needs of particular sections, and putting in special clauses to that effect, that the members will not forget, if I may be pardoned for reminding them of the fact, that in going through this Bill we ought to think of more than sporting people. The whole principle of this Bill is based on what has been suggested as the best thing from the standpoint of preserving sheep in particular. It is only fair to say that a sporting dog is just as hungry as any other dog when it becomes hungry. No dog is different from any other dog under such conditions. I merely suggest that so that the members may not be too much inclined to make alteration in this respect, as the enactment of regulations with regard to particular towns, and their dog difficulties will be cleared up by the proposed new Municipal Act.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, this morning I received a signed letter from the district of Harbour Grace. It is not a petition but more in the form of a suggestion in connection with this matter of the keeping of dogs. And the citizens of Harbour Grace, the leading people of Harbour Grace, business people and others, have taken a very deep interest in this Bill. It has been a recognised hardship to the people living in restricted areas, those people who go in for sport, they have been discriminated against owing to the fact that they have had restrictions put on them under the Sheep Preservation Act. It is an absolute absurdity that a man living in one part of Conception Bay can take his dogs and go down over the barrens in restricted areas and do all the shooting that he wants, and tramp about there, while the man living in Harbour Grace is excluded from enjoying the same privilege. But the difficulty, as it has been pointed out, is, how are you going to get over the situation. I am not here this afternoon to advocate the keeping of dogs by sportsmen as against the same rights exercised by ordinary individuals. I don't advocate that because a man wants to keep a sporting dog he should have the privilege over his next door neighbour. But surely there is some way by which a man, who wants to go for two or three days shooting, can be allowed to bring a dog into a certain place, provided he keeps the dog entirely under his control. This act has been so formed that the period of its operation in restricted areas is so long that the people abandon all hope of having a change; if the majority of the people so desire it they will have to wait for ten years before having a vote as to whether or not they want to remain a restricted area or not. So I think that the idea of the amendment is this, that in any one year, upon due notice being given, the people living in any area can call for a vote as to whether the keeping of dogs should be allowed or not. I think that this

is a long step towards relieving the feeling of those who feel that they are being discriminated against. And I take it that down in Harbour Grace, after the passage of this amendment, upon giving notice, this year they can ask for a vote as to whether dogs can be kept in that particular section. And if the majority can decide they can try it out. And then if it is found that it is going to interfere to any appreciable extent with the agricultural pursuits, then in another year they can rescind it again. Now dogs are a blessing and a curse. There is nothing better than a good dog. It is a faithful friend, but still those who have lived there all their lives know what a nuisance they are around our streets. They come out and in spite of all restrictions of the Municipal authorities they are instrumental in strewing the streets with garbage of all kinds and making them generally unclean, and it is questioned very much as to whetheer many of these dogs are licensed, as provided for under the Municipal Act.

The keeping of sporting dogs is one aspect of the thing. Another aspect is the keeping of pet dogs. Another aspect is the kepeing of mongrel dogs. It is so complicated that it is very difficult to know just what this Legislature should introduce to solve the difficulty. Let us picture. Suppose the district of Ferryland votes itself into a restricted area, and suppose they were an agricultural section of the country, and they in all sincerity thought to defend their sheep and cattle and other animals in connection with their daily avocation. Now immediately adjoining the district of Ferryland is the district St. John's West. It is a well known fact that Petty Harbour is proverbial for its dogs. They are world famous. However these dogs are absolutely essential to the people down there, and no one knows more than I do about that. They have no firewood, they have no vegetation, they can't keep ponies, and they must have something with which to go into the woods and bring out the wood during the winter months. Therefore it is an absolute necessity for them to have dogs. Then the people of Petty Harbour are as thrifty and comfortable as they are, yet perhaps there may be some who are not so well off and sometimes the dogs start to roam at large. It is a well known fact that on very many occasions they have done tremendous destruction to sheep, poultry and cattle. Of course the people who own these animals (I mean the sheep, poultry and cattle) come in under the Sheep Preservation Act, and they can claim compensation for any damage that may have been done. But at the same time it is going to be a setback to the encouragement of agriculture in the district of Ferryland. On the other hand we have got to consult the necessity of the people of Petty Harbour. To find a solution of this problem would puzzle a more brilliant brain than mine. Therefore I don't think that even with this amendment all the difficulties with regard to a matter of this kind are going to be overcome. I know this, that Harbour Grace and the vicinity have had a dog's act which has been put in force for a number of years. They have a certain amount of sheep there, but they have not got them to any great proportion. They have not reached the proportion which those who actually put the act in force anticipated or hoped for. We have on the other hand a body of citizens who want the privilege of keeping a dog so that they can have a few days' shooting in the fall. I hope that under the proposed Municipal Act, which will be introduced this session, that certain regulations will be brought about whereby a man that wants to can keep a dog providing he is prepared to pay for

it. I don't think that a man should be allowed to keep a dog unless he is prepared to pay for it, and that he is prepared to keep it constantly under his control; for I would not encourage any area to go back to the conditions where the dog is allowed to roam at large. I hope that the amendment that is brought in will pass this House. It is not actually a Government measure. It is a matter for any member of the House to express his opinion on, and he may vote whatever way he likes. But I think that it is right that people should not be tied down for ten years, if they happen to see things in a different light from what they saw them two or three years ago. I support the amendment for that reason, and I trust that the people of Harbour Grace and those who want to have a few days' shooting, that some way willl be devised to allow them to have the privilege of keeping a dog for the time being in the town. But I certainly would not advocate that if I thought that any other people who wanted a dog to haul wood, for instance, would not have the same privilege.

MR. DUFF—Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few comments on this Bill. We understand the position very thoroughly. Both the Colonial Secretary and the Minister of Justice have explained everything so well that there is not very much more to be said. I would like to say that in years gone by the fishermen kept dogs for the purpose of getting firewood.

At the present time there is hardly a man over there who doesn't keep a horse, so that part of the remarks do not apply. The point I want to raise is that in such a place as Newfoundland people are not permitted to keep sporting dogs—I don't think there is another country in the world where that could be said. And men can come in with their sporting dogs, and shoot the birds, and we have to watch them. The point I would like to ask the Minister of Justice is whether we will be able to keep them for our own barrens.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—My answer to that is that it is not possible to keep them. Judging by the dogs at my own house, and we have several beautiful setters, it isn't possible to keep a dog in, or from doing damage.

MR. DUFF—It is different in Carbonear. There is no reason why such dogs should not be allowed.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—How are you going to look after the ramifications of a dog? I do not think you are likely to get it.

MR. DUFF—Keep them on a chain. You see dogs on leashes everywhere else—in Europe for instance.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Yes, and they would eat you if they had the chance. That's what happened the dog at Wembley—they kept it in a cage.

MR. DUFF—Now as to collie dogs. Why should people be allowed to keep these and not the other kinds. I don't see why, if the Government wants revenue, they can't charge a fee for people who want to keep dogs. It is true that they see some hundreds in St. John's in the nights, but that wouldn't happen in Carbonear. Charge a fee and that would satisfy everybody. I don't believe there is one sheep more in Carbonear than when the dogs were prohibited—and I expected to see the hills covered with sheep. If it is possible to do this I believe everybody would be satisfied. I see the point of the Minister of Justice that there is a reduction from 10 years to one year, and that may work out in the same way. And if there is anything in the Municipal Regulations to cover it it will be satisfactory to me.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the stand taken by the member from Carbonear and others. The point he has taken has been gone through already carefully by me. We had the situation at Corner Brook; there were men there who wanted to keep their dogs, and put up a proposition, but it couldn't be allowed. They suggested keeping them carefully, but that wouldn't be according to the law, and couldn't be allowed, although it sounded reasonable. The reason is that we have to be bound by the law. This act gets over one difficulty—now the opportunity is given to bring in a petition within a year instead of ten, and this is the only object of the bill. And I am sure that the gentlemen referred to by Mr. Bennett and Mr. Duff would themselves admit the soundness of the principle. If they want to keep dogs they will have to come to St. John's to live. It is the same position as the old Local Option Act; if a man was living in Carbonear or other places where there was local option he had to come to St. John's to get a drink, and that had to do with the increase of the population here at the time. One thing however that hon. members will have to bear in mind that this does not change the state of things—it only reduces the time. I don't think the Government ought to break faith with the people of the localities where they petitioned against dogs—I don't think we ought to do that. What we are doing is to give the different localities the opportunity of changing if they want to do so. I should like to say to the member from Carbonear that I had a pressing appeal from a lady at Corner Brook, asking that she be allowed to keep her pet dog, and when it had to be removed, she wrote hoping that sometime I would feel some of the anguish I had caused in Corner Brook.

MNISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS— Mr. Chairman, I suppose there is no member of the House who has had more to do with the Preservation of Sheep Act than myself. I was vice-president of the Bay Roberts Agricultural Society for a number of years. About ten years ago a number of people had their sheep destroyed by dogs. Some of the men who kept dogs were indifferent as to the payment provided for such cases, and during the next week feelings were aroused, and those who had sheep destroyed became determined to do away with the dogs. At a meeting of the Society it was decided to circulate a petition to which 700 names were affixed, and subsequently the Sheep Preservation Act was put in operation. I remember my friend, the late A. W. Piccott, had a splendid Newfoundland dog which he had to give up or send to St. John's. There was a great agitation and I opened the columns of my newspaper for a discussion of the question, and those who wanted the dogs destroyed and those who did not contributed letters. Politically and otherwise I have been a sufferer for the part I took. For years certain dog owners were delighted when sheep or goats got into my gardens and destroyed my crops. Well, this amendment is an improvement on the old Act, but I see no objection to putting in a clause for the few who want to keep sporting dogs. It would be simple justice to them; but if it is to be gained by petition I am afraid that it will not be obtained. I had a letter the other day from one of those chiefly interested, and one who is typical of the men who want to keep sporting dogs, and the complaint is that now a man has to "farm out" his dog, paying for its keep all the year round for one or two months use during the sporting season. He further complains that sportsmen from St.

John's and other places can come and bring their dogs with them while a man who lives in the restricted area is under a great expense of keeping his dog outside the area. The law says that no dogs other than collie dogs can be kept in restricted areas. I am afraid that if a petition is the only relief that will not be secured, or it is unlikely, unless the Government do something. I hardly think that even under this amendment any change will be made in Carbonear or Harbour Grace, but it is in my opinion certainly an improvement to reduce this from 10 to 1 year. It will give the people who change their minds a chance to express it, and they can then keep the dogs.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, on this point I would like to say first that I am in thorough agreement with the principle. I have had considerable correspondence from people asking that an amendment be made to the present Act, and I am afraid that the evils complained of have not been covered by this proposed amendment.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Are you referring to Templeman?

MR. SCAMMELL—Yes. Templeman is in a part of an area under the Act, contiguous to Newtown, and to effect the desired result I think the two settlements would have to be made into one. The people of the two places use the same identical wood-track for hauling—the difference is that the Newtown people can use dogs, for they are allowed to keep them, while the people of Templeman cannot keep them—they are in an erea that is prohibited under the original Act. The amendment as proposed does not affect such a case as this. What would happen is that they would be able to petition, but in all probability they would split on it; the upper part of the area is not as much interested as the lower. I have no doubt but that could be remedied by smaller areas. Now I have had considerable correspondence, and the people are evidently anxious to get their dogs back. They have to go 8 to 10 miles for wood, and it is really no difference whether they keep dogs or not, for they are over-run by dogs from Newtown. I do not see how it can be done —you are making no provision here to change the areas so I suppose they will be the same as under the old Act. This is only a suggestion.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—On that last point, I may say that I had the matter up some time ago and had hoped to get results. The hon. member is correct as regards that particular question of areas. I hope that this can be remedied under the new Municipal Act we shall be bringing up. One can see the position of the places referred to by the hon. member, but we could not touch that under this amendment. The point will, I think, probably be covered by the Municipalities Act.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Regarding the signing of a petition. Does that have to be signed by over a majority of the inhabitants?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—It must be signed by a majority. That is the law under Cap. 143 Sec. 28, that a majority of the electors must sign.

MR. SCAMMELL—Can an area petition immediately, or must they wait for a year?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I take it that they can present it at any time.

MR. SCAMMELL—They can start the machinery in motion now, and be fixed up by next winter?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Yes, I think they can start now.

MR. SCAMMELL — What is the meaning of Section 2. This only amends two sections of the Act, doesn't it?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Yes, that is so. The sections affected

are Sec. 34 which at present reads (Reads)—That is the 10 years clause. The other under Sec. 2 that is repealed under the Act of 1918, or rather the amendment of that time to the Act of 1910. The position is that Sec. 2 completes the repeal of the Act of 1918, which refers back to Cap. 143, and this substitutes for the Act which you find under Cap. 143.

MINISTER OF PUGLIC WORKS—Just a question regarding collie dogs. Some people in my district believe that if they can't keep other dogs they can keep collies, and there is a difference of opinion. The question is whether they can keep collies when they have sheep and only then—that is the difference of opinion, whether they can keep collie dogs any way, or only when they have sheep to look after.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—That is a poser for me—I don't know if the minister means a dog that comes from Coley's Point. I can look up the point and advise you, but whatever the answer may be it will not affect this amendment.

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 Midwives' Bill.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—In moving the second reading of this bill I trust that it will not be thought that I am the most competent member of the Government in dealing with this matter of midwives. Some one had to take the responsibility of presenting the bill and one of the characteristics of the department with which I am associated, is that things of this nature usually fall to its lot. I think that this administration possesses individuals who have had as much experience in and can appreciate this important matter just as well as I can myself. In having this bill up for second reading I think that the House can at least feel gratified that it is one of these measures that can be approached by the members with the feeling that it is a matter of benefit and interest to the public. It is not a measure that can be said to have originated with the present administration. It is not a source from which the present administration hopes to derive any credit or privilege. There was a Midwives Act passed in 1920. It was a very short act and apparently at the time the experience of those interested in this very important matter had not developed to such a degree that what they wished to do could not be done under the act that had been passed. It was found very shortly afterwards that the act did not enable them to proceed with the formation of a department or board for the registration and the proper regulation and control and training of midwives. In other words the act did not give them sufficient authority. At that time, and to-day, one of those particularly interested and active in this movement was one who happens to be within sound of my voice, and Mrs. Hiscock's interest was unselfish because it was voluntary, without cost or charge to the community. But in addition to that her interest carried with it intelligent knowledge which well merited the commendation which is given freely to her. Under the Midwives Act there was a Board appointed on October 1921, consisting of Dr. Macpherson, Dr. Brehm, Dr. John Murphy, since deceased, Miss Southcott and Miss Taylor. This Board was appointed and my immediate predecessor in office has no doubt personal knowledge as to why the Board could not function as it was intended. Con-

siderable negotiations, interviews and correspondence took place and finally this administration came into office and found that the matter had already been engaging the attention of the Medical Association. The Medical Association passed a resolution unanimously that following out of this decision the Board took up the matter and the result is that we now have this Bill which is before the House to-day. I just want shortly to explain the difference between this act and the act passed in 1920."

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the fact that there is no quorum.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE.——I am glad to see Mr. Speaker that some of the hon. members are beginning to show some appreciation of the important subject with which we are dealing. I feel that some of them are not so indifferent to the subject of midwifery as they would like us to believe by their behaviour this afternoon. The 1920 Act was very short. (Reads) That is all that the Act contained. The House will see that it was only intended to provide for the constitution of a Board. The Board went into existence as I said and when they wanted to undertake certain things they found that they had not the authority. And there the matter rested, and I do not think that I will be accused of unduly crediting the lady if I say that it might not be in so advanced a stage to-day but for her interest. It has now arrived at the stage where this Bill is being presented to this House. I think that the details can be gone into when the House goes into Committee. I would like to ask the hon. members to understand that the bill really only applies to St. John's. It can only apply to places outside of St. John's, as the second last section will show when the Governor in Council so decides.

Now in this connection I would like to refer to matters which are not altogether matters of detail to remove any anxiety that may be felt by some of the hon. members present. This bill which we have here is the same as the bill that they have in effect in England. The English Act was passed on the 31st of July, 1902. It did not come into operation until the first of April, 1903. We propose not to have the act come into force until a year from now. In England the names of midwives practicising without certificates had to be registered by the 1st of July, 1905. That is two and a half years later; same principal here, after first of May, 1928. Similarly in connection with those practicising without certificates. In England the bill was brought in and it was not made compulsory to have certificates until 1910. A period of seven years. We are saying here that from and after the first of May, 1929 no woman may practice midwifery without registration.

I think that it will be found, Mr. Speaker, that a bill of this nature, recommended as it is, and originating where this bill has originated can have no other than a beneficial effect on the city of St. John's. It cannot leave any hardship and it is an attempt to make the benefits general throughout the whole Island. I do not think that any possible concern need be felt by the hon. members as to the working of this bill. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that I can do more than say that I am glad and pleased at the interest that the members have displayed and that it is worthy of the best kind of attention that a measure of this kind can get.

I think that there is a period in every man's life, no matter what side of politics he belongs to, and no matter what his political views may be, when he has a keen interest in matters of this nature. For these reasons, Mr.

Speaker, when the House goes into the Committee of the Whole on this bill, I hope to have at my shoulder some person who will have a thorough insight into the inside workings of this bill and then if any of the hon. members wish to have any questions answered I feel sure that they will be able to do so.

Just before I sit down, there is a letter here addressed to the Prime Minister, from Dr. Macpherson, the Chairman of the Midwives' Board.

(Reads)

I think that it merely corroborates my statement as intimidated that the Medical Society unanimously requesed this legislation. It was started originally by Dr. Murphy and completed later on by Dr. Macpherson.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Speaker, I was the gentleman who introduced this Act in 1920. It was passed at that time and it was a matter of regret to me afterwards that it could not function as it should because of some little technicality. The present act is more a matter of concern for the members for St. John's. But the outports are really more interested in this act than they think because the Governor in Council may, at some future date bring the act in force as regards the outports. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the speech made by the Minister of Justice and as far as I am concerned I support the act. I was particularly interested in his closing remarks in which he said that he would probably have some officer to pilot the act through the Committee stage, I have been looking around and I think that the House will be reasured to learn that the man who can be got to pilot the act through is the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs. That esteemed gentleman may not be the father of anything else but he is the father of the House and I feel sure that he can give the Minister of Justice material assistance in putting this measure through the Committee stage.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to Secure the Better Training of Midwives and to Regulate their Practice," 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 an Agreement between the Government and the Marconi Wireless Company of Canada, Limited.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—In connecton with this matter I want to say that it will be remembered that on yesterday, when in Committee on the Resolutions, the hon. member for Fortune Bay made some reference to a contract drafted in 1920. I told him I could not find it in my Departmen t or in the Prime Minister's Department, but this morning I discovered it in the Justice Department. I have just glanced over it and find it a far-reaching contract. I am very glad to let the hon. member have it, but I may say that I do not think that it has any bearing on the case in point. With the indulgence o the House I now move for the Second Reading. I do not think that there is any other point to be discussed. As has been explained, it is merely an arrangement for a year. I have explained as explicitly as I could on Tuesday and I think if there is anything further to be discussed it may be brought up in Committee and we shall be very glad to explain.

MR. WARREN—I agree with the Colonial Secretary that this 1920 contract has not anything to do with the present contract before the House. I asked for it only to refresh my memory as to the terms of the agreement suggested at that time. There have been tremendous advances made since that time in radio broadcasting and

in wireless telegraphy and telephony, and I merely want it to refresh my memory as to the terms contained in a contract drafted at that time.

MR. SCAMMELL—On the merits or demerits of the contract between the Marconi Wireless Telegraph Company and the Government I have nothing to say at present. I have no knowledge of the contract now in existence. I rise on the second reading to protest against the principle of allowing the Governor in Council to make any such agreement. If it is necessary and desirable for an agreement to be made with the Marconi Company, that agreement should be brought down and made and discussed here, and then perhaps there might be a great deal more to be said about the whole matter of wireless in this country. It may be thought, perhaps, time for the Government to embark on a larger policy, to make improvements in wireless connection with isolated sections of the country. I have been anxious for the erection of a Marconi station at certain isolated sections of St. Barbe, at Jackson's Arm and in White Bay. The Government, too, ought to consider the establishment of a station at Groais Islands and such isolated places, not only from a particular point of view but from a general point of view, there ought to be a Marconi station erected there. Marconi stations are badly needed in these places, from the standpoint of the assistance they would be to ships. This matter, possibly, belongs to the province of the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, but, with regard to making an agreement, we want it discussed here. I certainly do protest against the Governor in Council being given power to make any agreement with any company. I don't think those things should be done by Governor in Council or by Minute of Council. There is no necessity for doing things in the dark, and I don't see that there is anything to hide. I don't see why the Government cannot come to an agreement with the company, and bring that agreement down here to be discussed and ratified. Is it asking too much that the Government should place their cards on the table and do things openly.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY.—I am sorry the honourable member for St. Barbe was not present when this matter was discussed in Committee on the Resolutions, as he seems to have missed the point that was then explained, that we are not making a contract, and merely extending the present agreement for a year, to give time to the Government to look around and see what kind of an agreement we can make. We are not committing the country at all to any contract, except authorizing the expenditure required to carry on as under the old agreement. There is no new contract or new agreement. The Marconi Company have simply been asked to continue operating, as they have done, for the next year, when we will negotiate an entirely new contract either with that or some other company, or we will carry on ourselves under the management of the Post and Telegraph Department. There is no desire to hide anything, or manage affairs by governing by Minute of Council. We are merely extending the present agreement for one year until more suitable arrangements can be made.

MR. BROWN—Do the stations on Labrador belong to the Marconi Company?

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY.—The stations on Labrador belong to the Government, and Fogo station belongs to the Company.

MR. BROWN.—I asked the question because I heard that the Government

were buying the station and apparatus at Fogo.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—There is no truth in that report.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Colonial Secretary the Bill entitled "An Act respecting an Agreement between the Government and the Marconi Wireless Telegraph Company of Canada, Limited," 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 MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I have much pleasure in laying on the table of the House the report of the Board of Liquor Control.

MR. CASHIN—Before the House adjourns, and in view of what transpired here to-day, I wish to make a few further remarks in that connection. I have since got in touch with our office and got copies of those invoices, which were, I say, submitted to the Customs Office, no matter what the Minister of Finance says, and with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I ask to place those invoices on the table of the House, for the information of the country and for the Members of the House, and to be a proof that the author of that article in the Daily News made an attempt to hurt a business firm on Water Street, not because it is my firm or anyone else's firm but because it is a deliberate attempt. May I be allowed to place these invoices on the Table of the House? I trust since these documents are now on the Table of the House, this paper, if I may call it such, will avail of the opportunity of publishing the figures contained in them, and also, I trust, will state that the Customs Department did not give the full information to the House. I trust, too, they will convince the Minister of the Crown that Cashin & Company did not falsify invoices; the same Minister of the Crown who was instrumental in losing $10,000 on account of his errors.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—In reply to the honourable member, I may say that I don't wish to continue this debate, but in connection with the statement that invoices were not presented, I have here an invoice for duty, passed in July last, and, on the face of it, it shows that no invoice was presented.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Mr. Speaker, I must repeat the statement. I have here an invoice for duty passed in July last, and on this very invoice entry it shows clearly that there was no invoice. There is no invoice in the Customs House, and the entry will show there was no invoice.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker, I emphatically state that invoices were supplied, and moreover that when the information was tabled here the Customs Department failed to give the full information. The Hon. Minister has seen fit to make outside insinuations on my family, and I want to be straight with the Hon. Member here and now—

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—It will be the first time in your life.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker, I have never been anything else than straight. I can do nothing else than stand up for my own flesh and blood when men slink behind their backs and attempt to knife in the dark. And I say that they are afraid to come out in the open be they individual members of this House or Ministers of the Crown. The Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs has stated openly in this country that he was going to put Cashin in his place—and I could bring proof of that statement in this House.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Bring it in.

MR. CASHIN—Let him go out to

the people he said it to. Mr. Speaker, I regard myself as every bit as good as the Minister of Finance and Customs; I have done as much good as he has done or can do, and I can say that I haven't broken as many laws as he has, probably. And did I come in here and make any reference to his breaking the Customs law, or when or where he did so? And now I am going to refute everything, because it has been said with ulterior motives. He needn't worry — I wouldn't be afraid of him if he were twice his size; and if I wanted to be nasty I could say that I have often shot better men. He says that we had no invoice—the mere fact that the information was given is proof that they were lying, and the Minister comes in and admits as much in this House. I never said that I was going to get the Minister of Finance—what I say I say openly in this House, and I say through you, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. Minister broke the Customs law of this country when he sold one and a half million cigarettes for which he received only $400.00, and should have received nearly $20,000.-00. Is that correct or is it not? And he was backed by members of his own party! If these had been sold by public auction, as they should have been, I would be the first to come in here and defend it.

HON. THE SPEAKER—I don't want to interrupt the hon. member, but if he is making a charge it must be made in proper form. This is not relevant to the debate.

MR. CASHIN—It is relevant, Mr. Speaker. It is relevant in that the Daily News says that Cashin falsified invoices, and I believe that the Minister of Finance inspired that statement, and I say that the people who published that statement are lying, and furthermore that they are too cowardly to come out in the open and fight. I can almost embrace a liar, Mr. Speaker, but I despise a coward, and that is the position, pure and simple—making charges against individual members of this House, and against others outside it who are unable to defend themselves! And the Member for Ferryland, or the Junior Member for Ferryland as the News insists, says here and now that he owes nothing either to the Daily News or the Customs. That he at any rate has not tried to defraud the revenue.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Mr. Speaker, I rise here because I have been given the opportunity by the hon. member. I have been charged with breaking the law, and I have not answered to that. My answer has been given in the fact that I was acquitted by 12 of my countrymen, despite the fact that Cashin and his crew stayed up all night to try and get me.

MR. CASHIN—I rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

HON. THE SPEAKER—If the hon. member rises to a point of order he must state the point.

MR. CASHIN—The hon. member says I was up all night trying to get him. I want to state that I was not trying to get him—I wouldn't waste the time on him.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—I accept the explanation, Mr. Speaker. He has charged also that he has shot better men; well, I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I have dreamt of better men than he. And I want to tell this House that I did break the law, and broke it for you (Cashin). And I appeal to the Attorney-General to bear me out in that statement—I broke the law for you in 1924. Do you remember when you came to me at the Customs House, and told me that your father had been unwell and had forgotten to pay certain duties. And I said to you as Minister of Finance that I did not think I could fix it or put it through without breaking the Prohibition Law,

and that I would have to see the Attorney-General. I saw him, and he said it would be contrary to the Prohibition Act. And I put it through for you, and broke the Prohibition Act. I don't want to take up the time of this House, Mr. Speaker, but I want to say that I shall be tabling a report of G. N. Read, Son & Watson, and the country can judge when that is made public, who is right, or who did right or wrong.

MR. CASHIN—Just referring to that, Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see that report is going to be tabled. I recall that it was asked for by the Leader of the Opposition, and I was in the Government at the time. I haven't got the Hon. Minister's remarks here, but I will have them, but he said that there were certain charges in that report and the people were going to get the opportunity to defend themselves. I remember distinctly that I rose in my place and insisted that that report be tabled. I still insist, and say that if it is not on the table of the House to-morrow I will put it on there myself, and the Minister can go and tell his people they can keep their report, as the House is going to get it, although I obtained this in a sort of confidential way. I am tired of threats, Mr. Speaker, and I am going to put it on the table to-morrow.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I think the Hon. Member will find that it is not the same report.

MR. CASHIN—Anyway, I am going to put that on the table to-morrow, and let the country see it.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—The report I am referring to is a different one altogether. This is an audit on the Customs House for 1924, and I will lay it on the table and ask the country to judge me on my merits and perhaps they will also judge others on theirs.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—Just one word, Mr. Speaker. When Mr. Warren was addressing the House he made reference to the fact that a report had been promised by us, or rather that we expected we should hold a commission of enquiry. Mr. Warren said that he supposed we profited by his experience and loss of prestige in handling a commission. I want to say that at the very time Mr. Warren was speaking, the Treasury Board was making a report. And when that is tabled together with the audits of Read, Son and Watson, for which accounts enquiry has been made, I think the public will be impressed with our conclusion that it was unnecessary to make an enquiry.

The report of the Commission Board will be full and complete in itself and just as full as could be obtained by any Commission that would come out here and give us quite a lot of publicity, without very much effect. We feel that our report, when placed upon the table of the House, will show and justify the fact why we did not consider it necessary to go any further in the shape of an enquiry; and I promise that the Minister of Finance will place the report on the table of the House within the next few days. We have no intentions at all of shirking the issue, but we want to have the reports tabled and some explanation made before certain statements are made.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Prime Minister the names of those who comprise the Treasury Board?

HON THE PRIME MINISTER—The honorables J. C. Crosbie, J. R. Bennett, W. J. Higgins and A. B. Morine.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Speaker, with your permission, sir, I would like to ask the Prime Minister, as Chairman of the Railway Commission, to send a boat with freight to the northward pretty soon. Down around the south side of Bonavista Bay where they have no train or coastal connections the

people are running short of provisions, particularly with regard to hay and oats for their live stock. In some cases people have had to kill their cattle to get enough to eat. A few days ago the "Malakoff" went north and called at Trinity, Catalina, Greenspond and Wesleyville; but that did not serve the places where food stuffs were mostly needed. As ice conditions are favorable now, there is no reason why the "Sagona" or some other ship could not get down with freight.

I would also like to ask the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs when he intends to install a telephone connection between Wild Bight and Little Bay, in the district of Twillingate, as promised? The poles are already there for three years and on two different occasions, last year and the year before, the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs promised me on his word of honour that the work would be attended to immediately. Now I do not think that this sort of thing is hardly good enough, and I wonder if the Minister thinks that because the suggestion comes from the Opposition side of the House that he does not worry about it.

Another grievance I have is in connection with Grand Falls station. They have no telegraph communication there. They have no money order office there and I think that a vote for such should be taken at this session. The place known as Grand Falls station has a population of five or six hundred people, apart from business people in that section. I know that one business man had a message on his desk three days old, and I know of another who had a message four days old. Now Grand Falls pays its portionate share to the general revenue of the country, and I think they are entitled to a telegraph office there. There are places in this country with not one quarter of the population of Grand Falls with all sorts of public facilities, and I would like to ask the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs what he intends doing in that direction.

I would also like to ask the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs if he has done anything in connection with his promised enquiry into the case of Lloyd Young, who was the courier between Springdale and Pilley's Island. Another thing that was promised and never materialised is the erection of a half way house between Long Tickle and Pilley's Island. This is a very dangerous place where mail couriers get hung up. The water runs very swiftly in that channel there and very often men have to spend a night on the island. If we cannot get money to provide for this contingency, we will have to take the money out of our district grant in order to save people's lives.

I would next like to make reference to an advertisement that appeared in the newspapers stating that on the first of May the Nfld. Power and Paper Co. wanted three machine tenders, three backtenders and three third hands. I consider that this is an insult to the paper makers at Grand Falls, and, perhaps, the Government Director of the N. P. & P. Co. could tell us something about it. Now if you cannot get these men from this country you certainly got to get them from abroad, and I do not know of any of this class of man floating around this country looking for a job. I would like to ask if there is an understanding between the A. N. D. Company and the N. P. & P. Company that they will not take one another's men because there are dozens of men working on machines at Grand Falls and who are capable of taking hold of the work that the N.P. & P. Co. are advertising for. I consider that this is unfair, Mr. Speaker, and I think it is time that the N. P. & P. Company should be told where they got off.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS — Mr. Speaker, with regard to the remarks of the hon. member for Twillingate I might say that I did promise what he alleges, but owing to the fact that there are so many applications of a like nature I was unable to carry it out, because there was no vote for it, and, I consequently, referred it to the Executive Council for their consideration. I may say that the representatives of the different districts are anxious to have telephone connection extended and I have to send that recommendation to the Executive Council for their approval. I do not think there was any intention whatever to hamper the members of the Opposition in their request any more than there was with regard to the members of the Government side of the House.

Of course if the House would vote me the ten or fifteen thousand dollars necessary to clean up these odds and ends I could do it. But there you are. The other members of the Executive are in the majority and I am only one member. With regard to Grand Falls and Bishop Falls. The explanation of that is that I sent in a recommendation that an office be established at Bishop's Falls Station. The amount necessary was very small but we could not get anyone to take the office.

I also made a recommendation that an office be established at Grand Falls station. It is over two miles from the station down to Grand Falls. Both these recommendations were sent in at the same time. I think that ought to satisfy the hon. gentleman that I am trying to keep my word. With regard to the building of the halfway house, I think that the matter might be referred to the Board of Works.

MR. BROWN—I thank the Minister for that answer. I really do not see that there is anything that he could do under the circumstances. I would like to see that amount put into the estimates. I would like to take this opportunity of thanking the Minister of Mines and Agriculture for his courtesy to me during the past week. I had much business to do with his department in connection with my district and I must say that Mr. Walsh treated me well.

MR. LAKE—In reply to the hon. member, I do not feel myself to be in a position to answer the question of the hon. member for Twillingate. But the Directors of the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company will be here to-morrow, and I will put the question before them and will then be in a position to answer you.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I may say that as soon as we got the stories that people were starving down in Bonavista district, it did not make any difference if it were Bonavista district or any other district, we immediately got the Malakoff and sent her down there with all the freight that was offering for there. And as far as that is concerned we have another boat that can be got ready as quickly as there is any freight offering. If the hon. member will assure us that there is freight offering we will have a steamer ready right away.

MR. BROWN—Pardon me, just a moment, I would like to ask the Prime Minister if he would see that it is advertised in the public news that the Sagona is going North?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I will do so to-morrow.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act Respecting the Taxation and Immunity from Taxation of State Enterprises without amendment."

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that

when the House rises, it adjourn until to-morrow, Friday, afternoon at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, April 16th, 1926.

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

Petitions were presented by:

Hon. Mr. Sullivan from Davis Cove re mail service.

Mr. Lake from Little Bay re Ferry.

Mr. Cashin gave notice of question.

Mr. Halfyard gave notice of question.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I beg leave to lay on the Table of the House the G. N. Read, Son and Watson Report, dated 2th day of January, 1925, and accompanying it the Report of the Treasury Board. I would also like to lay on the Table of the House a letter in the Daily News editorial as follows: (Reads)

MR. WARREN—May I ask who comprised the Treasury Board?

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—The Minister of Finance, Mr. Morine, the Colonial Secretary, and the Attorney General.

Notice of Question

Replies to the following questions were tabled with the exception of questions 1, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8.

MR. HICKMAN asked Hon. the Prime Minister if it is true that the S. S. Eagle proceeded to the rescue of the crew of the S.S. Seal without a doctor on board.

MR. HICKMAN asked Hon. the Minister of Justice when the Court of Enquiry into the loss of the S. S. Seal is taking place.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries answer that question, as he was one of the first to get the information of the "Seal' disaster and who immediately started to get a steamer to go out for the men.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker, I arrived from the sealfishery at 11 a.m. on Friday, the 9th instant, and at 2.45 p.m. I was notified by Job Brothers that the "Neptune" had to go out at an hour's notice, as the "Seal" was reported to be on fire and that all the crew were on the ice at Grate's Point. I started out to get the engineers and firemen on board when I was told by Baine Johnston and Company that the "Eagle" would be available in an hour, although I was taking the chance of going out in the "Neptune" short of coal. I immediately went to Bowring's office and arranged with Mr. Wills there to get the Eagle ready. I then proceeded to the Southside to get the firemen on board. I spent until 5.45 p.m. trying to locate the firemen at Logy Bay and other places. With only three firemen on board the ship was pulling out from the wharf to go on her rescue mission when it was discovered there was no doctor on board. To get a doctor then would mean considerable delay and possible loss of life to the marooned men; I let the ship go and acquainted Baccalieu Lighthouse Keeper that she had left, because, being a sealer myself, I figured out how men on ice take these things. The quicker we could get the boat there the better chance there would be of saving the lives of the men. If men were on the point of dying, the mere fact of seeing the steamer coming for them would keep them alive longer. My experience has been—no doubt other sealing masters have experienced similar conditions—that fifty per cent. of the deaths that occurred at the icefields were not due to hardship; but to men losing heart. This was proven in the Greenland disaster and again in the Newfoundland disaster when young and half clad stowaways

of boys came through and men of strong physique perished. In the case of the "Seal" disaster it was a question here of despatching a relief ship with all possible haste, and I did my best to get away the "Eagle" quickly. I admit that it was necessary to send out a doctor, but in the hurry I did not think of it. However, I am glad to know that there was no loss of life through not sending a doctor.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker, we have listened to the explanation given by Captain Winsor, who had just returned from the sealfishery and the responsibility fell upon him, as Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to send out a rescue ship and it was not like he was here in St. John's all the time. But it was a very serious blunder on somebody's part that doctors as well as nurses were not sent out. Whilst I do not want to throw the blame on Capt. Winsor, I am of the opinion that there was gross negligence committed by somebody.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, as to a Court of Enquiry into the loss of the S. S. Seal, we have instructed that an ordinary Magisterial Enquiry be held as we think that probably we will get the facts out of that method of an enquiry as out of a Marine Court of Enquiry. I just discovered this morning that Chief Engineer Perez, whose deposition we had hoped to take at the Hospital, had, unfortunately, passed away. If it be found on investigation that it should become necessary to alter or enlarge the proceedings to a Public Enquiry that course will be adopted. The fullest possible investigation will be made.

MR. HICKMAN — Mr. Speaker, I thank the Honourable Minister for his reply. My object in asking the question was to make sure that an enquiry is held; but I think that a Marine Court of Enquiry is the proper thing. I think the responsibility should be placed on somebody for looking after where powder is kept on shipboard. From the description of the disaster that I read in the papers, a tin of gasolene was mixed up with a tin of kerosene and nearby was a powder magazine. I think there should be some regulations regarding the stowage of such inflammable and combustibles articles, and I hope that the Minister of Justice will have a full and complete enquiry held to prevent such confusion and explosions in future.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 143 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Keeping of Dogs,'" 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 respecting an Agreement between the Government and the Marconi Wireless Telegraph Company of Canada, Limited."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, yesterday afternoon I was favored with a copy of the draft agreement of 1920 with reference to this matter. I asked for a report of the Commission on directional wireless finding. That Commission in the Squires Government, I think, comprised Mr. Collins of the Marconi Co., Sir William Coaker and Captain English. Evidence was taken before that Commission from all captains and a report made, and while I do not want to delay this Bill now I would like, as soon as possible, the report of that

Commission on directional wireless finding?

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—I will have it for the honorable member at the next sitting.

MR. WARREN—Now that is practically the act you are now going to bring in. I quite agree that the contract will not be any more than for one year, but I think that in this Bill this House is giving the Executive Government the widest scope and the widest authority that was ever given to the Governor-In-Council by this House at any time. The only limitation which is given is that the contract is not going to exist for more than one year. I would like to point out that the House has no safeguards at all, except as regards the period of the contract. When I spoke on this matter a few days ago I got an assurance from the Colonial Secretary who is in charge of the Bill, that the contract would allow the Marconi Company to operate the stations they had at the present time, the Government paying the cost and giving the Marconi Company ten per cent. of the profits. There is absolutely nothing in the Bill to confirm that and we have to rely entirely on the Colonial Secretary's word. Personally, I am prepared to accept his word. But while I accept his statement that these are the terms of the contract, I would like to point out to the Colonial Secretary the responsibility he undertakes in seeing that no contract of a wider nature is made with those people that might be used by them as an authority or precedent for a permanent contract.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, I think when I introduced the Bill that I read the offer of the Marconi Company for the continuation of this contract. They really wanted it for two years, but the Government decided that they would not enter into arrangement beyond twelve months because the Government considered that that would be ample time for them to consider and study conditions with a view to bringing in a permanent contract next year with this or any other company, or, perhaps, with the making of any arrangements between the Marconi Company and the Department of Posts and Telegraphs. I am perfectly satisfied to give the assurance to the House now that this agreement is based entirely on the understanding of one year. There will be no contract entered into justifying the Marconi Company to continue on for another year. The only difference now is that the Government will guarantee cost of operations and ten per cent. profit. The tolls will be divided evenly between the Marconi people and the Government. I discussed that matter with Mr. McCallum, the Company's representative, and he said that this would be an incentive to their company and make them interested in tolls. I said that tolls do not amount to very much now, but that when we enter into a permanent contract that tolls could be made very much larger. The tolls collected from the people using those stations, I added, are very insignificant, and I think, that to-day they are the same as the land lines at the initial stages of this contract. From what I can understand the Labrador planters and fish merchants are prepared to pay a considerable amount more in tolls, as they realise, apparently, that this service is going to cost the Government very much more than heretofore, and, I think, that this can be definitely settled and arranged when the making of a permanent or binding contract is being considered. I do not think that there is anything more I can say on this matter, except to assure the House again that the present Bill provides only for one year's operations of the stations.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, is it

contemplated that there will be any increase in the rates?

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Not for this year. The tolls last year were three thousand dollars altogether.

MR. WARREN—I quite agree that they don't amount to very much. It is the principle of the thing that I am looking at. That will be the thin-edge of the wedge. That is going to be used as a precedent by this Company or some other Company which undertakes to run the Marconi Stations. It will mean that they will not only be indemnified against loss, but they will be getting a profit of ten per cent. besides and half the tolls. We should go very slow.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I was going to ask the Honourable the Colonial Secretary what the tolls were, but he has just told us that they were about three thousand dollars. That would mean at fifty per cent., fifteen hundred dollars, that this Company will get next year on the operation of these stations. The Company should be quite satisfied on one year's operation to make ten per cent. profit over and above gross expenses, and I quite agree with the remarks made by the Honourable Member for Fortune, that we have to be careful because these Companies would use anything to their advantage as a precedent to try and do the Government and make a contract which may be regarded as a little one sided. The Government should inform the Company that the proposed agreement will be more acceptable to this Legislature if they would dispense with the 50 p.c. of the tolls. In speaking the last time to these resolutions I thought it would be better if this House made the agreement rather than leave the matter to the Executive Government, but as the Government will not table the agreement for the ensuing year, I hope that they will be very careful in making an agreement for the even one year. I have full knowledge of the negotiations that took place between the Marconi people and the Newfoundland Government, through the Postal Telegraph Department during the year 1920. The draft agreement was submitted to His Excellency, it only awaited the signature of His Excellency. He communicated with the Secretary of State, but there was an Empire wireless scheme on foot at the time, and His Excellency was asked that the signing of the agreement be postponed. Then other things intervened and the result was that it was never ratified. But in the negotiations that took place between Mr. Morse and the Newfoundland Government, we got an idea that Governments should be wide awake when making agreements. When the negotiations began with the Government, they wanted $1200 for each station on Labrador and $3,000 each for Battle Harbor and Fogo a year. Then of course as the Hon. Colonial Secretary knows we had no cable, and the Government was anxious to get communication with the outside world. All the revenue that Cape Race produced, $2000 a month, which we had been receiving as net revenue, went to the Anglo. We were anxious to make some kind of agreement. Personally I may say I was inclined to get cable connection I considered it a most important measure. This is only by the way. But from our experience in dealing with Companies we have reason to be suspicious of the demands that Companies may make, and we should be very cautious as we are not going to get any advantages. These people look upon it as a business; they are well informed; they have experts for drawing contracts, and also employ experts to estimate what an undertaking of this kind is likely to produce in the way of revenue. As has been pointed out by Mr. Warren, the Honourable

Member for Fortune, the Wireless Telegraph Company finds its connection with Newfoundland a revenue producing concern. Not Labrador of course, they lose on that. But they make a profit by their communications through Cape Race.

Without labouring the question any further, I may say that we are interested in these resolutions whether on this side of the House or the other, and we are anxious that the best possible should be done for the country.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, I would just like to express my appreciation to the Hon. Members who have just spoken. I realise the responsibility and I trust that the House will not be disappointed. But I am glad that the Member for Fortune has brought up the point about the division of tolls, because that is a new feature about the arrangement. He being a lawyer may see further than I do as to whether that would make a technical precedent for future operations.

MR. WARREN—I said that it might form a precedent in negotiating a permanent contract. They might say "Well you did it for the last year. You reimbursed against loss, paid ten per cent. and half the revenue." That will have to be guarded against.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, I don't think that this feature is very important. However, there is a question of $1500 involved and we ought to save that if possible. There are no negotiations yet concluded, and I will endeavour to get them to agree to let the whole of the tolls go into the Colony. The acceptance of the terms of this new agreement, I will submit to the Minister of Justice, before signing them, so that the country will be doubly safeguarded against being involved in any legal responsibility, of prejudicing its position next year.

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, with unanimous consent, the Bill entitled "An Act respecting an Agreement between the Government and the Marconi Wireless Telegraph Company of Canada, 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.

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 Secure the Better Training of Midwives and to regulate their Practice."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, I don't think that I have anything to add at the present moment to what I stated yesterday, except to tell the House, that so far as this Bill is concerned it is merely a question of putting into effect the requests of the Medical Society. I think that I might trace in general the history of the events that led up to the drawing up of this Bill. Shortly for the information of those members who were not present yesterday, it is this. This Bill proposes to embody in an act what was intended to be done by the members of this legislature, under the 1920 act. But which it was found not free to do. I therefore present in its committe stage, this bill with the intimation, that without exception every provision is simply a result of recommend-

ations of the Medical Society and those who are interested in the movement, that is on for the improvement of mid-wifery.

MR. MOORE—Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that after this act goes through that the old granny of the past, to whom we all looked up to with respect, with her white aprons on, has got to go. She has got to give place to some college graduate. Now I am not prepared to push out the old granny, and in conversation with some of our medical practicioners, they tell me further, that they would rather have the old granny than the flapper that is going to-day. Well next Monday, Mr. Chairman, if this bill passes the committee stage, the Hon. Minister of Justice will move for the third reading of this Bill. Well, then I intend to give my reasons why I will not vote to push out the old granny of the past.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, I would like the Hon. Member for Ferryland to take it from me that I have the greatest respect for the old granny. I would like the Hon. Member and the House to understand that so far as the effect that it will have on the old granny, I don't think that there is any real danger of anticipating very much trouble in that direction. But as a matter of fact the point that was raised, was a point that was distinctly referred to, in the comment about this Bill. But I am satisfied that in so far as I am connected with the midwives, being the person looking after this Bill, that the persons to whom the member refers are not going to be affected at all. In the first place, as far as the introduction of this bill is concerned, and as the correspondence shows, this Bill comes as the result of the unanimous decision of the medical men of the city. Of course we have only got to take their word on paper for what it is worth. Doctors are like lawyers. They say something to-day and they vary it to-morrow. Dr. Macpherson, as the Chairman of this Board, states his case in a letter on Feb. the 8th. I might by the permission of this House, refer to this matter again. Thus is a letter addressed to the Prime Minister:

(Reads letter)

I explained to the House when the Bill was in its second reading, that this 1920 Act was not a very comprehensive one. It was simply a short Act calling a board in, and giving them power to make certain regulations, but it did not go very much into detail. Nor was it more than an opportunity of more or less effectively, recognising the practise of midwifery that had been then started. I intimated yesterday that when the movement was started to train nurses, a Board was appointed by Minute of Council, the names of the members of which I mentioned yesterday, an attempt was made to draw up regulations, it was then found that the regulations that it was attempted to put into effect, were barred by the act. Since that time for the last four years this act has been the subject of much comment and negotiations, and finally we have the solution offered in this letter dated February last.

I may say that as far as the Government or my Department is concerned we have been instructed that the medical profession have unanimously adopted the measure, and that finished it as far as we were concerned. But from the point of view of a layman who has had considerable experience with midwives and who hopes that his experience is not at an end, I think that this Bill will not interfere with the case which the member for Ferryland has referred to. It will probably relieve members' minds to know that this will not apply to any outport in the Colony until that has been done by proclamation of the

Governor-in-Council—this was necessary for places where there are no trained nurses as yet. These places must be provided for, and we have in many of them people who have been practising midwifery for years and are suited to it, their work ought not be interfered with. I refer to Sec. 2 which covers what the hon. member had in mind. This gives a right to be registered if they apply within 2 years.

MR. MOORE—If some of them had 200 years they wouldn't qualify.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—They won't need the years. They can be registered if they have been practising 12 months. There are no rules to comply with, and no new fangled notions to learn. This is very clear—that if necessary she could take steps to compel by mandamus her registration. I am glad the Hon. Member raised the point because it helps bring this thing out more strongly.

MR. MOORE—Then I have no objection. I have in my mind the dear old granny who helped bring along our esteemed Chairman, Mr. Puddester, and who held him up to his parents as the best baby that she had ever seen. This is the only interest I have in the Bill.

Sec. 2.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the Minister of Justice if this applies to nurses already qualified. I understand that there are a number under Dr. Wilson.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—For their own protection they will have to register. It will be a mere formality of registration.

MR. HICKMAN—Can the Hon. Minister tell who composed the old Board?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I find that on Oct. 26, 1921, Dr. Campbell was advised by the Deputy Colonial Secretary that the Board consisted as follows:

(Reads)

That is the Board that was appointed, and I understand still are the same. Dr. Macpherson is still President. The Board was not paid, and I think I intimated yesterday that one of the members, and an originator and enthusiast, gave her services voluntarily and free.

MR. HICKMAN—I should like to know why there is this clause as to nominee?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—On that point I may say in explanation that I am adding to the Board the nursing Supt. of St. Clair's Home, and my reason for this is that if the Supt. is a sister, as at present, she would prefer a nominee.

MR. HICKMAN—What about adding the S. A. Maternity Hospital on Cookstown Road?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—The Grace Hospital is represented. I don't know anything about the other place—but it has been specially provided for the Grace Hospital if that is the point the Hon. Member has in mind.

MR. HICKMAN—I understand there is a hospital up there where a number are in training.

MR. LAKE—Mr. Chairman, I think the Outport Nurses' Association have five or six nurses in the outports, who are really English ladies who have come out here. I know one in particular, the nurse sent to Garnish, and want to say that she is a particularly fine type of lady. I understand what they hope to do is to train the people in this and other kinds of work. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that this ought to apply to the outports more than it does. I don't mean that we ought to take drastic measures. I agree with my friend, Mr. Moore, to some extent, although I have great respect for the flappers, with scientific methods. We need en-

lightenment and education; we are in an age of advancement. These outport nurses are women of a very fine type—take the lady referred to before, who ministers to part of the district of Burin as well as Fortune, so belongs to my district. Joking aside, I think this thing ought to be taken up seriously and something done, as I understand these English ladies are here only on a sort of probation.

MR. HICKMAN—I should like to call attention to the last part of No. 5—that members shall be entitled to be paid reasonable travelling expenses. Where is the money to come from.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—It is not intended to be salaries, but remuneration for expenses which I take it will be paid from the funds of the Board.

MR. HICKMAN—Is it to come out of the revenue of the Colony?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—No, I am searching for a point here. I had in mind the provision on page 8, which states that a charge shall be collected for examination, not to exceed $5.00. Thus they will have their own fund, and can reimburse themselves out of that. It will still be a purely voluntary Board. There is another clause which has the same effect as that. I take it that when the Board gets going, and if they have enough work they will ask the Governor-In-Council for permission to give a salary. The Governor-In-Council will not have to allot the salary—it contemplates the Board will do that. They have their source of revenue in a registration fee.

MR. HICKMAN—What is going to happen is a salaried secretary.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—There is no provision for the Board to do that—it will be a purely voluntary Board getting only their actual expenses. Personally I do not understand how the Board will need a salaried Secretary. They will only have to keep accounts of their own. The material thing is that the fees will fill the purse of the Board. The Governor-in-Council will be asked just to appoint a Board; there will be no salaries paid unless the work gets too much, but since the work of the Secretary will be to keep a record of the meetings and so on, I can't see why full time employee will be needed for that.

MR. HALFYARD—I don't know whether a great amount of work is to be done under this Bill, but it is certainly a formidable act.

THE HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—The main thing it is to do is to have a register of midwives, that is all.

MR. HALFYARD — Personally I think you are creating another subdepartment of the Government. The Board will regulate the fees for attendance and ask the Governor-In-Council to adopt their recommendation, that will be done, of course, because we wouldn't do anything to offend the doctor or nurse—we daren't grumble about our doctor's bill, and I daresay the Government will endorse any recommendations made by the Board. If the amount of good, or the importance of the measure, is indicated by the length of the bill, or the number of its sections, it should give good results. If it is the wish of the medical fraternity that this bill should be brought in, we can do no more or less than carry out their wishes, and give the credit to the medical fraternity—and the nurses of course.

MR. HICKMAN—My point is the same as Mr. Halfyard's. I think it is going to be a sub-dept. of the Government. As to the salary clause, that means shortly that if the Governor in Council makes the appointment he will pay the salary, and it will have to be put in the Estimates. As Mr.

Halfyard says, we can't afford to refuse a doctor or a nurse.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, I would like to get some idea as to what this bill is going to cost the country.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I would like to say frankly, Mr. Chairman, that the Government has not given the slightest consideration to this bill and the possibilities of its cost. The Government's position is the same with regard to this bill as is that of any hon. member. There is no second thought about the seriousness and importance of this measure which deals with the bringing of infants into the world, and all the Government has done is to fall in line with the request of the Medical Association and putting into effect what to-day is the law in every civilized country, and as a matter of fact this is a matter in which we are rather behind the times. What is the cost going to be? Frankly I do not know. I do not think that it will amount to anything that is worth considering.

MR. HALFYARD—I would like to mention the Board of Health. At the present time we have so many secretaries that we hardly know to whom to apply to get persons admitted to the hospital, it is quite confusing and it might be well to dispense with the service of the present secretary and appoint a lady secretary and let her handle both. She might help Mr. Bartlett, the present Public Health Official. I presume that the Government will give the matter some consideration.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—There is another thing about this. This has all to be done by highly paid officials. And I think that it is going to cost the Government a considerable amount. The Minister of Justice, the introducer of this bill, may not think that the cost is going to be very much, but he must not forget that this is going to be a statute on this country when he is not here and the outcome is going to be an expensive department of the Government. You are not going to get sufficient fees out of the midwives to pay for this board.

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. DUFF—Mr. Speaker, in moving the adjournment of this House, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the Minister of Marine and Fisheries on his safe return and his bumper trip. He went out for three or four weeks and brings back into this country $50,000. I think that if all the members of the Government brought in the same quantity each they would get enough in five weeks to pay for the hotel down there. And then if the opposition went out they would be able to pay for the dock. I congratulate the member on his great success. I would also like to remind the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the members of this House of the very serious storm that took place on the Labrador on the 24th December last, by which a great deal of fishing apparatus was destroyed. The fishermen of Conception Bay are particularly interested in this thing, and I feel sure that Capt. Winsor will do as much as possible to assist them, and in getting information as regards the conditions that exist down there at the present time. I admit that the Minister did all possible last year to get information, but of course it is impossible to get it in January, because these men, these

Labrador fishermen, do not live on the coast, they live in the bottom of the Bay. And the information that was received was not satisfactory. We have some Conception Bay fishermen who up to last fall had come to almost independence. They owned their own traps, boats and gear. They felt that they could go back this coming Spring and live as their fathers before them. At the present time they don't know whether they own a stage or an oar, a boat or trap or gear down there. That I want to ask is for the Government to give this thing their serious consideration. I am sure that the members will all agree with me that the producers of this country are all leaving and seeking homes elsewhere. And you have to give encouragement to the few that still remain to go to the fishery. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that a ship be sent down there by the Government as early as possible to get some information as many of the fishermen will soon be going on the Labrador to seek their trap berths. Then again many of these fishermen have lost their stages and their stores, and it is impossible for them at the present time to get the wherewithal to build new ones. I think that there should be some scheme devised whereby the Government could assist these men. I noticed in the press this morning that the Government have allocated $5000 towards the upkeep of Bowring Park. I don't think that I am in any way out of order in asking the Government to consider the position of the fishermen of Conception Bay. It does not apply so much to other people, but it does apply to Conception Bay. There are people down there and unless they know their exact position, they will not go to the fishery. Many of them who were independent are now lying back on their oars and wondering just where they are going to get work. They are some of the very best fishermen in the island. I should like the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to take this matter up with the Government, and do what is right and fair.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say something in regard to the fishermen of Conception Bay, and more particularly in respect of the loss of their fishing gear, that they sustained during the heavy gale of last fall. You will remember no doubt, sir, that it was reported to me last fall of a heavy gale, on the Labrador, along the coast as far as Battle Harbour. My department tried to do their very best to obtain all possible information. A man by the name of Murphy was sent down there, and I have not the slightest doubt but that the man Murphy did the very best he possibly could. I know the man very well. He comse from one of the very best families in Newfoundland. But at that time of the year on Labrador, it is impossible for any man to get to one-third of the settlements that are occupied by our fishermen, from the southern part of this island during the summer time. You take for example such islands as Bog Island or White Bear's Island. It is an utter impossibility for any man to get out to these islands, they refuse to go out in their boats, from the Month of December, until the latter part of May, or the first part of June. And I certainly agree with the Hon. Membef for Carbonear that all that can be done to assist those people down there, should be done. If this had happened twelve months ago it would have been a very easy matter, for the fishing department to find out what damage had been done to the fishing stages on the coast. I may say that last year in the latter part of April, motor boats had gone from the Canadian part of the Coast to Labrador. But most years the ice hangs around

until June, and sometimes much later, and from what I know of the ice conditions at the present time, it appears to me that the ice will be hanging around this year until late in the Summer. I don't mean to say until the month of June, but I don't think that it will be possible to do very much before the month of May. And certainly I think that it is not possible for the motor boats to do much at the present time. But as I said in my first remarks, I certainly think that this is a matter that should be taken up by the Government, and everything possible should be done for these people. Myself as well as others of the Government party know what a busy time we had last year in supplying labour to the people of this country. Everybody knows that there was more labour given last year than there has been given for a long, long time. And in face of all that labour that has been going on in St. John's, I know myself as well as my colleague for Bonavista Bay, we were put to our wit's end, as to what to do with the people in Bonavista who were unable to obtain employment. Now we have had for the last three or four years agitations to keep more people fishing. And some people may say that this is the proper thing, and other people may say the other thing. But nevertheless these people have been down there for years and they have created a good deal of property around them:—traps, motor boats, stages and other facilities for carrying on the fishery. And, sir, as I said before it is a coast that it is very difficult to get any information from. My only suggestion on behalf of Mr. Duff is that the Government would send down there at the first possible opportunity a boat to find out what has happened. And some people think that everything that they possessed was wiped away down there by the sea. In some places that may be visited it may be found that there has hardly been any interference by the sea at all. Chances are that some of these outside places are are not so greatly damaged as they think even themselves. And I give Mr. Duff the assurance here and now that anything that I can do to help out the situation with the consent of the Government I am going to do. It will be too late to put off doing anything until the first or the tenth of June because the steamers that go to the Labrador go down by the tenth of June, and if these people have to wait until the first or the tenth of June to find out what damage has been done to their stages, and then go down, and when they get down find that there has been a lot of damage it will just be an extra expense having to come back to their homes again, and consequently loss to the fishermen. If these men cannot find out the condition of things before the fishing time starts they will not be able to go down on the coast. I give Mr. Duff's suggestion my ready support. I hope that the Government will do all it can to help these people out. I thank Mr. Duff for his kind remarks about my success at the sealfishery. I am sorry that all the members of the House could not go to the sealfishery. As far as I can see there has not been much done in the House and the country is eighty thousand dollars better off and my constituents and Mr. Halfyard's constituents are better off than if I had never gone to the sealfishery.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until Monday afternoon, 19th inst., at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, April 19th, 1926.

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

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

—Mr. Speaker: Last week the community were rejoicing to hear that the late Hon. W. J. Ellis, who had been seriously ill, had passed the critical stage; but on Saturday last the news reached town that he had taken a change for the worst. This morning Hon. S. Milley, who is in New York, telegraphed to say that he had passed away. Mr. Ellis was one of those big, broad-minded and kind-hearted gentlemen, whom it is very hard to replace in this community. Mr. Ellis was one of those who was always prepared financially or in any other way to render assistance to the poor or the needy or do anything else that was for the benefit of the country generally. He was one of the three members of the Highroads Commission who offered last year to give their services gratis and take no pay whatever for the first year as members of that Commission. He was very deeply interested in that work and probably stayed in this community a little longer than was advisable in the interest of his health, because the doctors told him he was to winter in California or some similar climate. He left California again in his enthusiasm to get back to this work sooner than he should in the interest of his health, with the result that he struck the winter weather in New York again, which was probably the cause of his death.

I feel that, in token of our deep regret in the passing of such a good citizen and in the passing of one who performed such good service to the country in both branches of the Legislature and in respect for his memory as well as in respect for the sorrowing relatives whom he has left behind, we should adjourn this House to-day. I, therefore, Mr. Speaker, beg to move that this House do now adjourn.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker: It is my sad duty to state our sympathy for the relatives of the late Mr. Ellis. I have known Mr. Ellis very well and for a great many years he was a neighbour of mine, and, I suppose, a better neighbour could not be found anywhere. Mr. Ellis was a good citizen in every sense of the word. He was President of the Total Abstinence and Benefit Society for a considerable number of years and did a great deal to help those of the younger generation to lead a life free from alcohol. Personally, I know that he was responsible for conducting a great many people to take the pledge and go on the right road.

He was at one time a member of this Assembly and represented the District of Ferryland, and, as we all know, is now a member of the Upper House. He was always ready to take an active part in everything pertaining to the good of the country by legislation since he has been there. He was also a prominent rotarian. Perhaps, that would not seem very much to those not associated with rotary matters; but I might say that the members of that club have done all that they possibly could for the youth of the city generally and Mr. Ellis was an active member in that connection.

I quite agree with the motion of the Prime Minister that the House should adjourn to-day out of respect to his memory and I have much pleasure in seconding a vote of sympathy to the relatives of the honourable member.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker: I want to associate myself with the utterances of the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition with reference to the late Hon. W. J. Ellis. As has been pointed out, he represented the District of Ferryland for a number of years—the district that I have the honor to represent in this House at present—and, I feel that we owe it to the man who has proven himself an outstanding figure in the public life of the community and a conscientious

man at heart to pay respect to his memory.

I, therefore, Mr. Speaker, want to convey to the relatives of the late Mr. Ellis my deepest sympathy and I support the motion of the Prime Minister that this House do now adjourn.

MR. MOORE—Mr. Speaker: As one who took Mr. Ellis' place in the District of Ferryland eighteen years ago, I also want to associate myself with the motion of the Prime Minister out of respect for one who held a seat in this Chamber for a number of years.

I know that the people of Ferryland district will join with me this evening when I say "May the Lord have Mercy on his Soul."

THE HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker: It is hardly necessary for me to add any words to what have already fallen from the lips of previous speakers; but, as one who had a life long association with Mr. Ellis, I would like to express my admiration for the splendid fight he put up to try and regain his health, but the Almighty ruled otherwise and he had to submit and succumb. The late Mr. Ellis was an exemplary citizen in every respect. Twenty-four years ago I sat in the Municipal Council with Mr. Ellis and at that time I learned to appreciate his practical mind and his absolute sincerity of purpose. Since then I have been more or less associated with him in public affairs and I will say this that I never saw at any time the least evidence of his ever failing in his duty either as a citizen or as a man. He was an outstanding industrious man, exemplary in his religious duties and he was characteristically conscientious and kindly. At all times ever ready to help the needy or those in distress, or to give a kind word to those whom he could comfort.

His passing will be a great loss to this community. His association with this House was comparatively brief; but he was associated with the Upper House for a number of years, and of which Chamber he was at one time the Leader. The late Mr. Ellis was not a brilliant debater or a brilliant orator; but he was a clean, clear-cut, conscientious, right-thinking man, which are greater characteristics. I, therefore, desire to associate myself with the expressions of sympathy that will go forth from this Chamber to-day.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, seconded by Mr. Hickman, the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, afternoon, as a mark of respect to the late Hon. W. J. Ellis, whose death at New York was announced this forenoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, April 20th, 1926.

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

Petitions were presented by:

Mr. Scammell from Pacquet re Telegraphs.

Minister of Fisheries from Glovertown re Road.

Mr. Cashin gave notice of question.

Mr. Duff gave notice of question.

Mr. Brown gave notice of question.

Mr. Warren gave notice of question.

Mr. Scammel gave notice of question.

Mr. Hickman gave notice of question.

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act relating to the Railway and Shipping.

The Minister of Public Works tabled Report of Board of Governors of the General Hospital, June 30th, 1926.

MR. PUDDESTER—I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of referring to an editorial in Saturday evening's "Globe."

I would not attempt to do this, but

for the fact that just over the head of the editorial is the name of the Managing Editor of the paper, the name of one who sits in this House holding the responsible position of Member for the District of Fogo. I am very sorry that he is not present here this afternoon.

(Reads).

Mr. Speaker, probably the last paragraph in that editorial is the most offensive of the lot. That paragraph reflects on my position in this House as Chairman of Committees. This is more serious probably than any lying statement that might be made otherwise.

In this House as Chairman of Committees I try to be non-partisan. I try to be as fair to one side as to another. I try to give every latitude in discussion of matters that come before the Committee without reference to partisanship. I do not think that any Member can say that I have been other than non-partisan in the Chair. I do not hold the hon. Member for Fogo responsible for writing that, but take away the "H" from the name and put "G" in its place and I think we might come a bit nearer the mark. In refreence to the dispatch, I do not write the public dispatches going out to the country. I do not have anything to do with them, and I never saw the dispatch of Friday until I saw it referred to in the Globe. This is not the first time that I have been accused of sending out despatches. The gentleman who does send out the public despatch is well able to defend himself. However, I took the precaution to find out what was sent out and which was true and correct, and I have here a carbon copy of it, and for the information of the House I will read it:

(Reads copy of official despatch.)

As a matter of public interest that was sent out to the outports and I wish to say also that the gentleman who sends out the despatch is trying to keep it clear of politics more so than was ever done in the past, and, in so doing, is acting under instructions from the Colonial Secretary. Now here is what was stated by the "Globe" to have been transmitted:

(Reads extract).

I think that the documents are absolutely at variance with each other, and I need not say anything further. I apologize, Mr. Speaker, for bringing this matter up, but, as you will appreciate, I did it in justice to myself.

Answer to Question No. 3 was tabled; answers to Nos. 1, 2, 4 and 5 were deferred.

MR. CASHIN asked the Hon. the Prime Minister to table the following information:—(1) How many employees are now working on the Road Commission; (2) What are their duties; (3) What salaries are they receiving; (4) Give their names.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER —Mr. Speaker, I beg to table the information; also to table the answer to Question 1 of Order Paper April 16th, asked by Mr. Cashin.

Committee of the Whole on Besco Resolutions.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I have to again ask to have this order deferred. As I intimated to the House the other day, we are trying to have adjusted some alteration of the contract and numerous messages have been exchanged within the past ten days. I regret to say, however, that up to the present there is no indication of any adjustment of the matter, and, therefore, the order will have to stand deferred.

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 Secure the Better Training of Midwives and to Regulate their Practice."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Chairman, I want to apologize to the House for not being in the condition that a man in charge of a Midwives Bill ought to be in, owing to the LaGrippe epidemic, but, as promised, I did feel that I should get out and come forward and take up the points raised on the last occasion. The hon. member for Ferryland raised a couple of points and I undertook to get something in the way of a statement of a definite nature from Dr. Macpherson, Chairman of the Medical Board on the points raised. I am glad to be able to say that, apparently, from what I said at the last sitting I qualified in Dr. Macpherson's eyes. He was good enough to tell me that, despite the fact that we have no doctor in the House, the presentation of the case that I made was quite correct. I intimated on the last occasion that there was nothing at all further to fear in the way of cost for heavy machinery in the carrying out of this Bill. I think I also already indicated that, as to the cost of registering or cost of a Secretary of the Medical Board, what would happen would be that after the first registration there would be practically nothing at all to be paid out by the Board for a Secretary and that has been borne out by Dr. Macpherson.

For the information of the House I shall read a memorandum submitted by Dr. Macpherson as follows—

Newfoundland Midwives Board,

St. John's, Nfld.,

April 19, 1926.

Memorandum With Regard to Expenses to be Incurred in Connection With the Midwives' Board.

This Act is of the same nature as the Medical Act, the working of which has never involved any expense to the Government. In fact, the Medical Board is well in funds.

So long as the Midwives' Act is confined to St. John's expenses likely to be incurred under Section 7 (1) (page 6) will be nil.

In Section 6, sub-section 2 (page 6) this clause only gives legal power to the Medical Officer of Health to intervene in cases of infection in the same way as he is obliged to do at present, occasionally, in such cases. The expenses to be incurred under this Section would be very small, if any, and only just recompense to a person suspended from practice through no fault of her own. Where the fault lay with herself no payments will be made, as they are only to be paid in cases where it is thought fit to do so.

Also under Section 7, sub-section 2, the printing of Forms for Returns will also be small.

With regard to the Secretary. The Medical Board pays its Secretary one hundred dollars, and there will be no reason why the Secretary of the Midwives' Board should be paid more than that.

With regard to a Supervisor: It is hoped that while the Act is confined to St. John's that it may be arranged with the Child Welfare Association, that for the sum of perhaps one hundred or two hundred dollars one of the Nurses, being a qualified Midwife, could perform this duty, since their work takes them practically to every house where a birth occurs.

There will be a constant income to the Board in the form of fees for examinations and for registration. In fact the Board starts with a credit balance from this source of $93.50 (ninety-three dollars and fifty cents) after initial expenses have been paid.

Naturally the activities of the Board over and above the foregoing will be limited by the amount which the Colonial Secretary's Department feels itself able to place at their disposal.

All expenses in view, and a great

deal of valuable instruction to the older Midwives, who will register without examination because they have served for over twelve months, can be accomplished for one thousand dollars a year.

After the first year the printing charges will be much less.

(Sgd.) CLUNY MACPHERSON.

I think, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that I may be pardoned for saying that that information pretty well supplies the information that hon. members are desirous of getting. As I have previously stated, I took the liberty on the last occasion to get the fullest information on this important matter, and now I have the satisfaction of presenting a definite pronouncement from one who is eminently fitted for and who has taken a deep interest in this work.

The Act here before us is the unanimous and enthusiastic request of the Medical Association.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the information given by the Honourable Minister of Justice. I feel more deeply interested in this matter now than I did the previous day for the reason that I think that something should be done, as only to-day I saw an instance of a young lady from my own district, proving that something should be done in the direction outlined in this Bill. She called on Dr. Roberts, whom, I am informed, is closely associated with the present administration, and all she got from him was lip. However, my colleague and myself managed to get the affair settled up by getting the young lady admitted to the Hospital. Under this Act now, a great deal may be done for people who happen to get into serious trouble in that direction. While on this point I would like to avail of this opportunity of voicing a complaint over the difficulty experienced in getting patients into the General Hospital. About six months ago a little girl, about ten or twelve years old, wanted to enter Hospital and I made arrangements for her admission with a member of the Board, but, when she got there, she was forwarded to Dr. Roberts to get his O.K. and after Dr. Roberts examined her he wanted to charge her. Now I do not know what the new regulations of the new Medical Board, or whatever they have formed, are, but, evidently, there is something wrong somewhere and I would like to find out what it is. Something will have to be done in connection with these matters.I say a person coming from an outport and cannot afford to pay hospital expenses, it is certainly not good enough to have him or her fleeced by a doctor in the city, no matter who he may be. These are personal experiences I have had in connection with my constituency, and I strongly resent such treatment.

With regard to this Bill again, no doubt it has its good points, but I feel that the Government will have to pay out a certain amount of money, because they will become guarantors of certain payments. I hope that attention will be given to the matters I have complained of and I trust that whoever is responsible will take some action to remedy them, because I do not want to see my constituents—and I suppose other members in this House do not wish to see their constituents either—fleeced by doctors.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, apparently the subject introduced by the Honourable Minister of Justice has a fascination for challenging the interest and attention of the outport members; but, it would not be correc to say that I am anything for the betterment of social conditions. No doubt the objects are laudable in bringing about legislation of this sort. I am very glad to see, however, that this does not apply to the outports, because, as a man who had charge at one time of the finances of

this country described it: "We have the trappings of an elephant on the back of a cat." My summing of the Bill is that in the long run it is the taxpayers of the country who are going to be called upon to pay the money for this social legislation in the city of St. John's. Personally I think that that expense should be borne by the Municipality themselves Coming within the purview of the Act that is the only preliminary observation I have to make and I wish to draw the attention of the mover of this Bill to section 29.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I don't suppose that there is any aspect of social life that has been debated more of recent years than the nursing profession in all its phases, and I really think that it is to the credit of those ladies in Newfoundland who, of late years, have taken such interest in keeping in line with development elsewhere that this Midwifery Practice and the regulations pertaining to it have been advanced to the degree that they have. I don't think that the honourable members are going to take the position here in the House that we ought to take no stock of the advance in science, and I regard this branch of the nursing profession as much a matter of scientific training as any other branch of the same profession.

Now take the second point that the honourable member raises, as regards this idea of the time an Act of this kind should be applied. Now, on that point, I must say that I am totally at variance with him. We, in this House of Assembly, should be the last people in the world to be consulted on a matter like this. The honourable member, I think, will see, on reflection, that it is hardly a fair way to view this. It is all very well to take that matter and discuss the moral aspects of it, but surely this is a question for the Board of Health. If today any assembly of people had a meeting of medical gentlemen and told them that a certain state of affairs existed, and these medical men advised enactment because of that; surely their opinion would be better thousands of untrained minds. Now, the honourable member will admit, I am sure, on reflection, that I merely said that section 29 applied to St. John's only because the organization is here. Then, I also said that the controlling of the practice of Midwifery should be extended to the outports if and when the Board recommends it. If, for example, down in the honourable member's district he finds tha tthere is particular interest taken in nursing. Suppse that there are many young girls from his district who have gone abroad and studied nursing, and they have come back again as qualified nurses, and it is found that there is a plentiful supply of trained nurses in that district. You come along, and point out the fact to the Government of that day, and ask that the Midwives' Act be applied to that district. The Government say: "Certainly! We think it is right." I hope and trust, and I feel sure that some day this country will arrive at a stage, as regards nursing, when the outports themselves will have qualified nurses just as plentiful as they are in St. John's. The old granny is not confined to the outports, and all the flappers are not in St. John's. You will see as many flappers at the stations in the outports very often, as you do in St. John's. While I say this, in a jocose manner, I sincerely think that the honourable member, on reflection, will see that this is not a correct principle to advocate with regard to a measure of this kind, and to say that it should be dealt with as a local question. Matters of public health are not local questions. The spread of any disease or infection should not be regarded ever as a local concern. For that reason, I don't think that

members ought to approach this Bill with the idea that, because it does not apply to the outports, they ought to take no interest in it. I think that they, themselves, will see that if it is good for St. John's, it will be also good for the outports. But, I am glad to say that there is no danger of this Act being put on people of the outports without their being prepared for it. Moreover, I think that, if this Bill were to be foisted on people that would not be equipped for it, it would be highly improper. I trust that the honourable member will agree with the position that I have laid down here, and I think he ought to say that, if this section was not in the Bill, that he would be requesting that it should be put in. I think the honourable member ought to take this attitude: "Well; that is all right; you are putting it in for St. John's, but if you are putting this clause in at all, you ought to give us the benefit of it." I think that is the viewpoint he ought to take on this matter.

MR. MOORE—Mr. Chairman, I am sure that we are all very grateful to the Minister of Justice, for the explanation that he has given us here this afternoon. And I may say that he has almost entirely satisfied me with regard to the old granny of yesterday. But there is something yet that I would like him to clear up, and that is that in the back streets of St. John's to-day, or on Freshwater Road, John Jones wants the granny to go into his house, the old fashioned granny, he is prepared to pay five dollars, but he is not prepared to pay twenty-five to the trained nurse. These are things that we should take into consideration. Another thing, Mr. Chairman, I am not prepared to come into this House, and take the responsibility as a respectable married man, I am not prepared to take the responsibility of putting out the old granny. It is a well known fact that in this chamber there are three confirmed bachelors. The hon. member for St. Barbe, my friend Mr. Scammell, the member for St. George's, Mr. Power, and the hon. member for Burin, who, is not here at present, but is bringing back a handsome bride with him. I don't want the married portion of this House to put out of business the old granny, with the white apron that we all looked up to with respect. And if the Minister of Justice finds out, or if God spares us, and we come into this chamber and find that the Medical Association, or anyone connected with it, is going to put a hardship over on the old granny of ours, then I am going to do all in my power to bring in an amendment to that bill.

HON THE COLONIAL SECRETARY —Mr. Chairman, I have not so far taken any part in the discussion on this bill. However, I have taken considerable interest in it and I have made some enquiries with regard to the different aspects of this Bill, and I would like to first of all compliment the Attorney General on the persistent and very excellent way in which he has handled the subject. He has certainly set a pace for the whole of us with regard to the attitude which he has adopted towards this measure which we may have regarded as a trifle and of little interest. It is recognized that a matter of this kind is the foundation of the whole nation's existence and therefore it ought to be taken very seriously by us. Science nowadays is devoting more energy and is more interested in the life of the human being than ever before in the history of the world. Man who have had training beyond measure, and who could go into the world and amass great fortunes, through the knowledge that they had attained, have abandoned all their selfish interests, that they may have had, and have devoted their whole lives to the study of science without hope of

any reward, as regards a monetary standpoint. Science in the birth of children has gone as thoroughly into the matter as into any other subject. And if that is a necessity surely those who are called upon to participate in that work, should be as qualified as it is possible for them to be. It is quite true as Mr. Moore has said in speaking of this question—I remember it myself—in days past there were no trained nurses, no maturnity nurses but only the old granny. And very excellent old ladies they were. But still it was only by practise, that they became so efficient. And we don't know at what cost their efficiency was attained. I consider that this community has made very great strides, towards a reformation of the conditions that existed in that direction. It was a fact that a few years ago a nurse trained in our General Hospital down here, thoroughly trained and qualified, intelligent and bright in every respect, going out of here could not practise in any of the hospitals in the States or Canada, because of the lack of maternity training. However, that has now been gotten over by the fact that we have now got a maternity home here and nurses can get their maternity training there. And so now a nurse leaving Newfoundland, because of the reputation they have made(can ask for a position in any of the hospitals of the adjoining countries. It is a law in the United States that any woman attending a maternity case, should not be allowed to practise any more than a doctor, without a certificate. It is just as essential in one as in the other. And I foresee for this bill a great influence in the future, and if there are certain lives who are getting their living from this source to-day, I feel sure that every assistance will be given to make them qualified. In that way they will be better able to perform the duties that they will be called upon to undertake.

Now as regards the question of this bill applying to St. John's and the outports. I quite agree with the Minister of Justice. It is not a debatable point from the district standpoint. It is a national matter and it is absoluely impossible to organise a board or committee all over the country that would put this into operation in the different parts of the country. It is not exclusively for St. John's, and I hope and trust that it will spread out all over the country. I have not any hesitation in saying now that before many months are over, that many proclamations will be issued at the request of people living in certain localities. And when the usefulness and the benefit and the safety and the desirability of the movement is appreciated by people, it will become more general as times goes on. St. John's as the capital of the country should lead the way in a thing of this kind. We have not given it the attention that the importance of the question, apperaining to the birth of the coming men and women of the country, deserves. We have no way of knowing what loss, what damage, what incapacity has been caused the present and the previous generation, and I don't see any way of ascertaining as to the ability of those who have practised this profession in the past. We know the child is born. If it is alright, it is alright. But if complications occur, where does the inexperienced woman come in, if she has not the knowledge to handle this situation. And as everyone knows there have been women's lives and children's lives sacrificed through the inexperience of people called upon at some critical period. Therefore I say that any movement that has for its object the safety of the men and the women of the future should have the full and earnest support of members

of this House. We are merely bringing together those who have the interests of the community at heart, and we have enough confidence in the medical men of this city to know that they are not going to recommend anything that would not be a benefit to the people at large. Therefore I give this Bill my hearty support.

MR. DUFF—Mr. Chairman, I have listened to some of the remarks of the Hon. Colonial Secretary and I must say that I do not agree with him in every detail. Now I would like to ask the Hon. the Introducer of this Bill who is going to pay this Board that is mentioned. Now that is the aspect of the Bill which chiefly interests those of us who are members for our outports. We would have to pay for any board that would be established in St. John's even though the outports might not be particularly interested in it. We have to pay towards insurance premiums for schemes that are going on in St. John's. We have to pay towards the upkeep of the Hospital in this city.

HON THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —And you largely help to fill it.

MR. DUFF—Not at all. Now Mr. Chairman, I am perfectly satisfied to allow this Bill to go through, and I think that it is a right thing. There is no question about the necessity of having qualified nureses, in this particular business. We all agree with that . But I certainly don't agree with the idea of the Board getting paid here in St. John's.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, I rise to thank the Hon. the Introducer of this Bill, for the kind things that he said of the few remarks that I made in reference to this Bill. But I am very sorry if I left the impression with him that I had approached this Bill from a small point of view. In fact, I claim that I approached the discussion from a big point of view. And I say that on a question of forward, social legislation should the circumstances warrant it, I would have no opposition to offer. But I am certainly opposed to a clause being inserted in the act, so that at the instigation or recommendation of a small minority in any community, this act may be foisted on that community, without the consent of the majority of the inhabitants. Now I am not much concerned with the academic standpoint of this bill, but the pertinent point, which I am ra and the explanation of which, the Minister of Justice has not at all satisfied me, is this; how comes it that the Board shall recommend the application of this Bill to the Governor-in-Council. In the outports can anyone recommend that the regulations of this Bill for instance should be applied to Bonavista? And where does this Board get its authority for the application of these regulations.

HON THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE: —Mr. Chairman, I just want to say a few words in explanation. In a couple of years time the Hon. Member is going to get married, and about fifteen or sixteen years after that, there will be a bright young girl of his comin along and looking for a certificate as a nurse. Now with this board working in that district, all that the board will want to know is that such an such a girl, in a certain outport is qualified. There is where this board comes in. The young girl to-day has no opportunity in St. John's. If she wants to go out and earn her living as a nurse, with a maternity training, she has got to go abroad to get her certificate. These regulations render it possible for a young girl to qualify in St. John's, and I sincerely say, that I look forward with confidence to t fact that it will be only a question of time, before there will be in the different outports of this country, young girls who are going to qualify as nurses, and they will be asking for these regulations to be put into effect, and the people of that place will also be asking for them to be put in operation. And after all these people who

are granted certificates, surely they are better authorities than the most interested persons in particular localities.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, I may say that the jocular side of the Minister of Justice is very shrewd. He knows very well, back of his head what I am talking about. For instance if Doctor Forbes, down in Bonavista, thinks that it would be good to have the provision of this act applied to the town of Bonavista, he would say "well and good, let them act upon it." Now who is going to the board, and give them their knowledge for making recommendations.

HON THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —If Doctor Forbes thought it was the right thing to have this mid-wifey act apply to Bonavista, he would recommend to the Board that it would be good to put it into effect there.

MR. SCAMMELL—That is very good. But now we get back to the "Old Granny" that Mr. Moore has referred to.

HON THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —That would be taken care for under the provisions of this act which says that if they have practised for twelve months they can get a certicate without any examination.

MR. SCAMMELL—Well can't you make this section read better. Can't you make it read that the Board shall have some bona fide report made to it. You have got to start with the theory always that this Board is going to be arbitrory. What I object to is the idea of the Government putting this legislation into effect without enquiring how the district concerned, will be affected by it, and the getting of the votes of two or three nurses and having the whole country bound by their views.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Chairman, there is a matter that I want to speak on this afternoon. It is in reference to some Hospital Bills. For the information of the Colonial Secretary I may say that I have in my possession a bill to the amount of $465,00 for patients who attended the Twillingate and Grand Falls Hospital, and who are unable to pay these bills. These are men who are in very poor circumstances. And I would like to ask you sir,if the Board of Health would like to take over these bills, and pay them. Can you get me any information on the matter.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY —Mr. Speaker, I may say for the information of the Hon. Member that in the case of bills of that kind, the Board of Health would first want a thorough investigation to be made, to find out if the persons concerned are not able to pay these bills. We have cases where people have sent in bills to be paid by the Board of Health, and it was found that these people were in a position to pay the bills themselves, the Relieving Officer so refused to certify them. May I ask if these bills have been certified by the Relieving Officer.

MR. BROWN—I can get that done. There is another thing that I would like to mention. The Grand Falls Hospital charges Two dollars a day for patients, while St. John's Hostal charges only a dollar fifty. While the rate at the General Hospital is a dollar fifty. I don't see why there should be this difference, for it is certainly not for extra treatment at the Grand Falls Hospital, but the people there are disgusted. It is one of the finest Hospitals in the country, and if the staff was as good as the Hospital, we shouldn't have five appendix cases coming to St. John's on the trains lately, and I want to know whether something cannot be done. It is true that Grand Falls is a one-horse town—the A.N.D. Co. controls it in every way, and but for that fact there would be some good doctors in it to-day. I should be the last man to say anything against professional men, especially medical men, but something has to be done. You have one man here in St. John's to-day in the person of Dr. Frank Moores whom Grand Falls was sorry to lose, and there is another at

Holyrood whom Grand Falls was also sorry to lose—if they were there there would be little complaint in Grand Falls. But to-day you hear every where "Let us get a good doctor" and I predict that if one of St. John's good medical men went there he would make a fortune in 10 years, and I think it right and proper for the Government to take it up with the A.N.D. Co. and ask if a doctor can go there and practise on his own, and I know the people of Grand Falls would be more satisfied than they are. I speak Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the people I have the honour to represent, and hope the Government will take it up.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to hear the Hon. Member take the position he has. It is common knowledge that conditions he speaks of are not satisfactory, and I don't blame the Company altogether it is self-contained, and controls all affairs, civic and otherwise of the place. They have a first class Hospital there, but I know there is some cause for compaints regarding the medical men. I don't know personally but I have heard a great real of comment, and I have also heard that Dr. Moores, who has been mentioned, has been asked to return. Well it is a question whether we have a right to interfere and I am sure the Hon. Member will appreciate that, but I believe that where a number of the people of this country are concerned, we as a Government ought to have something to say. The point is well taken, and I will be glad if the Executive Government will take it up and see if it can't be arranged so that a doctor can go there and practice on his own account. I understand the charge at the Hospital is $2.00 per day, and besides each employee contributes to the doctor's pay. The doctor has no incentive, he gets his money anyhow, and I don't wonder at men of ambition leaving there. Unless a man is an absolute devotee to his profession, and as such doing what he can for the welfare of the community this is bound to happen. When a man's money is coming in anyway he is bound to lose incentive, science is always advancing—a man needs to get out and study the latest developments. So we find many good doctors taking post-graduate courses every few years—that is why Dr. Keegan is away now; his main reason is to brush up his knowledge in the Old Country—and it is amazing what benefit one can get in that way. The point is as I said, well taken, and if I have the sanction of the Prime Minister and the Executive Government I shall be glad to write Mr. Harris to see what can be done.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Chairman, I don't want to delay the House, but I should like to thank the Hon. Colonial Secretary for his remarks, which show a great deal of co-operation with me. I may say also that in 1922 a Workingmen's Union of Grand Falls took the matter up, but there has been nothing come out until this year the Paper Makers took the matter up with the Executive following on an accident, and I am informed that one of the Executive threw the matter back with the remark that they had no kick because the man was not a native. Now my opinion is that if they remove the Medical Officer, Dr. Scott, there will be no further trouble in Grand Falls.

HON COLONIAL SECRETARY—The Hospital at Grand Falls gets no subsidy from the Government.

MR. BROWN—I should like to refer again to this bill I have, which is for an employee of the A.N.D. Co. He was employed when he went into the Hospital, and was working the day he was injured. I understand that they don't charge their employees if they got hurt in the plant, but if it happened outside the plant they charge them, because I have this man's bill in my pocket.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—The Hospital in St. John's is a Gov-

ernment Institution, but in Grand Falls it is run at the expense of the Company. It seems to me to be an anomaly that they pay for the doctor and then are charged for attendance. I suppose then on these things the Government can't come in. In regard to Dr. Scott, I may say that I know him very well, and understand that he is a very sick man, and perhaps because of that he is not capable of handling the situation. I wouldn't think of casting any aspersions or reflections upon Dr. Scott, I have a very high opinion of him, he is a man who went overseas, and a man who has good degrees, but if he is a sick man it is difficult for him to attend efficiently to the work. I hope that this short debate will have some result.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — Mr. Chairman, we have drifted somewhat from the discussion of the Midwives' Bill, but I suppose we shall drift back. I just want to say that I was struck with what the hon. member for Ferryland said during his remarks (and he also drifted from the discussion). He said that in his opinion one of his constituents had been fleeced by Dr. Roberts of this city. Now I hold no brief for Dr. Roberts, but I don't think that a member should make such a remark lightly, and I think, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. member should either prove what he said or withdraw it. I don't really think he meant what he said, but it is the inference when he uses the word "fleeced". I shall just take this opportunity to say that people who can pay for medical services ought to do so. In years past many people who had bank accounts would come to the hospital and without paying a cent. I think every consideration should be given people who are unable to pay, but I do not think it is fair to tax the people of the Colony for those who can afford to do so, and that ought to be dealt with. Now I am not suggesting that the person of whom the hon. member for Ferryland spoke could afford to pay, but apparently she could do so, for he says she was "fleeced" by Dr. Roberts. I suggest that in due courtesy to Dr. Roberts or any gentleman of the medical fraternity in this country this remark as to being "fleeced" be withdrawn.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairmna, I have nothing to take back. At the time when the matter of which I spoke came up, some six or seven months ago when this woman came in from Renews with her child, I gave her a letter to Mr. Bartlett, who sent her to Dr. Roberts. Why he did so I did not know at the time, but have found that he constitutes part of the Board. She came to my office afterwards and told me that Dr. Roberts took $2.00 off her. Now I am not "after" Dr. Roberts—I know him personally, but I have another instance of a poor girl with this same gentleman—she got in trouble and went to a doctor in this city, and Dr. Roberts was the gentleman, and in my opinion—and I have had some knowledge of the fraternity, my wife having been a nurse and my brother being a doctor—I don't think he treated her properly. I know that if I were a doctor I should console the poor girl instead of ridicule her. The case I was speaking of was Mrs. Foley from Renews. I did everything I could for her and when I passed her along to the Board they took $2.00 off her. That is not a big amount of money, I admit, but it is bigger to some people than others. I rang up Dr. Roberts at the time and he became very impertinent with me.

Now that I am on my feet and have the opportunity, may I ask what is to be done regarding the poor people of this town who have to get attend-

ance under this Bill—I think that is a very important point. I don't represent St. John's people, but I realize that there are people in St. John's to whom $5.00 is as important as to people in the outports, and I think the Government should guard against any overcharging by the Board. Now the Board, according to Section 29, has power to put this Act in force in any outport by simply recommending it to the Governor in Council. I take it that this means that on such a recommendation the Governor in Council should do it and it would so go in force.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —They have power to turn it down.

MR. CASHIN—Have they? Well, that is alright. While on my feet I might state that in one part of our district they have been absolutely isolated this winer. Unfortunately Dr. Freebairn became ill and we were without the services of any medical man. I propose to make some remarks before adjournment of the House this afternoon, and will defer them until then. But don't you think that we should have something tangible put in regarding the fees for poor people of the City?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —That is the very reason why I don't want them put in. The old midwives who have been practising are entitled to be registered, and it is not just to put in anything that is going to deprive the people of their services.

MR. CASHIN—I take it then that the "granny" will be allowed to practise and will get a certificate from the Board, and still be allowed to charge the old fees. If that is so I am entirely agreeable.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Under the Act she can demand that she be registered.

MR. CASHIN, but you know that there are a lot of the old "grannies" who wouldn't demand anything.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I take it that the object of this Bill is for the preservation of the health of he Community, and I should be sorry indeed to know that a nurse of one year can be registered without examination and perhaps without experience, and given all the powers that a properly trained midwife would have. Now, Mr. Chairman, I consider this is the weakness of the Bill, with all due respect to unregistered nurses, young or old. I agree with the principle of the Bill and think it a good thing.

HON THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —They will be able to charge according to their ability, the same as in any profession. It works out to the benefit of the trained nurse, for they will be more employed and able to charge bigger fees.

MR. HALFYARD—I am dealing with it from the community standpoint. The regret in my mind is with regard to the outports. This Act cannot be put in force there because of the lack of trained nurses and doctors in many cases, so we shall have to keep on running that risk, and I fear it will be a long time before many of our outports will come under this Act. Some of the principal places such as Carbonear and Harbour Grace may come under the Act, but even then, there is a doubt, for our girls who become trained nurses and midwives will look for fields farther away, where there are better opportunities. That is why our girls who become trained nurses do not go back to the outports.

Another point. This deals principally with St. John's, and will doubtless be confined to St. John's for some time, and I regard it as a pity that the Municipality of St. John's cannot arrange for payment of its own nurses. It is treated as a national thing, and so the outports will have to help pay the cost of the operation of the Act. Regarding the remarks from the members on the old midwives, I feel that under this Bill

they will be looked after, but I hope not at the expense of the younger and better trained nurses, and the health of the patient.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, I should like to answer this point raised by the hon. member. The position had to be met with regard to those already engaged in the work of midwifery, and the 12 months clause is the result. When the hon. member raised the question that this might tend to discourage those who are better qualified by scientific training I answered that it would depend on ability. This Bill is the same as the provision of machinery for granting certificates to Masters, etc. Some men get certificates of competency, and others who will not will sometimes command the same salary—in other cases th man without the certificate will not get as much, although he may be quite as good a man. And other cases the man without the certificate tends to classify a man. The reward comes to competency—a better horse-shoer will get more work than a poorer one.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, what I had in my mind was this—that there are technicalities in connection with nursing that cannot be applied to the case of masters and mates; it is not a parallel case. He may be a good man and understand as much about navigation as a man with a certificate.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Suppose this Act comes into effect in the Outports say some time within the next five years. How will those who are practising midwifery at that time when the Act comes into effect be affected by it? I want it to be clearly understood that I do not want it to come into the hands of a few. Power is going to be taken from the House and be vested in the Executive Government, taken from forty and given to ten. Perhaps this is not unusual, perhaps I am too conservative as I believe that this House should have the full power and that the members of the district should have a certain say in matters pertaining to their districts. I notice that this power is to be taken from the members and given the Executive Government. With regard to Mr. Scammell's point I think that we should take cognisance of it and it might be advisable for the Government to consider whether or not it might be brought into operation after a petition is sent to the House from the localities interested. But I believe when a matter concerns the people of a settlement the matter should not be left in the hands of a few who may have pull with the members or with the Executive Government. It is because of that that I am here this afternoon to ascertain the details with regard to the application of this Act. The Colonial Secretary foreshadowed a great many proclamations in the near future and it is on account of that I do not see why that the power should not be vested directly in this House.

HON THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I take it that the hon. member admits the principle of qualification or the power of being registered? Now can the hon. member admit the position that if in his district the people want this Act brought into effect, and if they not alone want it to come into effect, but they also have a number of qualified persons able to be registered then there is no reason why the Act should not be available. If the Act is good for St. John's there can be no reason on earth why it should not be good for Twillingate. Now according to your suggestion an application could not be made to this House until the House opens and we passed an Act enabling the people to have the midwifery Act made applicable to their district. Then we would have Twillingate this year and Fogo next

year and the same way we would have to pass an act every year. Surely the hon. member will agree with me that there is nothing more sensible than doing as this act provides for. It is to be put into effect in St. John's, and in the other parts of the Island when they are ready for it and are able to satisfy the Governor in Council that they have the materials to meet the requirements and that it is recommended by the Midwives' Board. Cannot the hon. member see that if Grand Bank had the necessary qualification and the necessary number of trained nurses that they have to wait until the House opened and an act was passed making the bill effective in Grand Bank. I think that the hon. member may take it from me that it is absolutely—I do not say this in any critical or offensive manner,—but I think that it is absolutely nonsensical to make it so that we would have to put this thing into effect by special enactment. Now there is one thing about this administration, that while it claims to be able to do a lot of things, it does not claim to be able to control the bringing of children into the world.

MR. ASHBOURNE—My argument is as to whether the Government might not consider that it would be well to have a petition from the people of the districts in addition to the recommendation from the Midwifery Board. I can quite understand that the hon. the introducer of this Bill may not know anything about it. I think that when a petition has come from the majority of the people of a district and when the petition is granted and a recommendation is received from the Midwives' Board, the matter should be then referred to the Governor in Council.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —The hon. member knows, or any man knows that it is futile to leave a matter of such importance to a petition. This is a matter that can only be brought in by a concern in the whole situation and a realization of what it means to the health of the community. I think that the only method to adopt is to do as provided in the act namely to see that they are able to put it into effect and that the board recommends it. I would like to tell the hon. member that it is worked exactly as we thought would be best suited to the Outports. You would not like it to be noised abroad that the people of the outports are not interested in public health. I take it that the people of the Outports are just as interested in public health as the people of St. John's. I am looking forward as a matter of fact to the whole country wanting this act.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and had passed the Bill 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.

The remaining Orders of the Day was deferred.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker, before the adjournment of the House, I would like to draw the attention of the Government to the fact that we, in the district of Ferryland, although being very close to the City of St. John's, have been practically isolated since the middle of January. Although the Government has been running a coastal service on the southwest coast, which in the near future I may be in a position to prove did not give every service. During the past winter the people of the upper part of Ferryland District have been more than overlooked. It is unfortunate that Dr. Freebairn became ill and had to go to the Hospital and was unable to attend to that section of the district. It is practical-

ly impossible for the people of Ferryland District to travel to St. John's or to go from one place to another in the district. And people who have been sick in the district during the winter have suffered untold hardship and it is only during the past few days that I have got any kind of satisfaction about the opening of the railway. It is customary in the past to put a small coastal boat on between here and St Mary's Bay and so taking the place of the Railway down to Trepassey. This winter a small boat belonging to the Monroe Export Company, for their own convenience, has been on the route and some people have been travelling on her, and I was speaking to three of the men who had been on that boat and from what they told me the conditions were far from safe with such a large number of people on board. Possibly the passengers took their own lives in their hands. It took nearly forty-eight hours or at least more than twenty-four to make the trip. However, this may be a matter that has been overlooked before by the Government and I would suggest that they make every effort possible to open up the railway at once or otherwise put a small boat of the Malakoff type, possibly the Malakoff is not available, but the Sebastopol would serve the purpose and run from here to St. Mary's Bay until the summer months when the railway is put into operation again. I had considerable trouble during the winter to get doctors to go up to the district. We have had trouble getting doctors to come, and that has been made more difficult because of the amount of snow. The Bill we were discussing this afternoon gave me the opportunity of expressing my views on this position, and I feel that the Government should open up the railway or arrange for a coastal boat to St. Mary's Bay. There are six thousand people living in that district, from St. John's district down, and these people pay their portion of the public funds, and it is only right that they should be looked after—they have been absolutely out in the cold and have had no facilities whatever. I draw the attention of the Government to this and feel that the Prime Minister, as head of Railway Commission will see that this is done either by opening up the railway or putting on a boat for the time being.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, In moving the adjournment of the House I may say to the Member for Ferryland (and I can't say whether he is the Senior or Junior member) that we have overlooked nothing in this regard. The hon. Member for Ferryland on this side of this House, Mr. Moore, has been after us about this, and I can almost assure the hon. Member for Ferryland that by next Monday this will be looked after and the district opened up.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, I thank the Prime Minister, and merely say that his own letter to me is sufficient proof as to whether I am the senior or junior member for Ferryland.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, April 21st, 1926.

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

Hon. the Minister of Justice presented a petition from the Newfoundland Atlantic Fisheries, Ltd., praying for the Confirmation of an Agreement entered into with the Government in 1917. Said petition was, on motion, referred to a Select Committee for enquiry and report thereon. The Committee to consist of Hon. the Minister of Justice, Minister of Fin-

ance, Mr. Lake, Mr. Halfyard, Mr. Hickman.

Hon. the Colonial Secretary presented a petition from the Newfoundland Hotel Facilities, Ltd., praying for the Confirmation of an Agreement with the Government. Said petition was on motion referred to a Select Committee for enquiry and report thereon. The Committee to consist of Hon. the Colonial Secretary, Hon. the Minister of Justice, Hon. Mr. Cramm, Mr. Hickman, Mr. Warren.

Petitions were presented by:—

Hon. the Minister of Posts from Healey's Cove re Wharf, also from Long Pond re Breakwater.

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

Mr. Brown gave notice of question.

Mr. Warren gave notice of question.

Mr. Cashin gave notice of question.

Mr. Scammell gave notice of question.

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. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I do not intend to deal very largely with the Estimates this afternoon, beyond the matter of stating the increases and decreases and where they are. After explaining this I intend to move that the Committee rise so that the Opposition will have an opportunity to look into them and we can then discuss them to-morrow. The increases and decreases are as follows:—

(Reads from statement.)

It may be remarked that the Government have decided to give an extra twenty thousand dollars to the Old Age Pensions. I do not know that there is much more than that to be particularly explained. As we go along it will be seen where the increases and decreases are. The increase in the Justice Department is principally an increase in policemen's and firemen's salaries. The increases in the Finance Department is due to the Interest on the public debt.

If it is satisfactory to all I now move that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again on to-morrow.

MR. CASHIN—I feel that we should congratulate someone on the increase of twenty thousand dollars in the Old Age Pensions. I take the opportunity of stating that there are various old people in various districts, who, when this has been voted, will appreciate the action of those who advocated that increase of the Old Age Pensions to the amount of twenty thousand dollars. When in the discussion of the Civil Service Bill, in discussing various forms of insurance, I distinctly remember that I advocated that the same sum of money instead of being spent on insurance should be given as an Old Age Pensions increase. I am glad to see that something has been done in connection with these old people and I extend my congratulations to those instrumental in adopting that measure.

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.

Notice of Motion

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—To ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled an Act relating to the Railway and Shipping.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—

Before the motion passes I would like to make an explanation to the Members on the other side of the House in connection with their request that this Bill if possible should be distributed at the first reading. We are desirous of doing this. We were hoping to have the Bills ready to-day for the first reading, but at the meeting of the Railroad Commission this morning it was decided to make some slight amendments and it had to be sent again to the printers. The necessity for the Bill is that the Railway Commission be given power to act and control the operations of the Railway. The Railway Commission are acting now entirely without legal authority. The Bill lays down the rules and regulations in connection with the management of the railway. We will be able to have the Bills distributed to-morrow.

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

Replies to the following question were tabled with exception to Nos. 1, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 19, 20.

(1) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister, as Chairman of the Railway Commission, to lay on the Table of the House a statement giving the following information: What amounts of crockeryware, linen, mattresses, cutlery and other fittings were landed from the S.S. "Caribou" on her arrival in Newfoundland and put in the General Stores at the Railway Department; from whom was this material purchased ;what price was paid for same; and give all particulars in connection therewith.

(2) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the Table of the House Report, if any, by Messrs. G. N. Read, Son & Watson, or any other Report, into the accounts of the Imperial Oil, Limited, as mentioned in Messrs. G. N. Read, Son & Watson's Report.

(3) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Colonial Secretary to Table a copy of Minute of Council appointing Messrs. Read, Son & Watson, Chartered Accountants, to enquire into the accounts of H. M. Customs.

(4) MR. CASHIN asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the Table of the House statement giving the names of the firm or firms who supplied lighthouses with oil during the year 1925 and the price per gallon paid; also statement showing the price per gallon paid for oil during the year 1926.

(5) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the Table of the House a statement as follows: (1) The Revenue, Expenditure, Imports, Exports, and Interest on Public Debt for each fiscal year since June the 30th, 1911, to June the 30th, 1925; (2) Also the Net Revenue for the Fiscal Year 1924 to 1925 as separate and apart from all outstanding collections; (3) The total amount of outstanding Revenue due for the years 1924-25.

(6) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister, as Chairman of the Railway Commission to table the Auditor-General's Statement showing the Balance Sheet of the Railway to June 30th, 1925; this information to show value of stock on hand, etc.; also the number of tons of coal on hand and price per ton which it is shown to represent on Balance Sheet.

(7) MR. CASHIN asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House the following information: (1) What date was the last meeting of the Board of Works held; (2) Who is supplying the furnishings for the new public building at Corner Brook; (3) Were tenders asked for same; (4) How much will the new furnishings cost; (5) If

no tenders were asked for, why not.

(8) MR. CASHIN asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing: (1) The total amount paid for Taxi Hire or Motor Car Hire during the year 1925; (2) To whom the various amounts were paid; (3) Were one of the officials of the Board of Works acting as Chaffeur during the year 1925; (4) If so who paid his salary.

(9) MR. CASHIN asked the Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the Table of the House: (1) All Invoices submitted the Customs Department by Messrs. Evans and Reid, or the Hon. M. S. Sullivan, for coal supplied by them to the Railway Department during the year 1925; (2) Give the name of the steamer carrying each cargo, showing Invoice cost, amount of Duty and Sales Tax paid.

(10) MR. CASHIN asked the Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the Table of the House a list of Fishery Supplies given by the Government in 1921; the names of people to whom given and amount given to each; credit amount received in each case; also if it is the intention of the Government to collect from the firms that did not pay; and if not, why not.

(11) MR. DUFF asked the Hon. the Minister of Public Works to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing all special grants, other than main line or local, sent to the District of Bay de Verde since July 1st, 1924.

(12) MR. BROWN asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay upon the Table of the House a list with the names of all employees of the Dock and Dock construction who are paid by the week and by the month, and by the half month through the Government and through the W. I. Bishop Co., Ltd., and to state the amount of salary paid to each.

(13) MR. WARREN asked the Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs what position P. J. Colford, who signs the Report of the Treasury Board recently Tabled, holds in the Civil Service, if he has been appointed Deputy Minister of Finance, if the Minister is aware that by law the Deputy Minister of Finance is ex officio Secretary of the Treasury Board and why the provisions of the Statute were broken in this respect when the Treasury Board held the investigation and made the report thereon recently tabled.

(14) MR. WARREN asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to lay upon the Table of the House (1) a statement showing the amount of fines and forfeitures referred to in the Report of G. N. Read, Son & Watson recently tabled, paid into the Department of Finance and Customs during the years 1923, 1924 and 1925; (2) a statement showing how the amount received was divided and disbursed during the said years, giving the names of any persons to whom paments have been made.

(15) MR. SCAMMELL asked the Minister of Agriculture and Mines if there were Fire Wardens last season at Newman's Sound Reach, B.B., at Clode Sound and Chandler's Reach, B.B., and at Alexander Bay, B.B.; if so, to give the names of each of the Wardens employed in these various localities and to state the total amount paid each as (a) salary and (b) expenses.

(16) MR. SCAMMELL asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if certain structural alterations or improvements were made to the Lighthouse on Little Denier Island, B.B., last season, and if so to state the nature of same and to lay on the Table of the House a copy of all expenditure in connection therewith in detail; also to ask what it cost to remove the tower from the said Light-

house to Salvage and to give a detailed statement of such cost showing (a) the number and names of the men employed in connection therewith; (b) the amount paid to each man; (c) the amount paid for motor boat hire and to whom it was paid; (d) where is the tower at present lying and is the person on whose wharf it is lying receiving any payment from the Department for storage or taking care of it.

(17) MR. SCAMMELL asked Hon. the Minister of Education to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing in fullest detail how the amount of $12,380.00 for salaries in the Department of Education (as referred to in the Auditor General's Report) was apportioned for the fiscal year ending June 30th, 1925.

(18) MR. SCAMMELL asked Hon. the Colonial Secretary to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing in fullest detail how the amount of $4,824.00 for salaries in the Prime Minister's Department (as referred to in the Auditor General's Report (under the expenditure head Colonial Secretary's Department) was apportioned, for the fiscal year ending June 30th, 1925.

(19) MR. HICKMAN asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay upon the Table of the House a statement showing number of trips made by S.S. "Meigle" to the Labrador during the season of 1925; the number of passengers carried each way, each trip of the steamer.

(20) MR. HICKMAN asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to lay upon the Table of the House, a statement signed by the Auditor General giving a list of all payments made to G. N. Read, Son & Watson by the Government since January 1st, 1923; what amounts are still owing.

(21) MR. HICKMAN asked Hon. the Colonial Secretary what vacancy on the Hospital staff was filled by the appointment of Dr. Roberts recently gazetted; why was this appointment made without the recommendation of the Board of Governors of the General Hospital.

(In reference to No. 2.)

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS——An enquiry has been going on for some time in connection with the Imeprial Oil Co. It goes some way back and it will be some time before we can supply the information obtained by it. The enquiry is being made by an Auditor from the Auditor General's Department.

(In reference to No. 3.)

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY — There is no copy of Minute-of-Council to be tabled. The Minister of Finance made a representation to the Government that he was desirous of having an enquiry and suggested that Read, Son and Watson be employed and the Government took the matter up and employed them.

(In reference to No. 13.)

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I may say in reply to Mr. Warren that Mr. Keating the Deputy Minister of Finance being very busy and having some other important work, I just took my own secretary for a short while.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to Secure the Better Training of Midwives and to Regulate their Practice," 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.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Speaker, As the Orders of the Day have been completed I would crave the indulgence of the House for a moment to ask the

Prime Minister, as the Chairman of the Railway Commission, when he expects that the Commission will be able to start the regular train service according to schedule. We are not very well situated at present down on the Bonavista Branch as regards the train service. The trains for the last few months have been leaving on Mondays and Thursdays, and we have only got two trains a week from the city. I think that it is high time now that the railway should go back to the old schedule, and give us three trains a week. Spring is opening up, and business is beginning to get on the move so there is nothing to be lost by giving us our regular service. I don't know why we should not get the full service from now on, and I would like the Prime Minister to tell us when we can expect the Sunday, Tuesday and Thursday's trains.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to hear that Spring is opening up. We have been looking for it on the railway, but we have not found it there. Across the country we have been using snow plows for the last three or four days. Unfortunately the railway is up against conditions that they have not seen for a great many Springs. But it is the effort of the railway commission to get every branch open. As I explained to the House, we have been doing our best to get the Southern Shore Branch open, as well as all the other branches, and we would like to see the Bonavista Branch on full time service if it could be done. I want to assure the hon. member that I will make it my business to see that, if it is at all possible to have that branch and all the other branches operating, it will be done.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, April 22nd, 1926.

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

Petitions were presented by:

Minister of Fisheries from Port Blandford re: Road.

Mr. Hickman gave notice of question.

Minister of Agriculture gave notice of question.

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Regulate the Whaling Industry."

Hon the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act Relating to Newspapers and Books."

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act respecting Immigration" 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 following questions were tabled with exception of Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, which were deferred.

(1) MR. BROWN asked Hon. the Minister of Justice how long Mr. Chas. White, J. P., of Twillingate, has been doing magisterial work in that jurisdiction and if he has been paid any amount for his services in that connection, if so to state the amount paid him.

(2) MR. BROWN asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the Table of the House a detailed statement showing how the amount of $4,200.00 for Lighthouse replacements since July 1st, 1924, has been spent.

(3) MR. WARREN asked Hon. the Minister of Justice if the Magistrates make the returns called for under sub-section (b) of section 6 of the Lotteries Amendment Act, 1921, and if so, to Table a copy of all returns

made by Magistrates for the period from January 1st, 1925, to date.

(4) MR. WARREN asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing what goods were imported, free of duty, by the Newfoundland Power and Paper Co., Ltd., or Messrs. Armstrong-Whitworth & Co., Ltd., or any sub-contractors of theirs under the Power and Paper contract, giving the date when these importations were made.

(5) MR. WARREN asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing the amount, quality and brand of all liquor purchased by the Board of Liquor Control which had first been confiscated by either the Police or the Custom Authorities, and also to give price paid for same.

(6) MR. CASHIN asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the Table of the House a detailed statement showing how the amount of $10,840.00 has been expended in connection with Repairs to Lighthouses since July 1st, 1924.

(7) MR. SCAMMELL asked the Minister of Public Works if any money has been allocated by the Department of Public Works for repairs or enlargements to the reservoir at Greenspond since July 1st, 1924, and if so, to state the amounts and to whom sent; also to ask if any money has been allocated for Wells at Pond Head, Greenspond, since July 1st, 1924, and if so to state the amounts and to whom allocated.

(8) MR. SCAMMELL asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries how many acetylene lighting outfits have been purchased by the Department sine July 1st, 1924, from whom were they purchased and what price was paid for them.

HON. THE MINISTE OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I beg to table reply to question asked by Mr. Halfyard in reference to the Assessor's Dept. and the Income Tax.

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 Cap. 3, 14 George V., entitled "An Act for the Confirmation of an Agreement between the Government and Harry J. Crowe, Timber Merchant, and for other purposes," with some Amendments, in which they request the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I want to ask the indulgence of the House to dispose of the amendments that have been made in this Bill of the Crowe Agreement by the Legislative Council, before we proceed to the other business of the day. The amendments made are not very great and are perhaps more grammatical than anything else. They are as follows:

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the said Amendments were read a first time.

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 said Amendments had been passed 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.

Committee of the Whole on Supply.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Minister in charge of the Estimates where the salaries for the members of the Board of Liquor Control are contained?

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—They are not in the Estim-

ates. The members of the Board and the clerks of the Department are paid out of the till of the Department.

MR. WARREN—If that is the case, we have no opportunity of discussing how the Board of Liquor Control is functioning, unless specific Resolutions are brought in. I say, Mr. Chairman, that it is wrong in principle and wrong in every way that the Board can take the moneys of the people of the country and help themselves to their salaries, because their salaries are voted here by statute. Every year moneys that are paid out of the different departments of the Civil Service have to be accounted for before this House. Would it be right for the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs to pay himself his wages out of the moneys derived from stamps in his Department, simply because his salary is voted by statute. Why, every year the salaries of His Excellency the Governor and the Prime Minister are voted by this House and it makes one wonder and enquire when salaries like that of the Liquor Department are not stated in the Estimates. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have quite a great deal to say about this Board of Liquor Control and I would like to find out at this juncture when would it be the most opportune time for me to say what I have to say. I contend that the salaries of that Department should not be paid, without the consent of this House and they should be brought before us for discussion and consideration. I am not alone referring to the salaries of the members of the Board whose salaries are voted by statute; but the clerks of the Department have no business whatever to be paid and Mr. Mifflen, the Chairman of the Board of Liquor Control, has no right to put his hand in the till and hand them out their salaries, without the authority and consent of this House. The people of this country, be it remembered, were given to understand that when this Government was elected there would be none of the old Government by Minute-of-Council or so-called hole-in-corner methods, as before; but I certainly raise my voice and protest against public moneys being taken from the till of a Department to pay salaries, without the consent of this House. The principle in granting Supply was to provide for redress of grievances and that was established away back in the past century, and the present administration, by not including those salaries that I have referred to in the Estimates to-day, are violating one of the principal bulwarks of the Constitution. Those salaries ought to be in here, because, if for no other reason, the Department of Liquor Control is by no means above criticism. If the Minister in charge of the Estimates says that they will be put in, then I shall reserve anything I have to say until the proper time arrives for criticism of the Board; but, if he is not going to put them in, then I shall have something to say on a special resolution.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, because the Finance Minister has no particular reason for either putting these salaries in the Estimates or keeping them out, I take the liberty to say that I think the explanation is that the Board evidently is its own absolute boss and a law unto itself as regards the handling of funds. I have had my own struggles with the Board as to their powers. I am now looking at Section four of the Alcoholic Liquors Act.

(Reads Section four)

According to that, they can do as they like and no Government or no House of Assembly have any control over them. Then there is section eleven which reads as follows:

(Reads Section eleven)

It looks to me that the Board takes the position that the money paid into the Department of Liquor Control

only becomes part of the Consolidated Revenue, after the Board has paid out salaries, etc. After the Board does as it likes, in other words, what is left of the money is passed over to the Minister of Finance and Customs. And one of the reasons why the Board is taking that attitude is because it is a republic of itself. I was consulted recently by the Chairman of the Liquor Control Board with regard to the raising of salaries and I dealt with the anomalous position, pointing out to him that, whilst almost every official in every other Department were looking for increases in their salaries and could not get them, the clerks in his department could get increases. I am pleased to see the point raised by the honourable member for Fortune Bay, namely, that if we have the right to control the Control Board that we ought have the right to control their salaries and put them in the Estimates, but I hesitate to say, under the Act, that we have the right to control them as regards expenditures by them. However, the point raised is a rather important one and I would suggest that the debate on it be deferred. It strikes me, and I would invite the honourable member's attention to the Act, that it is only the salaries of the members of the Board that are voted by statute because section seven of the Act intimates that the clerks of the Department only function at the pleasure of the Board and may be dismissed, without prior notice. Therefore, I would venture the opinion now that the Board is absolutely in control of its own finances.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, with the argument advanced by the Hon. Minister of Justice I do not agree. I served on a Joint Committee with gentlemen of both Houses of the Legislature and I never knew for one instant that it was contemplated that that Bill took away from this Legislature control of the Colony's moneys. Here we are voting the salaries of every Minister of the Crown, the Auditor General, the Judges of the Supreme Court, the members of the Board of Works and others, and why should the salaries of the Liquor Department be paid out of the Colony's funds in that Department. Now last year the salaries of the members of the Liquor Control Board were in the Estimates and this year they have been taken out. Why is this? I see no reason why the members of the Liquor Board should not have their salaries set forth in the Estimates like the Ministers of the Crown, whose salaries are voted by statute. I do not agree with the Attorney General in the conclusion he has come to. I know the members of the Board are a law unto themselves to appoint clerks and such like just as the Board of Governors of the Hospital have similar powers, but not as regards the handling of money. This Liquor Department should be free from political influence. I submit, Sir, that a bad precedent is being set and it will lead to disaster in the end; and I will guarantee now that every salary paid in connection with the Newfoundland Government Railway is being paid out of the till also, without being voted by this House. If I were the Government I would put these salaries in the Estimates just the same as those of everybody else.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, I did not make the clean cut statement that my views concerning the Liquor Board were right, but for the purpose of argument I would like to point out that it is only since the Bill was in Select Committee that it has been discovered that the Bill contains provisions that are very drastic and that it is only now that we are realising how drastic they are. It is an absurdity what is going on to-day, and I feel sure that there is not a man in this

House who will agree with the sort of prosecutions that are being handed out. To-day you have the humiliating position in the Police Court that the ordinary policeman has no standing at all with what are no more than ordinary drunks. It is an absolute absurdity, matched with an extreme kind of notion about carrying out the law. Honourable members will agree that it is the kind of a law in which we follow the principle of taking everything clear of politicians and pass over to independent Boards. The one great trouble about the Alcoholic Liquors Act is that the Board is a law unto itself. In the matter of infractions of the liquor law to-day neither the Chief Justice or the Governor of the country have as much power in a sense as the Chairman of the Liquor Control Board. He decides on all questions, has most extraordinary power, and we find ourselves in the position to-day in seeing that, as regards the extent of the powers of the Board, the more one reads of the Act the more one discovers the vast powers the Board has.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Chairman, this is a pretty hard job for a layman to decide, but I think that the Minister of Justice is right in what he said. As it is a matter of $13,000.00 for the members of the Board, I have no objection to having the vote placed in the Estimates, and I would much prefer to have them there rather than have the members of that Board calling on me for their salaries. The way the thing has been going on the past year is that the salaries were paid out of the funds of the department, but no irregularities went on there, as the accounts were audited monthly by the Auditor General's Department.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, I am not suggesting any irregularities, yet why should these officials take the cash out of the till without this Legislature saying so. I do not purpose at this juncture to argue with the Attorney General on some of the points he has raised, as I have not had an opportunity of reading and studying the Act, but I will do so probably when the Government bring down the new Act, replacing the present Act, as foreshadowed in the Speech from the Throne. I would like to know when I will have an opportunity of dealing with the work and proceedings of the Board of Liquor Control and of some of the complaints that one hears about. As the Minister in charge of the Estimates has promised to put that vote in the Estimates, no doubt the opportunity will present itself in due course.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, I would like to know how the salaries were paid the Liquor Control Board last year, as it seems to me that their salaries were voted by this House and were paid by themselves out of the funds of the Department—a most irregular thing to do. I think it is an absolute absurdity for us to come in here and vote money for salaries and for the members of the Board of Liquor Control to pay themselves out of the till.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Mr. Chairman, I think that each man's salary in that Department should be voted in the same way by this House as the salaries are voted for any other Department of the Public Service.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few observations on the subject matter now before the Chair. When this Bill was framed the idea was to keep it clear of party politics and the intention of the Bill, as has been explained to the entire House, was that the Government would have no control whatever over the Liquor Control Board. We were absolutely prevented from interfering with the affairs of the Liquor Board, and that is how

it worked out. In dealing with this matter this afternoon Mr. Warren intimated that the people of the country thought that they had finished with Government by Minute-of-Council. Let me tell him that the Government are just as helpless as the Opposition are as regards the control of the Liquor Department, except that we see any misconduct we can dismiss the Board, but beyond that we cannot interfere, and as long as they transact their work properly they will continue as a Board to operate and pay such salaries as are necessary to employees of that Department. The honourable member for Fortune Bay was perfectly right when he referred to the officials of the Railway getting paid in a similar way as those at the Liquor Control office. The proposition in the Railway Bill is to give control to a certain Board to manage the railway affairs and make proper returns to the Government, and it may be in the best interests of the country to have it done that way and taken clear of Government control. For instance, in taking over the Canadian National Railway to run, Sir Henry Thornton would not take charge at all unless it was taken clear of the Legislature entirely, and detail management has been taken out of the Control of the Canadian Parliament, in spite of the fact that the Canadian National Railway has been dropping one hundred and twenty million dollars per year. Any Estimates needed for operating our Railway or Board of Liquor Control can be voted, but there are no Estimates needed to be voted the Control Board, as they are able to finance themselves. Consqeuently, they are clear of Government control and political influence, and, I am inclined to think, rightly so.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, we have listened with a great deal of interest to the speeches of the Attorney General, Mr. Warren and the Prime Minister in connection with salaries paid officials of the Liquor Control Board and the Railway. Now this House, as far as I can see, has not voted anything for the Railway, and I contend that both the salaries of the Liquor Board and the Railway should be placed in the Estimates. The Prime Minister stated that they did note vote any Estimates in the Canadian House of Parliament for the Canadian National Railway. I do not agree with that statement, because when the Finance Minister of Canada presented his Estimates in the Commons up to March 31st, 1927, he presented separate Estimates, one for the Canadian National Railway and one for the Canadian Merchant National Marine under the direction of Sir Henry Thornton. It was said by the Prime Minister that one hundred and twenty million dollars per year was lost on the Canadian National Railway, but that amount is included in what was spent on capital account. Now for the purposes of proof here are the exact figures which shows a surplus of between twenty three and twenty four million dollars on operating expenses of the Canadian National. Still the Prime Minister would like to have people think that that Railroad was losing an enormous amount of money annually. Mr. Chairman, I propose to prove that the Newfoundland Government Railway, controlled by a Commission and of which the Prime Minister is Chairman, is losing about three million dollars a year in oprelating expenses in this country.

I would also like to avail of this opportunity, Mr. Chairman, here this evening to give a few ideas, in connection with the operation of the railway. I have some notes here, which I may have occasion to read, in connection with the figures that I have taken the trouble to compile, out of the information that I have obtained during the past two or three weeks.

This country, Mr. Chairman, will undoubtedly have to bear the burden of any deficit incurred by the railway in years to come, because at the present time there is no hope, there is no one in sight who would feel like taking over the Government railway and running it as a business concern. Now my point is this that these estimates should be included in the estimates here this evening. We find ourselves in the position here this evening, that according to the law that was passed last year, we are not going to vote the monies for the Controller's Department. Now as an ordinary layman in that Government last year, I did not know anything about that. We voted the money last year, and it is only logical that we should vote it this year. Now there is something wrong somewhere. Now, sir, I contend that my position is the same in connection with the railway. The employees of that railway are drawing down $150,000 a month in salaries—$2,000,000 a year. And there is not one individual gentleman in this House to-day, and I will go that far, who can explain anything in connection with the operation of that railway. Why? because the Railway Commission meet for an hour or an hour and a half once a week, and they have not time to consider the great vital details such as the salaries and the expenses of the railway. It would be almost just as well to say: "Here take the railway, Messrs. Employees, run it and we will meet the deficit."

During the calendar year, the expenses for the operation of the railway, clear of the steamship service, amounted to $2,710,713.45. These figures are derived from the answers given by the railway commission themselves. What revenue did we get? $1,136,630.27. This shows a deficit on the calendar year of 774,000 odd dollars. We might include in that that the Post Office Department paid $60,000 for mail, etc. My point is this that the railway last year lost over $800,000 of Government money, which it cost this country. And in addition to that you spent one million and a quarter on capital account, that is excluding the dock. That does not include the interest on the money, because that is charged to the public debt of the colony. My point is this: that there should be a separate book of estimates for the railway. I know that I am speaking to deaf ears, so to speak, and I might as well go out of the House altogether, as far as that is concerned. Now in connection with the operation of them at the railway amounted to $682,023.10 for the year 1925. Now what were they earning? Including the subsidies paid by the Government it amounted to $338,122.20. Now the total earning that were $729,716.19. Therefore on that branch of the service alone, Mr, Chairman, you made $43,000. But you took $337,000 of that from the Government and without that you would be losing $290,000 which the country would have to pay. Therefore the railway deficit is over a million dollars.

Now a bill has been forecasted to keep from the public who own that railway. If I am a shareholder and the Prime Minister is the president, and he calls a meeting of the shareholders he is bound to give me every detail. But the people between here and Port aux Basques don't know anything about the running of the railway.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—They don't want to know.

MR. CASHIN—They do want to know. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that my opinion is just as good as any individual member of the Government. And any depraved man might say that the members of the Railway Commission are members of the Government trying to hide something. I am not making that statement. But it could

be made and made with good foundation. The answer is this. Why do you refuse to table the estimates in connection with the railway.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—We never refused to table the estimates.

MR. CASHIN—Well, Mr. Chairman, I submit that I asked the Prime Minister a question the other day and I got the answer in confidence, so to speak. The answer was not allowed to be published to the public, where 51 officials are drawing down $12,000 a month as salaries.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Those are not estimates.

MR. CASHIN—Well, I submit that you are keeping that secret when it should be made public. I claim that if you or I were running that as a business proposition we would bring it down to $8,000 a month. Why should an individual or any gentleman working on the Government railway be getting more than their bosses. The Prime Minister is the boss. The Minister of Finance is the boss. They are hardly getting half the salaries. Is that logical? I submit, sir, and I have not heard one argument in this House why those estimates should not be published. Why are we publishing these estimates in book form. Why not let the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs and the Minister of Public Works each go down to his own department and pay the salaries there. It would be the same thing. But here is the largest burden on the public that we deal with.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Foisted on us by a previous Government.

MR. CASHIN—In which I had no part.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Neither had we.

MR. CASHIN—But I would like to have something to say in trying to remedy the conditions. I want to go further and say that the railway could be made to square its accounts, if it was managed properly. Last year, if the figures that were tabled here are correct, you opened up the Gaff Topsails for a distance of 63 miles at a cost of $300,000. The branch railways that we have heard so much about cost this country an enormous sum of money. Last year I was a member of the Railway Commission when we purchased two new steam coaches at a cost of $37,000. That was the best investment that we ever made; and why? We allocated one to the area of Corner Brook. That coach made seven or eight thousand dollars. And the one that operated between here and Kelligrews made two or three thousand dollars' profit. I submit that you could have one of these on each of the branch railways. You could have four or five of these with a trailer attached. It was only yesterday that I was reading in the Canadian Marine World in connection with the same thing. I say that you can operate these on the branches and make money. I submit that you can make fifteen or twenty per cent. a year. The one at Corner Brook could have made twenty-five per cent. more. I submit that you should have had two at Corner Brook and they would have made money.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—We do not want to spend too much money, you know.

MR. CASHIN—But sometimes you have got to spend to save. The man that can spend it is the man that can make it. Now we have got to realise that we have got three divisions of this railway, and in order to make it into a good railroad it will cost three million dollars at least. More, for your steel will cost that. And the labour. There will be ties to be replaced—2,600 to the mile. And then there is the upkeep. And we hear the Government saying that the money that was lost was lost on the upkeep. But every railroad in every country

has to charge and include in its operating expenses the ordinary upkeep, such as ballasting. It is just as well to face the situation properly. Compare the operation of our railway with the C. P. R., where they handle at the terminals 2,000 cars a day. The superintendent gets $4,000 a year. The assistant engineers in these places between three and four thousand a year. And one of the officials on the C. P. R.—one of the men that built the Panama Canal—pulls down a salary of $10,000 a year; and you come down here where we have a twopenny-halfpenny road and you have 51 employees getting $12,000 a month. I would not mind if the people had anything to say. But they have got nothing to say about it. I grant you that you reduced the salaries last year but you did not reduce them enough. There are some getting too much and others not getting enough. On the railway there is no discipline to-day. And you cannot operate a railway without discipline. I know, for I travelled on it ten or twelve times across country last year. The rules that are in operation to-day are inadequate. They were drawn up in the time of Sir Robert Reid and they are not even put in force. And there is no attempt made to have them carried out. Then, again, I submit that the locomotive engineers should be paid on the mileage basis. Now I don't want to drive anyone out of a job, but I just offer this as a suggestion, that the engineers should be paid on the mileage basis. The more miles they make the more money they get. Then, again, the trains are very late at every point on the railway and not an attempt is made whatever to make up the time. And no excuse is given by the superintendent of that division, or the superintendent of that division does not endeavour to get an excuse as to why the train is late, especially in the summer time, when they should be running on time. Mr. Bury was brought down here some years ago. He is an all round practical man. He was the General Superintendent of the C. P. R. There is a story told about him. There were a number of English gentlemen over in North Bay on a visit and they had a private train. It was due to leave at 14.20. The men went around North Bay and when they came back the train was gone. They went and complained to the superintendent and he told them that the trains were run there on time. They had to get on an ordinary passenger train and go west. Here they will even stop at the crossing and pick you up. The old French engineers used to stop now and then and get off and have a mug of coffee.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —You know that the story was written by Bury himself, and surely you don't mind all he says about himself.

MR. CASHIN—I take issue with the Attorney General on that point, that Sir George is as great a man as he says he is. He probably has his faults, but he is a man that worked his way up from nothing.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —He is tired telling us that.

MR. CASHIN—There are a lot of people writing about themselves.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — Yes, and a lot of people talking about themselves, too.

MR. CASHIN—And we have got to come in here and listen to them. The other day we were told that we were going on with Besco and we have heard nothing about it since. And the Prime Minister said in his speech that there were certain matters still to be dealt with by the Governor in Council. I am not disappointed, but some of the members of the Government are. In your speech, Mr. Prime Minister, you said that it was the best you could do. But the position is that you can do better. You have done

better since. The trouble is that your own party have no confidence in you. You have had to change the Bill so often, or get out, because some member in your own party said he would not vote for it. Now, why don't you bring it in. It is signed by the Governor in Council and subject to ratification by this House. Now you have the majority in this House, and the only reason for the delay is that your own party cannot agree about it. I grant you that I will fight it tooth and nail, because it is an absolute sell. For fifty years! What right have I to come in here and vote for my great grandchildren?

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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 Cap. 3, 14 George V., entitled 'An Act for the Confirmation of an Agreement between the Government and Harry J. Crowe, Timber Merchant, and for other Purposes.'"

"An Act Respecting the Apportionment of Periodical Payments."

"An Act to Amend Chapter 125 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series), entitled 'Of Trustees.'"

"An Act Respecting the Taxation and Immunity from Taxation of State Enterprises."

To these Bills His Excellency assented, and return was made to the Assembly Chamber.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a Message from the Legislative Council that they had passed the Bills sent up entitled respectively "An Act to Amend Chapter 125 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Trustees,'" and "An Act Respecting the Apportionment of Periodical Payments", without amendment.

Committee on Supply was again resumed.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Chairman, when the Estimates come up on Monday next there is a matter which I want to bring before the Minister of Agriculture and Mines. I might not be in the House then, Mr. Chairman, I may be away, and if I am in order I would like to make a few remarks now re certain matters applying to my district. Mr. Chairman, there are certain timber reserves in the district of Twillingate, such as Thwart Island, Black Island and all these islands around that district which have been reserved for fishery purposes. During the last year, if not before, many people have been cutting and taking away the timber on these re-reserved areas, and in some cases sold it for the advantage of the mills, and there have been many complaints about the timber slaughter.

Last December I asked the Minister of Agriculture and Mines if he would send out a man from his Department and make a report with regard to this matter, which he very kindly did, and I have a copy of the report which he handed in, and the Minister knows just as well as I know that timber has been slaughtered, yea, has been murdered. If it is allowed to continue it will only be a matter of four or five years when all the timber will be destroyed and the people of the district will not be able to get any kind of a piece of timber for boat building or for any other kind of fishing purpose. Now, Mr. Chairman, I ask that a vote be put into the estimates and that a man be paid

to watch these islands, to be paid a salary of not less than forty dollars a month, which after all is very small, and that a man can be got for that amount. And travelling expenses should be included. What I mean by travelling expenses is, between two hundred and fifty or three hundred dollars, because to cover these islands he will have to have a motor boat. In the winter he would have to be provided with a horse or dog team to cover the whole area. I think that this is in the best interests of the country. A few hundred dollars spent on that account is in the best interest of the country and I think that there is somebody cutting this timber today and making money by it. I do not want to make any broad statements as to who it is, but I do want to say that as a representative of this important district, and I believe that the Minister of Agriculture and Mines will agree with me, that it is in the best interest of the country to protect our timber limits, and if the small sum of six or seven hundred dollars will do this, I do not think that anybody will have any objection. Therefore I sincerely hope that the members on both sides of the House will give this matter the fullest consideration and decide in favour of my suggestion and endeavour to protect the timber on these islands for the expenditure of a few hundred dollars.

I have something else to say before I sit down. In the Department of Agriculture and Mines we have two timber men—two men to look after the timber limits of this country. I think that they are Mr. Phillips and Mr. Thistle. Now that is hardly good enough and there should be a change there. In my opinion there should be a Department or a Superintendent of Timber and he should be responsible to the Minister, and he should be able to give accurate information when called upon regarding the timber of the country. In fact he would know just the amount of timber in every section of the country; he should be able to say how much timber is burned and how much blown down and rotten, etc., and other such details. And I think that it is only right that one of these two men should be appointed as the superintendent of the timber limits of this country, and I think that you could appoint no better man than Mr. Phillips. He is a man, in my opinion, of valuable experience. He has qualified in this business and is qualified to give out a correct report on the timber limits of this country, and, Mr. Chairman, I would like to see that this matter is taken up quickly and a man appointed to do the work.

HON. THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the hon. member I would like to say that I quite agree with the suggestion that he has brought before the House that special provision should be made for the passing of a vote for a sufficient amount to protect these islands in Notre Dame Bay. These come under a proclamation but because of the considerable distance of the settlements from one another, and because of the outlying section, I find on enquiry that the timber is being cut supposedly for fishing purposes but that considerable timbers have found their way to the various saw mills. As the hon. member has said, it will be a very short period when the people of that district will find themselves in the position that if they require timber for fishing purposes they will have to go a long way from Twillingate District to find it. There was an attempt made by a previous Government to protect some of these areas at least, but the salary offered was very small—fifty or sixty dollars a year, or perhaps it was only twenty dollars. A man must be paid a reasonable stipend if he is supposed to make a serious attempt to do this work. Well, now, I want

to assure the hon. member that now that he has brought this matter before the attention of the House that an effort will be made to do something. We have no money at the present time to do anything of that kind, but I think that I can assure the hon. member that an effort will be made to do something along the lines that he has suggested.

With regard to the other suggestion, that is a matter already being considered by the Government and it may be found possible to do something along the lines suggested by the hon. member. But the work of surveying the timber limits of this country will require a considerable expenditure of money. A considrable number of men would have to be employed and they would be occupied for a considerable period. In the Dominion of Canada they devote millions of dollars to the conservation and protection of forest areas, but the amount voted here in Newfoundland is insignificant. It is impossible with the present information that is at my disposal to be able to do anything or make any attempt to give estimates of standing timber. However, now that the hon. member has brought this matter before the House I think that I am in a position to assure him that every consideration will be given his request.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and had made some progress, and asked leave to sit again on 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 Monday afternoon next, 26th inst., at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, April 26th, 1926.

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

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — Mr. Speaker, with the unanimous concent of the House, I move that the House go into recess and proceed to the Upper Chamber, where we have been asked to attend on a matter of some importance for a short time. I propose, if there is no objection, that we go there immediately to dispose of that business and return here again.

On motion recess was taken for half an hour for the purpose of attending meeting of Parliamentary Association.

Accordingly Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

Petitions were presented by

Mr. Ashbourne from Summerford re road.

Mr. Scammell from Bonne Bay re Court House.

Hon. the Colonial Secretary tabled Report of Registrar of Births, Deaths and Marriages.

Hon. the Colonial Secretary presented Report of Select Committee appointed to consider the Petition of the Newfoundland Hotel Facilities, Ltd., as follows:

The Select Committee appointed to consider the petition of the Newfoundland Hotel Facilities, Ltd., beg to report that they have considered the matter to them referred, and find that the Rules of the House have been duly complied with in respect to the matter referred to in the said petition.

April 22, 1926.

(Sgd.) J. R. BENNETT,
A. E. HICKMAN,
W. R. WARREN,
RICHARD CRAMM,
W. J. HIGGINS.

Hon. the Colonial Secretary gave notice that he would on to-morrow

move the House into Committee of the Whole respecting certain Rosolutions to confirm an Agreement between the Government and the Newfoundland Hotel Facilities, Ltd.

Mr. Scammell gave notice of question.

Mr. Hickman gave notice of question.

Mr. Godden gave notice of question.

Mr. Ashbourne gave notice of question.

Mr. Halfyard gave notice of question.

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

Replies to the following questions were tabled with exception of No. 2, which was deferred.

(1) MR. WALSH asked Hon. the Colonial Secretary to table the following information: (1) Was the road between Hurley's Bridge and St. Vincent in St. Mary's Bay surveyed under the supervision of the Highroads Commission last year; (2) on whose recommendation was said survey made; (3) who was the surveyor in charge of said work; (4) what was the cost.

(2) MR. HICKMAN asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay upon the Table of the House the Report of Mr. D. Davies on the British Empire Exhibition at Wembley.

In reference to No. 2.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I have got here information asked by Mr. Hickman some time ago in connection with the Wembley Exhibition. Mr. Davies has not yet made a full report, but Mr. Ounterbridge, Secretary of the Wembley Exhibition Committee, tells me that a full report is now being prepared and some details are not yet ready. Mr. Davies report will be attached to the full report and will be practically the same as the speech he delivered in the Normal School and which appeared in the public press.

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. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman, in reference to the expenditure under Head 23, we have the salary of the Governor placed at $15,000. It will only be a matter of another year when a new Governor will be appointed for Newfoundland, and I do not think that this country, with a population of 250,000 people, can very well afford to pay $15,000 for the salary of the Governor. I say this because, in the provinces of Canada, which have a greater population than that of Newfoundland, the salaries of the Lieutenant Governors of these provinces are only half the amount that we are paying the Governor of this country. We have talked considerably in connection with the conduct of the Civil Government and of the expenditure in connection with it, and that there ought to be a reduction made, and I think that the opportunity is now come for the Government to put into effect the promises that were made in this direction. If we go through the expenditures in connection with Government House we will find that they are in the neighbourhood of $30,000. Now, sir, I think that this is where we can save, at any rate, $5,000 or $6,000 for the country. In view of the condtions that the country is facing to-day, I don't think that there is anything that is more pressing on the Government than the need for cutting down expenditure. The people of this country do not expect the Governor to put his hand in his pocket in order to keep up the dignity of

that office, and, after all, most of these functions that occur in connection with Government House concern a very small section of the people of Newfoundland. This is well borne out by the expenses that are incurred in connection with the functions that have to be met by the Lieutenant Governors of the various provinces. Take, for example, the province of Nova Scotia, with a population twice that of Newfoundland, the Governor of that province gets a salary of $5,500 a year. Here, with a population of only half as much, we are paying $15,000. I think that this is a matter that ought to receive the serious consideration of the Government, and, when these estimates are being made out, I think that, at any rate, we ought to put his salary back where it was before, that is, at $10,000. We have had a Governor in the country who was satisfied with a salary of $7,000, but, at any rate, there is no question in the minds of any right thinking persons that we are paying too much for this office, and I submit that the Government should take consideration of this matter and reduce the salary of the new Governor coming in to $10,000, and make provision accordingly.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, the last day we were on the Estimates I was speaking of the railway. Now I would like to hear the Prime Ministetr this evening, for the information of the members of the House and for the country, to give us an idea or some reason why the Government does not intend to bring in the Estimates for the railway.

MON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the honourable member I may say that, as far as I understand, the railway has been running absolutely illegally for some years past, and now that a Railway Commission has been appointed, we are bringing in a Railway Bill to legalize the operation of that Commission, and my idea is that the Estimates of the railway should certainly come in; that is, the General Estimates, but not the Estimates in detail. I think that this House would have to spend a much longer time in session if we had to deal with all the details of the particular salaries of everybody in the railway. I don't think it is necessary. It is not necessary for this House to vote every salary for every clerk in connection with the railway, but I think that the General Estimates should be brought into this House.

MR. CASHIN—I thank the Prime Minister for the information, but at the same time I can't agree with him in all he says in connection with the railway. True, the same could apply to every public department in the service to-day. We could have the Post Office Department brought in in the same manner. The total required for the operation of the Post Office could be put in a lump sum and put into the Estimates, brought into this House and voted on. But, if we look into it, and if every detail was voted for in connection with the Post Office, if every postmaster's salary in the island was voted for through the channels of the Legislature, it would be very interesting to see how very concerned the members of both sides of this House would be about the salaries of the clerks in every small post office and custom house in the island. No doubt if they took the same interest in the Railway Department, which, as I said the other day, is the largest money department in the control of the Government to-day—if they took the same interest in it, you will find that there would be quite a decrease in the expenditure in connection with the railway. My object, Mr. Chairman, in trying to endeavour to get the Estimates for the railway brought into this House was with a view to economy, because I consider, from what little I do know about the railway,

that considerable economy could be effected. The last day, Mr. Chairman, I was in the middle of a lecture, so to speak, on the railway, when the wind veered to the northeast and my lecture was interrupted, but I propose this afternoon, even though a Bill is coming in here in connection with the Railway Commission, to have a few words in connection with the operation of the largest department that the Government operates to-day. I think, sir, on that day, I pointed out to the House that the railway itself, minus the steamship service, was losing, or did lose, $1,000,000 during the year 1925, which is a sufficient guarantee in itself that we members who represent the shareholders in that railway, because we are here directors of the Ship of State, and I am going to suggest something that could be done to reduce expenditure on the railway and so that our position here would not be a joke, and I claim again, Mr. Chairman, that although the Government does not see eye to eye with me in connection with the operation of the railway and in connection with the bringing in of the Estimates with regard to that railway, that the time is coming when this Government, or the next Government, or some other Government will have to face a railway situation in this country, and it is just as well to face it now. You have got to find $5,000,000 within the next two years to put the railway in any kind of decent shape.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — You said $3,000,000 the other day.

MR. CASHIN—I said $3,000,000 to re-rail it; but you must remember, Mr. Prime Minister, that you have got, what we all claim, a lot of junk up there. We find from figures that were tabled here that the greatest earning power on the railway is its passenger service, which last year earned $750,000. The total earnings were $1,136,630; consequently the freight service only netted $300,000; therefore the greatest revenue was derived from the passenger service. Consequently I submit that you have got to cater to the service that gives the most money. To-day on the railway you have not got good rolling stock. Travelling on the railway to any part of the country you are confronted with inconveniences of all descriptions. You have got to get new coaches, first class coaches in particular. I believe you will have to scrap practically all the second class coaches. All that means money, and it has got to be voted for through this House, and it has got to be found by the Exchequer of this country. You have got to get locomotives. The engines of the best ones can only pull 250 tons of freight. The bridges on the railway to-day possibly cannot handle larger engines, but, for all that, we have to get new ones. You have 42 or 43 locomotives, and there are only 20 worth speaking of. The rolling stock of the Newfoundland Government Railway totals 900 odd pieces altogether, and for which this country is paying certain people $150,000 a month in wages. Then we are all supposed to come in here and know nothing about it; because I submit, sir, that the members on both sides of this House are not acquainted with the details of the running of the railway, which they should be; and, in order to become acquainted with those details, it is necessary that the Estimates should be submitted and debated on in the Government ranks, and then brought before this House for their ratification, the same as these Estimates here; but I submit, sir, that if the Government Railway had a surplus of $1,000,000 this year instead of a deficit we would hear all about it in this House.

I say, sir, that if that railway is properly operated you could make it balance its accounts. This winter the railway, I venture to say, lost half a million dollars across the Gaff Top-

sails. You have not made any attempt to sell it. You have not put it up for tenders—this Government or any other Government. Possibly you may lose on it. There is a possibility also of someone making money on it. The Reid Newfoundland Company made two millions on it, but they only gained what they lost previous to that. But to-day you have twice as much freight handling as formerly. When you want to go across country, when you want to get a berth on any of these trains, you have got to book your passage a week ahead, and it is from the passenger service that you have got to get the revenue now. We have a Tourist Policy in Newfoundland now. You have substituted a Tourist Policy for a Fishing Policy, and it is to the tourists that you have got to look now for the future revenue of the country. The passenger service paid last year but you lost on the freight. In going over the Time Table I find that there is about 63 miles of railway between Millertown Junction and Deer Lake. I have a copy of the Time Table here that was drawn up two years ago. That 63 miles of railway cost the Government to keep open during last winter $500,000. I submit, sir, that that money could be saved with economical management, and you may ask me how. I say, sir, that you should run a coastal boat of the Caribou or Kyle type from here to Port aux Basques once a week. That boat could connect with the train and could take freight and passengers and mail to the industrial centre of Corner Brook. It would only take a day. That boat would then leave Port aux Basques and go across to Halifax and Sydney; that train could go to Humbermouth, discharge its freight, return in time to make connection with the boat at Port aux Basques, which could then come to Argentia or St. John's. I submit that, from that plan, you could have saved $200,000 this year.

Now we have the branch railways operating in this country: Trepassey, Bay de Verde, Heart's Content and Bonavista. These lines lose $100,000 or $150,000 a year. These branch lines could be made pay and I'll prove it is so from figures that were tabled here the other day in reply to a question asked as to how much money was made by the operation of the two steam coaches that were purchased by the Government last year at a cost of $37,000. We find that those two coaches cleared over and above their expenses, $10,000, or as Mr. Sullivan told us 26 per cent. If you put a coach of that type attached to a trailer which could carry sufficient freight on these branch lines, these coaches would run economically, because they burn very little coal—only 600 pounds to go from here to Trepassey. It would be interesting for some member of the Railway Commission to tell us how much coal it burns now. Now, I want to point out to the House where that railway could be made pay. The Minister of Justice, a few moments ago, practically said that it could not be made pay. I am going to show you how it can pay. Now outside of three or four members on the Railway Commission to-day, there is no other member of the Government that knows any thing about the operation of the railway. I say that there were thousands of dollars wasted up at the dock. It was done possibly before this time. Thousands of dollars were thrown away that belong to the country. Well I have got a little ahead of the situation. We should get a coach for each of the four branches. Put the cost at a hundred dollars each. You can make twenty per cent. on these. That is $20,000 a year clear. At the present time what we are spending on capital account is not charged up as a loss. New rails plus ballasting and work of that kind is always included in the overhead expense of the railway. But

the re-railing of the road from here to Clarenville is not included, at a cost of one and a quarter million dollars. The interest on the money which we lent to the railway last year, and which including capital account was approximately $3,000,000, besides the dock which cost two million more, making five million dollars. Now the interest on that at five per cent. was $250,000. Someone has to pay it. And we are that "someone." It is the people of this country who own that railway, and yet their representatives in this House know nothing about it and they can't get at it. Now I am not trying to make politics out of the railway. But I would like to see something done to reduce the expenditure of the railway. I said the other day that there were fifty people drawing $12,000 a month. My plan would save $50,000 a year on these people alone. There are fifty people drawing down approximately one and a quarter million a year. At a reduction of twenty five per cent., some people could be given better salaries, and at the same time you could save two and a quarter million dollars, and your account is square.

Now sir, with regard to the operation of the Coastal Boats. Where are we with them. Last year they netted $47,000. That included the $300,000 they got from the Postal Department in the form of subsidy, but it is coming out of the revenue of the country. And you really lost $290,000. I say here sir that these boats are costing too much to operate. In 1919 the railway people handled the coal which is about fifty or sixty thousand tons for forty cents a ton. In 1925 it cost them 73 cents. The labor was the same in 1925 as it was in 1919. Last year, sir, you had in operation approximately eleven coastal boats in Newfoundland. The wages paid out to the people in these eleven boats was $231,050.80. Now with regard to that point I would like to draw the attention of the House and the members of the Railway Commission in particular, to something that I consider is not proper and that is, that the master of the Northern boat and the master of the Western boat, are paid salaries of $175 a month. While the master of the Sagona or the Kyle gets considerably more. He gets $200 or $250. To my min the masters of the other boats have just as dangerous a job as the master of either the Sagona or the Kyle. And if that be so, why the difference in their salaries?

Either have one come down to the others or else let the others go up. The total operating expenses in these eleven ships including everything $680,023.10. That includes the $231,000 wages. That is approximately $450,000.

Consider the revenue brought in by these boats, and I think you will find it very, very small, and they obtain considerable amount of their revenue from the subsidy given by the Postal Department. Add that to what they earn, and you get a total of about 721,000 revenue; take off from that and you have a net total profit of 47,693.09. But, as I said we must remember that $338,000 comes from the Government, and we find that in this Department last year we had a deficit of over two millions. Now Mr. Chairman, don't you think I have a right to ask that the members of this House be asked to ratify these expenditures—if I failed to do so, I should fail in my duty to the people who sent me here. I claim it would be just as proper for the Finance Minister to come into this House and say he wanted nine millions, and we let it go through without vote or explanation—and that is what is being done with the Railway. In the Canadian House they have submitted estimates in two forms on the Railway —this was done by the Minister of Railways, Mr. Robb, and the Canadian Government is making 23 millions this

year, although we have heard here that they lost money. They spent it on capital account, but that represents an expenditure in putting railways through parts of Canada that will bring revenue. I am serious about this, Mr. Chairman, but the Government members don't take it seriously. I think you should come in here and give us all particulars of what you propose to expend. I claim the other departments and the railway ought to be on the same basis, but we don't know what they are getting at the Railway, although last year you voted the salaries. There is no other department, or only one other, where they can take their own salaries. There is too much politics wrapped up in the railway, you are not running it on a sound, business, economical basis. On the stock sheets which have been handed me—I haven't got a balance sheet for 1925-26 asked for the other day, there are some figures which are surely not correct—I want to know what the Railway lost in the last 12 months. Does it cost $1.70 a ton to take coal out of a boat—a matter of handling—and put it in the engines? There is a lot in the Railway, Mr. Chairman, which is properly the business of the House. On the last day, Mr. Chairman, I endeavoured to show that the Railway operated under the same rules as when Sir R. G. Reid was there—that these are still in vogue, although they are by no means carried out. That there is no standard time—a person's watch is supposed to be correct, but there is no way of checking it. We have conductors paid by the month and engineers and brakemen paid by the 100 miles, and the latter is the proper way, because when a man is not working he is not making money. And I want to say that I believe the firemen on the Railway are underpaid, according to the standard of wages in Canada, and the engineers are getting fairly good wages.

Look at Corner Brook—take the town of Corner Brook itself, Mr. Chairman. A person only has to visit Corner Brook to see the inefficiency of the management. Whoever was responsible for the building of the station ought to be examined, for he built it the size of the ordinary small station—Mr. Sullivan himself will agree with that. And some time ago a girl lost her leg simply because the station platform was not big enough; I understand she is still alive—and that was on account of the inefficiency of the management. Take the trains—today No. 1 arrives at Corner Brook, and is supposed to stay there for 10 minutes only, but what happens? She is there for an hour, simply because the accommodations are too small to handle her properly. And still nothing is done, although we are told that it is under consideration. That will mean building a new station at a cost of $25,000 or $30,000, and that would have been saved with proper management. Corner Brook is one of the places out of which the Government is going to make money on the Railway. During the winter there was a time when the mill was in operation at the rate of 300 tons per day, and I believe that they were only operating three machines, and they feared they were going to be short, and would have to haul wood from outside—that would be a source of revenue. Furthermore our cars are not the proper size to haul the pulp—I have that from Mr. Stadler, who says that they are too small to suit the machines in New York or Philadelphia.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—That is only true as to part.

MR. CASHIN—During the debate on the Address in Reply I think I made the statement that we can't undo what has been done. The situation faced the Government when they came into power and if we had taken the two millions which has been spent for road-

building, and fixed up the railway we should be in a much better position than we are. Last year two millions was spent on the Roads—and that is a point I want to discuss on the estimates—there have been raises of salary to people in that Department which are not in the estimates, and there is not a member in the House that can prove the estimates are complete because they are not. We have 43 locomotives of various types and the working capacity of the highest is 240 tons of freight. And there are considerable increases in the amount, so this is a very poor condition indeed. And I was just speaking to one of the officials from Corner Brook, and he told me that the steam coach was laid up all the winter, and when the time came when they could put in on the road it had then to be repaired. And now they are using an engine when they should have had the coach repaired during the time it was idle—this would not have happened if they had had decent management. I do not want to make any incorrect statement, but I feel that the members of the Railway Commission are not more familiar with the railway than other members. They may know more about it, but I know from my own experience the few months I was on that Board that we got very few vital statistics regarding it. And you can't master it in one hour's attention a day—you have to be on the job day and night. I do not advocate doing anybody out of his job, but I do advocate economy in an undertaking that is costing us two millions a year, which must be taken from the people. And the revenue this year is going to be less than last year, for Corner Brook is practically finished, and that was a great source of revenue. We have derived considerable returns from Humbermouth, and unless the Gander proposition opens up, the freight returns are bound to be less. The only chance is the passenger traffic—I feel that the Government ought to start the first of June and operate an express every day across country, and they would make money. Have two boats on the Gulf, as the Reid's did a few years ago. I said the other day that if the Government said they had nothing to hide I believe them, but that there might be evil-minded persons who would think so when they found that the Government refused to table the accounts or estimates.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—I said that we were going to do so.

MR. CASHIN—That is only the estimates.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—It is for the expenditure.

MR. CASHIN—Have the Government made any attempt to have it taken over by any private firm. I don't believe they have tried, or even advertised it, or stated that they were prepared to enter into a contract to operate for 4 or 5 years and pay a sul sidy of say $4000 or $5000 per year, but they haven't offered any such inducement. I claim that the Railway could be operated for half a million less, and money made out of it.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN.—Without a subsidy?

MR. CASHIN—Yes, without a subsidy. They are now getting over 400 thousand, and $83,000 in the Postal Estimates making approximately $400,000 per year for the Railway, and if they are going to re-rail there is no provision in the Estimates. We have only the statement of the Prime Minister on the opening day when he stated we should have to borrow more money because part of the railway would have to be re-railed.

I know that I am only wasting my time, for the Government have adopted their policy and don't intend to

take any suggestions from gentlemen on this side of the House. To begin with it is questionable whether the Estimates in that direction are going to tally with the Budget, but the proper time for that is in a few days when the Minister of Finance brings down the Budget. But in the hey-dey of the Monroe Government they were eager to tell the public how much they saved, but now they are silent—they are not consistent in loss. And furthermore in view of the fact that there was an increase of about 15 per cent. on the tarriff, there is a loss in revenue over the corresponding period last year.

Now, Mr. Chairman, on opening day when you moved the appointment of a Committee on the Address in Reply you told us wonderful things about how prosperous we were. And yet we find that in an examination of these periods there is a difference of $70,000. Last year under the new tariff there was practically $70,000 less than the previous period under the old, and up to the present time in 1926 we find the same thing. We find that the revenue for January and February 1926 was $1,115,727.45, and that for the same period in 1924 under the old tariff was $1,161,605.35—consequently under the new tariff, with its extra taxation we find the revenue was decreased by the amount of $45,877.90. Add that forty-five thousand to the seventy thousand and you have $115,000.00 or $120,000.00. And the same thing applies in the month of March—in 1925 we have a revenue of $761,431.81, and for the same period this year the amount of $736,392.45—difference this year of $25,000.00 less than last year. So we can say that up to the present time in 1926 there has been a decrease in revenue of approximately $150,000.00 —we are that much lower than the previous year; and expenditure is the same in each instance. Now sir, last year in the Budget Speech (but this cannot really be discussed intelligently until the Minister of Finance brings down his Budget) the Minister of Finance prophesied a surplus of $200,000.-00. Instead of that we shall be found short $145,000.00—and I don't think any member will try to persuade us that times are looking better than they were last year. And the fishery question is the same; very seldom are the words "the fishery" heard mentioned —they are a thing of the past, apparently. And where in the Estimates is the bonus for fish we heard so much about some time ago? Faded into oblivion, apparently. And where is the reduction in taxation? Your own actions have proved your incompetency. Under your administration you have gone back over $150,000.00 from that of the previous year's revenue and you got that from the work of the previous administration. I don't seek to defend them, Mr. Chairman—I was an opponent of that administration as much as anybody, and I don't intend to throw bouquets at them now. Further, Mr. Chairman, I want to be sincere, and say that I believe we can get no Government to come into power and do the job sincerely— and the Monroe Govt. took office under prevailing conditions. Party politics have destroyed us, and we have had party politics since the days of Responsible Government. You have members in the Government ranks to-day, and you had them last year who were opposed to Government policies but who for party reasons cannot do anything. I say the same as I pointed out before, Mr. Chairman, that if the Government were run on the same lines as an incorporated Company, appointing its President something might be effected, but not till then will Newfoundland be put on a sound economic basis or will we have sound Government in Newfoundland. It is true that for some short while we were prosperous, but shortly after the war the slump came,

and a change in Government came, and we haven't had sound economic Government in Newfoundland since 1918. To-day Sir, the prime ideas of the people regarding Government is that we are out to get more and more. Our National Debt is already $65,000,000.00 and we have got to borrow more; there is no doubt but that a Loan Bill will be coming forward—it will have to be, or the Government will be hard up. The Estimate of the Dock's cost will be increased from $1,186,000.00 to $2,000,000.00, and I regard that as being a poorer job than it might be. Although I was associated with the Government when that was decided on, I believe that some of the material in the way of sticks, is not of first class quality. Otherwise you have a first class job in the Dock, no doubt, but it is a job that will never pay for itself. Now Sir what is this country going to do. Don't you think we should forget party politics and get down to business? Bring down the Estimates of the Railway and the Liquor Control Departments—and the only branch of the Government that is making any money is the rum shop, and there they are allowed to sell rum and pay themselves from the till—and the Railway is allowed to sell tickets and pay themselves out of the money. No doubt the Government is going to bring in a Bill in connection with the operation of the Railway, but it is only to legalize the Railway Commission, and which down to the present time have been voting the salaries to be paid by the people of this country, and which ought to be voted by the Legislature. I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, that if the Government is not going to bring in this material, it is just as well for members on this side of the House to lock up their desks, take their papers and get out, because these are the only things of importance at the present time, unless the Minister of Finance intends to bring in a scheme of reduction of taxation, which I very much fear he won't do.

It is interesting to note that it is possible to get information from the railway department about the poor individuals who are getting the small salaries and have it published, but you cannot get the information about those getting the high salaries. I feel, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister of Finance would be doing the proper thing if he would adjourn this House although it is already in session for eight weeks and take a week off and give the country the compiled estimates for the railway, and bring them down here and let us vote on them intelligently. Surely you are not going to vote a lump sum for the railway and come in here and say to the members on both sides of the House, here are the railway estimates and vote for them. Every post office and every telegraph in the country is voted for in the estimates, but there is no government railway office here and we do not know anything about it at all. My claim here, Mr. Chairman, is that it is the duty of the Government to table these estimates. I feel like standing up here and reading every booklet in the library to make them bring it in because I think that I owe it to the people of the country and every member of this House owes it to the people of the country. But as long as you want to sell the country, go ahead and sell it. You are heading that way now. I think that those who are advertising it most are those who are in the Government. Some of those who claim that they are your supporters. One of them the President of the Upper House. And he ought to be tickled to death with himself, considering the things that he said about Newfoundland and written to the greatest paper in the world. You are advertising the country yourselves, Mr. Chairman. Your Government is. You were advertising how

easy you are when the Government brought in a bill here about the Besco. We have not heard of it since. Then some one else wired the papers in Montreal, I suppose that it was the same man. I know nothing about it. Care less. A man who deliberately cables that sort of stuff across the Atlantic is not fit to be a member of this House or the other one. That is the stuff that is killing this country. Two or three individuals sucking the life's blood out of the people and it is time to take the two of them and throw them over the wharf and drown them like a pair of kittens. Those are the people who sold this country. They would write an article to-morrow and sell this country with it for twenty-five dollars. I know that people have been sold for less, but I have not been in at the purchase. Possibly the Hon. Minister knows something about it. I think that he may have had some experience. The peculiar thing about some of these people who are advertising Newfoundland is that they are with every Government. A Government goes to the country and says that it is not going to have anything to do with Esau. But Esau finally arrives. I suppose another one is Jacob, but Jacob finally arrives too. There are only two of them here and I hope you will pardon me, Mr. Chairman, for saying, but I think that there ought to be enough of us to handle two of them. They are now contemplating a trip to Australia. But it is feared that one of them may not be able to go on account of the climatic conditions. But nevertheless I would like to hear some member of the Government explain to me the details of the working of the railway and the handling of the dock. You will have the dock on your hands in the next two months from now, and you will have one of the finest pieces of work possibly on the North Atlantic. But you have not got a man to run it today. The Prime Minister as much as admitted that in the House last year. But, Mr. Chairman, there is a lot in these estimates when you begin to pick it out. I would like to know now before I sit down if it is the intention of the Government to rerail a further section of the railway.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—That is a matter for the decision of the House. We will probably ask for a loan for that purpose. But it is a matter for the decision of this House whether it is done or not.

MR. CASHIN—I feel that the Government has to do it, and I will be one of those that will come in and vote for it. But I do not propose to come in here and vote for a department about which I know nothing. I feel that I know something about the railway. I had four or five years' railway experience and I feel that I have some knowledge of it. I say here that the Government is not going about it the right way, and I don't know which member of the Government says that I am wrong. We know nothing about it in here and you are endeavouring to keep it from us. Now I am going to make a few suggestions. I trust that they will not fall on deaf ears. I propose to the Government now, Mr. Chairman, that they bring in a loan bill this year for one million dollars to rerail the road between Port aux Basques and Humbermouth, a distance of one hundred and forty-four miles. I propose another hundred thousand dollars be spent towards acquiring four steam coaches. I may be criticized to-morrow for advocating the expenditure of this money, but looking at it from a business point of view you have to have the assets that make the money. I trust that the Government will take my advice about rerailing the line from Port aux Basques to Humbermouth.

Do not touch the section between

Bishop's Falls and Humbermouth. I would close that section up in the Winter time. That is my proposition, rerail the road from Port aux Basques to Humbermouth or from Clarenville to Bishop's Falls. These are the sections that are getting used most. I would also suggest another hundred thousand dollars for rolling stock. You need it. You need new first class coaches and burn these old second class tourist cars. I do not believe that they are fit to travel by. I travelled in Western Canada on Colonist cars and they were better than these. I believe that Mr. Sullivan is taking down notes since the Prime Minister went out. You need some first class pjassenger cars. They will cost about ten thousand dollars each. I was going to suggest another hundred thousand for locomotives. But I would suggest that you get heavier locomotives than you have now, and not be stalling on these grades. They cannot pull eight cars and when an engine cannot pull eight passenger cars it should be put in the junk pile. I was on a train last year and we had to double up outside the Gaff Topsails on a fine summer afternoon. My point is that we could have a passenger train daily and run seven cars and we would get better results and there would not be the delay there is now. You would get better service and make more money. And you have to build a new station at Corner Brook. I do not need to tell you that. It was built by the late Government at the suggestion of the people out there and the company themselves knew that they were doing wrong, but they took no advice and went right to it and banged it up. And when building it up there put up a proper platform so that in slippery weather the people may not be losing their lives. A poor girl lost her life out there last year. Her legs went right from under her and it was the Government's fault or the fault of the railway. And I would also point out to the railway commission, and to Mr. Sullivan particularly the railway crossings up here in St. John's are most dangerous and they should have gates across them automatically raised to protect the people. There is going to be an accident one of those days as sure as anything, one of these engines will come backing out of the station and kill someone. I would like to ask that the Commission see that there be instructions issued to the people running the switch engines that when they are backing up that they see to it that there is a man on the back end of it and a man on the front of it because people are liable to be killed. Because people are in the yard after night and have no business to be there is no reason why they should be killed. Mr. Chairman, now that I am making these few suggestions, I am very pleased indeed to be getting so much attention. It was only in '98 when it was considered that this was the greatest bill that ever came before this Legislature, and now members on both sides of the House do not think it worth their while to come in here and say anything about it. In other words they do not care what happens. I feel that I owe something to the people who sent me here.

Now we have a million for the rerailing of the road either from Clarenville to Bishop's Falls or from Port aux Basques to Humbermouth. We have a hundred thousand for steam coaches and a hundred thousand for rolling stock, also a hundred thousand for locomotives and another hundred thousand for repairing the stations and another hundred thousand for incidentals. And if the Government were to bring in a bill for a loan of a million and a half for these purposes it would have my support. I feel that the administration

now in power made a mistake a couple of years ago when they spent the two million dollars on roads that they should have spent it on the railway and we would not now be looking for a loan because the railway would be made pay. But you laugh at me when I say that the railway can be made pay. Now there are 2174 men on the railway with six hundred miles of railway. Three men to every mile. This seems ridiculous from the fact that the revenue of the railway is only a million and a quarter. You might say that the C.P.R. has only fourteen thousand miles and it employs fifty thousand employees. But the C.P.R. operates fifteen hotels and sixty or seventy steamships. They have twenty-five hundred locomotives and fifteen thousand cars. It is the same with the C.N.R. The C.N.R. paid last year even though it is a Government owned railway. And when anyone tells you that the railway cannot be made pay you can tell him that he does not know anything about it. But, Mr. Chairman, I feel that the Government owes it to the country that they bring in the estimates and say what they are doing. The Prime Minister's manifesto promised reduction in taxation and expenditure. But the Government has done nothing that it had promised. There has been an increase in expenditure and taxation. I used to come to this House when the famous Squires Government was in power and heard them told that they had made I don't know how many promises and that they had never carried out one of them. But I suppose that they felt the same about it as the present Government. They let them talk away. I am glad to see that one member of the Government saw fit to take down the suggestions that I made and I trust that they may see fit to carry them out. If there is no opposition there would be no clean government in any country. If there were no freedom of speech, and it is becoming very scarce in Newfoundland now, everyone has to be very careful to have his I's dotted and his T's crossed, otherwise he will be called to order. Now there are people up there at the railway who are responsible to nobody but the railway commission. There are men up there now that are doing nothing but drawing their salaries, walking Water Street and drawing salaries from the Government. But now, Mr. Chairman, this total expenditure is not complete. You will have Minute of Council Government. What are you going to do about it. I say that you should get to work and make the railway pay, and bring the surplus back to consolidated revenue. If I were to be absolutely to the point I would say that these estimates are not prepared. But I do not mind that. We find the Labrador boundary here for ten thousand dollars. I want to say this much about that, it is a joke. A Jersey Cow. It should be transferred to Mr. Walsh's department. Then we come to the Public Works Department. The Minister does not see fit to come down here at all. It is just as well to lay our cards on the table. I asked questions about this department, and the Minister does not see fit to come here at all. I do not think that it is right that this man should be let loose with millions of dollars and not be responsible to anyone. He hardly ever calls a meeting of the Board of Works and when he does they are nearly as bad as himself. The Prime Minister has become a member of the Board and I believe that they only had one meeting since and they are supposed to have a meeting once a month. Still the members of the Board get two hundred and fifty dollars a year. Sometime ago, Mr. Chairman, tenders were called for supplies for some of the institutions, and the Deputy Minister of Public Works told the Prime

Minister that under the old scheme they got the goods cheaper than when they called for tenders. Is this not ridiculous. This department, sir, is nearly as bad as the railway. Efficiency is wanted, and I am sorry to say that, sir, although the man is not present. He may be efficient but he does not show it here. I was a member of the Opposition a few years ago, two years ago. Mr. Jennings was the Minister of Public Works then. Mr. Jennings is now a civil servant, and he was an archangel compared to the present incumbent of the office. There is no comparison at all.

Do you think that you are acting right as a Government to allow that sort of thing? And is it not the duty of the Executive Government to see that the Minister of Public Works carries out his job? Just imagine him buying pianos for the public institutions. I suppose he will supply this Assembly with one next, as if we haven't got enough music here already. Why, Mr. Chairman, it is a frightful position for a Government to be in to-day. The Government went to the country two years ago advocating and preaching economy for the public service, and after they are entrenched in office they act worse than their predecessors did. As the Prime Minister is back in the House I would like to remind him that Mr. Sullivan and myself have been having a slight friendly discussion as to how a million and a half dollars of a loan could be brought in here shortly in connection with the railway, and we decided that one million dollars of it could be spent on re-railing one division of the road and one hundred thousand dollars for the purchase of four or five coaches; and I might say in passing that these new coaches already in use on the road are not all that they are boosted up to be, because the mechanism of them is very delicate and that in Corner Brook last year there was quite a number of breakdowns. In addition to that we decided that we would spend one hundred thousand dollars on five or six new first class coaches and one hundred thousand dollars on new locomotives, because several of the locomotives now in use are in a dilapidated condition and need a thorough overhauling to have them properly fixed up for use on the road, although, perhaps, it would be cheaper to scrap them altogether. So that all told it is necessary that one million and a half dollars should be spent the coming summer on the railway in order to put it in proper shape.

If the two million dollars that were spent on the highroads had been spent on the railway, this country would be better off financially and would not have to borrow a million and a half dollars next year to re-rail the railway line. Again, they will have to go to the loan market in 1928 to borrow six million dollars to pay off another loan which will be then due. So that altogether the next two years in office of the present Government will be loan years. The Government will have to go on their hands and knees to the monied sharks of the world and ask for money—money which will bring the national debt of Newfoundland up to seventy million dollars, plus the ten million dollars demand stock on the Humber, or eighty million dollars altogether, which, divided up, will mean that every man, woman and child in Newfoundland will be called upon to pay $320.00 per head. This is a very high rate for the taxpayers to have to pay when it is considered that the estimated catch of codfish for a year is a million and a half quintals, valued at about ten million dollars, whilst the amount derived from the other various industries does not exceed ten million dol-

lars. Still every man, woman and child has to pay $15.00 a year in interest on the big public debt that has been piled up by loans. Does not the Prime Minister then think, Mr. Chairman, that my suggestion with regard to the railway was a good and sound one? If it was not a good and sound one, he would bring in these Estimates of the railway and discuss them here; and it is our right to have them here. What is the constitution of this country, anyway? Is the country to be governed by Government of Minute of Council and to allow people who owe no allegiance or responsibility to anyone to take the money belonging to the people of the country and do what they like with it? You have the Department of the Controllers and the Highroads and the salaries of the officials are not voted in here. The Highroads saw fit to give extra wages last year, wages which were not, but should have been, voted by this House. Furthermore, in speaking of Highroads, I asked a question recently in this House about the number of people employed by the Road Commission this winter and I was told that there was none working. Now I may say that they have had men working all the winter in certain sections and they have men working now, and it would be interesting to know what they have been doing. Is it not that, Mr. Chairman, an absolute and wilful waste of public moneys? But in view of the fact that the Government have seen fit to withhold from this House the information that it is entitled to, contrary to the constitution of the country, and because of the fact that I am the one individual in this House asking for that information, I fail to see why my seat should not be vacated in this House for the remainder of the session when the Government are withholding from me and my constituents the information which we are justly entitled to. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the present administration is not carrying out, or even attempting to carry out, the promises they made to the electorate, because, if they had economy in the back of their heads, here is the place to discuss the Estimates for the railway. There is no one here to stop the railway from operataing, but we can discuss the various items of expenditure which are going on and some of which should be cut out. I pointed out here where fifty thousand dollars a year could be saved in salaries alone in connection with the railway. No doubt some of the big salaried gentlemen of the railway will not like to hear this, but I am not afraid to get up here and say that their salaries should be cut, because I realise as a young man of Newfoundland that unless we start in and do something there is going to be a sudden ending to it all. We cannot go on borrowing forever. Furthermore, in connection with that railway I do not see any vote in the Estimates towards endeavouring to find out if there is any coal of any commercial quantity in Newfoundland. I do not know if there is any coal of commercial quantity in the country, and you do not know. Some people will say yes, and some will say no. Why not get somebody to decide the point and spend say fifty thousand dollars to find out if the coal is to be found, and, if it is, then your railway problem is solved. If you could get three hundred thousand tons of coal from all the different areas per year at $2.00 per ton, which would mean six hundred thousand dollars, then you would not have any more trouble about invoices; it would be a great source of relief to future Finance Ministers and a great source of revenue, because the country would

save two million dollars which goes out of it for coal every year. I admit that it is going to be a big proposition, but, at any rate, do your best to find out by getting a good man, irrespective of the price, to detetrmine what there is in our coal areas, because we all know that there is a great number of people in this country interested in St. George's Coal Fields. It is the Government's job to find out what is there. Take a gambler's chance to find out. I feel sure there is no one on the Opposition side of the House to object to your endeavours in that direction. And, if you succeed, you will make a half million dollars a year instead of losing it now.

I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, that it is not the fault of the Prime Minister that the Estimates for the railway are not tabled. I believe in being straight about it. But it is the fault of some of the high salaried people of the railway who are double-crossing and quibbing about the matter. I know that the Prime Minister is satisfied to have these Estimates tabled, and he was satisfied a year ago when I was a member of his party and of the Railway Commission to have them tabled. We had a meeting of the Railway Commission anent the matter and it died out. I remember that the Prime Minister, as Chairman of the Railway Commission, was perfectly satisfied to have the Estimates of the railway made up and tabled in answer to a question asked by the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Hickman. Therefore I say to the Prime Minister and his associates of the Railway Commission to assert their authority—you are the boss—to have them made up. The making up of these Estimates would not take any longer than a week. They are of vital importance to the pople of this country who got to pay the piper.

Now, sir, I think that I have made a fairly good endeavour to point out to the House how the railway can be made pay, and summing up I say this, that you can cut down a quarter of a million dollars a year on the wages bill. That is twelve and a half per cent. on two million dollars. And you can save three or four hundred thousand dollars by cutting out the Gaff Topsails in the winter months and have a service between here and Halifax or here and North Sydney. Now, sir, that is a half million dollars on these two items, and if the Government would buy these five coaches there would be a saving of another hundred and fifty thousand dollars, because the branch lines could be made pay. That is six hundred and fifty thousand dollars or seven hundred thousand, and during the year 1925 the loss was $774,000.00. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have never advocated before in this House a Minister of Railways, but I think that there should be some man in this House to represent the railway, who puts in his work up there every day. I think that Mr. Sullivan would be the proper man. I am not trying to give him a job but he is a man who knows something about it. Put him up there and I believe that with the criticism that he would receive, and his own work, he would be able to save three quarters of a million dollars. Then the Government comes in here and says that they are going to take the suggestions of the members of this House. I say that they are not taking anything. Mr. Chairman, for the present and until the Railway Bill comes into committee I propose leaving off the discussion, but first I ask the Prime Minister to reconsider his decision. And I would make other suggestions now. There are a lot of members in this House who live in St. John's, and I would say, appoint

a commission consisting of members of both sides. I am not anxious to get on this commission; take three members, and I will go so far as to name them: the Prime Minister, the Leader of the Opposition and Mr. Sullivan. They could consider the railway proposition out of session. Let them enquire into the workings of the ralway. And let me tell you, sir, that there are departments of the railway that can be cut out. There are two departments that can be put into one. When Mr. Morgan was down here, I had the pleasure of knowing him previously. I worked with him for four years, and I often discussed the railway situation with him. He considered that what was necessary was that it should be taken clear of politics, because there were politics mixed up in it then as now. He believed that if it could be run on an economical basis it could be made pay. Possibly his ideas were a little different from ours. He looked at the railway in a different sense. He said that we were getting subsidies for this and that. We will pay subsidies. But I think that this commission would find that we would be able to cut the overhead expenditure by a quarter of a million dollars a year. I submit that if the Prime Minister owned the railway himself that he would cut the expenditure by two hundred and fifty thousand dollars a year. I submit that if other gentlemen in this House owned it they would do likewise. Well, sir, acting for the people, who own it, it is your job to cut it. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that it is going to take a lot of fighting to do it. If I had a chance to-morrow as a member of a Government, or as a member of an Executive, I believe that I would have my job cut out for me to do, and I believe that it will be the same no matter what Government is in power. I believe, Mr. Chairman, in being frank in my statements, because I do not mean to assist any Government that is not going to carry out its promises. I hate to be leaving Governments because they do not carry out their promises, and if I were a member of a Government and did not carry out its promises and duty I would leave that too. And is it not the duty of the Government and the Executive and the Railway Commission to get down to business and to forget party politics. Pay salaries for it. I do not want men to work for nothing. If a man is paid I like to see him producing something for it. I therefore ask the Prime Minister and the Railway Commission to get down to business, and for this afternoon I will finalize my remarks in connection with the railway. I have a lot of notes in connection with the operation of the railway which I have held over, but I ask the Prime Minister in all seriousness, I have not criticised him personally in any way, to get down to business, because I know that one of these days that we will be coming to the parting of the ways in connection with the railway, and unless something is done pretty soon we will find ourselves in a frightful mess.

Do I understand from the Prime Minister that he is going to make some endeavour to reduce the expenditure in connection with the railway? I think that something can be done and I would like to ask the Prime Minister if they propose trying.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—It is the duty of the Commission to reduce expenditure and they are guided very much by the suggestions of the Manager, Mr. Russell. No reference has been made by the hon. member for Ferryland to the Manager of the Railway. He was talking about Mr. Morgan and what he said could

be done. I heard constant claim in this House that we have as good people in this country as can be imported. The hon. member for Ferryland is fond of telling us that himself, that local talent is as good as any that can be imported. We have in Mr. Russell, the Manager of the Railway as good a man and a better one than Mr. Morgan ever was. I claim that Mr. Russell is doing his utmost towards the reduction of expenditure on the railway. It is a very difficult proposition for any man or any Commission. The hon. member contradicted himself a number of times this afternoon when he told us to get busy and cut down expenditure and then he told us that if there were a change of Government and he were in charge he did not think that he would be able to get it down. It is really rather hard to understand what he really did mean. We as the commission have done our best at every meeting. As I told the House, we cut down two salaries from seventy-five hundred to forty-eight hundred dollars. There are a great number of employees looking for increases and we are not giving any increases. And in cases where there has been a vacancy in the head of a department we have not appointed another to the position but have moved up the next in line and got one man out of that particular department. I claim that we are doing our very best to cut down the expenditure on the railway, and if the hon. member asks if we intend to cut down expenses I tell him that we are going to do our best as long as we are in the offices which we hold. We intend to do the best that can be done at a weekly meeting. You cannot possibly go into the details of the working of the railway at a weekly meeting, and I think that the railway is as well run a department as any in this country. I would not say that it is not better. I think that Mr. Russell is doing his best and that he is the best manager this railway ever had.

MR. CASHIN—The Prime Minister says that the Railway is run as well as any other Government Department. Well, if I wanted to be sarcastic I might say that that does not speak much. If compared with the Public Works Department, it is run as well as that, it might just as well run itself, because the Department of Publib Works is running itself.

I made no reference to Mr. Russell. I made no statement as to his ability or inability. Mr. Morgan was brought down here by a former Government and paid a salary of fifteen thousand dollars a year. I do not think that the Prime Minister has any right to say that Mr. Russell, or anyone else, is a better man, for the Prime Minister is not in a position to prove that. I did not say that Morgan was a better man than Russell, but I do say this, and the Prime Minister knows it, that the Department of the Railway can be economized. The Hon. M. S. Sullivan knows it. Every member in the House knows it. I said that possibly if I was a member of the Government in power the balance of the Government members possibly might not be of the same opinion as myself with regard to the means of economy and things to be cut out so as to enable a full and proper enforcement of economy as I should wish it. Possibly if the Prime Minister had his own way altogether he would cut out a lot of expenditure. But he is Prime Minister and he is one of the members of the Government and we know that there are wheels within wheels. I made no personal statement against Russell or anyone else, but taken collectively I said that the management is not efficient and I can prove it. Is it an efficient management that threw away half a million dollars running their trains all winter across the Gaff Topsails when the Port aux Basques route

could have been used instead? That is a foolish and incapable management. In former years they used to cut out the Gaff Topsails at times and use instead the Port aux Basques route. Of course the winter is practically gone now and it seems like crying over spilt milk, but the Government might try out the suggestions made in the future, and I made this suggestions, too, earlier in the year.

The railway I agree with the Prime Minister is on a par with other Departments. It is on a par with their inefficiency. The present administration have become inefficient though they point out various reforms in proof of their efficiency since they came into power. A decrease in the revenue of one hundred and fifty thousand dollars with a higher tariff than last year. Is that a proof of efficiency, or a proof that people don't buy when prices are high or wait until they drop? Is it a proof that everything is not so rosy as painted by you on opening day. Collectively I criticized the railway and I did it in all sincerity and seriousness and I intend to do it again. I made no personal references. I spoke of them collectively, and I say that the best of them are no better than a callboy and they get thirty dollars a month out west. Surely you don't mean to tell me that it is a proof of efficiency that the Railway Coastal boats only cleared forty-seven thousand dollars profit with their subsidy of three hundred thousand dollars.

It is inefficiency. They should have made two hundred thousand with that subsidy, at least. No gentleman in the House knows better than the Minister of Finance and Customs that they should have done so. Are you going to tell me that it is a sign of efficiency to travel between here and Port aux Basques in an unsanitary car, with no discipline, peeople piled in one on top of another who have paid their fares properly. Is that efficiency? It s the worst kind of inefficiency. I have made a suggestion with regard to efficiency, Mr. Chairman, and though I am not a Van Horen or a Lord Strathcona or a Thornton or a Russell or the Prime Minister of Newfoundland, I consider this much and I say it, that I know as much about the railway and things connected with it, if not more, than any individual member of this House, and I know what I am talking about when I say that the railway is run inefficiently, and I shall have further remarks to make on this subject as we go along and when the Railway Bill comes into Committee.

MR. SCAMMELL—I would like to ask the Prime Minister if the Railway Commission have advised the management of the railway as regards operating over the Gaff Topsails, if the Commission considered cutting out the Gaff Topsails during the past winter. Have the management kept running over this portion on their own responsibility or have they been advised by the Commission that they should continue to do so?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The railway has been run over the Gaff Topsails every year and early in the winter we discussed cutting out operations for the winter and it was decided to let it go on. We had a good many people applying to go to Corner Brook and for various considerations it was decided to keep it open. Only at the last meeting of the Commission, the matter was discussed and we came to the conclusion that we would not do it another winter. Mr. Russell also is in favour of cutting it out the coming winter.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Last year it was the intention of the Railway to cut out the going across the Gaff Topsails, but strong representations were made by the Humber Company that if this were

done they would find it difficult to keep their men in the woods during the winter. A good many men from the Northern parts of the Island would not stay at work as they periodically wanted to go home. These representations were so strong that it was decided to continue in the interest of keeping up the work at the Humber. I cannot however subscribe to the idea that a half a million dollars was lost in running over the Topsails and I cannot see where the member for Ferryland gets his figures for that.

MR. CASHIN—Half a million dollars was lost in these four months.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Every section lost money; it was not the Topsails alone; trains were held up in other parts besides at the Topsails. Last year an attempt was made to cut out the railway across the Topsails and for the sake of keeping the industry at Corner Brook going it was not carried out, for it was argued by the Company at Corner Brook that they could not get the men to stay if the railway was stopped.

MR. CASHIN—I submit that these men could have got to Corner Brook by way of Port aux Basques. They could have gone round by boat and done without the passage over the Topsails.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—That proposition was put up to them also and was not considered satisfactory.

MR. GRIMES—In connection with the operation of the railway over the Topsails, I would like to ask if there has been prepared any estimate as to what it would cost to have the railway diverted around the Topsails. It has been suggested that an amount of money be spent in re-railing the railway from Port aux Basques to Humbermouth, would not that be better spent in constructing a new route for the railway around the Topsails and so avoid that portion that causes the trains to be held up and enable them to run through the winter over a new section?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—We have not considered that matter.

MR. GRIMES—Do I understand that the Government would not consider it?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Oh no. We are quite prepared to consider the suggestion.

MR. SCAMMELL—Is it clear that the Commission accepts the full responsibility for the operation of the road across the Topsails?

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, Tuesday afternoon, at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, April 27th, 1926.

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

Petitions were presented by:

Mr. Ashbourne from Friday's Bay re: Coastal Service.

Mr. Scammell gave notice of question.

Mr. Godden gave notice of question.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Colonial Secretary the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions to Confirm an Agreement between the Government and the Newfoundland Hotel Facilities, Ltd.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, it will be remembered that last session a Bill passed this House confirming an Agreement between the Government and the Newfoundland Hotel Facilities, Ltd. The purpose of this Agreement was to erect a hotel in St. John's and certain guarantees were asked for and agreed to, but after the House closed and the Agreement went into effect, it was discovered that there was some question as regards the security that had been agreed to by the Government. Accordingly in the month of June last negotiations took place between the Company and the Government and a new agreement —a new Trust Deed—was drawn up. The Resolutions now before the Chair provide for the further provision in the agreement of last year of the guarantee of the interest on the bond issue of $450,000. The hon. members will remtmber that last year in the Agreement, under Section 6. . ., which for the information of the House I will read, and I will also read the amended section, so that we will be in a better position to judge as to what is purposed by these Resolutions. There is nothing else in the amended clause outside of this that is of consequence, therefore I commend the attention of the House to this particular section before proceeding with the Resolutions. Under the Act of last year Section 6 reads as follows:

(Reads)

Section 3 under the present Resolutions which is substituted for Section 6 of last year's agreement, reads as follows:

(Reads)

It will be observed that in this clause the Government is making a specific guarantee of both principal and interest. Though last year this was not specifically set forth yet we were responsible for it if any default or foreclosure took place the Government would have to pay interest on bonds as well as principal. The company found it difficult to realize or sell those bonds under the acts of last year, and asked that the guarantee be extended to interest and principal as it was found difficult to sell the bonds unless they had an absolute guarantee.

Another matter referred or alluded to is the period of redemption. The first bond had to be redeemed in thirty-three and one-third years; that has been found impracticable. There are now periods of ten years. The bonds are guaranteed for ten years and an opportunity is then given to the Company to take up all bonds. The Government will have power under the act to renew the power every ten years until final disposal of bonds takes place that is thirty-three and a third years. The Government have been actuated in this matter by a sympathetic desire to afford these people assistance in every possible way because of their absolute faith in the project. The hotel is practically built now and there has not been a dollar received on these bonds so far. The construction is of the very finest kind, so far, and the work performed is of the highest quality. It will be remembered that under the Agreement last yar payments were to be made on construction in proportion to nine-fourteenths of the work performed. The building is to cost in the neighbourhood of nine hundred thousand dollars and for the four hundred and fifty thousand dollars that the Government guaranteed the security will be there costing nine hundred thousand dollars.

I may say that we were asked by the Company to extend the guarantee to another hundred thousand dollars. The Government did not feel itself in

a position to do so and did not see its way clear to give any further guarantee than was extended last year. The reason that an additional hundred thousand was asked for was that the building has cost more money through improvements and alterations and greater facilities being included than was contemplated at the beginning They have spared no expense in makthe construction of the very finest character and in doing that they have materially improved the security of the bonds.

Last year when speaking in the House of the hotel or possibility of the hotel we were speaking of something in the mist as it were. To-day we can feel that we are speaking of a reality. To-day I think we can speak with a certain amount of gratification that those of us who were optimistic have had their dreams realised. This Hotel will improve conditions in the country and through its agency, I believe, a great deal of money will be spent in this country. We will have a place where visitors to the country and others can be suitably accommodated. In other words, I believe we have an establishment that will be a very fine asset to the whole country. Those competent to express an opinion say that the project is going to be a good paying one. I have had some conservation with Mr. Rousseau and he is quite optimistic over the possibilities of the Hotel. The hotel is up to date in every respect. It is very much better than many recently built in different Provinces of Canada. They have acquired the services of a very competent and experienced man, Mr. Frank Quick who was Manager of the Ritz Carlton in Montreal for many years. The hotel is capable of housing two hundred and fifty people. The room accommodation is one hundred and fifty, but that is the ordinary accommodation but by doubling up, putting double beds in rooms and so on, another hundred can be easily accommodated in the building. I am informed very creditably that if the number of guests was one hundred and fifty even for seven months out of the year—revenue and earnings of the hotel would be sufficient to pay all expenses including interest on Debentures, payments to preferred shareholders and so on. That is even if not another dollar was earned for the rest of the year, and at the prices that are to be charged which I understand are very moderate indeed.

Much to the surprise of many, it may be, that those who have identified themselves with this movement consider it one of the best propositions in Canada to-day. The possibilities of Newfoundland are only now being realised. We have steamship line connections to-day that we little dreamed of a few years ago. We have up to date Furness Withy boats running from Liverpool, Halifax and Boston, and vice versa. We are to have a new Red Cross boat, up to date and capable of steaming fifteen knots, with very large passenger accommodation, speedy and powerful, and that will be an attraction in itself. We have the Clarke Steamship Company with a recently built ship called the NORTHLAND, a very fast vessel which is to run regularly in conjunction with another steamer to Corner Brook. All these ships are capable of carrying a large number of passengers, and it must be conceded that those who have gone to that expense are not dreamers and have invested this money feeling it is to good purpose. We have the CARIBOU as an addition to the Government's fleet, plying to Port aux Basques, capable of taking more passengers than any vessel on that route hitherto. The only thing left is for the people of the country to do their part. The Hotel will be the ground work or the corner stone of the Tourist Policy the present

Government has adopted. Some people question the wisdom of the expenditure in this direction. Personally I think it means a great lot to the country, and if backed by a proper spirit amongst our people, every dollar invested will be turned to account. One of the most hopeful signs is that a number of young business men have banded themselves together under the name of a TOURIST BUREAU, and have been in operation a short time and have awakened an amazing amount of interest, not alone in Newfoundland but in places outside Newfoundland.

I trust that when this hotel will be opened that it will mark a new era in the life of this country. We never know what we can do unless we try. I know of lots of travellers abroad who would like to pay a visit to this country, but who are very anxious to know what our hotels are like. We have had many people who visited this country who came in and wished us the time of day and went out again, because of lack of hotel facilities. We must get on the map of the world today and make our attractions known and then there will be no question but that many from abroad will flock to our shores for both pleasure and business.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the Colonial Secretary. Last session a Bill was passed in connection with the Hotel Facilities, Limited, under which this Legislature gave the Governor-in-Council authority to draft a Bill guaranteeing a sinking fund of three per cent, which is $13,500 a year, which the Government will pay in the event of the Hotel not being able to earn sufficient money over the overhead expenses to provide for the sinking fund, and in consideration of which the Government are to receive bonds. The Prime Minister stated at that time that the promoters of the Hotel did not want interest on their outlay and that he had refused the offer of the W. I. Bishop Company to build a Hotel with a guarantee of five per cent. interest. Now we find that we have been fooled and deluded by the Government, as reference to Hansard of last year will show. The present Hotel was intended to be built without a guarantee and the whole thing so far as the Government are concerned was only a camouflage. If you had come down like men at last session and asked to have the interest guaranteed it would have been a much better proposition than the one we have before us to-day. I would like to see a Hotel built in St. John's as well as anybody, but I do not like to be fooled, and I do not think other members of this House like it either. The Hotel might just as well have been built by the Government and called a Government institution. The Prime Minister said last year that they had a Company to take care of the bonds. Now the country is going to be saddled with another obligation before finding out whether there is any necessity of having it or not. The new Hotel is, without doubt, a very well constructed building. As I said before, I do not object to the Hotel being built, but I do object to the Government coming in here and asking for authority for the Governor-In-Council to make an agreement one year and outlining to us what the terms of the agreement are, and now coming in and asking for something entirely different, and when the Hotel is in such a condition that it must be carried on. I think it is high time that when any agreement is being made that the agreement should be laid upon the table of the House for inspection.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the Leader of the Opposition I might say that it is perfectly true that last year's Act meant that there was to be a sinking

fund of $13,500, and that there was no interest guaranteed. That was the proposition of the Hotel Facilities, Limited, at that time. The Bill was put forward in the best of faith by the Government, but later these people found it difficult to raise money on the bonds, and they went to the Montreal Trust Company, who wanted interest guaranteed. We put our case clearly before the House, and the Government were as much astonished as the Opposition as to the terms without interest. The fact that a trustee was appointed left those people without money, and the promoters of this project went out and found the money somehow, without aid from the Government. After all, as has been stated by the Colonial Secretary, there is no enormous difference between the agreement then and now. If the hotel fails at any time, we got the hotel for the value of the bonds, and we are naturally responsible for the bonds, and we are naturally responsible for the interest. The hotel will cost about $900,000 and the very worst that can happen is to take it over at half its cost. If I had $450,000 I would be mighty glad to take over the hotel to-morrow as an investment. Of course, the Government do not want to take upon itself any more obligations than is necessary, but this is an obligation now that is necessary. The new hotel will be the nucleus of the tourist traffic and is condemned only by those who condemned the Dry Dock and Highroads undertakings. I claim that the Hotel will be an asset to Newfoundland and I claim that there is no material difference between the agreement now and last year, but the alteration to the agreement has to be made to satisfy the trustee of the bonds. We came before the House last year with a perfectly frank and clear proposition and no deception was practised by the Government, and, I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the proposition now before the Chair is not materially different to the one submitted last year.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman: If this money could be raised by people outside this country, I submit that it could be raised inside this country. If our people had been given an opportunity, I contend that that money, raised by the Montreal Trust Company who are guaranteed six per cent. interest, could be floated in this country within an hour. I will go further and say that that money would be taken up by a half dozen of our own people to-morrow morning at par value. I approve of the hotel project for various reasons but I think that our own people should get something out of it instead of sending about $27,000 out of the country in interest.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman: I would like to know if the Government has any idea who the shareholders and directors of the Hotel Facilities Limited are. Mr. Rousseau is referred to as the contractor and I would like to know personally if Mr. Rousseau is taking any shares in the hotel himself. So far as I know at present he is merely paid for erecting the hotel. Who are really the responsible people? I know that Mr. Stafford and Mr. Blandford are the local directors of the concern, but I think we ought to know who the principal directors are of that building which is a credit to the town.

THE HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman: The agreement we have before us is signed by Mr. Blandford as President and by Mr. Stafford as Secretary. They were the promoters of the hotel and they induced Rousseau and Company and Mr. Ahearn to negotiate this concern. I do not know who the other gentlemen are that are interested in this proposition; but I know that preference shares were sold in Quebec where most of the money was raised. These mortgage bonds are not going

to sell as quickly as guaranteed bonds. Outside of that we do not know or have no means of knowing if anybody is behind the scheme in Canada, but evidently someone of substance is behind it, as no certificates have been asked for from the Government Engineer.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman: The fact of what they have done is proof that there are people of substance behind the hotel, but I think it is the business of the Government to find out with whom they are dealing. I am entirely in favor of the Resolutions, but I would suggest that the Government enquire as to who are the people who are going to run the hotel when the construction work is finished. The hotel is part of the tourist policy of the Government and they have a capable and experienced manager in Mr. Quick, who has managed small and big hotels in various parts of Canada, from the smallest to the largest—the Ritz Carlton, the Swagger Hotel of Montreal. Another reason for supporting the hotel is the interest shown by shipping firms in building new ships to bring people here. Then again there are a number of young men working at the Tourist Bureau, without pay, advertising Newfoundland and I have letters from them asking me to give them reports upon the salmon and trout rivers of Fortune Bay for the purpose of laying information before some prominent people who contemplate visiting Newfoundland the coming summer. I feel sure that the hotel is the best investment the Government has yet made. We are a small community and we have to get nine millions of dollars to run this country annually and we have to invite people to come in here to help pay our debts by the money they leave here. If we can sell our attractions to outsiders then I do not think that we are making any mistake. However, I agree with Major Cashin that local investors should have been given a chance to buy the bonds, and, perhaps, the Montreal Trust Company will put them on the market.

I support the resolutions, Mr. Chairman, and I hope that the Hotel will be the means of bringing into this country people that have not been here before—people of some wealth and influence, people who can go away and make out in the newspapers of other countries the fact that they have been well treated in Newfoundland.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman. I would like to ask the Hon. the Prime Minister if there is any understanding between the Government and the Montreal Trust Company in reference to this Agreement. Evidently, someone has found the money for the construction of the Hotel as far as it has gone. In the Speech from the Throne, reference was made to an agreement between the Government and the Montreal Trust Company. It is quite natural to expect that there would be some understanding between that Company and the Government in reference to this bond.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—There has been no agreement, Mr. Chairman. There has been no agreement between the Montreal Trust Company and the Government in connection with this bond, whatever. Our agreement is with the Hotel Facilities Company, and the bonds were handled by the Montreal Trust Company whom we don't know in the matter at all.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman: I am going to ask the Hon. the Prime Minister again if he thinks it is quite right to bring in a Bill guaranteeing 6 per cent. bonds. Does he not think 5 per cent. is enough for a Government guaranteed bond, which is just the same as a Government bond? And, if we raised money at 5 per cent. for our last loan why give these people 6 per

cent. now? It is all very well for the member for Ferryland and the member for Fortune to say that this loan could be taken up in St. John's. I quite agree with him that the loan could be taken up in St. John's if it was placed on the market at par, but if it is placed on the market in St. John's, it is going to be placed at 110, and it is going to sell in Canada at 110. Any 6 per cent. Government Bond or a municipal or provincial bond is selling for 109 or 110, and this bond is worth 109 or 110 guaranteed at 6 per cent., yet these Hotel people, or the Montreal Trust Company are going to make $45,000.00 off of this issue. If the Hotel Facilities Company get the benefit through this bond when it is put on the market, their income from, $450,000 at 110 is going to be nearly $500,000. Then, if we don't give that Montreal Trust Company the raising of the loan, somebody else is going to get it. Whatever anybody in the Government does, he is not going to induce the Montreal Trust Company or any other company to put a 6 per cent. guaranteed loan on the market at par. There is no necessity for the Government to accept everything that they are told by people that want to bring Bills into this House. Evidently that is what they have been doing all along. Reference was made to Besco to-day, and they say that everything in that Bill is what people want. The Hotel people are bringing in a Bill, and they are not asking the Government to do this or that, but they say "YOU HAVE GOT TO DO THIS." I think it is time that we protested against this sort of thing. A guarantee of 5 per cent. interest is quite sufficient, instead of 6 per cent. You are going to give this Company an opportunity to make $45,000 out of the public.

To begin with, the land that the Hotel is built on was given free. All the stone that went into that Hotel was given free. The Hotel is free from taxes, except municipal taxes. Now the Government come in here and gives a 6 per cent guarantee on bonds, which allows the Hotel Facilities Co. or the Montreal Trust Co. to make $45,000 out of the public, when the issue is put on the market. The member for Fortune Bay told us that it was going to be a swagger Hotel, and they have got a swagger manager. Now I have nothing to say against the manager, but I know this that The Ritz Carlton Hotel in Montreal which he had charge of only once paid a dividend on its capital since it was running and that was 4 per cent.

MR. WARREN—That was when Mr. Quick was Manager.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—He may be a very good Hotel man. He may be a very capable man to run a Ritz Carlton Hotel, but that is no argument that you can use in favour of guaranteeing a bond issue, that will make me believe that we will not be called upon to pay the interest on these bonds. These are intended to lead us to believe that we will not have to pay the interest. If we run a swagger Hotel we have got to get swagger tourists, during three or four months of the year and if we want to get anybody else to patronize that Hotel we will have to cut out the swagger rates.

Now I think that the Government should change that, and make the interest five per cent. instead of six. You can raise the money on Government guaranteed bonds, at five per cent. and you can sell these bonds on the market anywhere from "97 to 100." The Canadian Government 4½ per cent. bond is selling at 96 and a half. And there is no reason why par could not be obtained for this bond when issued, if it was made 5 per cent. instead of 6 per cent. Now the Government can use all the arguments that they like saying that we will not have

to pay the interest. The same thing was done in reference to the Humber there we were told that we would never have to pay the interest. That it was a matter only of guaranteeing, but the chances are that some day in the very near future the directors of the Newfoundland Power & Paper Co., Ltd., will come along and require us to pay the interest on the bonds. The same thing might apply to this Hotel. When the Government are making a deal they should make a deal to protect themselves. They should not make a deal to allow any corporation to make forty or fifty thousand dollars off of this country's guarantee.

MR. GODDEN—Mr. Chairman, whether this will be a swagger Hotel or not, the question this House has to decide upon is, are we going to guarantee $27,000.00 interest yearly, and a principal of $450,000.00, if so, what is your security for that guarantee? Is the security on the assets sufficient for this? or will these resolutions be like the resolutions that were brought in here some years ago in connection with The Newfoundland Power and Paper Company. At that time the Government of that day were satisfied that they had security enough, but I notice in the Court Registrars Records during the last few days that Deeds and Debentures to the amount of $25,500,000.00 have been mortgaged to people outside of Newfoundland. Where then is our security from The Newfoundland Power and Paper Co., is it worth anything at all? We are asked to guarantee the interest and the principal of this new hotel scheme. The hon. member of Fortune, Mr. Warren, asked who were the parties principally interested in this Hotel, from the financial standpoint, I presume he meant. I say that we must have all the security possible, and I say, that as well as getting a first mortgage, we should get a guarantee from those principally interested, and make our security more worth while. I am afraid this Hotel scheme is going to be fraught with financial difficulties. I like the look of the building, but I think it is going to be too much of a swagger scheme.

Now the Colonial Secretary says, that if there are 150 guests for seven months of the year it will pay, whether there will be any more for the rest of the year or not. Now I don't believe that for a moment, because as has been admitted, the new Hotel has cost $900,000.00 already and I understand that a Manager is coming down here, who will want not less than $10,000.00 a year for himself. Up to now it is a one million dollars scheme, and not completed yet, and I believe it will be difficult to find customers enough to come to Newfoundland as tourists to pay all the profits required to make this venture successful. Now my sentiments about Newfoundland are these, that we have one of the nicest countries in the world to live in, but conditions are not as favorable as in other countries, therefor, our population is small and does not increase. We have one principal industry which is the fishery, I am sorry to say that this industry has been neglected since this Administration took office. Now the Colonial Secretary has asked me to give some reasons why I think this Hotel is not going to pay, and I have suggested one or two things. I believe that we have a country that should prove of interest to tourists, but the first place that a tourist would go to if he visited England, would be the Capital, London, and if he visited America, he would go to New York first. These tourists are impressed with those wealthy and up-to-date cities, and that would give them a good opinion of the rest of the country, and they would want consequently to visit some other places. Now what have we got to offer to those who come to see New-

foundland, in our Capital City, all we have to offer them is this new Hotel. Instead of guaranteeing the money to build this new Hotel, we should co-operate with the City Council first. Let us have some real streets in St. John's, and a cleaner looking City. On top of that, instead of wasting two million dollars every four years on a tourist highroad policy, repair the roads in the different districts, connecting one with the other, so that the people of Newfoundland can have the benefit of good roads. Start in with the roads you have and make them attractive and navigable, build others up gradually, that would encourage those who have been here once, to come again a second time. I don't want to knock this scheme of a Hotel in St. John's. We want a good Hotel in St. John's, and in other parts of Newfoundland; but why the Government should be asked to guarantee the interest on Bonds as well as the principal, on a business proposition of this sort, I fail to see. I believe in Mr. Cashin's suggestion, that all the money needed for this Hotel, could not only be found locally, but that parties could be interested in putting up a Hotel of sufficient size, and a modern Hotel, without any Government assistance, and I think that the agreement that was put before us last year in this House, between the Government and The Newfoundland Facilities Company went far enough, without doing anything extra, and the idea of the Government coming in here, and asking us to consent to these further concessions, is, I think, going a little too far, and I think that we should not consider these resolutions for a moment, and I suggest that they be given a six months hoist.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to add anything to this debate, but from the excited feeling displayed by one hon. member it seems evident that he thinks that the hon. minister has introduced this as a Government measure. As this is not a matter that the Government have any interest in, there is no necessity for the hon. member to get excited about the attitude of the Government. There is no occasion to worry, or desire to be caustic to any person. Now the position of the Government that I have drawn his attention to, is merely presented to him for his own observation. The hon. member who has just sat down, says that this country wants a hotel. And he says that there are people in this town who will build a hotel. But the trouble is this that for years past efforts have been made to get Newfoundlanders to put up a hotel themselves. Mr. Cashin did not say that we could get people here to build a hotel, but he did say that you could get people in this country to take up the bonds guaranteed by the Government which is a totally different thing. I quite agree with the gentleman who made that suggestion. You have dozens of people who would build hotels, if you come along and suggest that they would have no responsibility. But I say now that this is the first time that anyone within sound of my voice, has said that he was able to get a hotel of that class built without some guarantee. Now so far as this discussion is concerned, one would imagine that it was some kind of hocus pocus game that we were playing here. One would imagine that the Prime Minister came in here last year, and got a bill written up, brought into this House, and got it assented to, and then put on the statue Book, and then two months afterwards, he is going to come in here and say that that was not exactly what he wanted. "What I wanted to do was to get the Bill passed through the Committee and then the Government could change it to suit their own idea.

MR. HICKMAN—That is what it looks like.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —It all depends on what kind of glasses you are wearing. If you want to change the colour of your glasses, you can make the object that you are looking at appear in any colour you wish. Now I would like to state that the view presented by the Prime Minister last year, is the fact, that he came down here and said, "This thing is too good to be true?" He says "As I understand it the position is this. These people come forward and say that all they want to put up a hotel, is to have us garantee a sinking fund of $13,500." He says "Gentlemen, there is one thing about this. They are depositing as evidence of good faith $25,000. We have that cash in hand. And as he said in the House last year, if all comes to the worst, we are getting $25,000 for passing this bill through this Legislature. And it is good to know that even now while I am talking, that $25,000 is down in the Bank of Canada to the credit of the Government. These people have not alone put up the deposit but they have left it up with the building practically completed.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—They put that in to fool you.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Now if the hon. member wants to answer by foolish remarks of that kind, if he wants to talk like that, he can do so. If the idea he has got is that everyone is trying to fool you, I must say that I don't look at things that way. I try to take the idea that when a man gives his word he means it. And when a man gives me his word that he will do such a thing, I have to believe him, unless I find that he does not mean it. Everyone knows that the building is up, and that the country has not paid anything towards it, and if fate decreed that the whole thing stopped, and that we never did put this thing through, we still have that $25,000 to the credit of this country. Now if you call that fooling, you have a different conception of fooling from what I have. I am rather surprised at the hon. gentleman who is supposed to be a very sane business man, endeavouring to get down to the idea of feeling that the only way that he can take a little credit from the Government for its part in this proposition, is to say that the whole thing is done to fool us. But I say this to be candid with you, not only do I think that we have not been fooled, but while I have heard of cases where buildings have been put and where the people got nothing for them, this hotel proposition takes this form, that the building is there and certified by the Government engineer, and there is $25,000 to the credit of the Colony in the Savings Bank, without our paying over one cent. Now the suggestion has been made here that this town cannot stand a swagger hotel. Why can't it, what is wrong with St. John's?

MR. GODDEN—I said a modern hotel and not a swagger hotel.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to the hon. gentleman that what he calls a modern hotel is another way for saying something different, from what we have at the present time. An up-to-date hotel is like up-to-date clothes or anything else. If you want to be up-to-date you have got to be a swagger. You would imagine here, that all that this town consisted of was the crowd who wanted to keep up the tradition of old times and live under the style of "out dogs and in dieters." Now St. John's has got people, who are able to live in this hotel, and require the conveniences afforded by any hotel of this size. And surely it is sound policy to cater to those conditions.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—But why do you give a guarantee of 6 per cent.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Because it is the only way that the bonds can be floated I persume. However I am not raising that point at all. There is no difference to-day as far as guaranteeing the principal and the interest, as the Hon. Colonial Secretary has already pointed out. If one will take the section of last year it will bear out that point.

MR. HALFYARD—We have been told that there was a difference.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Well, I didn't think it was necessary to refute that—I thought everybody knew it.

MR. HALFYARD—It is just camouflage.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—It does no good to import such terms as "camouflage" into this discussion. The section is there and says that the Government undertakes to be responsible for the principal, and there was a sale of bonds to be retired yearly. The difference is last year a man took 30 year bonds we might be able to say that we would only be responsible for the present part of the indebtedness. There is really no difference in the situation except that last year we had nothing, but this year we have the hotel, the building there. There was no percentage mentioned last year—no reference to interest at all.

MR. HALFYARD—(Reads Mr. Hickman's speech in Hansard re point).

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Then I am delighted that we are a half per cent. better off now. The Government guaranteed there last year (Reads Act). I am very glad the hon. member raised that point. Look at Sec. 9 of last year (Reads). When you undertake to guarantee the interest you guarantee the principle, because holders will take steps to realize their security, and that means that automatically we have to look after the principal to protect ourselves. The hon. gentleman made a very interesting remark that bonds not guaranteed by the Government would be placed at 6½ per cent. I say as regards to that that it is very encouraging to us to find that we could place such bonds. Conditions can't be as frightful as the hon. member have indicated if we can find so easily a half dozen people who would take them up—people don't take up such things unless they are safe. I support this measure because I have evidence of the whole thing before us, and it is quite apparent that these people are confident of their venture. However much they may have misjudged the financial end of the thing, and the calitre of the financial world, they have supreme confidence in their venture, and I hazard the opinion that when this building is finished it will be worth in actual value nearer one million two hundred thousand than seven hundred thousand. As far as the building itself is concerned I think there are members in this house who have been near enough to observe most of the erection and the manner of erection. It is the very best of work and finished to the last degree. Frankly, I fully appreciated the position put up by these people some time ago, when they put up the position that the erection cost more than they anticipated, and asking that the amount of the guarantee be increased $100,000, and I say that I feel we have got the value of the increased cost. I wish everything we had was as well copper-fastened and secured as that $400,000. And if the whole thing becomes a myth—if the development of the country comes to nothing there is still one thing that we have—we certainly have value in the building, and greater value than any Government has heretofore got. If everything goes we still have value

in the building, and I support this measure, and hope that this day twelve months the country will be able to realize its value. Mr. Judson, the Furness Withy Co's Tourist Agent, is enthused over the outlook, and arrangements have already been made for Cook's Tours to touch in, perhaps only for a couple of days, but it means something—on their sight-seeing trips. So I take the position that I do, and give these resolutions my support.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, I have a few remarks to make arising out of the debate. I made the suggestion that the money be raised in Newfoundland. There is nothing in the Bill to guarantee that that be done. I make the further suggestion to the Government, and it is that we rise from the Committee now, and see if this money can be raised in Newfoundland. If the Government is going to guarantee $450,000, the people ought to get a chance to invest in it. I say that it can be raised here if the Government will guarantee the interest, and you might give the few people who have a little money left the chance to invest at 6 per cent. But I have heard, Mr. Chairman, and I believe that this money is already raised and that the people will not have that chance, and I don't agree with the Government's action in that. I think they have been lax in their duty in that respect—they went outside this country without giving their own people the chance to get this investment. I am a supporter of the Hotel project, but I am not of this phase of it.

THE PRIME MINISTER—They will get their chance when the 4 or 5 millions comes along.

MR. CASHIN—Yes, but they will not have the same prospects. And they will not get 6 per cent. The Canadian Government raised a loan of several millions at 4½ per cent., which sold at 95.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—Yes, and if they had given 6½ they would have sold at 110.

MR. CASHIN—Yes, when you guarantee interest to be paid every year it is easy to get 110. My point is that you ought to have given the people of this country a chance. If the position is that you don't want to give the people of this country a chance, then move out. Letting an outside company come in and lop off this thing—the money could be raised in this country, and I say that at 6 per cent. I could raise in by dinner-time to-morrow.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — Mr. Chairman, there is one point that has been lost sight of. That point is that with interest guaranteed at 6 per cent. it will mean more money to the Hotel Facilities, Ltd., for their bonds will sell at a higher price. On the other hand the fact that the Hotel Facilities raises money at 6 per cent. does not mean that the investor gets more—he has to pay more for the Bonds. Now that is the point. I may say that we are perfectly satisfied that the Government has enough security in this building. We realised that when the Hotel Facilities people came to us and pointed out that they had spent $180,000 more than they had counted upon, and that expenditure was on account of extra fittings and furnishings, which made the building more valuable. They asked us for an increased guarantee of $100,000, making the Bonds issue $550,000 instead of $450,000. Our feeling was that it couldn't be tampered with. I still claim that while of course it would be better to have Bonds at 5 per cent than 6 per cent., the investor doesn't get that increase, for he has to pay more for his Bonds.

MR. CASHIN—The Hon. Prime Minister has mis-stated my point. My point is that the people of this country ought to have had a chance.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — They will have their opportunity.

MR. CASHIN—Yes, but not so rosy a chance.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — Yes, just as rosy.

MR. CASHIN—My point was that 6 per cent. ought to have been given the people of this country. It would be interesting to know what people the Montreal Trust are selling this loan to. Not until we find that out will we know who made money out of this; but the chances are that no people in Newfoundland had part of it.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — You can get Bonds for 110 now if you want them.

MR. CASHIN—No, you can't get them now. They have been mopped up by the Montreal Trust, who have cleaned up on the thing.

MR. DUFF—Mr. Chairman, I have just a brief statement to make. I don't want to appear to be a knocker of this scheme, but coming as I do from Conception Bay, where we see the people leaving every day to get a living elsewhere, and to come in here and be told by the Minister of Justice that we can stand a costly hotel is refreshing ,to say the least—to hear him taking that view. Now last year we were told that there was to be a deposit of $25,000, and that that has been made is evidently a matter of surprise to the Premier. Probably we were also told that the Government might have to raise $13,500 on their guarantee, and we were asked to guarantee $13,500 last year, or double that amount. Now I think the assurances of to-day are most ridiculous to the outport people, who do not want the hotel scheme. The new dock was to have cost one million, now we find that it is double that. And the highways are the same way; the Nfld. Power and Paper Co. has increased its amount, and so it goes on. Why can't the Hotel Facilities come in this place and work without security—if they want the hotel and think it will pay, why don't they risk their money in it? The people in the outports have no interest in it and should not be asked to put up this moneey.

Just one more remark about the Hotel. The Minister of Justice has told us wonderful things about the construction work, but I say he doesn't know what he is talking about. If you will talk to any masons here you will find from them that a winter job is no good.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —There were Carbonear men working on it.

MR. DUFF—I know there were—I know what I am talking about. I also know that these men were getting 40 cents an hour and the imported men were at the same time getting 80 cents. That is the way things are being done in this country, and now we are asked to raise our guarantee $80,000. I am against it.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, I have just a few remarks to make in reply to the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice. The Prime Minister has told us that these people wanted a guarantee on five hundred thousand dollars instead of four hundred thousand dollars, but because people had their money invested in preference stock without a guarantee the Government would not consider this offer. Now the interest on $550,000 at the usual rate of 5 per cent. is $27,000, and the interest on $450,000 at 6 per cent., why didn't you guarantee the $750,000 at 4 per cent., it would be just as well as the present scheme. You have no right to ask us to guarantee 6 per cent., it is an illegitimate rate of interest. You give a rate of 6 per cent. on your bonds, and allow the Montreal Trust to come in and clean up $45,000 off the people. When they could dispose of the loan at 5 per cent., what reason is there for paying 6 per cent.?

You are forcing on the people of this country a burden which could be carried at 5 per cent. It is illegal and outrageous. The Minister of Justice has, as usual, dragged the red herring across the track in his customary way. The question is not about the building of the Hotel, it is of the guaranteeing of the money. It is an obligation that there is no necessity for, and we are going to fight it in this House. The Minister of Justice can draw the red herring as much as he pleases—he can't fool us. This thing was all gone over last year in this House. I have Hansard before me, and these are the words of the Prime Minister (reads). Now he comes in and asks us to guarantee 6 per cent. bonds. We were fooled right through the session and that is why we take this attitude. We don't intend to have the Government come in here and put anything over on us. The people of this country are not toiling and paying their taxes to have this sort of thing put over on us. It is true that we may not be called upon to pay, but the obligation is there, and I can't see why the Prime Minister is supporting this rate when he knows that the Government bonds yield only 5 per cent.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — I will back it up not only in this House but by putting my own money in the common stock of the undertaking.

MR. HICKMAN—Well, I haven't as much money as the Prime Minister, so I can't do that. If I had shares in local industries protected by legislation by which I could draw big dividends, I might be able to invest some money also, but the country is paying 6 per cent. when it ought to be 5 per cent.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Colonial Secretary if there is any guarantee that the Hotel Facilities, Ltd., can raise the rest of the money required, and what is the exact amount required. We hear various amounts spoken of, from $900,000 up. I should like to know if there is any guarantee that this further amount is forthcoming, and also if the interest on the preference stock is to be a first charge on the revenue of the company? Because I have figured out that 150 people living at the Hotel for seven months at the rate of $5.00 a day brings the revenune up to $157,500. The interest on $450,000 at 6 per cent. that the Government is called upon to guarantee is $27,000.00. Add to that interest on, say, $450,000 at 7 per cent. and you get a total of $58,-500.00. That is a heavy drain right away, and I should like to know whether the Government is satisfied that the Company can float this amount successfully.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —If the hon. gentleman would not mind reading sections 5 and 6 he will get an answer to that. Section 5 says (reads).

I would ask the hon. members to give special attention to section 6, as that is the protection section. Taking the basis that as we were advancing four hundred and fifty thousand dollars, taking the assumption that the Hotel was going to cost seven hundred thousand dollars, it was the agreed proportion four hundred and fifty to two hundred and fifty or as nine to five. Accordingly section 6 says:

(Reads.)

In other words the point the hon. member enquires into is that the Government is responsible for nine fourteenths and five fourteenths outside sale of stock. I think the hon. members will agree that this insertion that was not there last year is a protection.

MR. CASHIN—Has the Government got any information as to where

these people got that money to continue operations. Is it not a fact that these people raised four hundred and fifty thousand dollars with the Montreal Trust Company. These bonds are guaranteed six per cent., and at one hundred and ten they will give practically five per cent., and they will clean up forty-five thousand dollars in one stroke of the pen. The Montreal Trust Company are not in this for their health. My point is this, that they advanced the four hundred and fifty thousand dollars on the understanding that there would be a Government guarantee. They gave them four hundred and fifty thousand dollars cash and now we are passing a Bill here guaranteeing six per cent. and letting them clean up forty-five thousand dollars. Is not that a fact? Mind you, I am voting for it, but I submit that the Government showed very poor business in that connection to let these people have these six per cent. bonds at par.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER The Hotel Facilities will be paid at 110.

MR. CASHIN—Do you mean to tell me that the Montreal Trust is in this for the good of their health? It is in big deals that these financial brokers clean up. Why I speak of this is because I saw a quotation of the Hotel bonds at ninety-eight. When there was no Government guarantee they were ninety-two. With the five per cent. guarantee they were offering at ninty-eight. However, I take the Prime Minister's word. My point is that I do not want to see the Montreal Trust down here. If they got one per cent. they would only get forty-five hundred dollars, and I believe that they made a bigger thing out of it than that. They did it with the Newfoundland Light and Power Company and I believe that they will do it with this company.

HON. THE COLONOIAL SECRETARY—In reply to the hon. member I do not see how we can interfere with the business transactions of the company. Last year we brought in a bill to guarantee the bonds. Now we find that they could not negotiate the bonds under the circumstances and they come back to the Government and the Government agree to guarantee the interest. As to whether it should be five or six; I would like to see it five. I did not happen to be in the country at the time, but that does not matter. We are committed to a six per cent. guarantee. I do not agree with the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that they are going to get a hundred and ten for these bonds. I think that our last loan at five per cent. was at ninety-seven and a half. I think that the six per cent. bonds should be worth about 106. These people negotiated with the Montreal Trust Co. and they know if they are going to get the premiums on the bonds but they are not going to make a present to the Montreal Trust Company. The bonds will be issued to the Hotel Facilities Company. What they do with them is not, I think, any of our business. I agree with the hon. member that it is a pity that more of our national debt is not held in this country. I remember on one occasion when Mr. Brownrigg was Minister of Finance I was talking about the comparison between the Canadian Debt and the Newfoundland Debt. I pointed out at that time that while the Canadian debt was higher than ours pro rata, I think that it is higher to-day, that a lot of the Canadian debt was held in Canada itself. But in our case the majority of the interest charges go out the narrows and the country is impoverished to that extent. As far as this proposition is concerned, the hundred thousand that these people may raise on this second mortgage will probably sell at around eighty-

five. I do not suppose that they will get much more than eighty-five or ninety. It is purely a business tranaction. Another thing about it is that we are speaking on behalf of the people of this country, but what about the people who have put their money into this concern and got no guarantee. I think that my friend, the member for Ferryland, and some of his people have put money into it and every dollar of the guarantee must be paid before they get a cent. The sinking fund is the first charge on the earnings of the hotel. They have got five hundred thousand capital and four hundred and fifty thousand dollars mortgage bonds. I do not know what shares they have sold in Canada but I think that they sold about a hundred and twenty thousand dollars worth in Newfoundland. The rest of the money I presume they are raising from some source until they can sell their shares. I am told that Mr. Quick, the manager of the hotel, took quite a number of shares in the company himself. With regard to the provision that the bonds be marketed here I do not think that the company would object. We have made this agreement and to tell them that they must sell their bonds to this one or that would not be quite fair. They, no doubt, will sell to the highest bidder. I would like to see more government debentures sold here than there are. If we had to raise a half million dollars to-morrow I question if the money would be subscribed here. We would have to go abroad and get it from some other place. I hope that the hon. member will realise that as far as the Government is concerned that there is no desire of putting anything over. We are most desirous to have the fullest enquiry into the whole proposition. There is nothing to the Government's credit to have a hotel here. We happened to be the people in power that entered into negotiations with the company that came down here and had belief enough and trust enough in the country to put up the hotel, and if any other Government were in power they would, no doubt, have done the same thing. It is only a matter of signing the contract and it does not matter what they are sold at. If they sell at a hundred and ten then so much the better for the hotel company. They are ten year bonds. The entire issue is to be taken up in thirty-three years at a rate of thirteen thousand five hundred per year. Whatever is the call amount of the bonds the Hotel Facilities Company will have to pay it. They have to hand it back at the rate of thirteen thousand five hnudred dollars a year. The total issue to be redeemed in thirty three years. I do not think that there need be any concern about the redemption of the bonds.

MR. HALFYARD — I have one or two remarks to make on the subject that is now before the chair. The Hon. the Colonial Secretary told the House that it is our business as much as theirs. Perfectly correct. It is our business to make ourselves acquainted with the terms of the bill. But if the Government has made an agreement and now simply asks us to vote on it, then it is not our business as much as that of the Government's. It was the Government's business to find out, when they were asked by the hotel people to give them some assistance in the shape of a guarantee to build a hotel in St. John's, if they were responsible people and that the proposition that was made here last year was bona fide. Now we find that these people are falling down on their jobs. That is what is meant by the introduction of these resolutions. You were dealing with men of straw. Men that could not carry out the promises

that were made on their behalf to the House last year. Therefore the proposition that has been outlined by Mr. Cashin, the hon. member for Ferryland, cannot be put into effect. You have signed an agreement as submitted here and now the Government having obligated itself to these people, these people have acted accordingly and apparently they cannot or will not put these bonds on the market in Newfoundland. We have practically no control over these bonds. We are in an unenviable position. It shows that the Government put too much confidence in the people who approached them last year to guarantee the sinking fund of thirteen thousand five hundred dollars. They could not carry it through and they came with their fingers in their mouth after the building had been started two or three months and said that they could not carry on. and the Government simply fell for it and granted their request. And it is all from a sentimental point of view. It is not business. Somebody asked what is wrong with St. John's? It is a very pertinent question as to what is wrong with St. John's. It is funny that the people of St. John' could not build the hotel without having to ask the Government to guarantee the bonds. If it will be such a financial success as forecasted by the Colonial Secretary, I regret to have the opinion that there is something radically wrong with St. John's, that is speaking from a financial view point. I was opposed to the Government guarantee last year, I am opposed to the Government guaranteeing this amount of money on the bonds. It is a part of the scheme in connection with the tourist policy, but it is something that we cannot afford. We cannot afford to make any committments with regard to the expenditure of money from the Treasury of this Colony, on such a visionary project. I am reminded now having the estimates before me that we make our committments and then in a week or two we look for ways and means to pay for them. That is what we are doing if we adopt these resolutions. Where is the money coming from to meet these obligations. It is most regrettable that the people of St. John's could not find the money from its own people to build this hotel. Now, of course, the obligation has to be bourne by every one in this country whether he lives in St. John's or not. The hon. the introducer of the resolutions says that we are about to see the realization of our dreams. Certainly it is a dreamy proposition. The promoters succeeded in getting funds to construct the hotel, when the Government assured them, that the principal plus interest at 6 per cent. and sinking fund of $13,500.00 yearly would be guaranteed. But the dream that the operation of the hotel will not cost the Colony anything I fear will never be realized, and we will wake up from our dream to find the hotel as a white elephant, a financial drag, on our hands. I am disappointed with the policy of the Government in this respect and I think that there should be no further obligations of this kind entered into because it is adding greatly to the burdens of the people and piling up the public debt considerably. It is impossible to have a reduction of taxation, which is what the masses of the country are longing for, owing to the increased liabilities that have to be met. I really thought when this Government took office that they would administer the affairs of this country better than they have. There will be no great influx of tourists coming to this country, Mr. Chairman, because of our geographical situation. We are differently circumstanced to Canada

altogether. Then, again, before making large expenditures on hotels, or highroads, I think our city streets and the general appearance of the city should receive attention. Further, the people of the country at the present time question the wisdom of any Government borrowing money and upon which they will be taxed to pay the interest. People cannot carry on their natural avocations to day in the country owing to the way they are taxed, particularly with regard to outfitting for the fisheries. Anyhow what is the good of labouring the question. The Government has committed itself to this hotel proposition and are bound hand and foot. The financiers say you guarantee the bonds at six per cent. and you have to abide by that. If the Government can help themselves by making it five per cent. instead of six, why not do it, if at all possible.

THE HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—The Montreal Trust Company only get the ordinary rate of interest and the more money that they get for the bonds the more money that will be put into the hotel.

MR. HALFYARD—Well, if the Company wanted six per cent. and you promised to give it, I dare say they will not agree to five. I move, Mr. Chairman, that the Committee rise until we get some further information as to the floating of the bonds, etc.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again 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 have passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to Amend Section 4 of Chapter 1 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Promulgation and Construction of Statutes'" with some amendments, in which they request the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the said Amendments were read a first time and it was ordered that they be read a second time on to-morrow.

Answers to Questions.

The answers to the following question were tabled with the exception of Nos. 1-3-6-8-9 which were deferred.

(1) MR. SCAMMELL asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if any amount has been allocated by the Department for Pond Head wharf, Greenspond, since July 1st, 1924, and if so, to state what the amount is and to whom was it allocated.

(2) MR. SCAMMELL asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing the cost of repairs to Puffin Island (Greenspond) Lighthouse and to submit a detailed statement of all expenditure in connection therewith, showing persons employed and wages paid in each case; also to ask if a store was built at Puffin Island and if so to state the total cost of this store and to lay on the Table of the House a detailed statement of expenditure in connection therewith, showing persons employed and wages paid in each case.

(3) MR. SCAMMELL asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing the total receipts for: (a) Freight and (b) Passenger traffic, for the Bay de Verde Branch Railway for each of the fiscal years ending June 30th, 1924 and 1925, and to show the total expense of operating the said

Branch for each of the same years.

(4) MR. SCAMMELL asked the Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs if there remains an unexpended balance from the vote for repairs to mail camps and winter mail routes for the season of 1925-26 and if so to state what such unexpended balance is and if there is no such unexpended balance to lay on the Table of the House a full and detailed statement showing how the whole vote of $1,200.00 in this connection was expended.

(5) MR. HICKMAN asked Hon. the Prime Minister if the Government have considered the retirement of Judge Johnson; if so when is he to retired; has it been decided who is to get the position of Judge of the Supreme Court.

(6) MR. GODDEN asked Hon. the Prime Minister, as Chairman of the Railway Commission to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing the quantities of Sand, Cement, Rock and Granite used in the construction of the Dry Dock, the statement to show the approximate cost of the Sand, Rock and Granite, and the price paid per barrel for the Cement, also the cost of (1) quarrying the Granite, (2) transporting it to the Dock, (3) cutting it, and (4) placing it in position.

(7) MR. ASHBOURNE asked Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay upon the Table of the House a statement giving the names of the Nomenclature Committee, date of last meeting and the names of places that have been changed since July 1st, 1924.

(8) MR. HALFYARD asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the Table of the House a statement in explanation of the discrepancy in the first and second reply to question No. 9, Order Paper April 8th. First reply gives catch of Fish on North Side District for July 8,250 quintals; Second reply gives catch for July 9,250 quintals; First reply for August gives catch 5,260 quintals; Second reply for August gives catch 2,275 quintals; on South Side of Trinity District: First reply gives catch for August 5,260 quintals; Second reply gives catch for August 4,195 quintals; First reply for September gives catch 5,845 quintals; Second reply for September gives catch 1,065 quintals; First reply gives catch for October 527 quintals; Second reply gives no amount for October; difference in total catch first and second reply, 13,152 quintals.

(9) MR. HALFYARD asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing: (a) The amount paid Fishery Warden S. R. Winsor as salary for reporting the catch of codfish on the North Side Trinity District for the five months, June to October inclusive; (b) The total cost of expenses in collecting this information, also (c) The amount paid Fishery Warden Charles Woodman as salary for reporting the catch of codfish on the South Side of Trinity District for the five months, June to October inclusive; (d) The total cost of expeness in collecting this information.

Remarks on Questions.

No. 5.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—In reply to that question I may say that Judge Johnson has no intention of resigning and the Government have given no consideration to retiring him or appointing a successor.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker, as this House is now about to adjourn until to-morrow, I would like to ask the Minister of Finance if he has got that report that he was talking about the other day, referring to my family or the company that I am connected with.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Speaker, as it is now rather late, and as it

will take me some time to go through the report, I ask that the matter stand over till to-morrow.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker, if the Minister has got that report now he can table it and any debate on it can take place to-morrow.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — Mr. Speaker, the position of that report is this. We sent a copy of that reported to one gentleman who is concerned in it and asked him if he wished to make any explanation that could be tabled with that report. He referred us to a second gentleman, and now we have ased that second gentleman if he would care to make any explanation in connection with it. To-morrow I shall table that report with the reply from the first gentleman, and the reply, if any, from the second gentleman.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker, why I asked that question was because that information had been required by the Colonial Secretary, and the second gentleman concerned is Sir Michael Cashin. I was speaking to him about half an hour ago and he told me to ask for that report. There is no information from him, so to speak, and the report should be tabled; and on his behalf as a member of this House I would like to have it tabled. People are beginning to talk and I don't want to be coming in here under a cloud, and I am going to get out unless that cloud is cleared. I submit that I was told that that report would be tabled yesterday, and it is two days now and that report has not been tabled yet. And I submit that in view of the circumstances surrounding that report it should be tabled this evening.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — Mr. Speaker, I gave you my reason why it was not tabled this evening. And I also give the hon. member my assurance that it will be tabled to-morrow.

MR. ASHBOURNE—I would like to ask the Minister of Finance and Customs if he would inform the House when he is likely to bring in his Budget, because we had the Budget at this time last year, and now that the spring has opened up, or approaching, when the fishery is commencing, men would like to know where they are with regard to their importations. The bringing in of the Budget would help towards stabilization of conditions as much as possible, and I think that the country at large would like to know when they may expect the Budget.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—As soon as Supply has gone through. I suppose in about ten days.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, April 28th, 1926

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

Mr. Scammell gave notice of question.

Mr. Godden gave notice of question.

Mr. Ashbourne gave notice of question.

Mr. Halfyard gave notice of question.

Mr. Hickman gave notice of question.

Hon. the Prime Minister presented Report of Select Committee appointed to consider the Act respecting "The Encouragement of Shipbuilding," as follows:

The Select Committee on Act respecting "The Encouragement of Shipbuilding" beg to report having considered the matter to them refer-

red and have suggested certain amendments, as shown on accompanying Bill.

(Sgd.) W. S. MONROE,
M. S. SULLIVAN,
I. R. RANDELL,
T. G. W. ASHBOURNE.

On motion said Report was received and the adoption deferred.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — Mr. Speaker, I beg to table the report of G. N. Read, Son & Watson on the Liquor Controllers Department furnished by them in 1923.

Notice of Question.

Replies to questions numbers 1 and 3 were deferred.

(2) MR. SCAMMELL asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the Table of the House a detailed statement in each case showing (a) the cost of removing derrick or crane from the light station at Shoe Cove Point, B.B., to Puffin Island (Greenspond); (b) the cost of removing the tower from Shoe Cove Point, B.B., to Greenspond for reshipment elsewhere.

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

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.

THE HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Chairman: On Thursday afternoon when in Committee of the Whole on Supply, I was attacked by the member for Ferryland, Mr. Cashin, about his father's firm and family. He wanted to know whether I accused Cashin & Co. of falsifying invoices at the Customs, to which I replied that all the information I had was tabled and that I had nothing to add to it or take away. In other words, it was official information.

At that sitting of the House my reply apparently caused Mr. Cashin some worry, and a considerable amount of abuse was fired at me. As a result of this abuse I promised to state the facts on Monday and to lay certain information on the Table to enable hon. members and the country at large to judge the firm of Cashin & Co. and Sir Michael Cashin as to their honesty and integrity, and it is as Finance Minister and not as John C. Crosbie that I speak this afternoon.

Upon my being elected in 1924 for the Monroe Party in St. John's West and the formation of the new Government, I was requested, without wish or desire of my own, to take the position of Minister of Finance and Customs. After assuming that position I was re-elected as Finance Minister in St. John's West by acclamation. I assumed my duties, but after a few days in the said position I realized that this Department was in a chaotic condition and I hardly knew exactly what to do for the best. Yet I felt honourably bound to do what was right, as I really owed it to the great crowd of people in the West End of St. John's who elected me. After very great thought and consideration I appealed to the Government to consent to the employment of auditors for the purpose of enquiring into matters and re-arranging and adjusting the Department of Customs on a proper business-like basis. The auditors began their work on the 27th of June, 1924, and the investigation was hardly started when I was somewhat astounded one morning as Major Cashin appeared in my office and said: "Sir John, father is not well to-day; he is terribly worried." I replied, "Sorry to hear that, Peter; what is the trouble with him?" Mr. Cashin said: "Well, Sir John, the fact of the matter is this: What is really worrying father

is that in 1919 when he was Finance Minister he had some liquor come in, namely, forty cases of whiskey and three octaves of rum and he cannot remember whether he paid Mr. John Jackson for the liquor or not, but he does know he forget to pay the duty and he wanted it fixed up now." "Well, Peter," I said, "I do not know exactly what to do about it. The Auditors are here and it is against the Prohibition Law, but I will see Higgins in the House this afternoon and find out whether anything can be done about it."

In the afternoon of the same day, in company with Mr. Cashin, I consulted Mr. Higgins. His reply to me re the matter was that "it was against the Prohibition Law" and that he could not advise me otherwise. "Well," I replied, "we need the money," and I told Peter I would accept the duty. Next day, or probably a day after, appeared Mr. L. V. Cashin with the entries, which I initialled and they passed through the Custom House, paying duay of $1,120.10, after being owed to the Colony for five years. It was only then Sir Michael Cashin woke to the fact that he owed this money; and that is the true story of the forty cases of whiskey and three octaves of rum.

I have no doubt in my own mind that the employment of the Auditors in the Custom House caused him to awaken to the fact that he had wronged the Colony for five years. That is Transaction No. 1.

During the summer of 1924, I was very much worried by Mr. Peter Cashin from time to time trying to sell me White Horse Whiskey. I always replied: "Peter, don't sell any more liquor; keep out of it. The profit you will make is not worth while. Surely, after all the rum scandals and the worry liquor has caused your father, you should not worry any more about selling liquor to the Controller. Take my advice, Peter, it is not worth while." Yet in spite of this advice often given by me he persisted in trying to push or make a sale of whiskey. After about five months being continually pestered by the hon. member to buy I had to give in. He dropped into my office on or about the 3rd of November, 1924, and said: "Sir John, I do want to sell a couple of hundred cases of White Horse Whiskey." "Well, Peter, if you insist I will ring up Captain Bonia." Which I did. I informed Captain Bonia over the phone that Peter Cashin wanted to sell a couple hundred cases of whiskey, and asked him to try to take it from him if he could. He replied, "All right, sir." Turning to Peter, I said, "All right, Peter, go along to Bonia; he will take it and you can settle up with him."

I never bothered further about the whiskey or what Captain Bonia paid for it. In fact I never heard anything more about it until four months afterwards when in the Curlers' Rink the Prime Minister said to me: "You bought two hundred cases of Rye Whiskey from Cashin and Company." "No, sir," I said, "I never bought any Rye Whiskey from Cashin and Company; I bought two hundred cases of White Horse; that was the only whiskey I told Bonia to buy." "Not at all," he replied, "Mr. Mifflin told me it was Rye Whiskey." "Nonsense," said I, "Mifflin does not know Rye Whiskey from Scotch." Nevertheless, I was very much worried, I must admit, so much so that I immediately left the Rink, hired a horse and drove to Captain Bonia's house on Barnes' Road. Upon asking Bonia whether it was Rye Whiskey he had bought from Cashin and Company, he said, "Yes, sir." But he added that he did not know it until it was delivered and that when he was paying for it, he did not think it worth while raising a row over it. I replied, "This is a pretty mess you have got us into." I was

very much worried about it, and that night I consulted with Mr. Higgins, the Attorney General. He said that "if the Rye Whiskey is good, you have to keep it." "I suppose I'll have to," I said, "but if so I'll pay for it myself and destroy it over my own wharf." I said I thought it was awful to be taken in in that way by one's friends.

The next afternoon I visited the Controller's Department and met Capt. Bonia and Mr. Mifflin there. In discussing the matter of the Rye Whiskey, I asked Mr. Mifflin to let me see some of it. Two or three bottles were brought in and the corks withdrawn. I looked at the Whiskey and said: "My Heavens, that is not Rye Whiskey; it is worse even than moonshine; it's not fit for human consumption." Just about this time, Mr. Bennett, the Colonial Secretary, came in. He looked at it and expressed the opinion that it was "awful stuff." Upon being told what happened, he said "That will be all right; Sir Michael Cashin surely does not know the quality and he will take it back. And I said, "Yes, I suppose he will," I ordered Bonia to ring him up right away but he said. "No, sir, I think it is better for you to ring him up." Which I did then and there. I located him at the Southside premises. Upon explaining the matter to him over the phone, he told me to "Go to H——; we had the whiskey and he was paid for it and we could keep it.' The rest of the remarks can be left out. But even then I was of Mr. Bennett's opinion. I thought surely Sir Michael Cashin cannot know the quality of the liquor and I wrote him the following letter:—

February 13, 1925.

Dear Sirs,—On November, 1924, the Department of the Liquor Controller paid to you through Mr. L. V. Cashin the sum of $3,000.00 for whiskey at $15 per case. As you are aware, this whiskey was purchased for the purpose of sale by the Department. The very first bottle sold was returned on the ground that the liquor was unfit to drink. An examination has disclosed the fact that all the liquor was of the same quality and therefore could not be offered for sale to the public.

I am now cleaning up the affairs of the old Department and so have to request that you kindly return to me the amount of $3,000.00 and take back the liquor in question.

I have, etc.,
(Sgd.) J. C. CROSBIE,
Minister of Finance & Customs.

To Messrs. Cashin and Company,
Water Street.

And this is the reply:—

Hon. Sir John C. Crosbie, K.B.E.,
M.H.A., Minister of Finance and Customs, City.

Sir,—We are in receipt of your communication of the 13th inst., with reference to a parcel of Rye whiskey sold to Capt. Bonia of the Department of Controller on November the 5th, through the writer. Your letter was the first official information we received that the goods were not suitable. When it is convenient for you to return same we will promptly let you have a cheque for the amount.

Yours truly,
CASHIN & COMPANY,
Per (Sgd.) L. V. Cashin.

After these two letters had passed between us Sir Michael Cashin took the liquor back and returned the money to the Treasury, which fact speaks for itself..

Some time after that, in chatting with Captain Bonia, the Captain said: "Sir John, Sir Michael knew all about the quality of the Rye whiskey. One woman to whom the Department sold a bottle of it returned it and said it was not fit to drink. When this happened I sent Grant to see Sir Michael about it. Grant showed Sir Michael the whiskey but his reply to Grant was, 'You bought the whiskey,

keep it." And for the information of this House I now exhibit two bottles of the famous Rye whiskey, a part of a case taken out of the 200, and which is kept under lock and key in the Customs' safe.

(At this juncture the Minister produced the two bottles and passed them over to Mr. Hickman and others to look at its druggy contents.)

Why I kept this whiskey I don't know, but apparently I am justified this afternoon before the House by being able to produce samples of the poisonous liquor, and I can leave it to this country and members of this House to decide, after looking at this whiskey, what their opinion is of a man or firm who would sell such whiskey to his brother-man. Enough said, gentlemen, and that ends Transaction No. 2.

Now the auditors, Messrs. G. N. Read, Son and Watson had not the time to go into the Customs Department fully; they covered only two branches thoroughly, namely, the Warehouses and Temporary Permits, which the report practically shows.

On my return from England, about the last of January of this year, I had occasion to look into the Excise Accounts in connection with a certain mattter. I asked Mr. Alex. LeMessurier to turn up the Excise Account of the United Tobacco Company. I found to my surprise they owed Excise Duty on 199,000 cigarettes. Mr. LeMessurier said he thought it was paid. "Well," I said, "why is it not credited?" To which he replied that he did not know. I immediately went to Mr. H. W. LeMessurier, my Deputy Collector, and enquired about thesee cigarettes the United Tobacco Co. owed Excise Duty on. He replied that he did not know of any duty owed by them, that that was all fixed up long ago. "Well," I said, "it is not credited on the late Mr. Watts books." He repeated, "Oh, but I know it is paid all right." Whereupon I asked him for the proof by next morning. "All right," he said, "I will prove it."

Next morning I went down to Mr. Alex. LeMessurier. "Sandy," I said to him, "is it paid?" Answer, "No, sir. I cannot find any record of its being paid." I told him to call down Mr. H. W. LeMessurier. When he came down he had to admit that it was not paid. He then informed me that Mr. L. V. Cashin was the liquidator of the United Tobacco Company and that he had never made any attempt to pay, although the Company had gone into liquidation in 1922. I replied, "Write him a letter at once." And here is the letter together with his reply:—

8th February, 1926.

Sir,—Enclosed please find an account of Excise due by the United Tobacco Products Company for cigarettes manufactured by them from the 19th August to the 7th October, 1923, both dates inclusive. I am directed to request immediate payment of the same.

I am, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.)) H. W. LEMESSURIER,
Deputy Minister of Customs.

L. V. Cashin,
Liquidator United Products Co.,
St. John's, Nfld.

February 10, 1926.

H. W. LeMesurier, Esq., C.M.G.,
Assistant Collector of Customs,
City.

Dear Sir,—I am in receipt of your bill for amount due the Customs for cigarettes manufactured and sold by the United Tobacco Products Company. I may say that at a meeting of the Directors and Shareholders of this Company, of which Mr. Thomas Smythe was President and the Honourable J. R. Bennett one of the Directors, I was appointed Liquidator for this Company, with instructions to

wind up its affairs. There are quite a number of bills outstanding and I have placed same in the hands of Messrs. Wood and Kelly who will endeavour to collect these amounts. I shall forward you a cheque for the amount due the Customs as soon as we have a meeting of our shareholders when I shall lay the matter before them.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) L. V. CASHIN.

As a result of calling Mr. L. V. Cashin's attention to this matter, the sum of $2,839.94 was paid into the Customs after four years and I suppose it would not be paid now if he were not called upon to pay.

And now I come to the next transaction which occurs in the report of Messrs. G. N. Read, Son and Watson, left in the hands of the Prime Minister of that day, Mr. Warren. From this report we learn that the amount of rum sold to the Controller (who was then Mr. John T. Meaney) by the Hon. Tasker Cook amounted to $59,-322.00. When the public read this report and note that the initials of "M.P.C." appear on some of the cheques with the prefix of "Sir" noted on the reverse side of the cheque, they will have something to think over.

The Hon. the Prime Minister has tabled this report. It is not very interesting to me beyond the fact that they are official facts which cannot be disapproved or denied. Perhaps it will be possible as we go along that the Honourable Member for Ferryland, Mr. Cashin, will give me a further opportunity of proving one or two other matters which will be of interest to this country.

This House must now weigh the evidence before them, and the country will have to decide as to the honesty of Messrs. Cashin and Company and Sir Michael Cashin. I leave it entirely in their hands without any comment from me whatever.

I regret this incident but in justice to myself and the country at large, I feel I am only doing my duty and in doing that I fear no one and care less.

MR. CASHIN—I have heard funny stories about Parliamentary doings in other countries. I have heard that sometimes, especially on the continent, that duels of this sort sometimes end outside the Commons, with pistols at six to twelve paces. To begin with I feel that such a duel, if it were possible in Newfoundland, would be too one-sided for me to challenge the hon. member, in view of the fact that possibly I had more experience in that direction, secondly, we do not want to enter into a formidable puglistic contest with the hon. Minister, as he is not of my weight.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I would like to say one word, I will send up one of my youngest boys to you.

MR. CASHIN—Perhaps he would be frightened too. Now, then, Mr. Chairman, I propose to deal with the hon. Minister of Finance and Customs and I trust that he will accord me the same courtesy as was accorded him, that is, that he will smile as I smiled. To begin with the Hon. Minister opened his remarks by referring to something that occurred a short while ago in connection with invoices of coal. He has not yet told the country, nor has he made a broad statement that we did or did not deliberately falsify our invoices. When the matter was brought up in the House, and the question was answered on the first day, I drew the attention of the Minister to the fact, and I asked him why there was the difference on the duty for a certain period, he got up and told us, as can be vouched for in the records of this

House, that the only explanation he could give was that the invoice prices were different. To begin with, the only explanation he could give if he knew that the invoice prices were different, was that last year he changed the tariff himself, and evidently he forgot it. Because at that time the whole duty especially the sales tax and the duty were paid at the point of destination which is St. John's, on the cost of the goods. And under the new tariff which Sir John Crosbie brought in here last year, and now he has lowered the duties on coal and he doesn't know it. Because the sales tax is not payable on the cost of the article at the point of origination. The Hon. Minister absolutely refuses to make a charge one way or the other. He has gotten up and delivered a wonderful harangue, but he has not pointed out one criminal offence performed by either one of the Cashins. If he did or if he wanted there is a place called the Supreme Court. That is the place to make a statement of a derogatory nature against any individual Then we would see who is right or wrong. But let us get down to the rum question. If any one was heard tell of selling rum certain people would hold up their hands in horror. In 1924, as pointed out by the Minister of Finance, I did go to his office and I told him that my father had ordered rum in 1919 and had not paid the duty on it. I told him that I wanted to pay the money. After he had an interview with the agent, he accepted it. If he did not he would not be doing his duty. His duty was to accept it. It was eleven hundred dollars. That rum was imported to replace rum that had been stolen from the Custom House. That deals with that report. But what the report does not point out is this, that the Company of which the Hon. the Prime Minister is the President, or at least an important shareholder, was for years in arrears and is still in arrears according to that report. Why make a one-sided affair out of it. Is that true or not, according to the report published the other day, and various firms on Water Street are still in arrears, but we hear nothing about it. Because they don't happen to be in public life in this country. But we have got to be crucified by an incompetent administration composed of incompetent ministers of the Crown, corrupt ministers of the Crown.

HON. MR. CRAMM—Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. The hon. member has said that this Government was composed of corrupt ministers of the Crown. You will have to prove that immediately. Mr. Chairman, does the hon. member mean to connect that statement with all the members of the Government, or do you connect that statement with the heads of the various departments.

MR. CASHIN—I was referring, Mr. Chairman, to the heads of the various departments. And I was going to prove that they are both incompetent and corrupt. And if I fail to do that I am man enough to withdraw the charges that I have made. The Hon. Minister of Finance states that in November, 1924, I went to his office and I wanted to sell him some White Horse Whiskey. Now I want to tell the hon. minister that on November the third I did not go to his office, and on November of the same date, my brother went to Capt. Bonia and sold him 200 cases of whiskey of this nature. Now it may be asked how did my firm get possession of this whiskey Now when the hon. gentleman was making these statements he forgot to make mention of a certain section of that report telling the country how my firm came into possession of that whiskey. If he would go and read it again he would find that a vessel call-

the Spit Fire, cleared from this town town bound for some unknown port with liquor, for the Island Liquor Co. This vessel was out a couple of days and she got water logged off Cape Spear. Our tug towed her in, in a sinking condition. My father was out of the country at the time. He had no knowledge at the time of what happened that whiskey. We claimed the cargo of that boat for salvage, and put the whiskey in our bond sore. That was not the whiskey at all. It was other whiskey. The man that owned that liquor accordingly came out here and went to the Island Liquor Company, which was operating in this city, and if necessary I can bring that man to the Bar of this House, and he handed over the bill of lading for the goods which he claimed he had come out on the Sachem. He said "Give me the 180 cases ofwhiskey and take this bill of lading and collect the new whiskey when it arrives." I said O.K. and he went off with the 180 cases. We claimed that whiskey as salvage, in the ordinary course of business. There was nothing wrong about that. A few days after that Mr. Thomson and Mr. Huel came to me in my office and said that they would like to get their own cases of whiskey back, and if we would give him that stuff back he would give us the stuff that he was bringing out to begin with. It looked alright to me, and we gave him the good stuff back and we got this. So really it was not the Government that was done but I was done. And in the November of that year, 1924, my brother went to Capt. Bonia. He did not know the quality of that liquor anymore than any other man in this House. And I am prepared to take an oath on that.

HON THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I say that he did.

MR. CASHIN—The Minister is a prevaricator. My brother went and sold 200 cases of whiskey for $15 a case and he got his money a short while after that, two or three months. I may say that in the interim the Prime Minister was out of the country and the Minister of Justice and the President of the Upper House were in Montreal, and it was then that the Mifflin party came into control of the Liquor Department. Now, sir, the Minister of Finance does not know the whole story. We had no session for a couple of days and I availed myself of the opportunity to go to the Prime Minister in his own office and he told me that the quality was bad and he produced a bottle that he had on his desk. He told me that his authority for calling it bad was that Mr. Thomas Smythe said it was bad, and he was a good judge of liquor. I went back and in a day or two I wrote that letter to the Finance Minister. He returned the liquor three and a quarter cases short. I do not know where it went to. He gave me the liquor and he got his money. Now, sir, is there anything corrupt about that. Prior to that I rang up my father, who did not know that we were in possession of that liquor, as he was out of the country when it come into our possession. They rang him up on the Southside. I did not hear the telephone conversation, but I know it. And I want to say that Sir Michael Cashin did not know the quality any more than any man in this audience, and I defy any Minister of the Crown to say that he did. Mr. Chairman, is it any more harm to sell whiskey or rum at a good profit and in a good business way than it is to sell spars that were bought for nothing at an exorbitant price. Is there any more harm in that than in coming in here as Finance Minister and increasing the duties on various articles such as butterine and then going out and building a butterine factory himself, after finding out from the Custom

House Department the profit that the other butterine factories in this country were making. Mr. Chairman, I am going to put a name on that kind of thing. That is prostituting one's position. Now I have heard so much about this report. It has been dangling before my eyes for weeks. This famous report was to be held over for the next election. It helped to elect the present administration. Yesterday the Minister of Justice did not come into this House, and he was to table that report then. He said that he had not time to table it then. I replied that he could table it and any debate could come up to-morrow. The Prime Minister said that they had some discussion about this report, and that one gentleman who was concerned had been approached and had referred them to another. The Prime Minister was sold by bringing in this report to-day.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—What do you mean by that?

MR. CASHIN—I mean that they put one over on you. The Minister of Finance promised to bring it in, and you tabled it.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—Well you have it now.

MR. CASHIN—Yes and it has taken a long while to come, and we will be a long while waiting to be put in clink. Now the Finance Minister refers to cigarettes, to the United Tobacco Products Co., of which I was a shareholder, and as the Colonial Secretary also was (and we lost our money). Sir John Crosbie's other cigarette partner seemed particularly anxious that my brother should not pay duty, and that he should pay out all the money he had on hand, but he wouldn't do so. He asked the Customs and couldn't get hold of the information. He held the money in trust and the other day paid that amount—and I admit I was a shareholder in that Company. Cigarettes, Mr. Chairman, they should be the last thing the Minister of Finance would mention. One and a half million cigarettes sold by auction, and the auctioneer, Mr. Fitzgibbon, told to hold for a price, and the Finance Minister gets $400 for them. If the Finance Minister had put them up at public auction I would compliment him, but we find instead that Tom Smythe, the cigarette fiend, gets them for $400 when the country should have received 18 or 20 thousand dollars for them. It would seem that there is some corruption there, Mr. Chairman. It would be well now for the Hon. Minister of Finance to try to dig a little deeper—th epick is not in the oil yet. That report is not here this evening about Read, Son & Watson—the one on cattle and other commodities. Dig back a little and see if anyone tried to get cattle thru' and got caught. Dig a little farther to the war period and see if in 1917 and see if you can discover anything of this sort when Sir Michael Cashin was Prime Minister. And go back and search the stubs of the cheques of that Department and see if you can discover that a person—a then Minister of the Crown, received a cheque for approximately $30,000 or $40,000 and was made to put it back.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—I rise to a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I am going to explain this. The Hon. Gentleman is referring to me. Mr. Cashin's father was then Finance Minister and sent me a cheque for $40,000 which he said was owed to me. I said I did not think so, and that cheque was never cashed, but was returned to the Department, and Sir Michael Cashin didn't know anything about it for a week.

MR. CASHIN—I have mentioned the transaction on cigarettes, and now I say that the action of the Minister of Finance in depriving the country of $20,000 was a crime on the country —and I am told that the Government is not corrupt. I say so now, that the

very actions of the Government have proved that they are most corrupt—the most corrupt bunch since Responsible Government, and I defy any one of them to deny it. We have been told that the Squires-Coaker administration was corrupt—wonderfully corrupt. I say, Mr. Chairman, that they will have seats in Heaven in comparison with you. They will be breeding wings when the present administration will be sprouting cloven hoofs. The reply to every question we ask shows your corruption. In reply to a question asked the Prime Minister which he answers to-day, I find that there are ten or twenty men drawing money—$75.00 a month—for looking at the snow on the roads. Do you try to tell me that these men are needed to look at the road in the winter months—for they have been there some considerable time, and there is six feet of snow on the roads. In the District of St. John's West the farmers can't get over the roads, and have applied to the Government to help them—and you have men for looking over the roads and snow. You spoke about the coal invoices—is it any great crime for Cashin and Co. to fail to submit invoices for coal when the firm in which Mr. Sullivan is interested does the same thing? And the Minister says nothing about that except that he said yesterday he couldn't find them. Mr. Sullivan was the representative of these people even as I was of the American Company, but you don't find that hurled at the people by the Daily News. And Sir, referring again to liquor, it would seem that by making money out of liquor we have committed one of the deadliest sins in the calendar. Now there are people who would like to sell liquor, quietly, and would like even to drink it quietly, but think it is a sin to be discovered. And the present administration are like that. I would like to refer you back to the Fall of 1924, when the Prime Minister and the Attorney General were out of the country, and when the Finance Minister was acting Premier. The people were looking for scripts and almost besieged the Control Dept., and the Minister threw it open. The gentleman who is leader in the Upper House kicked, and the present Finance Minister made no bones about it—he said he had thrown him out, and wouldn't sit in the council with him—and wrote the Prime Minister to that effect. I told the House last year what happened—there was a feast, but it wasn't at Sterling's, it was in the Executive Council, and it took a janitor a week to clear up the feathers. Your attitude is "You scratch my back and I'll scratch yours." Mr. Chairman, there was a report tabled here the other day—I got a note of it but handed it back to the clerk. Now I would like to ask the clerk if he has here that report of G. N. Read, Son and Watson—I want it now; we will see if the Cashins are the only law-breakers in Newfoundland. I don't want to make statements about anybody in it unless I have that report here.

(Reads)

I am not making any set against the Prime Minister, but I consider the keeping of my reputation is just as important to me as that of the Prime Minister is to him—and I am going to read about the Newfoundland Wholesale Dry Goods, Ltd., of which the Prime Minister is a large shareholder.

(Reads)

Now, Mr. Chairman, if that had been about Cashin & Co., possibly I would have reason to feel a little shiver when the Finance Minister got up, but because it is a company in which the Prime Minister is interested largely there is no reference to it. I am not attacking the Prime Minister, I believe that he knew nothing about it, but he is a shareholder. I for one am not going to make any statements that I can't prove. Why the "dead-

set" is made on Cashin & Co. is because Sir Michael Cashin is opposed politically to the Finance Minister, and if he were in this House the Finance Minister would have someone who could defend himself. But he takes a cowardly advantage, although there is nothing here to give him an advantage to on which to make a criminal charge. Last year I was given a copy of that report by the courtesy of the Attorney General, and thought so little about it that I lost it—that is how much interest I had in it. But there are two or three people in the present administration who differ politically from Sir Michael Cashin, and among them the Attorney General and the Minister of Finance, and they are trying to put him out of business.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I am not losing much sleep over it.

MR. CASHIN—And he is not losing much over you. Perhaps you have heard the quotation "The evil that men do lives after them, the good is oft interred with their bones." I say now without fear of contradiction, and the Prime Minister will corroborate what I say—that the opening of St. John's East was up to the members, of which the Attorney General was one. And he was afraid to open up St. John's East because he thought Sir Michael Cashin would lick him, and he told me so himself, when he tried to arrange to have him stand for that district.

They have been trying to use all the threats they can, and perhaps the Minister of Finance has more. He made the statement that it was only because the audits were coming out that we paid up. The Minister of Finance knows as well as anyone that Sir Michael Cashin always paid his bills, and even his election expenses, and those of others, and some of these are now occupying front benches opposite. I ask again, and ask the country, if the transaction of the United Tobacco is any worse than that in which Mr. Smythe took part. I say that transaction was a vile outrage on the country, and I will leave the country to answer it. I will leave it to the people of St. John's West and of St. John's East—and you have proven that you daren't do so. I heard all before this House opened about "Getting" Cashin—it is a favourite expression with the Minister of Finance. Well there is one Cashin here now, and he stands up and tells the Minister that he isn't worried one iota. He may say I haven't worried him, but I doubt it—I dragged this report out of him, and that was something. Now I shall tell you something about liquor, and it is that the Minister of Finance mistook hair-oil for gin, and only for Sir Michael Cashin and the Minister of Justice it might have proved serious. I ask if hair-oil is much worse than that or much better. And I can well guess that that three and a half cases found a consumer somewhere, that probably all that is left is the two bottles on the table. And I have something else to tell about whiskey—this is a real washing day, and it is a pity it was not brought up on Monday, or that it wasn't a half-holiday. Last year the Bank of Montreal held some goods in a bonded warehouse owned by Cashin & Co., and there were several cases of whiskey and rum in it. Mr. Sandy LeMessurier came to me and said the Minister wanted a sample. Well the Customs had keys as well as I, and he got a bottle, which didn't belong to me, but to the Bank. Several days after he came again with another bottle, and when he came the third time I asked him what he was doing with it, and he said "Giving it to the Minister." I told him to go back and tell the Minister if he wants any more he has to go to the Bank of Montreal—I didn't want to receve a bill for shortage. It didn't belong to me, and if he had sent

LeMessurier much more I would have gone in debt. That reminds me of the report about a bonded warehouse where some people didn't worry about keys at all. Now, Mr. Chairman, I can't see that there is any sin in handling rum—any more than in handling spars or butter.

And while I am at butter—six cents a pound preference for the three butterine factories in this country. There was an increase from four and a half to six cents by the present incumbent of the Department of Finance and Customs. And then he went and built a factory himself, and there are six million pounds of butterine used in Newfoundland per year. Multiply that by six and that is a preference of three hundred and sixty thousand dollars a year, and where did it go. Into the pockets of the people who owned the butterine factories in St. John's. Divide that by three supposing that they all get the same amount. That is a hundred and twenty thousand dollars each, which is a very nice thing to start business with. And Mr. Chairman, the present Minister of Finance and Customs sells butter to the public institutions and no other butter is allowed to be brought in because they are afraid to buy it because they are afraid that they will lose their jobs. And then we are told that Coaker was autocratic. He is a mild lad compared with the present Minister of Finance and Customs. Like a new born babe in comparison. I have no brief for Coaker. I opposed him harder than did Sir John Crosbie and won, and we will win again. Why, Mr. Chairman, if you went back to the olden days when they used to send a circuit court out here from England it could not be worse. I make the statement here now and I have no fear in making it. He was my leader at one time. Mr. Bennett is the cleanest man in the administration to-day. I am an independent member in this House and I am going to tell the truth. He is not autocratic like the present incumbent of the Department of Finance and Customs. In that department down there they are coming in at one door and going out at the other. Why did you dismiss Mr. LeMessurier a couple of years ago and reinstate him? You dismissed Mr. Chafe and took him back. Last year you told us in this House that they were not being paid for the time that they were off. And now in answer to a question we find that they were paid. Mr. Chairman, we are coming to a pass down in the Custom House where it will soon be impossible to get entries put through at all. They make out a set and they are gone the next day and another man has the job. That has been going on for practically the past eighteen months. The department of Customs to-day is a disgrace and I am going to prove it. My father was down there for ten or twelve years. My father was a member of this House before you ever thought of coming in here and he will be here when you are gone. And Mr. Chairman, if the opportunity is ever afforded me the very man I would like to meet in the West End if they do not change that Redistribution Act is the present Minister of Finance and Customs. Talking of the Department of Customs. Did you not send two sneaks out to practically induce people to commit crime and arrest them. One of them carries a revolver I am informed. Imagine a revolver in the hand of an imbecile. I can prove this, because one of them came to my own premises last year and tried to influence the Captain of our boat to go out to the Dane in the harbour and get a bottle of rum. The Captain had sense enough not to do it. Then he went and got some other innocent man into trouble aboard the Herbert Green I think it was. The Hon. Minister of Finance did not tell us about the smuggling last year in

Holyrood. Why does he not tell who was involved in the smuggling in Holyrood. Are they too grand and you want to shield them? Why were they not brought before the courts? Unless there is court held down in the Custom House, which evidently it is. Court has been held down in the Custom House for the past twelve or fifteen months and then we say that Coaker was autocratic. That is what some people would call a "Merchants' Government." And the next thing that we are going to have in this Government, and the bill is here, to close up the press in order to keep the people from knowing the deeds and the misdeeds of the present administration.

I regret, Mr. Chairman, in passing that yesterday a misunderstanding took place across this House between the Minister of Justice and my friend, Mr. Godden, regarding the fishery. I do not think that the Minister of Justice meant to slur the Member for Trinity because he was an Englishman and did not know anything about the fishery. I have no brief for Mr. Godden, but I can say that Mr. Godden is doing a legitimate business and has money invested in the fisheries.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is another item in that report about the Imperial Oil that we know nothing about, and all that we can find from the Minister of Finance and Customs is that the Auditor General is trying to clean it up. The Imperial Oil is another big corporation. Why not get after the Imperial Oil instead of making a dead set on one person. I claim, Mr. Chairman, that the present Administration, including the Minister of Finance, have debauched the public morale of the country. What they cannot do they try to twist it in a personal attack on some individual not in this House. I have no brief for Squires. Is it because you are afraid of him politically? Is it because if there was an election in St. John's West to-morrow you are afraid that he would beat you two to one. That is what it looks like. Squires; Coaker.

What about the Minister of Finance in 1922 himself. In 1922 he never sat in this House, and he went down to the public treasury and got his thousand dollars from Mr. Keating or some other official down there. Is that true or is it not. You are proud of it, no doubt. You should be proud of it. It is wonderful. And then you tell me that I should come in here and hang my head with shame. Your head should bend with shame. Rum and spars. I am rum and the Minister of Finance is spars. This is the man who sold the spars to the Government at an exorbitant figure. I was not in the country at the time. The spars were already paid for so to speak. They were salvaged out of a vessel in St. Mary's Bay and the Minister of Finance had received the insurance in full and then he sold them to the Government for a thousand dollars. Then you come in here and talk about Sir Michael Cashin. The place to talk about Sir Michael Cashin is on the public platforms in this city. If you wish we will pay for them for you. We will not worry about it. I doubt if you would go on a platform. The only thing in this report is that we broke the prohibition law. If you can show me six members on both sides of this House that did not break the prohibition law I will take off my hat to you. To begin, you were one of the first to break it. Mr. Chairman, tell the Minister of Finance that in 1924 he was one of the first to break the prohibition law, and he did not tell this afternoon about the cheque that was sent up to Captain Bonia. Surely the Minister of Finance and Customs did not turn philantrophist and pass money across to Capt. Bonia without any records. You have set on some individuals opposed to you politically.

The country will be very wise to-day, sir, after hearing the Minister of Finance's address on cigarettes. The community will be amazed that the Minister of Finance brought up about the cigarettes that were brought in without paying the duty. I hope that the Daily News will see fit to print a full report about the transaction about the cigarettes between the Minister of Finance and Mr. Thomas Smyth, who according to the Prime Minister is a very good judge of liquor. I think that it would be a good thing to get him here and see if we can get any further details about the cigarette transaction. You should never think about cigarettes again. I would almost go so far as to state that the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs will come in here to-morrow and put more protection on cigarettes or take it off altogether. I thought that the climax had come when I heard the Minister of Finance speak about cigarettes. Just imagine, Mr. Chairman, yourself an ardent prohibitionist this afternoon being confronted with the situation of having two bottles of Kentucky Rye in front of you. I realize, Mr. Chairman, that you are in a different position, but suppose some individual came in here and took a photograph of you it would be a wonderful piece of election talk next election. Imagine, Mr. Chairman, from where I am now taking a photograph of you with the two bottles of Kentucky Rye and then sent a copy of it to Bay de Verde district for the next election. They will say, Mr. Chairman, that it is nearly as bad as the cigarettes.

To be serious, Mr. Chairman, last year we were confronted with the wonderful tariff that put from twelve to fifteen per cent. more duty on the taxpayers of this country. And yet we find ourselves in the position that the revenue is from one hundred and fifty to one hundred and seventy thousand dollars behind what it was 1924-25 under the old tariff. And the expenditure is six or seven hundred thousand dollars more. Then I am called to order for saying that the Minister of Finance is incompetent. To-day we are confronted with the situation that the largest department in the Government is not included in the estimates. I claim, Mr. Chairman, that it is the duty of Minister of Finance to have these accounts in the estimates. I doubt if the Minister of Finance could get up here and explain any detail of the working of the railway with the possible exception of the coastal service. Under the present administration it lost a million dollars in 1925. I was told by the Prime Minister the other day that the railway was as well run as any other department of the Government. Then if that department is run no better than any other department of the Government it does not speak much for it. The railway is running itself. It is running this country overboard. How long is it going to continue? You cannot go on borrowing for ever. We have to borrow. I realize that. Probably because of the force of circumstances I will be forced to vote for it. I will be compelled to because of the incompetence of the present administration that came in to clean up and give a square deal to all. These reports that we have here would have made wonderful political capital if the present administration could have held onto them. That report during the last election elected the present administration. That report that we told across the floors of this House was something awful, although I knew a little better. You would almost think that when I got outside the House after the House closes this afternoon that there would be a detachment of police headed by the Inspector General to take me to prison. That is what the Finance Minister would convey this afternoon. And I suppose that we will get

a full report of this row in the Morning News. Because that is all this is a row between the Minister of Finance and myself. He thought that he would get me and he got left. I have proved that he is incompetent in his position. The Minister of Finance has yet to get up here and make direct charges against me or against my firm or my father, and the reason is that he cannot, and he could not, and he knows he cannot.

I was speaking a moment ago about the Railway, and I am going to have more to say about it before I am through. I am going to make the statement now that there are men working at the railway, or rather men who are at the railway (they are not working) and drawing down salaries, and I want to ask the country if that is competency or incompetency? It is my duty owing to the point raised by Mr. Cramm to show that the Ministers of the Crown were incompetent or corrupt—I ask now is that competency or incompetency? I have proven they are corrupt—I intend now to show that they are incompetent. I ask now if you make statements you know you can't carry out, is that deceit or bravado? Or isn't it a coward who is afraid to say "No" —that is what the present administration is guilty of. I was a member of it—and got out. They found they couldn't do something they had promised to do—is that competency or incompetency? If I make an agreement outside this House, am I supposed to keep it? If I contract to ship as a fisherman with Mr. Lake, am I liable to be fired out or be paid off if I don't keep it? and that is what ought to have been done with the present administration, for they have failed. The Finance Minister is careful not to make charges, but he comes in and makes insinuations and brags about them outside. Here is the place to make your charges—man to man. Last year I was confronted in a nasty manner with a remark about some money that father had received as expenses in raising a loan. Let me say that the Finance Minister, who has a short memory, is the man who moved the Minute of Council approving of that. He now by his insinuations wants to leave a different impression. But although Cashin bought liquor, and probably broke the Prohibition Act in doing it, he didn't drink much of it—he is a man who doesn't drink much liquor, and no one knows that better than the Minister of Finance. What did he do with that liquor? He distributed it to his friends, and among them were the Minister of Finance and the Attorney General.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—You mean at his house?

MR. CASHIN—Yes.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Yes, many the drink I had there—many the drink.

MR. CASHIN—Perhaps the Minister of Finance can tell us something about the rum smuggled at Holyrood. I am departing again now from rum; I intend to speak until 6.30, so the Minister may make up his mind that he'll get no Estimates until after that.

I was talking on the Railway Commission, and said that the losses could be averted. To-morrow or the next day we shall have a loan bill. I supported one yesterday, and I congratulate Mr. Stafford and Mr. Blandford on their initiative. But I cannot congratulate the Government on their method of handling it. It was brought in here by the Colonial Secretary when it was the work of the Minister of Finance. Last year when the Imperial Delegation was here the Colonial Secretary had to do the same thing. The Finance Minister ought to be ashamed of himself. Sir Michael Cashin never had to get other people to make his speeches for him. He was not a highly educated man,

but worked up from nothing, and no silver-tongue speaker—and the people he helped politically are knifing him. Now as to the Railway—I am going to talk railway until I beat it into their heads. Mr. Sullivan is the only man there who knows anything about it, and he will agree that he doesn't know everything. I doubt if the Finance Minister would agree that he doesn't know anything about the Finance Dept., but will say he knows it all. But I will say that he knows nothing about it. It is like giving the command of a big army to a fool.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—To Major Cashin.

MR. CASHIN—I don't class the Minister as a fool. But I have been in command of a body of men, and would have liked to have the Minister of Finance among them.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—As your colonel?

MR. CASHIN—He would be a wonderful target for a machine gun. But speaking of the railway, there are 2174 employees there getting $150,000, that is at the rate of $1,800,00 per year, which is more than they are taking in. Now, Sir, I can understand people losing money, but I cannot understand them paying out more than they take in. And unfortunately the Prime Minister does not think it necessary to acquaint the people of its doings—the people who represent the shareholders in it. I was a member of the railway commission and I am still legally a member, and haven't been notified that I was fired, so that shows they are too cowardly or incompetent to have done so. Mr. Sullivan will agree with me that the four members do not know all about the transactions of the railway, in fact they know very little. Mr. Sullivan is a man who takes a special interest and he knows a great deal more than the others about it, but he will agree that he doesn't know all. I advocated the appointment of Mr. Sullivan, and he knows that there were rumours that he was to handle it. I believe that he would fit in there, and that he is the only member of the Government who would handle it. He might keep a few jobs for Placentia Bay men, and Mr. Halfyard will probably agree with that, because he used to have a few squabbles in the old days with Mr. Sullivan, but I believe he would be approachable about it. I think there are a lot of irresponsibles who can do what they like. The Prime Minister castigates me because I mentioned Mr. Morgan—I didn't say he was more or less capable than Mr. Russell, but I asserted that the management was inefficient, and I am prepared to prove it. Mr. Morgan's report is here, and we haven't got a man there who can write that report to-day.

We have not got a man there that could write it to-day. There may be one able to write it, but not with sufficient knowledge in connection with railway matters to write it. The Hon. M. S. Sullivan can corroborate my statement in that respect. Mr. Morgan is a man that had to work hard. I know, I worked with him in Western Canada. We went through strike in Western Canada and the coolest man on the job was Morgan, and that was while doing a business that included the handling of a thousand cars a day. There are not a thousand cars in this whole establishment and there were a thousand a day to handle, and Morgan was getting four thousand a year. I know what he got because I handled the pay roll; thirty nine hundred to be accurate. We pay that much out here, almost to train hands. I outlined some suggestions the other day, and I feel that they are not going to be carried out. Why? Because the suggestions come from this side of the House, from the Opposition to the Government. It would be just as well for this Government or any other Gov-

ernment that has been in power during late years except one for the Opposition to move out of the House altogether and not come here. I have heard concrete suggestions from Members on this side of the House, and they have been turned down. The Government did not accept them and I suppose they won't ever accept suggestions from this side of the House. They won't; it is not their business. Their business is to give out party work and distribute patronage, and that is what is being done to-day. Then I am flown at by the Minister of Finance and Customs, and I will fly back at him, I am not here to be flown at for a personal squabble. I regret to say that this Government has not got the interests of the country at heart. I was fooled and the country was fooled by them. They even go so low as to call members "junior" and "senior" members. The press in some instance has been depraved—making insinuations that we were robbing the Customs Department. It is regrettable to have the press controlled, so to speak, by hypocrites. To-morrow "rum" will flare all over it.

The Government says then that it has the interests of the country at heart. I say that they have not got the interests of the country at heart. They have the interests of themselves at heart, and no one knows it better than the Minister of Finance. He wants to be the big "Pooh Bah," and strut around, instead of getting down to business rather than trying to get after people. He got after the Jews and after the Gentiles. All he has done is get after people. Of course he did not get after the Prime Minister or the Nfld. Wholesale Dry Goods Company, of which the Prime Minister is a shareholder. The Minister of Finance now feels the shame of being castigated by a young man. The Honorable Minister should remember that when he became a member of Sir Edward Morris' Government he was no older than I am now, not a bit, and he was probably less competent than I am now. I heard a good story once about him at that time. Sir E. P. Morris was told that Crosbie and Coaker were in combat on the floors of the House and he said that he hoped that Crosbie killed Coaker because Crosbie would then be put down for manslaughter and Coaker would be dead. That will give an idea of the opinion held by that gentleman for the Minister of Finance.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Finance has expressed comments on liquor and on cigarettes, but never on "hair vigor." I would like to see a bottle of that hair vigor there side by side with that liquor, and we would know and the Minister of Finance would know which was the better, and would be a very good judge of quality. I suppose he has drank both frequently and could consume a very large quantity of either. Furthermore he forgot to bring up here some of the cigarettes. He could supply us all with a few and turn round to the Chairman and say "Here are the cigarettes I gave to Smythe for $400 and that I should have got $20,000 for. It would be unfortunate if he had to do that. It is unfortunate that he did not bring down here some other things. He could open the doors of the House and have some men carry in some spars and he could tell us what quality of wood they were made up of. It would be interesting to have him describe to the House the quality of the wood in these spars. He could tell us whether they were pine, birch, var, or spruce.

I would advise the Minister of Finance in all seriousness to forget getting after people and remember the old adage "People in glass houses should never throw stones." If such a thing should happen to-day as an election in St. John's West I feel sure

the Finance Minister would endeavour to proceed to White Bay instead of facing his constituents, whom he deceived, and if there was any possibility at all he would probably proceed to Labrador. There are people in St. John's West to-day eating butter on which he put on an extra cent and a half last year. There are people naked, so to speak, because he came in and put on twenty two per cent. on clothing, and then they and we are supposed to praise the capable Sir John Crosbie. I would be one of the first to praise him provided he deserved it; provided he was fair, but he is not fair, and he has not proved himself fair since he came into power. He has promised jobs to so many that there are almost enough of them to elect his opponent and there are men going round Water Street paid out of the public money, paid for doing nothing. They are paid for doing nothing on the West Coast. There are tide waiters and subcollectors. It is alright to have a subcollector where necessary, but there is one town where there are half a dozen and not enough revenue collected to pay one man's salary.

If the Finance Minister went back to St. John's West to-morrow and was asked to give an account of himself it would not be well for him. He would be asked why he gave those cigarettes belonging to the people to Smythe for $400 instead of getting $20,000 for them. Would he tell them that he went into the Custom House and made it his particular duty to get after Cashin, and after Squires and after Coaker, or that he went down to the Custom House in 1924 to clean up and got into such a mess that he does not know how to get out of it. The revenue is short $2,000,000 on account of inefficiency. The budget may show a surplus for the past twelve months, but the business of the country is short $2,000,000, and I am supposed to say that this is efficiency; I say again it is inefficiency. It is the most inefficient, incapable administration since responsible Government. I say again the most inefficient, incapable Minister of Finance since Responsible Government, and I have proved it; I don't need to prove it, because he has proved it himself; he has proved it by his bravado—his bluff that's all. We must remember that the present Minister of Finance is not a Mussolini. If we had a Mussolini, the Minister of Finance would find himself in a place where it would be very difficult to find himself. It is a pity we have not got a Musolini; it is about time we did have a Musolini; a young man of forty-three years old who has put Italy on the map, and rose from a blacksmith. He says, in one of his remarks, that he aims at co-operation for moral and physical benefit of the country—the co-operation of all classes.

You have drawn a line of battle, so to speak, between the wealthy and the poor in this country, and how, by coming in here last year and taking off the Income Tax and Profits Tax, and what else, and placed it on the shoulders of the poor producer in Newfoundland to boost up the revenue. You have drawn a line of battle between the rich and the poor which possibly might have serious developments of this kind of nonsense that is going on in this House continues. It is like a red rag to a bull. The masses of this country cannot stand it much longer. The public debt of this country is $320.00 for each man, woman and child in Newfoundland. Put that down at five per cent., that is $15.00 per year to be paid from every man, woman and child in this country. The Minister of Finance is incapable and incompetent, he ought to be proud of it, he ought to dream about cigarettes. I wonder if he had any Sweet Dream Cigarettes which I think at one time were on the market

here, and he put the people who were manufacturing these cigarettes out of business. Mr. Chairman, I would like to go further this evening, but I can't do it. I owe it to my decency not to go any further. I could talk cigarettes. It may not be the kind of cigarettes he is accustomed to smoking, and last year the poor unfortunate individual who had a factory here, and because he could not employ eight men the Government put him out of business, for what? To help him to build up a fortune for the Imperial Tobacco Co. The President or at any rate one of the great men of that Company died a short while ago, and left his wife living in a rookery in New York that is the type of individual that they are helping in this House to support and become wealthy. You talk of the moral welfare of Newfoundland and the public welfare of Newfoundland. I say that the Minister of Finance does not know the meaning of the moral or the public welfare of this country. I say that the Minister of Finance is illiterate as to the facts of the operations of this country. I say, sir, and I challenge the Finance Minister to get up here after I am through, and tell this country the financial position in which it stands at the present time, to tell this country how much he wants this year to square his budget, to tell this country he sold spars himself that cost him nothing, for a thousand dollars each. He told the country that Cashin sold rum to him, did he tell the country that he sold cigarettes that did not belong to him, and that he should have got twenty thousand dollars and he took four hundred. To tell the country that he holds forth down in the Custom House, and it would be practically just as well for us to wipe out the Supreme Court altogether. To tell this country that when he came into power a Jew firm on Water Street, which he claimed owed a hundred thousand dollars settled for $20,000. To tell this country that when he came into power he took action against Sir Edgar Bowring for Income Tax, and that he got judgment for $125,000, and the Government accepted $20,000. That would be a very interesting story. One of Jack London's novels would be a joke by comparison. Then I am castigated by Members of this Government, because I say that the present Minister of Finance or the present Government is incompetent. Did he tell this country that he went into the Custom House and fired the same men and then took them back in a few days time. Did he tell this country that he went down and instituted an inquiry, illegally so to speak, at the Custom House? Did he tell the country that the report he put on the table the other day in connection with the Treasury Board was even illegal, neither can he forget to tell the country when he came into power, and went to the Department of Finance and Customs, and discovered the firms in the butter business were making enormous profits in this country, mainly on account of the exorbitant rate of duty imposed upon that article coming in, that the present Minister of Finance came in here last year and had the impertinence and audacity to get up here in this Legislature and introduced your Budget putting an extra cent and a half on butter, and then to go out and build one himself. That would make a nice story, one that I feel the Minister of Finance will be proud of. Mr. Chairman, now that I have had the opportunity of having that photograph before me this evening, there is only one thing else I would like to say. I regret sincerely that you happen, Sir, to be put in such an awkward position, to be in the chair, confronted on your left by the incompetent Minister of Finance, and before you two bottles of whiskey. I feel sorry for you. It is my regret that

the incident should have been referred to in this manner. I am not in here telling deliberate lies, neither am I in here making deliberate charges, but I am in here to defend myself, which I have got to. The Finance Minister came in here the other day and his paper of that morning contained an article making suggestions of a degrading, low, contemptible type, written by a liar whoever he was. The man's mind where this emanated from is diseased. Why, sir, his mind is so diseased that it would be dangerous to be in the same town with him. That is what brought this row about. If we are going to have a row, I would like to have a good row, it is not going to end here. If I am charged, Mr. Chairman, with improper conduct in that Customs' Department, or Rum Shop, and I submit, sir, that the Court might as well be transferred down to the Custom House, which it evidently has been according to the goings on there during the past summer; if I am charged with any improper conduct, that is the place to settle it, and it is up to the Government to-day to institute these proceedings. But I regret that he has not put the charge in such a form as to enable me to take the necessary proceedings, neither has the Government acted manly in it. It has all been done behind closed doors. It is all like playing hide and seek. A fellow comes up and gives you a root of a dagger and drops down again. You make the other way and you get another one somewhere else. They are not manly enough to come out and fight it in the open. That is the type of man that has brought this out, and as long as I am in here, and I am in here at the request of the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice, it was none of my choosing whatever. I would not be here at all only for them, and it was my being here that caused this report to be published last year and used to try to defeat the Government that I was associated with, and after I left they were dirty enough to try and drive me out of this House altogether. I want to tell the Finance Minister now that if he wants to do that he has got a job cut out for him, and any other Member that may have that idea in the back of his head. I am going to stay here until the next General Election. If I want to go back to my own district I shall go back, and I will pay my own expenses, and not call on anyone in this House to pay them, and the present Minister of Finance cannot stop me even though he is the law.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER— Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word in reply to the member who has just sat down. It seems to have been a sort of whiskey day, and I might as well continue the debate along those lines, for a few minutes longer, although I do not want to delay the Estimates longer than is necessary, because I feel that we are making very poor progress this session, and if we don't begin soon to do some work, we will be here until the middle of June, or else we will not be able to put through the legislation that we have in contemplation. Now I do say that if there is one thing that this Government has done for the benefit of the country, since it has been in power, it is the introduction of that Liquor Control Act. I think that before this House goes out of session, I will be able to bring before this House, figures to show that during the last few years this country has been deprived by bootlegging, smuggling and theft of something like four million dollars. Surely we did right by taking things out of the hands of politicians, and removing it from the possibility of any mismanagement by any Government that might come in.

I think that when you bring political pressure to bear on the Controller

in the purchase of his goods you do not know where it will lead to, and I think that the more the Board is removed from Government control the better for the community. I do not propose to reply to Mr. Warren's criticisms about the brand of liquor, and I am not going to say that I am a good judge of liquor; but when liquor is seized by the Government it goes to the Control Department by necessity, and if the Board finds it suitable for sale they sell it instead of destroying it. When the Board came into being they found very inferior liquor there, and I should not be surprised if some inferior goods were sold when they should be destroyed, but I belivee that the Board are selling very much better goods than what they found in the department when they took charge. I quite agree with Mr. Warren that good liquor should be sold because I believe that the cause of drunkenness in this town is the consumption of bad liquor just as it was in the prohibition days. That is what we want to cut out, and I believe that we should not allow people to drink bad liquor. However, I do think that Mr. Mifflen and his associates should be given a free hand and not be interfered with, as I believe that in time they will make up for any mistakes that they might have made in the past. The very report that Mr. Warren has in front of him now, shows that every bottle that ever went into the Department since the Board took office has been accounted for, and a very large revenue turned in to the Colony without any more consumption than before. I hope to show before the closing of this session of the House that the yearly consumption of liquor, under the present law, is only two and a half bottles per year for every adult in the community, in spite of the loud talk about a bottle a day. I do not intend to debate at length the liquor law now. I simply rose to correct Mr. Warren in some things that he said. I believe that the Control Board are ready and willing to accept suggestions so far as the purchase of liquors are concerned, and I agree with Mr. Warren that we cannot give the people anything too good in the way of quality.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, just a few words arising out of the complaint made by the honourable member for Fortune Bay. A couple of years ago I was a particular advocate of the Quebec liquor system and my views on it are just as strong to-day, however much our opinions may differ. It is a great pity that there is so much insincerity about this whole liquor question. One of the unfortunate things that we have to face in all moral questions and which could be settled by the people themselves is that the greater number do not fall in the middle course. If the people would sit back and help this Liquor Control Board, and if the ordinary man would give a proper, sane opinion on the Act and give it a chance to operate, you will find, sir, that it will be a great improvement on the conditions that existed before its adoption. As has been pointed out by Mr. Warren, the idea of giving people good liquor is right and proper. In Quebec the business is conducted on a huge scale. They handle a tremendous amount of liquor that would not be purchased here because of the high prices. Of course, the primary object of control of liquor is to make revenue, but also to provide good liquor to the purchasers. And I subscribe to the idea myself that it should not be the idea of the Liquor Control Board that all they have to do is to make money out of liquor. I presume that there will be no doubt on that point. The object was that an endeavour had to be made to meet two extreme conditions and to make a measure to coincide with the aver-

age man's views, and that the matter of the control of a man's moral conduct ought not be made subservient to the making of money by that department. I think that it ought be the business of the board to see that the very best value is given for the money that is expended. As a matter of fact most liquors sell cheaper in Newfoundland than in Canada. Cheaper in St. John's here than in Quebec or Montreal, and I am instancing this point as regards to ordinary hardship that the hon. member referred to. In Canada the prices are higher. The price of the common ordinary Newfoundland man's drink, rum, is very much higher in Canada than it is here. Of course that is due to provincial and federal taxation. Mr. Chairman, I rise merely to say that the Government has no desire whatever to have it appear that the Liquor Control Board is to be nothing but a money making machine, and I think that so far as the members of the board themselves are concerned, particularly the Chairman of the Board, they have not that idea. In connection with complaints that have come in with regard to the quality he certainly appears to be desirous to meet the situation. I think that there is no harm in the discussion that has been raised by the hon. member. My point in rising is to accept the principle that I did not view the matter from a money making standpoint. But it must be remembered that in a country where the liquor is not an absolute necessity that the question of revenue is not one to be altogether forgotten. But at the same time it must not be absolutely guided by the principal of money making. It must be agreed that if a man is prepared to invest in a bottle of liquor then he ought be prepared to make up his mind that he is investing in something that is not absolutely guided by the principal of money making. It must be agreed that if a man is prepared to invest in a bottle of liquor, then he ought be prepared to make up his mind that he is investing in something that is not absolutely necessary for his family and he ought to be prepared to pay a high rate of taxation. A man has to get grub first. That is something that we do not forget. If a man is not an extremist on one side or the other then he must agree that it does not come in the same class with regard to taxation as the ordinary necessities of life. If any department is going to be run as economically as possible and as efficiently as possible, and has a good quality of liquor, I think that the ordinary man who has to provide for a family ought to get the benefit on the liquor that is sold because it is not an absolute necessity to anyone.

Now there is just another matter in connection with the penalties under this act. I merely want to say that in connection with the penalties that there may be no misunderstanding in the matter of any legislation that may come along later by those gentlemen o fthe House whose personal views may be totally opposed to ours.. Accepting the principle of liability personally of those who go and take liquor and accepting the idea that no man is perfect, and accepting the principle that every man makes a little slip, if not in one way, then in another, we ought to remember that under the present penalties of the Liquor Act the hardship in the case of every punishment unfortunately does not fall upon the individual himself. It falls upon his family and his wife and children, and unfortunately it falls upon that class of people whose condition of life is such that it makes it a severe hardship on them. I would like the House to understand that as I said before the hardship does not fall on those responsible. The position under the Act is that if a man is found guilty the third time he is

sent down for three months if he has not the two hundred dollars, and unfortunately it is the wife and little children that suffer and not the man himself. I am speaking as a result of observation of a great number of cases that if quoted to the House would appeal to it, and I say that if an amendment of this nature is introduced it is because of the reasons that I have given. It is no departing from the spirit of the act.

Now there is much said about the amount of drunkenness in St. John's. Well I am of the opinion that to-day in a town situated as we are and under the conditions under which we live there is not much to be ashamed of in connection with the matter of drunkenness. It is quite easy to make the statement that drunkenness is terrible. As I am speaking to-night if one were to make a round of the town and go into the different clubs and organizations where men congregate he will not see an evidence of drunkenness. It is very limited, and I do say, Mr. Chairman, that so far as this matter is concerned I would like the Member for Fortune to take it from me that his views and ours are identical in desiring that this Liquor Control should be removed out of political control, and that the matter of the health of the people should take the precedence to the making of money. It must, however, be remembered, as I pointed out, that it is not a necessity of life and the man who is prepared to make an investment in a bottle of liquor should be prepared to pay a high rate of taxation on it.

MR. GRIMES—As the matter of the Liquor Control Board is being dealt with this evening I would like to make a few observations on the matter and also on the remarks that have been made by the various speakers. It is only to be expected that the supporters of the Government would support the act that is brought in by it. It is their measure. They are going to make the most of it and they are sure to say that it is an improvement over the previous legislation. There were some figures presented to this House in the early part of the session that show that the supporters of the measure that all they say has not been fulfilled. The records of the police department show that last year there were 780 arrests for drunkenness, an increase of 227 over the previous year. Also there is a large increase in the number of violations of the act, and I feel sure that the figures that are given by the police department are correct, as they have not to support any party or proposition or measure, and I cannot see how in view of these figures any member of the Government can say that this present act is an improvement over the old legislation. The fact is that drunkenness is worse than it has ever been at any time. We have the statement of the Prime Minister that there are something like 40,000 bottles of hard liquor consumed in the past year. The people were not given an opportunity to express themselves as to a bottle a week, a day or a month. And it is the people who can least afford to spend it, as the report shows by the figures of the increase in drunkenness. And the greatest suffering is among the class that can least afford to spend their money at the rate of a bottle a day. We have the actual facts given by the Prime Minister that that represents 2 1-2 bottles per head per year. If that is so what is the reason for having a bottle a day? If, as I understand that is so, it shows that the larger portion of the liquor consumed is consumed by the people who can least afford it. And these people are mostly those whose work is of a casual nature, who have to make six or seven months work support them for a year, and if it was necessary to bring in legislation it

should be to lessen the quantities by them.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—The most of it is being bought by people who can afford it. Rum is bought because it is cheaper.

MR. GRIMES—You know that the better-off class of people drink very little rum. They drink whiskey, champagne and such like, while the rum is consumed by the poorer class of the community, and I say the greater part of that 460,000 bottles is consumed by the poorer classes who can't afford it. Take the men who are arrested—are they from the well to do class whose families suffer? And there is great room for improvement. If the people were not satisfied with the Prohibition Act, I believe they are not satisfied with the bottle a day act of hard liquors. Suppose the majority of the people do not want a bottle a day, and I believe that is so—the Government ought to keep their ears to the ground and see what is going on; they would not only legislate regarding fines and commitments, but would cut out the bottle a day. It may be said that if there is a decrease one way it will be counteracted by smuggling and moonshining. I suggest that we have a Board of Control of competent officials, men who have had experience in the business world and as lawmakers, and I think we might well invest them with greater powers—give them power to consult with the best people in the country with a view to devising a system whereby everybody who wanted liquor could get it only by a proper checking system. I am not going to elaborate that—the members know to what I refer, and I am sure this could be well carried out by competent men. That is a matter that the Government ought to consider before this Legislature closes, and if they don't they earn the condemnation of all right thinking men of the country. Now people have come in and said that conditions are better—as far as police records are concerned they are worse—it is time for the Government to put on its thinking cap and improve things. The Hon. Minister of Justice has referred to the fact that the Department ought not to be a money-making machine.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Not altogether so.

MR. GRIMES—That is one of the ways you can take it out from being a money making concern. You are getting $250,000 duty and $270,000 profits. There are members in the Government to-day who wanted revenue and chose this way of getting it. And I say that is a poor way to collect revenue at the expense of the families of the unfortunates who have to go to the Pen. I hope the Government will take stock of the conditions that exist, for the evils are real ones, and that they will do something before this House closes.

MR. W. BROWNE—Mr. Chairman, I think everybody will be struck with the difference in the attitudes of the hon. members from Fortune Bay and Twillingate. The hon. member from Fortune Bay has approached the subject in a proper spirit—his treatment of it has been admirable; he has given credit where credit is due, and I agree with him in his remarks as to the character of the members of the Board. I believe we could not have obtained better men, and although I have had occasion to disagree with the Chairman on matters of policy, I have great admiration for his impartiality and his integrity. No matter whether the person approaching him was rich or poor he received the same treatment, and that is to his credit, and more than could have been said heretofore. The Prime Minister has referred to it as a great improvement, and the hon. member for Fortune Bay has given us cogent facts and arguments. The hon. member for Twillingate has said there were

670 arrests, but it seems there were only 233 convictions for breaches of the Alcoholic Liquors Act. What makes this difference? Now I have heard the hon. member for Twillingate before, and I went to the trouble of getting figures, which I carried around waiting for an opportunity to use them, but waited so long that I lost them. I spend a great deal of time in the Magistrate's Court, and know what is going on, and if 500 people take advantage of the warning they get on the first offence doesn't that say something for the Act—that they have learned their lesson? Unfortunately in this country we have a class of people who must have something—if it isn't liquor it is moonshine, to give a feeling of drunkenness. These are the people who go down to the "Pen," and they would be going down anyway. My point is that there is an improvement as far as drunkenness is concerned. And further there has been a decrease in crime during the past year. Which is better—to have less drunkenness or less crime? Everyone will agree that it is far better to have the drunkenness. And don't you think the Act ought to get the credit for that? It must be remembered that before this Act liquor was considered a medicine, but it will be agreed that in nine hundred and ninety nine cases out of a thousand liquor was used as a beverage and not as a medicine at all. Then too there were stills all over this town and country, but there are not so many to-day. A Senator in Washington during a debate on Prohibition made a humorous remark on stills some while ago to the effect that the people of the United States were divided into two sections, those who still had a little, and those who had a little still. To-day the need for having stills in this country has been done away with, and they ar cnot being used because the penalty for illicit manufacture now is imprisonment without a fine. Mr. Grimes says there were cases every day of breaches of the Liquor Act but can he show that there were as great a number of convictions as cases. There were a great number of cases in which there was no conviction. I want to refer to the argument made here to-night that the best classes of people should be consulted as to a proper check system. Newfoundland I suppose is the same as other countries and the check system has been tried elsewhere. It has been tried in the Western Provinces of Canada and condemned as unworkable and the Quebec system adopted instead which is the same as that we have here, and which is almost unanimously accepted as a model system. We have been told that the best classes should be consulted as to what the poor should drink.

MR. GRIMES—When I said "best" classes I did not mean "rich."

MR. BROWNE—The poor were referred to as the people going to the Penitentiary. There is a certain class of person to whom it would make no difference whether the law allowed a bottle a day or a month or forbade it altogether. There are certain men who would get a bottle and get drunk even if they would be sent to jail for life for drunkenness. It is equally ridiculous to compel a man to buy a bottle a day or a week as to say he can't have a bottle a day. It is the same principal of intolerance. Why should we prescribe what a man should eat or drink?

Mr. Grimes has also said that the present act has been a complete failure. I must say I don't think very many will agree with him in that. Members of the House no matter what side they are on can't agree with him in that. Was the previous act which it replaced a complete success? Was it not rather a complete failure? The hon. member who has made the statement was a supporter

of the Government that knew drinking was going on in the city when they were supposed to be enforcing the Prohibition Act, and now he brings in statistics to show that under the present act there were two hundred more cases last year than there were in a year under the Prohibition Act, under the act under which it was impossible to get liquor! That is, in the year of which he speaks, there were five hundred cases in the courts and a prohibition act was in force, and other years there were six hundred. If that was not a complete failure what else was it? The attitude taken by the honourable member for Fortune is the correct and reasonable attitude. In certain things he has said I fully agree with him. There should be an improvement in the quality of the liquor sold. There should be the same courteous treatment given as in any store on Water Street. If a certain brand of jam or pickles were asked for in some store we would not be told that they don't carry it and that we will have to take what they have got. We would probably be told that they were out of stock at that time and they could supply another brand that was just as good. At the Controller's unfortunately there is only one kind of rum, it is labelled rum and that has to be accepted as rum. I think the people are entitled to know what brand they are getting.

I would like to make a suggestion in regard to the present Act, in a spirit of helpfulness. I regard the present Act as a very great improvement on the previous prohibition act, and I regard the system as pretty nearly the best medium between it and having free sale in open saloons as before the war. The suggestion I would make is to reduce the prices of wines and beers. There should be more light wines and beer consumed. As it stands now a man is not going to buy a bottle of wine for a dollar and fifty cents which can be drunk with his friends at one sitting when he can get a bottle of rum that will last very much longer. In France a bottle of wine can be had for twenty cents. Beer in Canada costs ten or fifteen cents and in England six pence. It is thirty five cents at the Controller's. The price of four bottles of beer equals the price of a bottle of rum. This is regrettable.

I may say that I am glad that the honourable member for Fortune has brought up this subject. Even if it does cause a little delay I consider the matter as important as anything else we have to consider. When a Liquor Board Report is handed in in Canada it includes the names and salaries of every official from the Chairman to the janitor, and I think that it would have been better if that had been done with this report. This report states that twenty-five or thirty thousand was paid in salaries. I think that it should be stated in detail.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, this has been a rum day. The House of Assembly is actually turned into a beer garden. For the visitors here this afternoon and especially anyone not belonging to this country, the impression made on them must be such that they are greatly edified with the proceedings of the Newfoundland Legislature. With regard to the remark made by the member for Fortune, that the expenditure of salaries in connection with the Liquor Control, should be in the Estimates, and as far as agreeing with him goes, I end there. I am not a connoisseur of liquors, and therefore I don't know much about it from the standpoint of the quality of the liquor sold.. Mr. Chairman, for the past few days we have been making a great fuss over something that is of very little importance to the people of this country, at the present time. Now Sir, I understand that the Chairman of the Liquor Control Board is most honest in his

intentions to carry out the letter of the law as far as he can, and that he is not influenced by any one, what ever his politics may be. Well then that is the right kind of man to have there. And if it is brought to his attention that the liquor that is being sold by that Department is not of the proper quality, of course he being a sensible and sane man from every point of view, what is his object in selling such stuff as described this afternoon. Don't be so ridiculous as to insult the intelligence of the man himself and those who have to listen to that kind of nonsense. The last speaker said that the hon. member for Fortune had approached the matter in the proper spirit. He criticised the management, and he said that he did not like the quality of the liquor sold by that Department. And he wanted the Government to do something so that a better quality could be put on the market. Now if he approached the matter in the right spirit, cannot the same be said re the manner Mr. Grimes approached the subject. The impression that he left on the minds of every intelligent man who heard him was such that he spoke intelligently. He stuck to facts and figures, and he spoke of conditions that actually existed. He brings before us the fact that there were 785 arrests for drunkenness and only 227 convictions. I don't know what the attitude of the court is in connection with those who are brought for trial, for conviction under this act. But I am led to believe that under the Prohibition Act the courts were not in sympathy with that act and that very few convictions were made. But now we have legalised the selling of liquor. We have legalised a man getting drunk. And then we use the law to punish them. It is deplorable that we have to legalise a scheme which is bringing such misery to thousands of people in this city and throughout this country, and throughout the civilized world. It is most unfortunate. We have heard talk about drunkenness decreasing crime. The hon. member for St. John's West would leave the impression that because there was a decrease in the amount of crime this year, it was due to the increase in drunkenness. What kind of logic and reasoning is that? We are inclined to question the saneness and soberness of the person making such a remark.

Now the question was asked "What is wrong with St. John's." When we spend one million dollars worth of poison stuff in eleven months, in this country. The outports consumed some, but it was principally consumed in St. John's. That is regarded as a fact. Now there are many people in St. John's who can't find employment, and still our way of living and spending of money is such that there is no reason why that in certain seasons of the year, we have to appeal to the Government for assistance. And the booze question is a great curse. The bottle a day has not brought about any better conditions. Some one referred to the present liquor act as being better than the Prohibition Act. But the Prohibition Act never had a chance to function. But I do not propose to further debate the liquor question at the present time.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, I have listened with very great interest since I resumed my seat in this House at 8.30, and I was so surprised that I hardly know what to say. I have listened to the hon. member for Fortune expressing his opinions in connection with the Board of Liquor Control. Now to-night we have found that there are other people selling that liquor. And that it was admitted by the present administration and proven by my friend, Mr. Warren. But we did not see a sample of that liquor tabled this afternoon. We did not see the sample of Ambassador whiskey tabled. Now we have been

most severely castigated, Mr. Chairman, by the Hon. Minister of Finance for selling rotten liquor. But what about the people that sold beef eater gin, and Ambassador Whiskey? I think I am entitled to what is commonly known as British fair play and if Kentucky Rye can be exhibited in this Chamber it would be interesting to know what the various brands of gin and whiskey, referred to by Mr. Warren, are like and who sold them to the Controller's Department. However, I do not propose to further dwell on the liquor question because I feel that we have devoted enough time and energy on it as to practically convert it into — well one would scarcely know what to call it. I think that it is the duty of every individual member of this House to try and do something here in the interests of their constituents. So far we have done nothing here, although the House has been in session eight weeks. I may be told that some members have obstructed the Government, but such is not the case. The Lgeislature was opened late, contrary to the promise of the Prime Minister last year, secondly when it did open the Government had no legislation ready to bring down and thirdly there has been no legislation of a tangible character submitted even yet. The debate on the Speech from the Throne occupied three weeks and the Governmnet were satisfied that it took that length of time because they had no business ready to put before the House. It is true they had a Besco Bill ready. That Bill was introduced and nobody has heard anything about it since. Then we had a Midwife's Bill, a Crowe Bill and a Dog Bill. These are very interesting Bills, and, no doubt, will benefit this country and the people of this country very considerably. It strikes me if any of the members of the Government realise that we are a fishing country. We have Estimates tabled here to-day and there is nothing for the encouragement of the fisheries beyond a vote for twenty thousand dollars. Did not the Monroe Government promise the people of this country that they were going to do wonderful things for the fisheries. They promised that they were going to pay a bounty on fish, reduce taxation and reduce expenditure in order to make this country a fisherman's paradise, according to the Manifesto of the Prime Minister. I may be told that I have repeated myself, but, Mr. Chairman, I will repeat myself more before this House closes. Why? Because I am entitled to repeat myself in connection with reforms, which I myself as a member fo the Monroe Party went to the country on and the Government were returned on those promised reforms, reforms which have not been carried out, none of them, and no attempt is being made to carry them out. The Prime Minister entered into a contract with the people of Newfoundland and he has failed to carry out that contract. I ask him as a business man to-night that if I had a business contract with him and I failed to carry out my end of it, would he not take the necessary steps to make me carry it out? No doubt he will now say that he was unable to carry out the contract he had with the people. Well then it is up to the Prime Minister and his administration to tell the people that you have not carried it out, that you have no intention to carry it out and that you deceived the people. It is not my intention to obstruct the business of this House, but I do propose to tell this country that the present Government have failed ignominiously to carry out their promises. Figures have been tabled in this House by the Government, proving their own incompetence and the Finance Minister is incompetent, because through their incompetency and incapacity this country is two million dollars worse

off than it was two years ago. I propose every day to bring to the attention of this House that we are voting nothing in the Estimates for the railway. The railway is being run like the Controller's Department. To-day the railway people collect passenger and freight moneys out of which they pay themselves. Now the Government intends to bring in a railway bill to legalise that kind of conduct and there are members in this House who have nothing whatever to say about it. It is the duty of this Government or any other Government to tackle that railway problem and endeavour to solve it. The railway lost a million dollars last year in its operations through incompetency, as I have already proved to this House, whereas it should have squared its accounts. Is it the intention of the Government to carry out the suggestions of the Auditor General, who, in his report to the Government, recommended that the Estimates for the railway should be submitted in a right and propre manner just as they are for any other department of the public service? What is the use of the Auditor General making recommendations, if you are not prepared to carry them out? And why not abolish this House of Assembly altogether and save money for the country. Let us take the Besco Bill and discuss it for a few minutes. It means that the Executive Government made a contract with these companies and the contract was signed for the country by the Colonial Secretary and the Attorney General and for the companies by Mr. Wolvin and Mr. Cameron. Does it mean that the Executive Government brought it before its party and was turned down on it. In other words it is a vote of want of confidence in the present administration, and this bill is evidently going to die a natural death. We will hear no more of it this year. It would make one laugh to hear His Honour the Speaker say Committee of the Whole on the Besco Resolutions and then see the Prime Minister rise in his chair and ask to have that order deferred. And this part of the drama of the political life of the country continues daily. That bill was sold so to speak by the Executive Government of Newfoundland to the two companies until the year 1923 and 24 were making big money in Newfoundland. There is nothing in connection with the contract for the benefit of Newfoundland. They came down here and attempted to put something across the Executive Government, and it is gratifying to know that there were members in the Government and not in the Executive to stop this bill. Under this bill the country was giving everything and getting nothing. As a matter of fact, I think that it was Sir Robert Bond who made a contract with these people some years ago to erect a plant for the manufacture of this ore in Newfoundland. And this country had grounds for action against these companies and this Government is going to do away with it in this bill. Why should we let this crowd get away with this? I spoke in this House the other day in connection with the coal industry of this country. They have their coal practically at tidewater and we have to pay an exorbitant price for our coal. I suggested to the Government, and I do not know whether they followed it or not, but I suggested that in view of the fact that they are gambling with the public monies that they make an endeavour to find if there is coal in commercial quantities on the West Coast. If there were coal there in commercial quantities it would mean two millions of dollars per year to the people of this country that now goes out of it for the purchase of coal, and I suggest that it would cost only somewhere from fifty to a hundred thousand dollars. As a matter of fact I was in receipt of a communication which

points out that a geologist reports that there is a hundred and forty seven millions tons of coal in the St. George's coal fields. That would be a million dollars a year for a hundred and forty seven years in wages. And multiply a hundred and forty seven by two million dollars and you will see how many millions of dollars that would not be sent out of the country. It would pay this country better if the Government were to spend some of that money they are expending on the tourist policy, which I may say in passing is demoralizing. Just imagine, Mr. Chairman, that there are between eighteen and twenty men employed on the high-roads at the rate of seventy five dollars a month. That was tabled the other day by the Prime Minister in an innocent way. The members of St. John's East and West have been approached by their constituents to get the snow shovelled to get their produce to St. John's. Well, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to contradict the hon. member for St. John's East. But I know the Goulds area. I speak of St. John's West because it adjoins my district. Yes the people are beginning to realize that some of the things that we said that we would do have not been done. I know what the Prime Minister's manifesto told the country. I have it by heart. And I think that when I am leaving political life I think that I will get it framed as a memorial of the first Government that I was associated with that did not keep its promises. But, sir, to return to the Besco I ask the Government if there is any truth in the statement that the Besco resolutions were brought before their own party and turned down by their party. The Prime Minister told us that it was the best he could do. I want to tell the Prime Minister that they have succeeded in doing better already, and will do better still; somebody is making them sit up. In speaking of the financial position of Nfld. this afternoon I said the National debt was eighty million dollars—that puts the interest at the rate of four millions a year. That divided among our population of a quarter of a million puts a burden on every man, woman and child of 320 dollars, on which every year he has to pay $15 or $16 interest. And we are going to have to borrow more but it could have been obviated—and that again proves your incompetency. The Department of Finance and Customs last year fell back approximately three quarters of a million dollar. I will prove that from the figurse of the Minister. The Customs returns for the fiscal half year ending December 31st, 1925, showing the revenue from all Departments exclusive of the Railway was $4,652,807.53 under the new and infamous tariff, introduced into the Legislature by the Minister of Finance. For the same period in 1924 under the old tariff, which is from 12 to 15 p.c. lower, the returns were $4,722,222.10—a difference in favour of the old tariff of $70,000. Now what was the expenditure for the same period? For 1925 it was $3,789,905.00, and for the same period in 1924 $3,157,007.70, showing a difference in expenditure in favour of 1924 of $600,000.00. Add to that the $70,000.00 difference.

Mr. Chairman, it has been suggested that we adjourn. I therefore move the adjournment of this 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 Minister of Marine and Fisheries gave notice that he would on to-morrow move the House into Commit-

tee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions respecting the Encouragement of Shipbuilding.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, April 29th, 1926.

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

Mr. Hickman gave notice of question.

Mr. Cashin gave notice of question.

Mr. Scammell 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 relating to the encouragement of Shipbuilding and Re-building and Bounties on Ships.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, in introducing these Resolutions I would like to make a little explanation why these Resolutions are now before the House. The honourable members of the House will remember that last year a Shipbuilding Act passed this House and at that time any boat or ship built under fifteen tons could not claim a bounty. During the last two or three years I have had numerous letters from different parts of the island and quite a number of people calling at my office to see if they could get a bounty on their boats down as low as twelve tons. Certain sections of the country demand a certain size of vessel for the prosecution of the fishery. In certain sections of the island they prosecute the fishery with vessels from thirty-five to sixty and eighty tons, as the case may be. Under last year's Act all these were entitled to a bonus if newly built or re-built. In other sections the fifteen ton boat, skiffs as they are commonly called, are used because they are suitable for the fishery there and they cannot have any larger. They have not got sixty ton vessels, not because they would not get them but because the sixty ton vessel would not suit them. We thought then that a man in such a case as that was just as much entitled to a bonus as the man with the sixty ton vessel. Therefore after proper consideration the Government has brought in these Resolutions asking that a Bill be brought in to give a bonus on all ships down to twelve tons. There are other amendments in respect of bounty being paid in cases where a ship is built and it is hard to get an inspector. In some cases these inspectors have long distances to go. Sometimes boats are built probably sixty or seventy miles in, in the bottom of the deepest bays, and it is hard for the inspectors to get there in winter time. Three trips have to be made for the three inspections that the law calls for, and this was often a great expense, and in some cases of fifteen ton vessels the expense of inspection would be more than the bonus given. Under this amendment if it is impossible to inspect during construction and upon one inspection, if certificate is granted the ship will be given half bonus. I personally think that it is right and correct that repaired vessels should in all cases be inspected at least three times. Newly built vessels in far away places cost so much for inspection that I think with a thorough inspection when finished that would do fairly well. I admit that three inspections would be much better but we want to save expense

to the Colony. Quite a lot of the money has been spent, and I think to good advantage, for this encouragement of shipbuilding, but we want expenses to be as small as possible. There are four inspectors: two of these are employed all the year round and two while vessels are in construction in different parts of the island. The travelling expenses of these call for quite a lot. Three trips for the inspection of a vessel are quite expensive if conditions are difficult and there is a long distance to go. Therefore I ask the House to consider this change so as to allow half bounty with only one inspection in special cases where there are one or two small boats a long distance from the inspectors.

MR. SCAMMELL—I have no doubt but that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has satisfied himself that he has made a sufficient explanation as regards the provisions of the Resolutions now in Committee, but personally I am not very clear after what he has said. I think on general principles that the idea underlying the Resolutions is quite alright. One or two points I think call for a few more words of explanation. Do these Resolutions apply to new and old, to re-building twelve ton fishing boats, and do they intend to cut out the three inspections?

HON. THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—The intention of cutting out the three inspections is in cases where the inspector can't get there to inspect the boat. We thought it a hardship if a man could not get a bonus if his boat was well built, and this is for these special cases enabling him to get half and have one inspection.

MR. SCAMMELL—Evidently the intention is to eliminate inspection in cases of long distances to save money by way of travelling expenses. Probably the Government are well advised and have given this matter serious consideration, but I feel a little doubt in connection with it. There may not be the same amount of need for a careful inspection for twelve ton vessels as for forty ton and so on up. I think it is very unwise to depart from the principle of inspection and it ought to be provided for. If there is not sufficient inspection there might possibly be cases where the Government might be imposed on and value would not be given for the bonus, and the trouble of the Government and the laudable intention of the legislation would be defeated. It is a laudable intention, the intention to encourage re-building. Taking the whole matter into consideration it is the only thing I can seriously congratulate the Government upon. I do seriously congratulate the Government on the stand they have taken as regards shipbuilding measures. It may be a very pertinent question as to where schooners are going to be found in five years' time to continue the prosecution of the fishery, even if these measures are good, without discussing the merits or demerits of these particular clauses. I am satisfied to take an open view of the measure and congratulate the Government upon their encouragement of shipbuilding, which is a material help to the industry. On other points, of course, I am in disagreement with the Government. As regards these Resolutions, to lose sight of some measure of inspection is wrong. Wherever possible inspection should be insisted on and brought into effect in a full degree, as otherwise, as I have said, the laudable and sound intention of the Government may be defeated. Probably this twelve ton boat business applies in a larger measure more to Placentia and the South Coast than up North, and it is only right and proper that the fishermen in these parts should be encouraged

in building and re-building as we are encouraged. If the people I have mentioned and on the West Coast find that the boats suitable to their fishing purposes are twelve and fifteen ton boats, they are just as much entitled to consideration as we are with larger fishing schooners, and therefore I think that providing for them in these Resolutions is quite right. I think it very good and quite laudable on the part of the Government. I merely wanted to be clear on a few points in connection with the Resolutions and I may say that I am not quite clear yet as to the meaning of Section 4. Do twelve and fifteen ton boats coming under this Act have to be registered to get a bounty?

HON. THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Yes, they have to be registered to get a bounty.

MR. SCAMMELL—I should like to have explained also what the clause with the amendment of "two-thirds" refers to.

HON. THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—The amendment of two-thirds. Under the Bill of last year for repairing an old ship a man got a bounty of twenty dollars. If built of a new hull and old gear he only got half bounty. It is now changed that he gets two-thirds bounty.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Mr. Chairman, I wish to state that it is not the case that schooners of under fifteen tons are used in our district, with the exception of a very few. I think they are chiefly used around Burgeo and LaPoile district. However, it is certainly not the intention, and it never was contemplated, to do away with inspection and the building of new vessels. Naturally any man building a vessel will do the best he can to get the best bounty and will do his utmost to get the inspector along to inspect his vessel. I think that the reason why Section 4 was brought in is because of those people on the South West Coast who went to work and built boats which they thought were fifteen tons in an endeavour to get the bounty, but on being measured the vessels turned out to be thirteen tons instead of fifteen tons. Under this Act now boats measured during construction since May 7th, 1925, of twelve tons or over, will be entitled to a bounty of fifteen dollars per ton.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — Mr. Chairman, as far as that last clause in Section 4 is concerned, it simply refers to vessels that were surveyed in the regular way. These vessels were built for the bounty and were expected by their owners to be fifteen tons, but actually turned out to be thirteen and fourteen tons, with the result that the men who went to the trouble of building them in the best of faith were left without getting bounties at all, although they had gone through the necessary regulations of having three surveys made during their construction and had otherwise complied wtih the law. So that in that case the builders are entitled to the full bounty for each vessel. As pointed out in the first clause of Section 4, the vessel that was only surveyed once gets only half bounty.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, it seems to me to be very peculiar the line of actions taken in connection with these Resolutions. It is the intention of the Government to encourage shipbuilding and to encourage ship repairing and to pay a bounty to a man who has enterprise enough to build a schooner, no matter of what size. The Government lays down certain rules and amongst which are rules with regard to survey, namely, that in order to entitle a man to a bounty a vessel must be surveyed three times during her course of construction. The Government now says

that the vessel must be built near where the inspector is located. Now this seems to me to be ridiculous, because if a man is enterprising enough to go in the back woods to build a vessel the Government should bear the cost of sending an inspector to make a survey of that vessel, as the expense would be very small and particularly in view of the two million dollars that they have been ready to give away on highroads. I think that this sort of thing is "straining at a knat and swallowing a camel", and is against the principle of the whole Shipbuilding Act. It does not matter where a man builds his vessel so long as it is an asset to the community. The spirit of the Act is to encourage him to build; but if the Government fails to spend a few dollars to send an inspector to see how a vessel is built or what it is composed of, the owner gets only half the bounty. I think that is wrong in principle.

MR. LAKE—Mr. Chairman, I am thoroughly in accord with the remarks of the honourable member for Fortune Bay. If there is going to be an inspection, let there be inspection from beginning to end. It may seem strange, but I do not agree with paying a bounty for re-building ships and I think the principle is wrong. I saw a statement the other day showing that we have 3,055 fishing schooners in Newfoundland with a total gross tonnage of 131,635 tons, and we only have 61 vessels built since 1910. I would like to know where we are drifting in this connection and whither tending. If you encourage the rebuliding of our vessels we will soon have a fleet of floating coffins. The bounty should be for building vessels, not for re-building them or give an extra bounty for re-building them, and then you will have a class of vessels fit to go to sea in. It may be all very well for Captain Winsor to repair a vessel for himself because, no doubt, he will repair her well; but these Resolutions are not going to encourage those who prosecute the bank fishery to do vessel repairing. Personally, I would not go to sea in the class of vessels that we see generally to-day; and you cannot patch an old garment with new cloth and make it as good as new. The Act, it is true, will help the poor man somewhat, but it would be better to offer say $15 per ton extra for building out of the new and have vessels fit to go to sea in. If you are going to have a vessel surveyed once only you are going to have a sorry mess in this country. I can quote instances of disastrous results through repaired vessels. To-day you have vessels that qualified for the bounty and that were re-built with all kinds of old spars, sails, chains and anchors. Then again it is a disgrace the way an inspector is paid. The inspector for the South Coast, residing at Burin, is paid the princely sum of $50 per month. Why a man cannot afford to give himself shoe leather for that salary, and yet that man is expected to attend to his duties properly; but a way can be found to pay people of the Highroads Commission as high as $400.00 a month.

Mr. Chairman, I want to place myself on record as being entirely opposed to paying a bounty on re-built vessels, and I would suggest instead that an extra bounty be given for newly built vessels so that those who are prominently identified with the fisheries of the country will not have to go to Nova Scotia to purchase their shipping as they are doing at the present time.

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, I wish to point out that it is not the intention of the Government to cut out inspection in any shape or form, but the Government thought it only right and proper to help those in isolated

places where, speaking from experience, inspection was difficult to be carried out and it was decided to pay those who built vessels half the bounty. Personally, I am satisfied that such people should qualify for the full bounty. Mr. Chairman, I would also like to assure honourable members of this House that as long as I have anything to do with Inspectors that inspection will be given in all cases. It is true that a few years ago we had a couple of cases in which a couple of vessels were hung up for inspection. This was in the winter season and the delay was caused by the Inspector being engaged in another part of the coast. Mr. Lake says that he does not believe in re-building vessels. I have heard it said that two sealing masters never agree and I suppose it will likely be the same in this case; but I challenge Mr. Lake that vessels have been repaired on the north side of Bonavista Bay and which were as good as any built from the keel and the proof of that is that they survived the wildest of storms on the Labrador coast and elsewhere. As to schooners being only patched and passed by Inspectors, I would simply ask Mr. Lake to put his statement in writing so that we can have an opportunity of dealing with any Inspector who does that kind of dirty work; and I think that the right and proper thing for any member of this House to do, if he knows of anything wrong going on in any department, is to notify the departmental head in writing so that the matter can be rectified. The whole country knows that it is only the past two years that the fishermen of this country have been able to live at all. Four years before that they were starving, with the result that their schooners to a large extent fell into disrepair and became practically coffins. Last year they were re-built and repaired and they will be afloat in this country when many members are dead. I know of some vessels that were built in my district that will not need to be touched again for twenty years, and I never knew of any repaired vessel, but the "Little Jap," being lost through storms. I do not think it is fair to say that vessels were being only patched. I have heard that statement made very often but on enquiry it was always found to be incorrect. The Inspector must be just as strict on old gear as on the hull and he has full power to see that equipment is alright. As regards a bonus for new vessels, I am prepared to do anything in reason for the fishermen. With regard to paying an Inspector $50 a month, I would say that if we pay an Inspector $100 a month there is an uproar about it whilst now people say on the other hand that Inspectors are not paid enough. The Inspectors appointed last year were satisfied with their salaries because they had to work only five months out of the year. I may say that the West Coast Inspectors are good men and gave every satisfaction last year. One man who had to be kept on for the entire year deserves more money and I shall guarantee that he will get more salary this year. While I am Minister of Marine and Fisheries I intend to do what is right according to my conscience and if the people who sent me here decide that I have done wrong at the end of my term of office I am prepared to get out and earn my living where I always got it.

MR. LAKE.—Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries stated that a repaired vessel will be good for another twenty years. Well, I would not like to put that vessel on the Grand Banks between the months of February and October because the difference would soon be found out.

I contend that you cannot repair a vessel and fasten her and make her as good as she was before. No repaired vessel can be good after twenty years, and if large numbers of those repaired last year were examined I think that the fastenings of many of them would be found to be bad and worn out. Personally I hope to see the fishermen getting all that is coming to them; but it would be better for this country to pay more for the building of new vessels instead of giving a bounty for repairing and re-building them.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER —Mr. Chairman, there are a few things that might be explained arising out of the remarks of the hon. member for Burin. The idea is not necessarily to give half bounty to a man because a Surveyor cannot reach him, but to assist those who had with the very best intentions built vessels which did not come up to the tonnage required by law; also there are a number of people who built vessels and who did not know about the bounty or how to get in touch with St. John's and they simply came along afterwards looking for the bounty and were disappointed and in that case our idea was to give them half the bounty. But do not confuse this matter. The law does not refer to rebuilt vessels at all. Section four applies only to new vessels. We find that after looking into the Act that if a man builds a new vessel and put old gear onto her, and if the bounty as it would be for Class A1 vessel was $30.00 a ton, he would be only entitled to $15.00, half the bounty. If a man according to this Act rebuilt a vessel under Class 1 he got $20.00 a ton although he put old gear onto it, so that the man who built a new vessel and put old gear onto it was penalized as against the man who had rebuilt the vessel and put old gear onto it. Our idea was simply to straighten that out for the benefit of the man who had a new vessel, so we give that man who has a new vessel to-day two-thirds instead of a half. If he got two-thirds of thirty dollars that would be $20.00, if he got two-thirds of twenty-four, which is the bounty on second class vessels, he would get $16.00. As it is he would only get $15.00 on rebuilt vessels. If he got two-thirds of $15.00 he would get $10.00 the same as the man who had a rebuilt vessel, so that the Act is an improvement in respect of giving the man the benefit who had a new vessel and fitted it up with old gear. That is the only alteration in the Act, except that in Clause 5 it was suggested by Captain Randell that the Governor in Council should have the power from time to time to bring in Rules and Regulations published in the Newfoundland Gazette.

MR. WARREN—I am afraid from what the Prime Minister has just said it has rather increased my fears as to the outcome of the Bill, rather than persuaded me of its benefit. I had listened to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries describing the features of this Bill, and I gathered from him that this Section 4 in which half the Bounty was to be paid to a man who built a vessel, was to be paid because the place where it was built was inaccessable to the inspector, and the expense of sending an inspector there would cost more than the Bounty, so they gave him half the Bounty. Now the Prime Minister has said that in the case where a man builds a vessel, and does not know that there is any such thing as a Bounty, although he may build it next door to a surveyor, and in the same town, is going to get half the Bounty merely because he tells the Government or the inspector, or the Minister that he did not know anything about the Bounty. This Clause is going to open the door

to all sorts of trickery. It should not be permitted. According to this Clause, if a man puts bad work into a vessel, he is going to say that he did not know anything about it. If he puts bad work into a vessel that would not bear the light of day, or the gaze of an inspector, of course, he is going to go ahead and finish it, and say that he did not know about the bounty. He will come down to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and if the excuse he makes is sufficiently plausible he will be paid half the Bounty, although the Department does not know what is in the composition of that vessel. It is a great mistake.

Anyhow it is slackening up the Law of Inspection which is contrary to the principle of this Shipbuilding Act. The people that have to use that vessel and sail in it should have a reasonable assurance that they are doing so with a certain amount of safety, and if we are going to pay a Bounty to a man for building a vessel that we do not know what it is composed of we are not only loosening up the law of inspection, but we are opening the door to the man who will come in and use all sorts of fraud to get half the Bounty. I think the Government are making a mistake in putting in this section in the Bill.

MR. HALFYARD—The remarks made by the hon. member for Fortune are practically the same as the ideas I have on these Resolutions, but he has presented them in a far more concise, acceptable and convincing manner, and I simply endorse what the hon. member for Fortune has said in connection with Clause 4. First of all we heard from the gentleman who introduced the Resolutions that the idea of the Clause was, that if it was not convenient for an inspector to get to certain sections of the country, that the man building the vessel would get half the bounty, and the inspector could stay at home because it cost something to travel. Now that is the first impression. The impression is one that would cause any intelligent man to ridicule the sense and justice of the clause. Now first of all the hon. member for Fortune has explained the other side of the question as to the effect of this Clause. The hon. member rightly said that the man that does not want inspection may go out of his way to have the ship built without inspection, and yet he would get half the Bounty. With regard to the other sections of the Resolutions, I think that all the members would be unanimous in support of them. It is no doubt quite right to give encouragement to the man that has built an absolutely new schooner and then may not put absolutely new gear into it, and after all the men who sail in those ships have to protect themselves by having proper gear in the vessels, but the man who builds the ship may not find it convenient to put all new gear into it should not be penalized. Anyway Clause 4 should be amended.

MR. DUFF—I have no intention of opposing this Bill, although I still maintain that this kind of Legislation is sectional. Last year a Bill was introduced in this House giving a Bounty for the repairing of all vessels from fifteen tons upwards. This Bill has reduced that from fifteen down to twelve. Some member probably desired to have these small boats repaired, and he had sufficient influence with the Government to have it reduced from fifteen to twelve. Why should a man who repairs a twelve ton vessel receive a Bounty, and another man with an eleven ton vessel not get a Bounty. The trap fishermen under this Bill who have no twelve ton boats are supplying the bonus for better off men. Now, Mr. Chairman, what I would suggest to the Government is this: we came to this coun-

try stating that they were going to improve the fishery. What have they done? They are just now getting around the edge, and now they are giving a bonus to schooner owners to repair vessels of twelve tons. I quite agree with what Mr. Lake has said, "you can't use repaired vessels on the Banks," although I have known local vessels used there, and now we have the state of affairs when some of our best fishermen, those who have been most successful in the fishery are selling their vessels and leaving the country, yet they come in here and build hotels. Yesterday we had a rum day, and to-day we have a salt-water day. I would like to see the Government go further. Let them go to it and encourage the fisheries, but I don't want the money spent in the way you have been doing it the past three or four years.

(Reads).

The whole thing is a big joke. You have done nothing, and this is the first act of any value that has come before us.

HON. MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES—Because of the fact that I have been a strong advocate for the past fifteen years of this very Legislation that we are now discussing, I think perhaps that I should not allow the Committee to rise without having something to say. It was back in the days of 1921 when the Shipbuilding Act was being amended, so that a Bounty might be given to the building of new ships, I had the seat on the opposite side of the House. During the course of the debate I made a strong plea for the Bounty to be given for the repair of ships. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries at that time although he agreed to the principle annunciated by me did not see his way clear to put that clause in the act that was going through at the time. I did not lose sight of the necessity of having the act amended along these lines, and on every future occasion after that, whenever I had the opportunity I advocated that some encouragement be given that where a man did not want or could not afford to build a new ship, but who had boats needing repairs, western boats I had principally in mind. Men who had boats that needed repairs and could afford it with some little assistance from the state, I advocated that assistance be given these men when large amounts were being given to encourage the building of new ships. I looked upon it at that time as discrimination, and I have heard no argument put in this House to alter my views. On the return of the present administration, one of the first things that I did was to interview the Prime Minister in connection with this matter, and I want to take this opportunity now, on behalf of the large number interested in this measure, to offer my thanks to the Prime Minister and to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, for having brought this matter to where it is this afternoon. I don't pretend to have any direct knowledge of whether a ship after being repaired is suitable to go back on the banks, as I have never been engaged in the bank fishery, but I have first hand knowledge of the class of boat that I was advocating and that I am principally interested in. I refer to the class of boat used largely by the people whom I represent in this House, western boats. Anywhere from ten to thirty-five ton boats. Some of them have been repaired as many as three times.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, I want to say that the remarks made by the hon. member for Fortune have more or less cleared up the position that I found myself in over the correct interpretation of Section 4 of this Bill. The Minister has stated that he wants to do the straight and proper thing. Now if he wants to do the

straight and proper thing, he will have no difficulty whatever. The course is plain. But you have not yet shown us very forcibly your real reason for the provisions of Section 4. You have got to meet somewhere some particular case that you will want to deal with. I can appreciate the case that will be provided for in the last section. But I cannot appreciate the necessity of the first part of Section 4, from what has been said this afternoon. Let us be clear on the matter. The right thing is to see that no man lets up on the inspection. Insist on that law at whatever cost, even if you have to appoint another inspector. This is a very important matter. I quite see the interpretation that Mr. Warren has placed on the section, that the door might easily be left open for all cases of dishonesty. So your course is plain. Insist on the inspection and you will steer clear of any corrupt practices that might otherwise arise.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say in response to Mr. Scammell, that I am very much inclined to be persuaded by his arguments, and also the arguments of the member for Fortune. This clause was simply put in at the suggestion of some member of the committee. I am a little at sea as to the particular object of this clause, and I think that the Minister himself sees that there is a certain difficulty in connection therewith.

MR. HICKMAN.—Mr. Chairman, we might as well have the views of the whole House. I didn't intend to discuss this measure, because it satisfied me as explained by Captain Winsor; that Clause 4 was for men who couldn't get an Inspector. I have seen cases of that kind. I have one in mind of a man who applied for an Inspector a little late, and couldn't get one. He built his boat and is now without any bonus. That clause covers that point. If a man is away down on the French Shore where he cannot get an Inspector readily, he cannot get the bonus although he has used the very best material. I think the clause referred to protects the man building the little schooner in out of the way places. The suggestion of the member for Placentian that the tonnage be restricted as to size in this clause is perhaps a good one. I certainly think that clause a good one, for the man who is not near enough to get a surveyor. I certainly agree with Clause 3, if a man builds a good schooner, puts in her good spars, sails, anchors, etc., there is no reason why he should have to discard it to get the bounty. The two-thirds ought to be given him.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES.—Mr. Chairman, there has been a great deal of discussion on Clause 4. I may say that I was not one of the committee that drafted it —I was at the sealfishery at the time. Since I saw it I had only one object in leaving it there, and that is the one the Leader of the Opposition spoke of. But before I would give the country or the members of this House any idea that I am slack in leaving it there, I would cut it out. I have had one or two instances that seems pretty hard and strange, and I had in my mind one or two or three cases that were discussed last year; I expected the hon. member from Trinity to bring them up now. This clause I had hoped would relieve one or two cases left undecided. I am prepared to show that I want to have as good vessels as possible go to the fishery. I have been there myself and always took pride in a good vessel as anyone does. But since most members seem to object to Clause 4 I have no purpose in enforcing it. Now, Mr. Duff said (I wonder if he is here now; I asked him to stay because what I have to

say I like to say to a man's face), that we were just trimming around the edge. Well, sir, sometimes at the sealfishery we have to trim around the edge, and that is how we got all our seals this year. If we hang around the edge we may get nearer the centre. As far as I could judge he wants a bounty on motor boats and cod traps. He says this bill is sectional, and that is because Mr. Duff has no schooners in his district. And I am sorry that the member does not see more schooners in his district than he does, for when I first went to Harbour Grace about 36 or 37 years ago with my father there was quite a fleet of vessels there, and now it is destitute. But I say as I said before that the schooner fishermen are better off than they were years ago—4 years ago. I do not blame the Government for it; we are getting better prices than we were getting four years ago. Last year we got about $5.00 for Labrador fish, and as high as $9.00 for Shore. And I want to take issue with Mr. Duff in one remark. He says that the fishermen are leaving the country; I know he refers to the men of Conception Bay, but I challenge Mr. Duff or anyone else to prove that they are leaving Bonavista Bay; in that District and others there are more men going to the fisheries than ever before; and that applies to the District of Twillingate. Last year they shipped on everything they could find, and more men went on vessels from Bonavista Bay, Trinity Bay, and as far as Green Bay than ever before. And the reason that there are not more schooners in Conception Bay is that the people got the habit of fishing on the coast—and I say that is a curse. If they get a quantity of fish they make their voyage—if there is none in that place they don't, and often have to be brought back by the Government. If a man has a schooner he can go from place to place till he finds it, and has nine times the chance of making a voyage. I hope the time will come when we shall see 100 more vessels in Conception Bay than now. And I am sure that if any proposition is brought up which will tend to get more good vessels it will be supported by me. Since I came from the sealfishery I have been beseiged by men from Conception Bay asking me about the Labrador; they do not know if they have anything left there. They ask: "What are we going to do on the Labrador?" I am glad to see that the Government is going to send a steamer down this Saturday. I ask that Clause 4 be now cut out.

MR. RANDELL.—Mr. Chairman, before that clause is cut out I would like to add a word or two. I was not here when the debate started, and perhaps missed some of the points. But I would like to bring up the question in this Committee of a ship being built in some out of the way place where a surveyor is not able to reach, where is the provision for that here? Much could happen to a surveyor even if he had started to go to the place. Well, suppose something does happen, is the builder going to sit down and discontinue operations and do nothing? So instead of cutting out Clause 4 I would suggest that you make some amendment to fit a case like that. There is certainly a possibility of a case like that. I understand there has been some discussion about ships being re-built. I am of the opinion that re-built schooner is not so good as newly-built, but it is a well known fact ships have been long to the Labrador, and the top can be re-built, because it is considered that one bottom will wear out two tops. Why should men go to the expense of building when they can save money be repairing. I know that for the

Bank fishery ships have to be stronger and perhaps re-built ships would not do there. And I think it is right to help men to re-build. I am not in accord with members who don't see the effect of extending this to re-building. I would suggest that the Minister give further consideration to Clause 4 before he cuts it out.

MR. HALFYARD.—Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has probably in mind some special cases that didn't receive the bounty because of lack of proper inspection. Of course my remarks were in general and not in particular, and I should not like to see any injustice worked. It has been suggested that we cut out Section 4 altogether—that was not my intention. Now, if, as the Minister says, he thought this could be made retroactive to meet some cases you can leave out this altogether. (Reads). Legislate for the few cases you have in mind and not for the future. I remember there is a case I was interested in, I think Robert Smith, of Trinity District, he built a new schooner and was late in sending for an inspector, consequently could not collect the bounty he should have received. You can leave out the words "that my be built and completed at any time hereafter." I should like to point out clearly that men might build first, make a poor job, and then ask for inspection, without putting in proper material. We are all interested in doing what we think best, and in doing what will encourage ship building, and in encouraging men to spend their money and time building schooners. Therefore I would like to ask the Minister whether this clause could be left in in an amended form.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman, in the course of the debate on the Address in Reply, I remember that I made two concrete suggestions to the Government. I suppose it was only to be expected that they should be turned down. The one was that there be a bounty on ships, and the other that there be a bounty on the herring industry. I understand that within the past twelve months 12 of our foreign going fleet have gone to the bottom. Besides the fact that that means 12 schooners gone down, it means that there are 12 captains and about 50 or 60 men to provide for and the question is where they are going to get other ships to take charge of. There is, as far as I can see, very little encouragement to build vessels, and foreign-going ships particularly, and it is with that in mind that I would suggest increasing the bounty for those ships. I also asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if he would get the statement of the registered ships built for the last 30 years. The reason I asked that question was that there was an idea in my mind. I felt the fishing fleet was getting very old. When these facts were given to me I went into them and I find that since 1910 461 vessels have been built and re-built, vessels under 100 tons. The total of sailing vessels in September 1926 was 3055 vessels. That means that the greater number of sailing vessels are over 15 years old at least. When a schooner gets old it becomes naturally depreciated in value. Not only that, but men are very chary in sailing these days in an old schooner. If new schooners were built it would mean more efficiency as they are safer to sail in. The people who looked to this government when they came in power for a fishery policy have been greatly disappointed, for they have touched everything else except the fishery. We are all aware that the government has practically a monopoly as regards steamers, and perhaps it is because of that they adopt this attitude. If we had less steamers I believe

the number of fishing vessels would be greater, if the men who wanted to build them could see a chance of remuneration. So we see to-day practically the bulk of the freight is carried by coastal steamers, and schooners are going out. The same applies to the exportation of fish—because Insurance people demand such rates of premiums it is almost impossible to ship in sailing vessels. I should like to get my views, which are those of the captains and seamen, considered by this House, and I think the Government would be well advised if they would encourage the building of more vessels, because at the same time they are stimulating labour. A man who has to build a vessel has to cut wood and haul it, and give work, and the vessel is a boon and asset to the community and country.

I do not believe that a man is going to build a schooner for half the Bounty if he can get the whole Bounty. I do not think that a man is going to put inferior stuff in the hull if he has to get new sails, anchors, chains, etc. It is provided that the surveyor must go there and he can satisfy himself. After all if you cannot trust a surveyor to survey a ship once how can you trust him to survey her three times.

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.

Replies to the following questions were tabled with exception to Nos. 1 and 4 which were deferred.

(1) MR. SCAMMELL asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries how much was paid Mr. Robert Chambers (who visited here last Summer in connection with the Fish Canning industry) as (a) salary or remuneration; (b) expenses; (c) who invited Mr. Chambers here and how long was he in this country.

(2) MR. GODDEN asked Hon. the Prime Minister if it is the intention of the Government to give any steam or motor boat service to Trinity Bay this year.

(3) MR. ASHBOURNE asked Hon. the Prime Minister if it is correct that the S.S. Watchful and the S.S. Sebastopol have been sold or chartered, and if so to state to whom and the prices or terms of charter as the case may be.

(4) MR. HALFYARD asked Hon. the Colonial Secretary to lay on the Table of the House a copy of the returns made by Mr. Elisha Button of New Melbourne, Trinity District, since his appointment as Relieving Officer, giving amounts and names of the individuals who have received able bodied Poor Relief.

(5) MR. HICKMAN asked Hon. the Prime Minister how many lifeboats are on the S.S. Meigle, and how many persons each boat is certified to carry.

In reference to No. 2.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The Government has not come to any decision with regard to any extra service for Trinity Bay.

MR. CASHIN—I thought that I saw the Minister of Public Works and there were some questions that were asked April 21. That is eight days ago and I think that it is time that they were answered now.

I might say that I was asking for a reply to two questions from the Minister of Public Works that were asked on April 21st. Questions No. 1 and Question No. 8 are outstanding, and I would like to have them answered this afternoon.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Speaker, I have some questions

ready for answer this afternoon. Is the time past for answering questions, Mr. Speaker? I beg to lay on the Table of the House Question No. 7 on the Order Paper of April 22 asked by Mr. Scammell. Also beg to lay on the table of the House answer to Question No. 18 order paper April 22 asked by Mr. Duff. Also answer to Question No. 8 of the Order Paper April 21 asked by Mr. Cashin,' also the answer to Question No. 7 of the order paper of April 21.

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 Respecting the Civil Service" with some amendments, in which they request the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER—It is my duty to draw the attention of the House to the fact that this is a certified money bill and the amendments involve the privileges of this House.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that we were consulted by the Upper House with regard to the amendment in connection with the phraseology. It does not affect the principle of the bill in any way. It is that very involved section in which we considered the matter of the soldiers pensions and the Upper House thought that as it went from here that the phraseology was too involved and they endeavoured to break up the section and it is sent down with the expressed desire that they do not wish it to be considered that they desire to trespass on the privileges of this House.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Speaker, I think it is immaterial what the nature of the amendment is. There are two sorts of money bills which go from this House to the Legislative Council. There is the ordinary money bill, which goes up not certified by you as Speaker and according to our rules the Upper House has no authority to make any amendments to that. Then there is another class of money bill about which the law is very much stricter. It is the money bill that is certified by you as Speaker as a money bill, and the Upper House has no power whatever to amend that, and the object of the Speaker of this House certifying the money bill is a distinct notice to the Upper House that under no circumstances will you permit any amendments to that bill. If this is the habit of passing bills under the Act and the Speaker endorses them as money billls and the Upper House amends them and pulls them apart and makes loopholes through them, I submit that it is a bad precedent and one that will not be to our benefit, and I think that if, as the Minister of Justice says, the amendments are trivial and only more or less referring to the phraseology of the section, that it would be better if this House were to insist on its rights and see that the Upper House does not infringe on the Parliament Act. I might take a different view of the amendment if it were important, and I might suggest another way out, but as the Minister of Justice says that the amendments are practically immaterial I think that it would be better for this House to insist on its rights and privileges and see that the law is carried out and refuse to accept an amendment to the money bill that has been endorsed by the Speaker.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —I think that the amendment is in that section which provides that the computation will be made of the allowance to a man that is being retired upon a percentage of his salary per year and emoluments. Apparently in the bill as it went up, in one of the sections emoluments were not allowed to be included and we now realize that it was the intention, and

while appreciating the point that has been raised by the hon. member for Fortune I think that in a bill of this nature this amendment is only to make sure that our ideas are not interfered with but rather made more certain, and I think that this is one of the cases where it ought to be justified without any injury to our privileges.

On motion, without prejudice to the rights of the House of Assembly, the said Amendments were read a first time.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —I leave the matter to the pleasure of the House as to whether the second reading takes place to-day or not. I would just like to say that the hon. members of the Upper House were desirous of making an amendment to the bill totally different to the position that we have here, but when they became aware that it was a certified money bill they made no infringement on the rights of this House. And I think that because of the nature of these amendments they ought to be accepted, and for the purpose of hearing the views of the House I move the second reading.

With unanimous consent, on motion of the Hon. Minister of Justice, the House of Assembly, without prejudice to their sole rights and privileges in respect to money bills, acquaint the Legislative Council that they accept the amendments sent down by the Legislative Council in and upon the bill sent up entitled "An Act Respecting the Civil Service", as the said amendments further the intention of the House of Assembly in that behalf. This is not to be drawn into a precedent, or to be taken to diminish or qualify in any wise the said rights and privileges of the House of Assembly.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Colonial Secretary, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions to Confirm an Agreement between the Government and the Newfoundland Hotel Facilities, Ltd.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—When the House was last in Committee on this Bill I was asked by certain of the members of the Opposition to obtain certain information in respect to the financial position of the Company and also as to the disposal of the bonds and also for any other information that I might be able to get that might be of interest to the House in connection with the contract that is now being considered. Since then I have had an opportunity of discussing the position with Mr. Rousseau, the head of the firm that is building the Hotel, and contrary to expectations, and I think the expectations of the majority of the members of this House, I was informed that the financing of the project is being entirely handled by his firm. He has not raised any money from any trust company or from any other source, and every dollar that has been spent so far on this building has been spent on the responsibility of himself and his associates, with the exception of the amount of money that he has received in connection with the preferred shares that have been sold. The amount of the preferred shares that has been sold is about $225,000, and a hundred and twenty thousand dollars of this has been sold in Newfoundland and the balance has been subscribed in the city of Quebec. I think that there is a bonus of 25 per cent. common shares on the preferred shares. Mr. Scammell was one of those of the Opposition that asked me to secure this information, and I might say that since we last sat on these Resolutions that I have had an opportunity of discussing the situ-

ation with Mr. Rousseau and he informed me that the total financing of the building of this Hotel has been done by him and his firm. He has not received any money from any trust company and the bonds that will be issued will be issued to them. They have entered into an agreement with the Montreal Trust Company to handle these bonds, and for the information of the House Mr. Rousseau kindly gave me a copy of the agreement which I will read. Mr. Rousseau assured me that the bonds would be on sale in Newfoundland and elsewhere. He said that they would not peddle them around in five hundred or thousand dollar lots but that they would put up a certain block and they would be very glad to receive tenders for them. If there are any premiums on the bonds they will accrue to the benefit of the Hotel Facilities Co. This is the agreement between the Hotel Facilities Co. and the Montreal Trust Co.

(Reads.)

That is the entire agreement, and I hope that it will be acceptable to the hon. members. I do not know of any further information that I could obtain in this respect. They will not issue any second mortgage bonds. There are five hundred thousand preference shares. We are only concerned with the bonds that we have to guarantee that have a first claim on the assets of the company.

MR. ASHBOURNE.—As far as I am concerned I do not see any reason why the Government that has control of the public money should take, say, forty-five thousand of their money and give it to the Hotel Facilities Company because that is, in effect, what it means. I think that the average rate of interest on Government bonds is about five per cent. or less and it is hard for the hon. members on this side of the House to understand why the Colony should be called upon to pay six per cent. for the next thirty-three years. We have to guarantee it, Mr. Colonial Secretary, and we want to legislate wisely. There is nothing to guarantee that we will not have to make our guarantee good under this. I would like to ask the Colonial Secretary whether or not the Government will have a director on the Hotel Facilities Company. The Government admits that the Hotel is the nucleus of the tourist traffic and perhaps that is the reason why they wish to give this encouragement to this hotel. I do not see any reason why the Government should take say $45,000 belonging to the taxpayers of this country and give it to the Hotel Facilities, Limited. I want to point out to the Government that in case they decide to go ahead and make this a Government measure and rush it through, that they should embody some clause in the Bill enabling them on the first day of May, 1936 to call in all those bonds even though the Hotel Facilities, Limited, wishes to have them unredeemed, because everybody believes that the rate of interest is higher now then it probably will be in 1936, which is ten years from now and not allow them to run for another twenty-three years and have this Colony paying six per cent. interest, because it is pretty certain that money will be down to about three and a half per cent. ten years from now. What guarantee, Mr. Chairman, is there anyway, that this hotel is going to be a success here? I would also like to find out something as regards the first charges upon the revenue of this hotel and if there will be interest charges on the preferred stock and if that interest will be the first item charged against the revenue of the hotel, after paying its running expenses? I think that should be distinctly and clearly

understood and should be embodied in the Bill.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY.—It is embodied in the Bill that the charges upon the revenue will be made after the interest and sinking fund are paid.

MR. SCAMMELL.—Mr. Chairman—I have nothing much to add to the position I assumed here last year in reference to this hotel proposition. I stated here then that it was bad enough for us to be called upon to guarantee even the sinking fund for this hotel project. I have no hesitation in saying, that, whatever the effects of this transaction may be upon members of this House representing city constituencies, as regards the wisdom or otherwise of the attitude of the Government in relation to this scheme, their conduct was received throughout the length and breadth of the country with amazment, and, if amazement characterized the receipt of this information last year, it will be characterized this year as nothing short of stark madness. I saw more enthusiasm and more energy displayed in this House by Ministers of the Crown, the past few weeks over this measure, than I have seen here for the past three sessions when legislation of much more public interest was before the House. Ministers on the other side were bobbing up and down at every trick and turn of the wheel making all sorts of suggestions, some of which were accepted and some rejected, in defence of this hotel proposition; and we, on this side of the House, have talked ourselves hoarse the past three sessions asking the Government to put into effect what they promised the people of the country and won their election on, namely, the policy of "Clean up, keep clean and a square deal to all," and to make the country easier for the common people to live in. You come in here and you pride yourselves as being a representative Government. You went to the country with a manifesto and a slogan telling the people all the wonderful things you were going to do to make this country a fit place to live in for the workingman. The Prime Minister in his manifesto told how he was going to reduce expenditure and taxation and that he and his administration were going to bring into effect a fishery policy that was going to make this country a "fishermen's paradise." Instead of carrying out any of these promises, after spending three sessions here, you have done nothing but brought in this hotel proposition, which the Prime Minister says is the nucleus of the Government's mad tourist policy, although we have nothing to show that it is not even from the Minister who has sponsered these resolutions. We have invariably found it useless to call a division of the House on any Bill because we know that the Government are at all times prepared to vote en bloc. Now the outport members in the Government ranks know in their heart of hearts that this hotel proposition is an absolute outrage. Go up and down Water Street to-day and nine men out of every ten will tell you, Mr. Chairman, that they have no expectation or hope that this hotel will be anything but a white elephant. There is no wonderful evidence that people are putting their money in the hotel, as the Colonial Secretary has stated that there was only $225,000 of the stock sold and that only $100,000 have been paid on it to-date.

I venture to say that the promoters have practically come to the end of their tether with regard to the selling of stock. We are coming here and guaranteeing six per cent. interest on this bond issue for the hotel, whereas the most you give on our best loans is five per cent. I am not go-

ing, however, to lose any more energy in giving expression to my opposition to this proposition, because the energy, the system and the spirit displayed by the Ministers of the Government show distinctly the attitude they propose to adopt. From a political point of view, it is the best thing that could happen us on this side of the House, and I warn you that within the next two years you will find the trail of this whole story throughout the length and breadth of this country, and when the time comes round to give an account of your stewardship you will find your visionary tourist policy and your subsidizing of this hotel to the extent of $45,000 per annum, which will have to be paid by the fisherman, the mechanic, the miner, the logger, and the laborer, who are at their wits' end to try and make two ends meet, will be the worst thing you have done yet. I consider it an outrage and a scandal and it is a brazen insult to the people who sent you here, and as long as I am permitted to control a platform in this country I intend to broadcast your actions to the limit as long as I have breath to draw.

MR. RANDELL—Mr. Chairman, I want to make myself clear with regard to this matter. I do not profess to be anything of a financier, but this I do know that when this Government goes to the extent of guaranteeing six per cent. interest on $450,000 they are taking upon themselves the responsigility that I for one am not going to endorse. I would like to ask the Colonial Secretary how much money has been spent on that hotel up to the present? I have heard that already there has been an expenditure of $900,000. It is capitalized at one million dollars, and, apparently, somebody has gone ahead and put up the money. If the building is there now by money subscribed last year, why should this Government concern itself and go to the expense of guaranteeing $450,000 and why not issue the bonds at five per cent. and charge the Company six and make $45,000 instead of risking the loss of that amount. Mr. Chairman, I think that this country has guaranteed enough on such kind of schemes before and I repeat that this Government should not concern itself now on that building at all in respect to guarantees. If somebody has gone ahead and put up the money and they have the building, why should we bother our heads about it?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY – We are guaranteeing the interest now.

MR. RANDELL—6%? And why isn't it 5%? I haven't been here through the debate and perhaps haven't heard all the explanations. If they have gone on and built, I don't see why we should worry ourselves about them. This country is already into guarantees to the extent of millions, and I do not think we ought to go any deeper. I am against it.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, before that section is passed, I want to put myself again on record as being opposed to this measure. We are giving this corporation a present of $45,000. They have a capital of 1 million dollars, $400,000 of which are 7% preference shares which sell at par, $600,000 are common shares. If they give away 25% of the common stock as a bonus with the preferred share that still leaves $450,000 par value of shares in their Treasury, which belongs to the promotors. Even if the hotel turns out to be a good proposition, there is still a heavy drain for they have to pay interest at 6%. The Government thinks it will be a paying proposition. The Prime Minister tells us he is going to put his money in the Common Stock. If they are sure the thing is going to pay what right have they to ask us

to guarantee any interest. They themselves don't think it is right—there is something wrong somewhere. I object to guaranteeing this interest because last year we were told that the interest was not required, and twelve months later they come in and say it has to be done. And at 6%—it is outrageous—it would be different if the hotel were partly constructed and there were a difficulty in raising the money. In my opinion if you had given 5% you would have been treating them liberally. I thought last year that this would not be raised without guaranteeing the interest. I said that last year and the Prime Minister said the Bonds had been provided for. I was surprised at that, for I knew the stock of the Mount Royal Hotel could hardly be sold at 8%. I knew last year that the Hotel would be asking us to help them before this was finished. But the Government is going too far by giving 6% guarantee. No one knows when we will have to meet our obligation, and it is not necessary because they ought to have put it in at 5%, and not give this Company a present of $45,000. They say that the $45,000 is going into the Hotel, but no one can say whether it will or not.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman, we are told that there are certain members of this House who are prepared to put their money in this Company; well, sir, I say they are the people to do what they wish with their money, but I am not convinced that it is proper to put the money of the country in it. 6% is a higher rate than should be paid on Government bonds. 6% per year is a big amount for the hotel to pay, and it would be much better off if they had to pay only 5%. I do not know of a business house who seeks to increase its burdens when they can be made lighter. The position is that within ten years the hotel will have to pay $135,000 towards the sinking fund, and also interest during that time at 6 p.c., and these two items are going to be a heavy drain on them. We were told by the Colonial Secretary a few moments ago that the interest would be a first claim—I see nothing in perusing this Act that gives us to understand that. The Section that we have under consideration is the one that I suggested should be amended and have a clause introduced so that the Government should realize the best possible bargain. And because I believe that we are here to look after the Colony's interests I think this should not go through as it is at present.

MR. HALFYARD—Before proceeding any further with the Resolutions now before the House I would like to make a few further remarks. I do so in all seriousness considering that, as has been repeatedly said, we are sent here to do the best we can in the interests of ourselves and the country, and while self preservation is the first law of nature in this case we are doing something to preserve ourselves as well as every inhabitant of Newfoundland; that is my idea of conserving the interests of the country from a financial standpoint.

Mr. Chairman, we are sadly disappointed that the Government has to introduce resolutions of this nature, and we fail to see the necessity of having these Resolutions with regard to the interest of six per cent. on bond interest for the Newfoundland Hotel Facilities Company, and before I go any further I would like to ask the Colonial Secretary whether he, or any Member of the Government, has during recess, interviewed the Company or any Members of this Company, to ascertain whether they would have any objections to making the interest on these bonds five per cent. instead of six.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY — The Agreement is already

signed for six per cent.

MR. HALFYARD—The agreement is signed, but that agreement is of no account until by this Bill it has been ratified by the House and the Trust Deed is automatically effective and is drawn up accordingly. Of course I am not a lawyer, but do I understand from that reply that the agreement is signed and that we are committed to the agreement between the Government and the Hotel people, and cannot make any alteration in it; that is what that reply seems to me, but I don't see why, when as a little while ago an agreement between Besco Companies and the Govrenment was brought before the House and it did not follow that the House adopted it, why, we can't take the same attitude with this agreement.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—These people have gone ahead on the understanding that the guarantee would be this. It would hardly be expected that they should now be asked to change the interest guarantee on the bonds.

MR. HALFYARD—That does not make a cent's worth of difference. It makes no difference whether 1 p.c. or 6 p.c. is guaranteed. It makes no material difference to the success of the project whether five or six per cent is guaranteed. Why in the world should we assume liabilities, probable liabilities. It is unnecessary and uncalled for, and it means giving a present to these people practically,—giving a present of forty five thousand dollars.

It is said by that that we are supposed to know that Newfoundland bonds at six per cent. can be sold at a hundred and ten. If you can do that there is forty five thousand dollars that these people will realize. Why should we as legislators undertake such a policy. And if the Government has not taken the latter up with the Hotel Facilities I think that that they should before these resolutions are allowed to pass this House. Who do we represent? Do we represent the Hotel Facilities Company or the people of this country? This is just as important as the Besco resolutions because it is a matter of principal. It is small in proportion, but we can see it no matter how small our imperfections. A child could understand them when once they were explained to it. Why in the world are we passing legislation that is giving these people forty five thousand dollars assuming that we will have to find the principal and interest. $45000.00 every year for thirty three and one third years. There was nothing at stake. We have the hotel there. It was put up and all they wanted was to get their money back. You could pay them back five per cent. as at six per cent. But still the hon. introducer of the resolutions says that the agreement is made at six per cent. and then this House has to pass these resolutions. The Government is committeed to these resolutions. Talk about reducing taxation. It is all very well to say that the hotel will pay. Who knows that. This whole transaction will be fully explained to the people of this country and the attitude that the Government took when these resolutions were placed before the House of Assembly. We are giving these people a present of forty five thousand dollars. What kind of a legislature is this if we cannot find the money to extend the sewerage of this town down to the battery and give the producers of the country who live in conditions that would be an eyesore to the tourists that you are expecting to come here. You guarantee a hotel for four hundred and fifty thousand dollars with forty five thousand dollars a year interest and you cannot clean up the city and make it a decent place for those people who live here and move and have their being. You were going to reduce expenditure. Take the estimates

that have been submitted. Increase in expenditure and who has to pay it? The labourer and the fishermen and the mechanic have to pay for it. All the natural wealth of this country and any other country must come from the raw material, and this is sent away in the raw state, and this makes for a social system and a system of Government, and this is what keeps the doors of this legislature open. But expenditure is increasing from year to year. On top of that those who are better able to pay taxation are having it lightened for them. And the man in whom there seemed so much interest at the time of the elections has to pay for the extra expenditure, through the Custom House for every thing that he requires. I will take advantage of this occasion, Mr. Chairman, to refer to the income tax that was repealed last year. That was repealed although the Government increased the taxation on an average of about fifteen per cent. Here is the schedule of the income tax. I take this opportunity to speak of this now, because I did not know that the Government realised from what source the income tax was derived, and that is the reason why I asked that question and found out what people in this country were paying the income tax, and it shows that you are taking the burden of taxation off those who can well afford to pay. There is no tax so just as the income tax if it was regulated properly; but not by drawing the most money out of the poor fellow who can scarcely get food for his family. The income tax may be looked upon as obnoxious here, but it is just as obnoxious in England, Canada and the States, where they get millions of dollars yearly from this source. In the Resolutions now before the House we are piling up unnecessary expenditure to feather the nests of Company promoters who have used their brains and their initiative in capitalizing it, and now they are looking to the Legislature to pay for it, if we are fools enough and unworthy of trust reposed in us by the people of the country. It is not good enough for the Government to say that they are going to help out this project financially, at the expense of the taxpayers, for the reasons that the other fellows did likewise. We are told that this matter is the business of the Opposition as well as the Government to deal with, and that is the reason why we are exercising ourselves over it in the way we are. The whole system of which this hotel is a part is iniquitous, considering the conditions of the country in which we live at the present time. What is the good of earning money in this country now. We got into a system of spending money that seemingly we cannot live unless we get money to squander in certain directions, such as the movies, and what were luxuries at one time are now apparent necessities. Our modern way of living and our modern civilization is making wrecks of thousands of our people as they feel bound to ape the doings of their neighbours, as compared with the old system when people were happy and contented. The Government is not doing anything to counteract this, but they are unjustly discriminating so far as the affairs of Trinity district are concerned. Is it right in connection with your tourist and highroads policy when dealing with expenditures of money for all the different districts to penalize one district? I will show you, Mr. Chairman, how that was done last year. The Highroads Commission were appointed by this House and they were to get their orders from the Executive Government as to where money should be spent and as to where roads should be built. Then they were given carte blanche with credit at the Bank of Montreal and they went on to spend a million dollars and here is a copy

of a Minute-of-Council as referred to in the Auditor General's report on the Highroads:

(Reads Minute)

We were led to believe that wherever the Highroads Commission built roads that the main line grants would not be given to them. They were not touched in any other district; but what happened in Trinity district? A road from Clarenville to Shoal Harbour, a distance of three-quarters of a mile, was undertaken to be built. The Commission built a half mile of it at a cost of $7,801.50, but they spent only $3,801.50 out of their million and they took $4,000 out of the main road grant for Trinity district—$4,000 that could be spent on roads and bridges in that district which are unfit for cattle to pass over. Do you call that honest? Do you call it a square deal? Is it not iniquitous that any one district should be penalized in that fashion? Yet that is the way the people of Trinity district were treated, even though they are called upon to pay their proportionate share of the interest on the money raised for the Highroads policy. A deputation waited on the Government and made an appeal to get grants to fix the bridges in Trinity District. The four thousand dollars that they took from Trinity District would not have made such a wonderful difference when subtracted from one million. And still I suppose that some member of the Government will say now that he knows nothing about it. Well it was done anyhow and done by Order in Council. The Governor-in-Council demanded that money from the Minister of Public Works and gave it to the High Roads Commission. Did you do the same down in Bonavista Bay. You spent $44,287.44 on fifteen and a half miles of road. I don't suppose that sum of money was taken from the Bonavista Bay grant. But if there was a bridge or a wharf falling down, in that district, when they understand the treatment that is being meted out to them having regard to what other sections are getting. Now I am not looking for this for myself. And the idea that I ever did anything for Trinity District to the detriment of any other section of the country is wrong. Do you think that the people of Trinity District voted for me, because I did anything for them at the expense of any other section of this country. Not on your life. They did not vote for me because I was instrumental in spending a large sum of money in the district. Because I did not spend a large sum of money on Trinity District. But strange to say they supported me. Of course I had two colleagues with me. The next time I will not. I don't know what they will say to me then. Anyway they supported me for my own sake or for the sake of my colleagues. I remember that we were up against conditions before. A large amount of money had to be spent to keep people alive, and since the money had to be spent certain works were done in the district. You have streets in St. John's that would never have been built only for the poverty of the country. Do these conditions obtain at the present time. If they do spend some money to keep the people alive, but for goodness sake curtail and cut out expenditure and try to reduce taxation, so that the ordinary producer will be able to live in this country and carry on the avocations that he is depending on for a living. I have spoken of transaction number one in connection with the Government dealings with Trinity District; now what have this Government done with regard to the steamship transportation in Trinity District. They took the Malakoff of Trinity District and they put her on Bonavista District, to reduce expenditure and to lessen taxation. It was to please and satisfy the demands made by certain sections of the district when the members who

are in this House now were contesting the district. The members that occupy seats in this legislature at the present time, and who represent Bonavista District were elected on that policy of putting a boat back on Bonavista Bay, irrespective of what it cost more or less. Now is there anything good or honest about that. As I said before, the people of Trinity District are the most reasonable people in any section of the country, otherwise they would not have elected me as often as they did.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—They have got a good faithful representative.

MR. HALFYARD—I am faithful enough in respect that I did nothing for Trinity district at the expense of any other section of the country. And now sir, I am trying to point out to you, if I have not done forcibly enough before, that this district has been discriminated against, and I want you as a well-known and trustworthy Minister of the Crown to see that if you undertake the expenditure as forecasted in this bill, that you see that something is done for Trinity District next year. I rose, Mr. Chairman, to draw the attention of the Government to a reply given by the Prime Minister this afternoon, to a question I had put to him. The reply was that the Government had not considered it, which means that there is going to be no service again this year.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Pardon me, Mr. Chairman, the reply was that the Government had not considered it yet. There is lots of time.

MR. HALFYARD—Lots of time. Is it lots of time for Bonavista district? You have made out your schedule. Trinity Service is under the Railway Commission, and you have not given it a moment's concern. You are going to consider it. Do you think that it is enough, twelve months before a general election, to spend some money down there on the high roads policy? And what you have done for Trinity District in the way of a fishing policy has only insulted the intelligence of the people. It has been a pure waste of money. Your own supporters in that district, business men are writing to me and complaining of your policy. They are asking me why in the world are you sending inspectors down there wasting their money. They tell me that there are turbot inspectors sent down there who don't know a turbot from a flatfish telling the people how to pickle turbot —and they didn't know pickle from Kentucky Rye. I know as much about codfish as some people who think I spent my life in a schoolroom.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—If that refers to me I say it's a downright lie.

MR. HALFYARD—Is that Parliamentary, Mr. Chairman?

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I don't care if it isn't. Your statement isn't either.

MR. HALFYARD—I have been told that the opinion the people got of the qualifications of the people sent as inspectors is that they didn't know a flatfish from a turbot. And it is not because the Minister of Marine and Fisheries says so.

MR. CHAIRMAN—Better keep to the subject, gentlemen; you are wandering a little.

MR. HALFYARD—I will take the opportunity to continue my remarks on the inspectors later on. Mr. Chairman, thanks for drawing my attention to the fact that I was wandering. It is only because once in a while I get roused so that I can speak with warmth, and to tell the truth I did use a little heat. To go back to the matter which is one of great importance. Are we as a Legislature satisfied to pass these resolutions without making an attempt to see if the Hotel Facilities are agreeable to

having the rate made 5 p.c., and save the country a sum of $150,000. Isn't it worth the consideration of the Government to have the committee rise and see these people and see if this can be one? Will they do this, or will they pass this bit of legislation, which is unnecessary and unfair to the people of this country whom they represent? They propose to give this Company a present of $45,000. There it is, Mr. Chairman—it is for this House to consider whteher it should do this or not. I leave it for the House to decide.

MR. GRIMES — Mr. Chairman, speaking to the measure before the House, I want to say that I am in opposition to the guaranteeing of either capital or interest. Not because I have anything against the hotel being established, but because I think they should have the initiative to come here and put their own money in it, as other businesses in this country have to do. I would like to say that I hope they will succeed, and never be in the position where they will have to ask the Government to pay up. I oppose it because I think it is giving special privileges to some that others don't get. A man who goes into the fishery and who has three or four hundred dollars in his bank or his pocket has to do so without any aid from the Government, and I ask whether the fishery is not more important than a hotel? He is supposted to start business and carry it on upon his own initiative and enterprise. If a man goes into farming he is expected to do so without looking to the government, and I think that if there is any industry in this country that needs encouragement it is agriculture. And I think the Minister of Agriculture and Mines will agree with me that if we are going to guarantee investments in any enterprise it ought to be agriculture, one that will be creative and will produce for years and years to come. If we are to support any thing in that way it ought to be fishing and agriculture. The more widespread wealth is the better off a country will be, but when the wealth is centred in the hands of a few, all we can say is "good-bye." And we ought to do our best to have our wealth evenly distributed. A man starts a business in the outports and what consideration does he get? I have several in mind —the Furniture Factory in Bonavista Bay and the West Coast—Pelley's Brickyard in Bonavista Bay—do they get any guarantee. No, they are satisfied to start and fail or succeed on their own efforts.

A man who has $50,000 can afford to put $10,000 in the hotel and if he loses he still has $40,000. But a man who invests everything risks all—the fisherman or the farmer—the small man; if he loses he is wiped out, later to start again when he has recovered. I say the principle of guarantees is wrong, whether it be interest or capital, unless it is in something that is going to produce. Why should we guarantee this capital and interest. Go to the men who are concerned and you will find them enthused over the project. If you talk to the men concerned in this project about its possibilities they are most enthusiastic over it. We are told that Mr. Quick is a well reputed and successful manager who is able to bring people in as guests that will ensure the success of the enterprise. Why then guarantee the interest and capital if he has sufficient acquaintance with people of large means and sufficient influence with them to get them to spend six or seven months in a year in the hotel.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—For the information of the honourable member I want to explain that the guarantee on capital has been made already.

MR. GRIMES—The principal is a bad one and that is what I am

against. The Prime Minister himself agreed with that a few years ago. It was only five or six years ago that down in the Board of Trade rooms he denounced the past Government in connection with the guarantee of portion of the capital of the Newfoundland Power and Paper Co. He is a great political back slider and seems to be sliding back all the time in connection with the high ideals he fought for down in the Board of Trade Rooms at that time. To a certain extent, too, he was right then, but why does he not take the same position still? What is the reason for his change of position? An acquaintance of mine in speaking of this the other day explained that to me by saying that Mr. Monroe who spoke at the Board of Trade Rooms the other year is dead, and Mr. Monroe who is to-day Prime Minister of the country is a different man altogether. Read the speeches made at the Board of Trade Rooms as to the position of private enterprises towards the Government and read the accounts in the newspapers of his speeches in the House of Assembly showing his attitude towards private enterprises, and it will be seen that the Prime Minister is now a different man altogether. There is always hope for repentance and I hope before the session is over the Premier will see the error of his ways and get back to his former views again. Another question in connection with this enterprise that does not look good is that after guaranteeing last year a sinking fund of $13,500 a year for thirty three and a third years and giving these men that advantage, instead of spending their money in the country when erecting the hotel, they went outside of the country to get fittings and other things. Surely, if we are going to be a part of this enterprise, the men in the Government should say that the industries of the country should supply the things for that hotel. The furnishings for that hotel should have been got in this country; they could have been got. There are a lot of men in this country looking for employment the year round. The Government had a chance to help out, even if only in a small way, in connection with the articles required in connection with the construction and equipment of that hotel down there. Were the men employed down there in connection with electoral fittings Newfoundlanders? Did we not have any electricians in the country who could have gone down there to put in the electrical fittings, and still the Government of this country, after guaranteeing the sinking fund in connection with the Newfoundland Hotel Facilities, allowed men from outside to be brought in, instead of having money kept in the country. Not only with electrical fittings, the same thing applies to plumbing. Have we not got experienced plumbers in the country who could have been employed down there in place of the outsiders.

MR. MOORE—They got their chance and would not take it. Prices were too high.

MR. GRIMES—It is not always a question of high prices that should rule these things. Men out of work ought to be considered, and it ought be fully considered whether, taking into consideration the difference in price possibly a few thousand dollars, and the quality of the work, we are going to bring in men or give employment.

MR. MOORE—There are some plumbers down there who are Newfoundlanders.

MR. GRIMES—There may be some now, but there were not all the summer. As regards the painting down there, was the paint used manufactured in this country or brought in from outside? We hear talk about encouraging local industries, and the Government sets the example of pay-

ing money in an enterprise and allowing this company go outside and buy materials from outsiders that should have been got in the country, and so have money kept in the country. That is nothing very creditable in my estimation. Mr. Halfyard has very properly asked the question here, do we represent the Newfoundland Hotel Facilities here or the people of this country? I fail to see how any honourable member can say that allowing that to take place after making a present to that Company of one hundred and fifty thousand dollars is looking after the interests of the people instead of the promoters of that enterprise.

Mr. Chairman, do I understand from the Colonial Secretary that we are bound by the agreement which was reached between the Executive Council, and the promoters of the hotel? These men know just as well as anybody else that the agreement has to be accepted by the Legislature before it can be looked upon as a guarantee. What right have they to say that the Legislature are going to accept the proposition as accepted by the Governor in Council. They have no right. In the case of the Commercial Cable Company agreement the House did not ratify it and they had no right, and these people have no right to expect that the legislature is going to ratify this agreement. I can't accept the statement of the Colonial Secretary that these men think that because this agreement was signed by the Executive Council that they must therefore take it as a sure thing that this six per cent. is guaranteed. I think the Government can go back to these people and say that the Legislature are not satisfied in presenting you with one hundred and fifty thousand dollars. If the Government is not corrupt and incompetent as has been said, there is then only one other conclusion to come to, and that is that they are certainly very careless of the people's interests if they allow these resolutions to go through in this form, with all these facts facing them. If you don't want to face your constituents when you go back to be told that you have sold out to the Newfoundland Hotel Facilities Company, then go and get these terms modified, and you may then save your faces.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Before proceeding with the Resolutions I would like to answer one or two points taken by Members on the other side. There have been a good many comments to the effect that the Government are giving away forty five thousand dollars to the promoters of the hotel, and to the effect that the interest guaranteed should be changed from six to five per cent. When the new Trust Deed was drawn up last June between the Government and the Company, in the conferences that took place, as I have been told by the Prime Minister, for I was out of the country at the time, endeavours were made to get the Company to agree to a five per cent guarantee. After considerable discussion of the pros and cons it was decided to allow the six per cent. guarantee of interest on the bonds. With regard to the statement that forty five thousand dollars has been made a present of to the promoters of the Company, the Government is not giving them a dollar, not a cent. These bonds will be put on the market either in Newfoundland or Canada or some other place, and I have no doubt, will be sold to the highest bidder, and if the promoters of the company get a good payment for the bonds, well so much the better for the Newfoundland Hotel Facilities and so much the better for the guarantee. The Government are not responsible for any more than the face value and they will be redeemed at face volue, only at $100 for every $100 guaranteed. Interest at six per cent

on $450,000.00 will amount to $27,000.-00 a year. That is the total amount the Government are responsible for. In addition to that a sinking fund of $13,500 a year represents a fund that is to be provided either by the Company or the Government to redeem the bonds, so that at the end of thirty three and a third years, the entire issue will be redeemed. If the company pays the sinking fund the company will own the bonds. But if the Government is called upon to pay the sinking fund the Govt. will own the bonds and the hotel. Now it must be appreciated that the value of the hotel is somewhere in the vicinity of a million dollars. And the people who have built the hotel and are promoting the company have shown a great deal more faith in this country than some of the hon. members oppostie because they are putting up a million dollar structure with four hundred and fifty thousand dollars guarantee, and the five hundred and fifty thousand dollars has to be secured in some other direction, thereby doubling the security upon which we are called upon to guarantee. It is all perfect nonsense to talk about what it is going to cost the country. Every dollar that is put into that sinking fund there will be value for, and who ever pays the thirteen thousand five hundred into the sinking fund will own the hotel. Talk about a hundred and fifty thousand dollars loss to the country. Hon. Members are jumping to conclusoins. What evdience have we that there is going to be any loss? Are we going to set ourselves down as a lot of fools and are we going to call those who are building the hotel a lot of fools. What about the five hundred and fifty thousand dollars that they have provided that there is no guarantee for? What about men who are of the financial standing of the contractors. Men that have built all kinds of structures and who have no doubt obtained the best financial advise in Canada. Do you think that they would come down here and put their money in this kind of a thing if they had not faith in it, and did not think that they were going to get some return for their money. And the Government has to be satisfied before the preferred shareholders get a dollar. The redemption of the bonds will be annually at the rate of thirteen thousand five hundred dollars a year. As I said before if the company pays the sinking fund that is all the concern that we have about the hotel for thirty three years. And every government for the past three or four years has been trying to get somebody here to build a hotel. It is one thing that everybody agree upon and it is absolutely essential if we are going in for any kind of advancement or development. We are no longer absolutely a fishing country, and if we had to depend altogether on the fishing of this country I do not know where we would get. More money is made in centres in the United States and Canada than from any other source. Every one that was interested in seeing this country advancing agreed that one of the first things that we needed was a first class hotel here. And I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that propositions were put up to other Governments not of very distant origin very much more serious than the present proposition as far as this country is concerned, and I would like to refresh the minds of some of the hon. members on this subject who were very active in their support of promotion of this very proposition. And I know this, that propositions were agreed to that were not half as good as the contract that we have before us to-night as far as this country is concerned. I know that one proposition was put to the Government, and the Government agreed to it to raise a half million dollars at five per cent. And the gentleman who had the proposition went

abroad and it was an absolute failure, and he could not get a dollar invested. People would not look at the proposition, and then he came back and the Government increased it to a million dollars. Five per cent. guarantee on a million dollars for thirty years with no security. Was that a good proposition. But that attractive proposition did not draw any investors. "What is the good of the bonds to us, we only have the hotel for security." "If it cost a million dollars we have only a million dollars security and no guarantee", and they could not sell the bonds. Failure ensued and now, as I explained in the House a couple of days ago, this company came down here and had faith in the proposition, and the result is that the hotel is assured. The Government of Newfoundland cannot lose because if the company does not pay any of the sinking fund and we have to pay the whole four hundred and fifty thousand dollars we have a million dollars worth of property for security. You say that is criminal action. If you say that is not good business, well then I have to disagree with your statement. If this country is going to be worth living in we have to introduce new avenues of employment and new avenues of revenue. A man in business has to extend his business, and he has to start out in new lines and new districts, and he has to advance, and that is what we have to do in this country. As I pointed out yesterday the example was shown us by those who carry on our transportation. They have faith in this country. They are spending millions of dollars in the improvement of our transportation facilities. They say that if we will put up a hotel for the people to stay in we will bring them here, and we will give the proper ships for them to come in, and if they are prepared to invest their money in the country, then surely the Government ought to be justified in their action to support this development. Unfortunately in the affairs of Newfoundland we always get down to parish politics. I do not give a hang about the next elections. I am prepared to justify myself on this proposition in any part of the country because I support this measure because it is for the best interest of the country and it is going to help to pay the taxes. We are not building the hotel as a political "Pull." We want to get the rich Americans and the Englishman and the rich Canadian and get some of their money off them. I will be frank about it. That is what we are after. I do not think that the hotel is going to be supported by our own people. I expect that of every dollar that will go into that hotel ninety five to ninety nine cents will be foreign money, and that is where we are going to get a new source of revneue. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not think that there should be so many knockers in this country. There should be a little more boosting if we want to be true to our country. Do not let it be thought that the members of the legislature advocates that the Government should have less faith in the country than outsiders who have never been on our shores before. They have built this hotel and every dollar that they have spent is their own money, and if that is not evidence of faith in the country, then I do not know what to call it. Is it any serious crime then that we should back up those people? What we are doing is simply this. We say to the Company, "You carry out your part of the bargain and we will carry out our part of the bargain," and that is all that is being done by us. As I pointed out a few days ago, the Government is not taking the credit for the building of this hotel. The promoters are the ones deserving of credit and to Mr. Rousseau, the build-

er, who is one of the cleanest, straightest and finest men I ever met in my life. Without a loan from the Government or anybody else he came here and put up that building, having faith in the Government of the country to carry out their part of the bargain. And it would be a nice spectacle for us to go back on that gentleman and on the bargain we made because of the six per cent. interest on the bonds. Why it should be indecent and improper and unworthy of Newfoundlanders, whose word is their bond. The Company have given their word and they have kept their word, and that is their bond. I would like to remind honourable members again that this hotel business is not anything new. There is a history that can be told with regard to this hotel movement within the past five or six years, and, I think, when that history is told that the contract before us tonight will stand out in marked contrast to the contract contemplated by a previous administration. We have now been debating this matter for a couple of days and honourable members opposite have been given every opportunity of discussing it, and I want to thank them for their fair and, I believe, honest criticisms of the Resolutions; but I cannot accept the position that this country is going to lose $45,000.00 on the issue of the bonds, because we are not going to lose a single dollar on the issue of the bonds. The Hotel Facilities Limited will sell the bonds and the returns will be utilized for hotel purposes. The Government is only responsible for the face value of those bonds, and at the end of 33 1-3 years the bonds will be redeemed dollar for dollar. The Hotel Company have entered into a solemn binding agreement to redeem those bonds by a sinking fund of $13,500. At the end of ten years, as provided for in the contract, if they want to redeem all the bonds they can do so, because if the hotel is going to be a success they want to be in a position to buy up all the bonds and relieve us of the guarantee, and if that happens so much the better. But at the very worst, if the hotel never paid a cent and we are then out the interest on the bonds, the hotel, which is our security for the amount of money advanced and guaranteed, reverts to the Government.

I trust, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that these few remarks by way of explanation will be accepted by the House, as they are intended to be, a clean statement of the facts. I do not accuse honourable members of the Opposition of distorting the facts, but I certainly think that some of their arguments have not been, at least, critically correct.

MR. HALFYARD — Mr. Chairman, what past Governments have done have nothing to do with this legislation. Whether they tried to encourage the building of a hotel in St. John's and were unsuccessful is neither here nor there. The question now is why are we guaranteeing those bonds at six per cent. instead of at five per cent? Nor has the idea that some of us are pessimists or optimists or blue-ruinists anything to do with the question at issue at the present time. Last year in this House an Act was passed and we made ourselves liable for $450,000.00 capital and a sinking fund of $13,500.00. We did not then make ourselves liable for interest, and when you made out your Trust Deed last June the financiers interested knew that the Government were not guaranteeing the interest. Therefore, this interest charge that we now have before us is a new thing altogether. Furthermore, in spite of the fact that the interest was not guaranteed last year the money was raised by the promoters, and to confirm their obligation they got to find ways and means to pay that money back, and they called upon the credit of Newfoundland to do so. We were

led to believe that the Company could raise the money on five per cent. bonds at par value; but, I contend, that if they are raised at a six per cent rate of interest, as is now proposed, it will be giving a present to the promoters of $45,000.00. The honourable introducer of these Resolutions argued his point very well but it was outside the actual subject in connection with clause three. Why should we give six per cent. instead of five per cent. any way. The people who put up the money last July did it under an agreement that has since been annulled. We are now assuming a greater liability than before. If the promoters had failed fo raise the money last year and could not get the money now without making the bonds six per cent. it would be a different matter; but the people who subscribed the money, apparently, only wanted their money back that they paid in, and I maintain that we are now going to make a present of $45,000.00 to the promoters. By the Government making the paper six per cent. instead of five they are losing one per cent. or $4,500.00 a year and that is a necessary liability, because who can tell whether the hotel is going to be a paying concern or not. What evidence have we before us that we are not going to lose a cent.

MR. CASHIN—Now I want to ask the Hon. the Colonial Secretary in view of the few remarks that he made a moment or so ago, do I understand that the bonds are to be put on the market here in Newfoundland.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—I asked the Montreal Trust Company yesterday and they said that the bonds would be available to the people here in Newfoundland or anywhere else. And that they would be sold to those who would give the best price.

MR. CASHIN—Possibly they may or possibly they may not be put up for tender. Is it possible for the Government to see that these bonds are put up here, and to let outsiders tender for them as well as insiders.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—I will be very glad to make that suggestion.

MR. CASHIN—Because my point is that here we are guaranteeing $450,000 of 6 p.c. bonds. Now this country is liable at the end of thirty three years for $450,000 plus the interest at 6 p.c. for thirty three years, which amounts to twenty seven thousand a year. Now is it not only proper that these bonds should be put up at tender here in blocks of a hundred thousand or two hundred, instead of allowing the Montreal Trust Company to get the most of the profit. Now in the Speech from the Throne which was brought in here on opening day if I am not mistaken, it distinctly says that we will be asked in this House this session, to ratify some resolution in connection with the rest of the bonds for the hotel by the Montreal Trust Company. I think that I am correct when I say that the Montreal Trust Company was mentioned. Now I would like to suggest to the Govrenment that they make every effort to have these bonds put up tomorrow, and give our people an opportunity of investing their money. I have a certian amount of faith in this hotel project, and I am going to vote for it. I think that it is about time that we had a decent hotel. It is about time that we did away with the two rookeries in this town to-day, one on Duckworth Street and the other on Cochrane Street. They are an eyesore, and that is why I am going to vote for this bill. Now there is another point that I would like to correct the Hon. Colonial Secretary. He has suggested that we will have to get something else besides the fisheries. But the question that I ask now is what are we going to get? Supposing that we do build this hotel. The most that

it can earn in a year is three hundred thousand dollars. Put it down that we have three thousand employed at the Humber, 3,000 at Grand Falls, 3,000 at Belle Isle, and 3,000 in other industries. Multiply that by four or five, and there are 75,000 people living out of outside industries. Take that from 260,000 and there are 190,000 people living in this country that are not going to live out of the hotel. They are going to live out of the fishery. Our main industry has been, is and shall be the fishery.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—I do not mean that we will have to substitute something else for the fishery, I meant that we can no longer live on the fisheries alone.

MR. CASHIN—Our income to-day is derived from the fishery and this is the main industry of the country. Even in spite of the fact that the Monroe administration promised to make this a further haven of rest so to speak for the fishermen of Newfoundland only to disappoint them. In spite of the fact that the Monroe Administration directly or indirectly promised the fishermen in Newfoundland, a bounty on fish and ignominiously failed to carry it out. In spite of the fact they promised a reduction in taxation and in expenditure, and they gave them the opposite. In spite of the incompetence and the recklessness and the carelessness of the great majority of the Ministers of the Crown. Now I do not, Mr. Chairman, want to make any more references to the Bill before the Chair, as I have assured the House of my intention. But before I take my seat I want to congratulate the two gentlemen, Mr. Stafford and Mr. Blandford, the two men principally responsible for the erection of the hotel down here. They have been agitating for this for a number of years and eventually they have accomplished something. It would have been well for your administration when they came in power had they tackled other matters, in conneciton with the operation of the affairs of this country, and stuck to them, as these two gentlemen stuck to their hotel project, and Newfoundland would not be in the sorry position that you and your administration are responsible for placing it to-night. And now, Mr. Chairman, with these few remarks and with the assurance that I intend to support this Bill in spite of the fact that I am opposed to the present policy of the Government as regards the fisheries and the general welfare of this country, and with the final suggestion to the Colonial Secretary that whilst I may not have liked the manner in which this agreement has been drawn up, with that Company, and before I sit down I would like to ask the Colonial Secretary is it a fact that the Government, or the Executive Government rather, have given this Company an agreement, or a note so to speak, that they would be responsible for the guarantee as outlined in this agreement.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Yes.

MR. CASHIN—Why I asked was because the Bill here is not signed by the Colonial Secretary.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—It is in the original agreement.

MR. CASHIN—Why I asked was because the other day I understood the Prime Minister to say that the Government had not given any. But I find out now that the Government did. That is why, Mr. Chairman, that people cannot have a great deal of confidence in the Administration. One day they tell one thing and the next day they say the very opposite. These are proven facts. It is just like the Besco Bill. You also gave these people a note, and that note was not honoured. I just want to point out all these little facts to the Government to prove that you are not

all that you are cracked up to be. You gave a note to the Hotel Facilities people on the off chance of coming in here and putting it through. I don't know whether your party are going to turn you down on the Hotel Facilities Bill as they turned you down on Besco, which I feel that the members on both sides of this House will agree with me was an ingnominious position for the Government to find themselves in to-night. To feel that a few short months ago you signed an agreement with the Dominion Iron and Steel Corporation, and it has been turned down by your own party. Not by the House, because the Besco Bill was only read in the House. And then again this afternoon the same little role was played. The Speaker read "Committee of the Whole on Besco," his part. Each day he has a new part. A few new words to add. To-day we find that the Directors are coming down next week, and I hope that they will make a better showing than they did. And I trust that they will bring along a few of the letters which they have from people on the other side, from the people whom they are requesting to change their furnaces to accommodate the Nova Scotia Coal Company. Now the Prime Minister has just asked if I said anything about the Railway. No, I have not. But if you want a few words on it, I will give them to you.

MR. CHAIRMAN—The hon. member will please keep to the question before the chair.

MR. CASHIN—The question before the chair, sir, concerns the financial conditions of this country. And I want to ask you even if I am going to vote for that Bill does it not concern $400,000 which the country is losing on that railway through the gross incompetence on the part of the railway commission, and the railway management. I have not said anything about the railway. Have I not just as much right as the Prime Minister to express my opinion on the railway or any other matter in connection with the affairs of this country. Now I did not ask him to run for his party. And I don't want to be put down as an obstructionist by the Prime Minister, but I have as much right in here as he has. More, because I kept my word to the people who sent me here, while he betrayed them. Is not that a fact? Is that a fact? Haven't I said a few words on the railway? I could say a few words about the Imperial Tobacco, or the Butterine Factory, or the Colonial Cordage Co., let alone the railway—they're a credit to the country. The Prime Minister brought this on himself—it was none of my doings. I have been told I made a vicious attack on the Prime Minister on the Address in Reply; I deny that, and I tell the Prime Minister that he has made a vicious attack on the people of this country—he and his Finance Minister. And I say their incompetency has cost this country two millions this year, and I haven't heard one on the other side deny that, because it is proven by the figures of the Prime Minister and the Finance Minister themselves. Yes, and I shall speak on the railway several times before the Estimates are put through, if that is any comfort to the Prime Minister. I feel that the Prime Minister has very little interest in the railway, and he has proved that by letting the officials pay themselves out of the revenue. Is there anything else he wants me to say about the railway? Does he want to know there are several officials walking around up there doing nothing and getting paid huge salaries—and I challenge him to contradict it. It is a fact, Sir, that at the Dock at the present time there is rotten work being done, and as a suggestion to the Prime Minister he can ask the Government Engineer who is in charge up there and find out if the proper

mixtures of sand, cement and stone are going into the work. I haven't any experience in that—I don't know, but you have members on that side who do. I have a right to speak in this House—I paid my own expenses, and am sneered at by the Prime Minister who asks if I said anything about the Railway. He ought to be ashamed of the railway, and he ought to be ashamed of the Finance Minister who made such an exhibition as he did. He made a beer-garden of this Assembly; turned it into what may be called a bagnio. And I am supposed to come in here and let the Prime Minister slur me—neither he nor any Prime Minister born can do that, Mr. Chairman. And I regard the way the Hotel project was handled, although I am supporting it, advocating it and endorsing it, as disgraceful. I have discussed the points of this measure, Mr. Chairman, but I am going to speak here. "Has he said anything about the railway?"—I have a little more to say. That the Trepassey Branch, on which you lost money, was closed down, as well as other branches, and the people practically isolated, and the Government made no arrangemenf for them. I almost had to go down on my knees to get the Kyle to call in at one or two places, and I was told that if she called at Renews and Fermeuse they would never get paid. And who is paying for their deficit? Aren't the fishermen of Ferryland paying their proportion? And they didn't lose a half million in Trepassey as they did on the Topsails last winter owing to incompetency. And you don't want to be a railway man to know it—any "Common Jack" on the street can tell you. I have this much to say about the Government—that they are incompetent and impudent. I can't say anything different in view of the Prime Minister's slurs—the most impudent and incompetent since the days of Responsible Government. There is one good man in the Governemnt, and that is the man who introduced this measure—I refer to John R. Bennett. He is the only clean man you have. I owe nothing to Mr. Bennett; he was a leader of mine, as he was of the Prime Minister, but he is clean and decent, and I don't get slurs from him as I did from the Prime Minister. Haven't I a right in this country? Haven't I a right to a living? Does the Prime Minister want a return of the open ballot, when the merchant could see how a man voted and refuse him supplies. I have just as much right to live in this country, and just as much love for it as the Prime Minister or any other man. I have been told that I have been ignorant in my remarks. I deny that—nor have I cast any slurs, as has the Prime Minister or his paper. It is a dirty, filthy, contemptible rag, conceived in iniquity and brought forth in sin. You see it reproduced in the manner in which the Minister of Finance conducted himself yesterday, and in which the Prime Minister cast slurs here to-night. Have I spoken of the railway? I intend to speak of the railway until it sinks in your head—until you dream of the railway. What bills have they put through this session? The Dog Act, the Granny Act, the Crowe Bill. You have put through so many crow acts—the Government is renowned for crows.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—There are crows on that side too.

MR. CASHIN—No, the crows are in the Executive Council. And the Finance Minister has increased about 20 p.c. in weight since last year. The Prime Minister probably thought I was knocking the Bill while I was supporting it, as strongly as the Prime Minister himself, and perhaps more so, for he hasn't made any statement about it since it came up. He told us there was no agreement with this country, and they had an agreement with the Executive Council. And that

is tantamount to a vote of want of confidence. Are they going to try and sell those bonds here, or are they going to give them away to an aggregation of money sharks—corrupt—but hardly as corrupt as your Government? Will I speak of the railway? Will I speak of butterine while the opportunity offers and tell this House that the Minister of Finance came in here with a budget tariff putting an extra cent and a half on butterine, and went out and built a butterine factory? There are six million pounds of butterine used in Newfoundland per year with a preference of six cents a pound. The owners of these butterine factories accumulate fortunes at the expense of the people of the country. It is about time in this country for a Mussolini of some description; and I'll follow him. Will I speak of the railway? An impertinence on my part no doubt. Your Bill possibly would have been thru only for the poor lack of tact of your Prime Minister. I have lots of time. I have less to take slurs from the Prime Minister. Keep the rules of the Legislature! A very good example for the Leader of the House to set. I come in here with possibly not such aristocratic blood flowing in my veins as the Prime Minister, probably not such high social standing as the Prime Minister, and then am slurred at by a gentleman of the Prime Minister's class; but I am flesh and bone just the same as he is. The railway is running itself and the Government are making no attempt to run it properly because they are incompetent. My advice to the Government about it has fallen on deaf ears. This Chamber has been turned into a beer garden by the present administration. It started at the very beginning this year. I did not ask a question but I was slurred by the opposite side of the House. I got evasive answers of various descriptions. I regret I have not got my supply of questions and answers here to prove it. I regret I have not got my notes on the management of the railway in which the Prime Minister is so interested that he allowed it to lose a million dollars and spent a million and a quarter on capital account, and he has to spend another million and a half. There are men getting $75.00 a month for looking at the snow on Topsail Road, and no attempt whatever is made by the Government to help the farmers in the western end of the city. They can pay about twenty men $75 a month to look at the snow, however. I will say so much about the railway before I am through that the Prime Minister won't know the railway from a merry go round. Let him go up to-morrow morning and see the shore train go out at a quarter to nine and have a look at the railway. Let him go up at 1.30 and see if the shore train arrives. Let him go up to the railway and see how many officials draw large salaries and don't earn them. Let him go and talk to the railway about their balance sheet. Let him go up and ask if they have a balance sheet ready that Cashin asked for the other day. Let him tell how many are drawing large salaries whose names must not be published; but the poor individual in the round house will have his wages shown because he is only drawing thirty five cents an hour. Twelve thousand four hundred a month is being paid up there for fifty one officials. It should be done for seven thousand four hundred, and then some probably would be getting more than they are worth. Squandermania exists on the part of the Government. This country thinks considerable of the amount of $450,000 that is to be guaranteed for the hotel. It is a lot of money, and if the Government were not incompetent that amount of money would be raised in this city instead of being allowed to go to a gang of money sharks. The House was led to be-

lieve that an agreement had not been entered into when it actually was. There was a similar agreement with Besco and they fell down on it. Is that true or is it not? Is that to the point or is it not? The place has been turned into such a beer garden that it is not fit hardly for any serious man to come into; and it was made so by a Minister of the Crown. Then to cap the climax your own Prime Minister comes in and makes a sneering, impertinent remark. I formerly had some regard for your Prime Minister and was his strongest supporter. I regret it. A stronger supporter than any man in here tonight. That is correct, because stilettos surround him on all sides and he does not know it, but I know it. I carry no stiletto for any man. I carry no stiletto for the men that are allowing that $450,000 to be raised in Canada instead of giving 6 p.c. interest to our own people. The Government did not have the foresight or business ability to realise that. $450,000 at 6 p.c.—$27,000—two months salary for fifty one officials at the railway. I answer the Prime Minister in this way. The man is yet unborn that is going to stop my voice in the House of the public of Newfoundland whom I represent. The people have sent me here and told me to do my duty, and I intend to do it as long as there is breath in me, unless the Government goes any further in their autocratic manner, and by force of bayonet and bombs attempts to stop my tongue in the House owned by the public of this country. "Order," has been called. I say there is no order in Newfoundland, and the people responsible for a great deal of it are your own administration, and no attempt is made to introduce order. You can take your Bill and put it through, I would not disgrace myself to vote with you, and I say to you "Good night."

MR. SCAMMELL—I gave expression to my opinion on this matter this afternoon and was as pertinent as I knew how to be, and I have no intention of repeating myself in that connection; but I was rather surprised to hear the Colonial Secretary state that he "presumed" there would be a Government director, but that no appointment had been made as yet. I say that the charge that you are incompetent is sustained by that fact alone.

Last year we came in here and guaranteed the sinking fund on this proposition. And then the hotel construction company comes along and the financing is begun, and the Government' responsibility begins, and then we are told by the Minister that we would have a Government director on that board as soon as the Government is responsible. I do not wish to be interrupted by the Minister of Justice at this juncture. You have been accused of being incompetent and of not acting in the best interest of the country. You expect the people to pay the charges and assume the responsibility, and the Colonial Secretary says this afternoon that he presumes that there will be a Government director on the Board of the Hotel Facilities Limited. I say, Mr. Chairman, that the charge that you are incompetent is borne out by the facts.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—It is rather interesting to see hon. members get excited about a thing about which they know nothing. If the hon. member wants to go on record, then that is his business if he wants to vote against the resolutions. But there is no reason why the hon. member should work himself into such a state of excitement. The Government is not responsible, not alone, until these resolutions are passed, but it is not responsible until there is a bill brought in to give effect to the resolutions and it has been passed, and there is now nothing

to appoint a director for until this is passed. Now in this matter I expect the hon. member to give a little deference to my opinion in a matter of this nature, of which I am familiar, as I would give attention to his views in matters which are in his line. The section that is important is section No. 7 of last year, and the resolutions now before the chair contemplate repealing No. 7 and substitution No. 7 of the resolutions. In the Act last year the provision made under Section 11 is:

(Reads)

The Government guarantee only becomes effective when the act becomes law. The Government has no right to ask to put a director on the Board of the Hotel Facilities until the act becomes law and the Trust Deed is executed. Naturally all the competence and all the intelligence is not confined to this side of the House, but this is a case where there will not be any directors appointed because up to now there is no power or authority for them to act. I make that statement as one in the office or the position to make statements of that nature under these conditions. The Government director does not come into effect until the agreement is finalized. I do not make this explanation in the spirit of critical reply, but I do say frankly that some of the remarks considering the fact that the bill was passed last year are hardly to the point. One would imagine that this was something new. The essence of the alteration is in section 9.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, I did not know that there was going to be a division taken. I have already promised my support to the Bill, and as I propose to vote against the amendment, I wish to state shortly my reasons for so doing. In the first place I look upon the hotel as an asset which has been got by the Government at this rate of interest, but because the Government guarantees that interest does not necessarily mean that the Government has got to pay it. If the Hotel Company have the good sense of getting their bonds at the rate of interest different than the ordinary debenture bonds of the country are sold at, well the hotel is down there in brick and stone and timber as security for the guarantee. I look upon the project as the only bright spot in the Government's tourist policy, and because of the difference of one per cent. in the amount we guarantee I do not think it is worth my while supporting the amendment. Another thing about it is that somebody has suggested that some people are going to make some money by reason of the six per cent. instead of five per cent. guarantee. And if the promoters do make $45,000 out of this bond issue, all the better; and have they not shown faith in the country that no people have ever shown before. I heard to-night for the first time, Mr. Chairman, that a previous Government were ready to guarantee five per cent. on a million dollars without a cent of security for a hotel proposition but could not raise a dollar. At all events, seeing that the present promoters of the hotel had come in here and taken our word to help them out and had gone ahead and built the hotel without any financial assistance from the Government, I think that there is no other course for me but to support the Resolutions.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, as Mr. Warren has seen fit to give his reasons for supporting the Resolutions and opposing the amendment, I propose to state my reasons for bringing in the amendment. But this is not the amendment I should be bringing in; rather should it be an amendment to do without interest altogether, because every member in this House who was a sitting member at the last session knows that the

Government brought in a Bill in which they told us that the builders of the hotel did not want any interest guaranteed on their bonds. We were told that this Company wanted the Government to guarantee a sinking fund of $13,500 a year; and the Prime Minister stood up in his place in the House last year and told us distinctly that he was offered from a Company to build a hotel in St. John's if the Government would guarantee five per cent. interest, and that he would not guarantee any interest, and he further stated that these people who came here were the best that ever came and that they were going to build a hotel without any guarantee of interest. Now, twelve months after, when the construction work of the hotel is practically finished we are asked to vote for those Resolutions guaranteeing six per cent. and to which I strongly object. I am not objecting to the hotel, and it is not my desire to obstruct its construction. I have as much interest in anything that will tend to bring foreigners to this country to spend their money and I have as much interest in that hotel down there as any member of this House, and I am not voting against the Bill as a Bill; but I am voting against the Legislature taking upon themselves an obligation for which there is absolutely no necessity and an obligation upon the people of Newfoundland for which there is no necessity. Why the ordinary Government debenture bond can be sold on the market at five per cent. par value and still you come in here and put up a bond guaranteed by the Government and you give six per cent. The member for Fortune Bay tells us that we would not have to pay the interest. Who knows that? I dare say the honourable member made a similar statement with reference to the Humber project. If he did not make the statement, it was in his mind as well as in the minds of others who supported that Bill; but it looks to me that the day is not far distant when this country will be called upon to pay the interest on that Humber guaranteed bonds. The same applies to the hotel. What hope is there that the hotel will be a huge success; but even if it does turn out a success that does not prevent me from standing up here as a representative of an important constituency of this Colony from objecting and expressing my strongest protest of the Government for taking upon itself a heavy financial obligation for which there is no necessity. Mr. Warren reported me as saying that a lot of money was going to be made off the hotel by someone. According to the Colonial Secretary's figures, the Company was capitalized at one million dollars made up of 400,000 seven per cent. preference shares and 600,000 of common shares and we were told that with each preference share sold twenty five per cent. of the common or ordinary shares went with it. In that case the preference shares when all sold would leave $450,000 of ordinary shares to the promoters, and if the hotel is going to be such a huge success the money thus earned in that way could pay the sinking fund and the six per cent. on the bonds, the interest on the preference shares and the ordinary shares. I say that the people who hold the 450,000 ordinary shares and got them for nothing can go on then and sell them at par if they are paying 6 p.c., and get their money for nothing. That is what happens in every Company that is promoted and that is why ordinary shares are given in a Company. So if the hotel is the success that it is predicted to be there is a chance for somebody to unload on the market the common stock and make $450,000 and I feel sure that Mr. Warren cannot dispute that. If that is the case, I do not see why we should guarantee

six per cent. interest on the bonds, and that is my reason for asking that the rate be reduced to five per cent. I do not want to do anything to injure the hotel in any way; but the trouble is that every promoter that comes in here gets the best end of the bargain, and after a while we wake up and find it out. Personally I think that the promoters of this hotel are being treated very liberally if we guarantee only five per cent. on the bonds. A Canadian debenture bond can be issued at 4½ p.c. Why guarantee six per cent. when five per cent. will give the Company the amount of the bonds, namely, $450,-000.00?

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, I merely got up a few minutes ago to explain my reasons for voting for the Resolutions, as I propose to do; but the Leader of the Opposition seemed to turn me into a protagonist of the Bill and devoted most of his criticism to what I said. As far as my recollection goes, I never said we would have to pay the interest; but that if we did have to pay the interest the difference of one per cent. would not be worth while talking about in consideration of the asset we would have and which would be well worth the money spent.

I am only telling the House why I propose to vote against the amendment, and I think that in the hotel down there in the East End of St. John's we have an asset, directly and indirectly, such as we never had before. As I have already said, it is the brightest spot in the tourist policy of the Government and I really think that it should be strongly supported. I am sure that since the Government has committed itself on the understanding that the Company was to get six per cent. interest on the bonds, and as this is an industrial proposition pure and simple I do not see how a proposition of this sort can be compared with the ordinary debenture bonds raised by builders or with the raising of a four or five million dollar loan on Government debentures. And I thought that I made that perfectly plain. Now this is a different purpose altogether. The Government have committed themselves to it and under the circumstances, I subscribe to it in this respect. All I said about people making money out of it was that I had heard previously in debate that the bonds would be handed to the Hotel Facilities Company, or the Montreal Trust Company at par, and they could get 110 for it. Since the Government has committed themselves to it, and the Leader of the Opposition has seen fit to confine his speech to more or less refute what I said, I am only explaining to the House why I propose to vote for this Bill.

MR. HALFYARD — Mr. Chairman, before the motion is put, I would refer to section 117 of the rules of the House which says that no member is entitled to vote on any personal question in which he has a pecuniary interest. Now I don't know whether any member in this House has a pecuniary interest in this measure or not, but I understand that some members hold stock in that company, and according to that rule those members cannot vote. Now, Mr. Chairman, do you rule that this rule does not apply.

MR. CHAIRMAN—My view of the matter is this, that the member affected must have an interest in the bonds that we are guaranteeing, not in the common stock. However the hon. member is at liberty to appeal against my ruling if he cares to do so.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, this bill is between the Hotel Facilities and the Government, and you are legislating for this company, and any man that is interested in that Company, no matter whether he possesses bonds of that company, and I think that we

should be clear on this point, because it is very important.

MR. CHAIRMAN—It is not a matter for me to rule on, it is a matter for the individual member himself.

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 without amendment.

On motion this Report was received.

On the motion for adoption of the Report, Mr. Hickman moved and Mr. Halfyard seconded the following amendment: "That where the words six per centum appear in the agreement that the words five per centum be substituted therefor."

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

Mr. Hickman
Mr. Halfyard
Mr. Grimes
Mr. Scammell
Mr. Godden
Mr. Ashbourne (6)

and against it:

Hon. the Prime Minister
Hon. the Colonial Secretary
Hon. the Minister of Justice
Hon. the Minister of Finance
Hon. Mr. Cramm
The Minister of Agriculture
Mr. Moore
Mr. Lake
Mr. Sinnott
Mr. Chambers
Mr. Power
Mr. Puddester
Mr. Cahill
Mr. Browne
Mr. Warren (16)

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. Mr. Cramm
The Minister of Agriculture
Mr. Moore
Mr. Lake
Mr. Sinnott
Mr. Chambers
Mr. Power
Mr. Puddester
Mr. Cahill
Mr. Browne
Mr. Warren (16)

and against it:

Mr. Hickman
Mr. Halfyard
Mr. Grimes
Mr. Scammell
Mr. Godden
Mr. Ashbourne (6)

so it passed in the affirmative and was ordered accordingly.

On motion it was ordered that a Bill be introduced to give effective to the said Resolutions.

Whereupon the Bill entitled "An Act for the Confirmation of an agreement between the Government and the Newfoundland Hotel Facilities, Ltd.," was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time 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, Friday, afternoon at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, April 30th, 1926.

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

Petitions were presented by:

Mr. Lake from Burin re: Road.

Mr. Lake from Fortune re: Messenger.

Mr. Puddister from Freshwater re: Road.

Mr. Chambers from Harbor Le Cou re: Fog Alarm.

Mr. Ashbourne gave notice of question.

Mr. Halfyard gave notice of question.

Mr. Scammell gave notice of question.

Hon. the Colonial Secretary gave notice that he would on to-morrow move the House into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of discussing the action of the Governor-in-Council in consenting to the raising of £1,000,000 by the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company secured by First Mortgage Prior Lien Bonds ranking in priority to the "A" and "B" Debenture Stock guaranteed by the British and Newfoundland Governments respectively.

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. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman: I don't want to detain the House any longer than necessary from going ahead with the Estimates, but I feel it is up to me to make some reference to a charge with which my name has been associated in connection with the Report of the Auditors of the Custom House Department. The "Daily Globe" newspaper, without any consideration for British fair play, referred to the Newfoundland Wholesale Dry Goods Company in large letters, because I happened to be President of that Company, and made no reference to a great many other people concerned in that report. The hon. member for Ferryland, in one of those rambling disjointed harangues of bluff and bluster, for which he is becoming famous in this House, referred again to that matter of the Wholesale Dry Goods Company, and although he added, that, possibly I was not personally implicated, the very fact that he selected that particular item out of the report to speak on, and to dwell upon my name once or twice, is enough to show that he intended to make political capital out of it at my expense. I feel, therefore, that it is necessary to make a little explanation in that respect. The report of the Auditors reached my hands on March 14, 1925, or over a year ago, and I saw the Wholesale Dry Goods Company, of which I was the President, was implicated in the charges made by the auditors, and I then wrote the following letter to Mr. J. M. Spearns, Manager of the Company:

(Reads)

I won't weary you with the reply sent to me by the Manager, but I sent both letters to the Minister of Finance asking for an investigation. On the 28th of March, the Minister wrote me the following letter:

(Reads)

The fact that the Minister did not give me the report is very well explained by the fact that, as you know, he has had more than enough to occupy his attention with the difficulties and troubles that have arisen in that Department during the past year. I have, however, been making some investigations on my own part. During the last two and a half years, I have spent two hours altogether in the interest of my own business, and therefore one can fully understand that I have not been able to give very much time to the affairs of the Wholesale Dry Goods Company, but have made some inquiries as to how matters stood, and I want to explain them now to the House. When the Finance Minister came into office, there was a system, a vicious system in vogue in the Custom House, by which any importer could bring in about sixteen packages of goods and put them in the Government warehouses, place the invoices in the hands of the Custom

House broker, and take delivery in single packages, paying approximate duty on the estimated value of each case. When the entire shipment was cleaned out, then, and not till then, did the Customs insist on the full settlement of the duty. A large proportion of the trade took advantage of the system, and, amongst others the Wholesale Dry Goods Company. Sixteen cases were imported by the Company in 1918, when goods were very high, and the sum of $46,000 was paid out by that Company for goods which were not really needed, and bought by an indiscriminate purchaser for that firm. Between 1918 and 1923, nine of these cases were taken out in the manner I have spoken of, and duty was paid on the approximate value of each case. As regards the seven cases remaining, in 1923 Manager Spearns asked Mr. Carter, the Examiner at the Warehouse whether he could get three cases on valuation to be given by him, as goods were of very much less value than when imported. Mr. Carter consented and put on a value, and on that value the goods were passed for and duty paid. Four cases still remained. When the auditors came in, the shortage which they appeared to find of $500 consisted of the difference between Carter's valuation and the duty as in our invoices, which was a matter not settled up, and, in the ordinary course of events, would be settled when the other cases were taken out. The Wholesale Dry Goods Company claim, and I think they claim rightly, that they don't owe anything, or at least a very small proportion of this to the Custom House. But, even so, there are four cases, which cost about $300 each, still left in the Custom House, that is $1200 worth of goods. Two of those cases were sold by the instructions of the Minister of Finance, and two more cases are still down there, so, if the Custom House realizes on them, it would certainly appear that there would be a credit balance there for the Wholesale Dry Goods Company, even if they are liable for $500. There has been no wrong then on the part of the Company, and I court the most utter and entire investigation as regards that matter. The same thing possibly applies to charges made against other firms. The first that two people charged under this investigation had two letters written to them is only because they happened to be Ministers of that Department when the irregularities appeared, and for that reason it was only considered right to give them a chance to answer the charges made in the report.

MR. CASHIN—I did not, by insinuation or direct statement, say that the Prime Minister, personally, knew anything whatever about that transaction of the Wholesale Dry Goods Company. I think I made a distinct statement, which may be proved by reference to the Records of the House, that I did not believe that the Prime Minister knew anything about it at all. I don't consider it right that spurious attacks should be made upon my firm any more than upon the Prime Minister's. Not that I am responsible for having it splurged in the Advocate or the Globe; the responsibility for the whole affair rests on the Daily News, on an impertinent, lying, hyprocitical, editorial in the Daily News, insinuating that our firm was attempting to defraud the Customs. I dare say the Prime Minister did not know that the firm he was interested in did owe any money to the Customs, any more than I did. The same thing applies to the United Tobacco Company, of which I happened to be a shareholder, as Mr. Bennett will bear out.

I resent the fact that the Prime Minister says that I am bluffing and blustering:—blundering possibly; but comments on blundering can be directed in other directions besides my

direction. I don't propose to take it from the Prime Minister that I am bluffing and blustering and blundering. I am here to defend myself. My honesty and integrity are at stake as well as the Prime Minister's, and I would be a poor specimen of humanity if I allowed anyone either directly or indirectly to cast reflections on my firm or family, when I know it is being done for political purposes. I want to tell the Prime Minister that I have no necessity to use his firm or any other industry for political purposes, to be returned a member of this Legislature. Neither am I supposed to sit here and receive slurs from the Prime Minister, as I did last night, and I don't propose to stand for it. I want to say right here, that if irregularities did occur, or had occurred, and if wrong doing had gone on, that all concerned should receive the same treatment and not partial treatment as was meted out to me, and my firm, in this Legislature, and that merely for political purposes. That was done by the Administration of which the Prime Minister is Leader and for which he is responsible. It was deliberately done with his knowledge.

I don't propose to hang up the Estimates any further with this affair, but I want to tell the House that I have my opinions as well as the Prime Minister or any other member of the House and I intend to vent them in this House, and I have a right to vent them in this House, and the Prime Minister can't stop me, and he daren't stop me. I made no slurs on the Prime Minister. As a matter of fact I exonerated him. He has not done that with me, and he has not even done me the courtesy to apoligise for the manner in which he slurred me, acrosse the House last night. I didn't take his slur, and I didn't get his apology, and I can get on without his apology.

MR. HALFYARD—As the question of the report of the Customs House has been brought to the attention of the House again, I hope I will be pardoned if I offer a few further observations on this question. I think it regrettable that the report submitted by Read, Son and Watson, to the Minister of Customs was ever presented to the public in its entirety. If I had no experience in Government and in the presenting of reports, I would be very silent on the matter, but my opinion on that is formed from experience. In connection with the report on the Agriculture and Mines Department by Read, Son and Watson, which was presented to Hollis Walker to be the subject of an enquiry, there were several names in that report which should never have been presented to the public. It did no good. Innocent persons had to go daily before that Commission. They had to go because their names appeared. It may be said perhaps that it did those persons no harm; it did no good. If there was any doubt in connection with these people charitable people would give them the benefit of the doubt, but a good many would take the opportunity to look upon these persons, whether they were actually innocent or guilty, as thieves and embezzlers, instead of exonerating them. We have heard quite a lot about reports on public institutions during the last few years. Possibly it has done some good, but as far as I am concerned, I may say it has done me no good. Personally, it has done me no good. It is not an incentive to honesty to any public man to see the result of these inquiries and consider that persons have profited at the expense of public offices and have gone scot free. You are called a fool if you miss the chance to get all you can. Seven-eighths of the people will call—you a fool if don't get all you can. Well, if I get the chance what do you expect me to do. I am not saying that I will do anything. I speak of this

matter seriously. What inducement is there for honesty as a result of these inquiries. If it appeared that irregularities did take place, investigations should be held, and if a proper investigation cannot be instituted without Auditors and Chartered Accountants, get them; but reports of these people and of Read, Son and Watson and any others, should be submitted to the Heads of the Departments, if necessary there should be a Commission, to hold a private enquiry and give the persons named in the report an opportunity to explain before the names are submitted to the world. We are painting ourselves blacker than we are. The trade is brought into it too. The Prime Minister got up this afternoon to defend his own personal character and honesty. Is that doing us any good? It is unfortunate that the report ever saw the light of day. Some do wrong and the whole country suffers as a result. When I saw that report I said that nine-tenths of the names there should never have been published. It is only painting ourselves blacker than we really are. These parties should have been asked for an explanation and no doubt in most cases it could have been given satisfactorily, as the Prime Minister made a statement here this afternoon which has been accepted by everyone who heard him speak that it was not the fault of the firm and if there was any fault it was the fault of the system. We must expect to find things the same in public offices as in ordinary commercial offices. The people there are only human beings and are not turned into angels because they enter a Government office. There is just as much embezzlement in private firms as in Government Departments. How many people have to leave the country as quickly as possible because of embezzlement?

It is regrettable that the report was ever made public. If after a thorough investigation it was found that there were individuals who had attempted to defraud the Government, the matter should be brought to the attention of the Justice Department and these people should be tried, and not have as now, the innocent suffer with the guilty.

MR. SCAMMELL—Now that we are on this particular vote, I would like to ask somebody in the House, possibly the Prime Minister would be the correct one, what the duties of the Government Engineer consist of. He receives, it appears from this four thousand six hundred dollars. I think a question was asked in the House the other day as to what he was paid in the capacity of Chairman of the Highroads Commission and an answer was given showing that he received in that capacity a large salary—sisty-six, sixty six a month—eight hundred dollars a year. I suppose we can assume that the Government are not in favor of the overlapping of large salaries. If he is acting as Chairman of the Highroads Commission and Government Engineer, who not let one salary suffice? Some time ago when Reids were operating the Railway he had to go over the road. He had to make certain reports. I don't know if he is still doing these things, or what he has to do, and I would like to know where this office stands to-day. I have no intention of casting any aspersions on Mr. Hall. He should be paid of course as a professional man is paid, but I don't see why he should be paid $4,600 if he has not much work to do or if his work is really at the Highroads Commission for which he is getting another salary. I think that the majority of the Government Engineers office are working at Highroads Commission work. I don't think a man should be getting two salaries unless there is a good and suffiient reason for it. I am not speaking from an actual knowledge of the facts, but I think it

should be explained to us if the Government Engineer as such, has any great duties, free from his duties as Chairman of the Highroads Commission.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

The Government Engineer has to do the work of the railway, which is small but still there. He has built bridges all over the country and not only railway bridges. All such work is done in the Government Engineer's Department. Take for example the large bridge at Grand River. I suppose that is one of the greatest engineering feats of the kind, in this country. That is not a railway bridge. Those things entail a lot of work; indeed an enormous amount of work.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, my opinion is that this whole vote considering the services rendered now by the officials of the department compared with the services that they were supposed to render when the vote was instituted, the comparison is such now that that vote should not be there at all. It should be under some other heading, as suggested by the Hon Member for St. Barbe. When Mr. Hall was appointed to the chairmanship of the High Roads Commission, I said that it was a mistake. That Mr. Hall as the Government Engineer should continue to perform the work that he was brought here to perform. Although the Railway is now managed by the Government I think that there is need for Mr. Hall's whole services up there, and he could render valuable services. When he was appointed his chief work was to take stock of everything in connection with the Railway, in regard to the rolling stock and the building the Main General Branch Railway. The Government would never pay a bill unless it was certified by the Government Engineer. If any man should know anything about the railway it is Mr. Hall. The engineer now is Mr. Joyce, who has taken the place of Mr. Powell. But why can't the services of Mr. Hall be used in connection with the railway. I don't think Mr. Hall has anything more to do with the railway at the present time that I have. He is not consulted in any way. All he has to do now is to supervise the building and repairing of roads and bridges. But I should think that Mr. Robinson is well qualified to do that, and I think that Mr. Hall leaves most of that work to him. Therefore the work of Mr. Hall is confined mostly to the Hight Roads Commission. Inspector of Rolling Stock. That is a misnomer now. And I think that Mr. Hall should still continue to be connected with the railway as consulting engineer. And for the work that Mr. Hall is supposed to do now the salary is too high, but for the work that Mr. Hall is qualified to do the salary is not too high. But the High Roads Commission work is of course a Bonanza to the officials of the Government Engineering Office. It gives them an opportunity to supplement their salaries. And without the High Roads Policy I fail to see what work there would be there for them to do. Anyhow this is an opportunity for us to express our opinions whether acceptable or not, on the vote that is being considered. But I don't think that there is any necessity for supplementing their salaries. Even if they do work for the High Roads Commission. You know and we all know that sometimes one gets an appointment and he is given a certain work to do outside of his commission although the performance of the work under his commission may take up 75 per cent. of his time. But if you give him anything outside of his regular work that is an excuse for him to demand more money. He would say "Now this is not my work. If you had to go outside and get someone to do this work, you would have

to pay him. Why not pay me?" But I say that if any official has a surplus of time he should do any work that the head of that Department might ask him to do.

Now I have wondered and I dare say that a good many people have wondered also why this work was taken away from the Public Works Department. Apparently now the Public Works Department have to spend the ordinary and local main line grants. The Minister has to supervise the spending or the allocation of that money, and he will take advice from the representatives of the district, and others who have knowledge of the circumstances and the conditions that apply. There it begins and there it ends. There is a division of authority now with regard to the building and the repairing of roads in Newfoundland. Why is this? Cannot the properly elected representatives responsible to this Legislature such as the Minister of Public Works, have the authority for spending money on roads and bridges. The authority now for the spending of money is given to men responsible to nobody. I cannot see for the life of me why this departure is made. Is there a want of confidence in the Public Works Department? And that is not bad enough for a new department to be made for the spending of one million dollars on roads, but you are taking a part of the money that is voted for the district of Trinity and passing it over to the Highroad Commission without consent of the Minister of Public Works. And during the past year, the Minister of Public Works has been giving attention to all the requests that have been sent to him. And the people in the district now think that the Minister is not allocating the money. I don't believe that the Government really intended to insult Mr. Russell and the representatives of the district that we could not handle all the money that is voted. But they have certainly not acted in a complimentary manner.

HON THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, while we are on this Finance Department I would like to ask the Minister of Finance, if he intends to do anything for the shoe workers of Harbour Grace with regard to the putting into effect of an act by which these people can exist. I would like to have some expression from the Minister as to whether the Government are considering this.

HON THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, I may say in reply to the Leader of the Opposition that the matter is being considered by the Government, but it is really very difficult to know just what to do. But we are bringing in here an act, it is really an amendment, but it is giving more powers to be able to help those people that you were speaking about.

MR. MOORE—Mr. Chairman, While we are on these pensions, I want to say a few words. When we were going over these at the party meeting an item that is here now escaped me. It is not of the making of the present Government but it is a legacy that was handed down when the Member for Fortune was Minister of Justice. He put a man on the pension list without either asking leave or license from the members of the district. No doubt the Hon. Members of this House are trying to get pensions for the people of their districts. But we are trying to get one off. On that list there is a mercha\t getting a pension of 38 dollars a year. And I want to find out from the Minister of Justice if there is any machinery to get that man off the list now. I have been advocating that for the last two years. You have down there widows and orphans living on five dollars a quarter, and this gentleman was put on here

by Mr. Warren, at thirty eight dollars a year. It is very small but he should get nothing at all, because he is a man that has got plenty of money, and he is a large merchant in that district. I want that taken off if there is any way of getting it off, and I think that I will have the support of my Hon. Colleague, although he is not able to see eye to eye with me in everything, he may be able to see eye to eye with me in this.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, I take it for granted that this man was pensioned when I was Minister of Justice, but I have not the faintest recollection of it. I think that at that time I was trying to get out some of the special constables, I do not want to drive a man out of his pension but there is no reason why this man should not be cut out immediately.

HON THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say in reply to the point raised by the Hon. Member for Ferryland, that the only way that this pension could be cut out is by bringing in an act to cancel it. Once a pension is passed it is passed for life.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, I remember when I was in the Government advocating the abolition of that pension, and I understood then that it was cancelled. And I found it here to-day and I drew Mr. Moore's attention to it. But it would cost more than thirty-eight dollars to bring in a bill in here to cut him out, and I don't consider that he is worth bringing in the act for. Mr. Chairman, we are now voting salaries for gentlemen that occupy seats in the chamber adjoining this place, and I would like to put myself on record here, as being absolutely in favour of the abolition of the Upper House. Here we have a number of gentlemen drawing big salaries, costing 9,000 a year and we are not getting $9,000 back out of it. I fail to see what value the people of this country are getting out of the back linnies of this place, for that is all that I call it. There are a number of individuals over there with "Honourable" tacked on to their names, and they have no interest whatever in the welfare of their country.

When a man is defeated to-day and his party goes in he is generally put in the Upper House, and probably in the Executive Council, and I claim that a man who is not elected ought not have any say in the affairs of the country. You find this ridiculous position in this Government as well as other Governments, especially in this one, that a gentleman who has not been elected is one of the largest factors in the administration. I am not making a deadset against that gentleman, but am trying to point out that this ought to stop. I read some time ago that the Government of Australia, or New South Wales, were trying to abolish the Upper Chamber, because it is a certain drain on the revenue of that country, and they do not derive any benefit, directly or indirectly from its existence. Possibly this idea has never come to the minds of this administration, and the next administration may have defeated candidates, or men with whom they are afraid to go to the country to look after. But no matter what Government is or may come in, the Upper House is only a farce. They are sitting about one day a week, and when they interfere with a money bill we can throw it out, and rightly so. Why should we take anything from a few people who haven't got the confidence of the country—people who should not be allowed to occupy seats on the Executive Council. I think if the Government did this they would be taking a step in the right direction. To begin with it will save a few thousand dollars, and do away with an unnecessary department. You go in this Chamber and look at the members

seated in arm chairs, doing nothing and knowing nothing of the affairs of the country, dominated by one or two. I want to put myself on record as being absolutely in favour of wiping it out of existence.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, I don't disagree altogether with what the Hon. Member from Ferryland has said. If the Government wants to practice economy, that is the way to do it. And another way is at the Government House—there we have a salary of $15,000, for a Governor with a large amount for expenses, fuel, unkeep, and such like, which runs up to about twenty-five thousand dollars. There are a lot of trappings which are no good at all. There is no Governor here at the present time; the administrator the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court is in charge, and he can do the work quite as well as any Governor, if not better. Now the Prime Minister has said that there are several institutions wanted, among them a Poor House. Now where can we get a better Poor House than the Government House? There are lovely grounds to sit in, and gardening to while away the time of the aged. I consider the Governor with all the trappings of the Government House an infernal nuisance. It ought to be done away with, and let the affairs be administered by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. At the same time you can do away with the Upper House. That is where the Government can save money, and you can spend it for the good of the fishery or some industries that are doing some good.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Colonial Secretary who has the handling of that $10,000. Is that for Beaumont Hamel Park?

HON COLONIAL SECRETARY—Yes. We transfer the money to the other side. I understand there is a man in France now—a Sergeant Brown. Colonel Nangle is through over there now.

MR. CASHIN—Is he a Newfoundlander?

HON MINISTER OF JUSTICE—No, I think he is a Canadian. He is not under pay now, but is proposed.

MR. CASHIN—We have plenty of men in Newfoundland who can do it and one of them ought to do it.

HON MINISTER OF JUSTICE—It is proposed that this man get the job. I too think there are plenty of men of the Newfoundland Regiment who can look after it. There is Mr. John Murphy, on the other side, for instance, who is a good man. Or there are lots of men out of work and one of them would be glad to look after Beaumont Hamel Park.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I am glad the hon. member brought up that question as it is one of importance. Up to the end of last year the disbursements were made by the War Graves Commission to Colonel Nangle up to December last, through the War Graves office. Beaumont Hamel Park, five or six in France, and one in Belgium were managed in that office. I was in London last year and spent a great deal of time on that question; unfortunately Colonel Nangle left for Canada shortly after I arrived but Mr. Murphy gave me all the accounts and statements of the office. Since then it has been practicaly fixed up and at the present moment there are only a few small accounts; some amounts that have to be cleared up. Regarding Beaumont Hamel Park, I certainly think a Newfoundlander will get it. I don't think Mr. Murphy will be an applicant—he is a very fine office official. But there are others there, and if not they are here. I know now of a popular young married man who was in our Regiment who would be glad to go there as caretaker. The matter is in

the hands of Committee of Council and will be straightened up as soon as the accounts are fixed up. But the man in charge of Beaumont Hamel Park is going to be a Newfoundlander. That Park is unique as a War Memorial, and the most striking in France. It has been availaed of by the 29th Division and by the Highland Brigade, and will go down in history as one of the finest of the war memorials. And this matter must be looked after in such a way that we will have nothing to reproach ourselves on. And I feel that we will be called upon to pay more. We have to send a man each year to each of the Memorials in France and one in Belgium. I assure the House that this matter is not being disregarded—we will get a man either there or here.

MR. CASHIN—I wish to thank the Colonial Secretary for his information. I understand that the salary for that man will be included in the main account. It is the intention, then to get a man to look after it? Can you give at the present time any idea as to the full size of the Park?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—About twice the size of Bowring Park. It is a large property. I should like to say one word—a proportion of that $10,000 must go to the War Graves Commission. We feel that the Park should be in our own hands—they wanted to look after it, but we thought otherwise.

MR. WARREN—Can you tell what proportion is given the War Graves Commission?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—About $6000. The British Government wanted to take it over but there was a very strong sentiment against it. Colonel Nangle was very strong against it. He said that its identity would be lost sight of. I think that while Newfoundland can do it we should keep it under our own supervision and even if we require more money we can make provision for it in supplementary supply or in some other way. I think that as a matter of sentiment we should keep the park under our own supervision.

MR. WARREN—I think, Mr. Chairman, that under this heading I might bring up the matter of Public Utilities. Now the peaple in St. John's are paying for electric light and power and gas and I would like to know if there is any inspection of meters by which the light and power and gas is checked up for the consumers. These companies have practically a monopoly of their respective business and the ordinary citizen would like to know if he is getting what he is paying for. The electric light is more a question of quantity than of quality although of some evenings the electric light is rotten and tiring and fatiguing to the eyes. I would like to ask Mr. Chairman if the Inspector of Weights and Measures has anything to do with the inspection of gas meters and electric meters and if not if the Government will not take into consideration the appointment of somebody who will be the nucleus of a public utliities commission, which I think is a necessity in this country.

HON THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—I mght say that the matter of a public utilities commission has been given consideration by the Government recently. The telephone company last year adopted the policy of charging an additional amount for the service subject to a discount if paid within a certain time after the end of the year which would make the bill the same as it was before the additional amount was put on. When the bills came into the Colonial Secretary Department I brought the matter to the attention of the Government and we sent them back to the company and told them that we would not accept the bills that way. By accepting them and having the discount taken off we would admit the prin-

cipal. So the telephone company corrected them and they were paid in that way. Since then the telephone company has notified the Government that it is absolutely necessary that if they are to continue the service that they increase the rates and the anomaly, or the paradox exists in this connection that the greater the number of subscribers the greater the cost of the telephone to each subscriber. After the number of subscribers goes over three thousand the proportionate cost is greater. That is the position that the telephone company is in to-day and I am rather surprized that we have not seen Mr. Murphy around as usual. Perhaps it is not yet late enough in the session. No doubt he will be along later and we can expect him. We will have to cross that bridge when it comes and if they can prove that the telephone operation is not a paying proposition it is very difficult to know how to handle it. That is where a public utilities commission would come in. We should have some board who can go into the office and go through their books and see if this paradox of which we speak is actually a fact. Now with regard to the question of reading meters, this is not a new subject. It is discussed year in and year out and I am just as enthusiastic today that it is absolutely necessary that there should be some person standing between the electric light and power companies and the consumer.

I think that it is necessary to appoint an inspector of meters and measures. We have an excellent man in Mr. O'Mara. He carries out his work in a very efficient manner. Now that we have all these new spring balance scales there is not such a great amount of inspection necessary but look at the number of people who use electric light and gas. They have no protection and we are absolutely in the hands of the companies. I do not know whether this House or the Municipal Council should take it up. Personally I think that it is a matter for the Municipal Council and I cannot see for the life of me why they could not appoint an inspector and let every person whose meter is inspected pay for himself. We merely pay Mr. O'Mara a nominal salary of two hundred and fifty dollars a year. He gets paid by the people whose scales he inspects. And the same thing should apply to the inspector of meters, particularly now that electricity is used so universally. Even the very poorest people are using electricity. Kerosene is becoming practically a thing of the past as far as lighting houses is concerned and it is important that something should be done in this direction and if it is the wish of the House I will drop a line to the Municipal Council and say that the matter was under consideration by the Legislature and say that they think that there should be some step taken towards the appointment of an inspector of meters. But that is not getting away from the question of public utilities. The whole country is getting involved in one way or another with these corporations. A Public Utilities Commission could be so elastic in its scope as to cover almost everything. The case brought up the other day by the hon. member for Twillingate, Mr. Brown, about the hospital at Grand Falls. I made enquiry and I discover that there is a great deal of truth in what Mr. Brown said. I understand that the hospital is fully equipped in every way, it has an elaborate and up to date machine and accommodation for thirty-seven patients and there are never more than seven or eight there, and they only go to the Grand Falls hospital for minor operations. And they go to the

Twillingate Hospital or the St. John's hospital for any serious treatment. Of course that is not a matter that concerns because it is outside the Public Health Department as the hospital is owned and operated by the Company but at the same time if we had a Public Utilities Commission and could send a person there to look into the matter and see what is wrong with the hospital and why people are going away from it to get treatment. I understand that Dr. Scott is in a very bad state of health and has not the energy required to look after all this work and they have got two young doctors down there from some small university in Canada for the last twelve months. They have had no previous experience and naturally the people are diffident about putting cases in their hands particularly when they can send them to St. John's or to Twillingate and get the benefit of these institutions. I think that there should be something done to change the conditions as they exist to-day.

MR. WARREN—I am glad to hear that the Colonial Secretaary proposes to take some steps in this matter. As far as St. John's is concerned there is some person necessary to look after the meters and I have no doubt that will require some legislation. The matter of a Public Utilities Commission is one for the whole island, the same as it is in Canada. There each province has its own Public Utilities Commission and the commission is paid by the Public Utilities. In the Province of Nova Scotia Public Utilities are not allowed to earn more than eight per cent. and they are not allowed to increase their rates if they are already earning this amount and the Public Utilities Commission has full power to enquire into their books and ascertain just exactly how much they are making, and I would draw the attention of the House to the fact that at the present time the Bell Telephone Company in Canada is undergoing investigation and a Newfoundlander is acting for the Province of Ontario before that Board. The creation of a Public Utilities Commission would require some legislation and under the act that is in effect in the Province of Nova Scotia it can be see that there are numerous ramifications. I hope that the Colonial Secretary will carry out the suggestion that he has made and take the matter up with the Municipal Council and have if necessary legislation brought in if not this year then next year to put it into effect.

HON THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Talking about the matter of a Public Utilities Commission, might I say that if the Government has this in their minds the best thing that they can do about it is to forget it. We have lots of commissions now and they are useless and worthless and I do not think that it would be a good thing to put any more of them into existence. We have a hospital commission. It has been in existence for some time. You have to pay the Secretary a salary and there was an appointment made in the hospital over the heads of this commission some time ago and what is the use of a commission of that type. I do not think that this Government or any other Government should consider anything more of that nature. It only means the creation of more jobs and will mean a serious loss to the Colony. That is how I feel about it.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Whilst I appreciate the point that has been taken by the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition I must say that I cannot imagine anything that would more justify the expenditure than a Public Utilities Commission if you get the right kind of a commission. I believe that whether this Government does it or not, we will live to see the institution of a permanent

board of some sort to handle disputes and all other matters pertaining to public utilities.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—We learned the other day, I think that it was in answer to a question that the Sebastopol had been let at a rate of forty-five dollars a day. Does that mean that you will have to hire another steamer for the Labrador service this summer?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The Sebastopol was a very good boat to get clear of. She is very expensive to run. Burns a lot of coal and it would be easy to get a smaller boat to burn less coal.

MR. CASHIN—With regard to the Sebastopol she is the sister ship of the Senef. She consumes about five tons of coal a day running for twenty-four hours and she can be run by nine or ten men. The Earl of Devon was on the Coast last year at the rate of a hundred and fifty dollars a day. That was forty-five dollars. The Sebastopol would not cost the Government a hundred dollars a day. That is where the Government could have saved fifty dollars a day and credited it to the railway steamers.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, I would like to put in a word for the Magistrates. Now, some years ago the Coalition Government in 1917-18 appointed a Civil Service Commission to go into the question of civil service salaries, and when I became the Attorney General in 1919 I took the report of that Commission and fixed the salaries of every Magistrate according to that report, and you will notice that these salaries are rather odd amounts, varying from $760.00 to $1,404.00. I think that I was the only Minister to adopt any part of the report of the Civil Service Commission as regards the matter of salaries. The Magistrates were unfortunately the only people affected by this report, and the salaries have been kept strictly to that amount recommended by that Commission ever since. There has been no change since then and I would like to put in a plea for them and ask if it is possible for the Government to add something to these salaries. Other salaries are increased from time to time. It was in 1919, seven years ago, since I fixed these salaries according to the report of that Commission, and I would like to suggest to the Government that the time is come when some addition, however small, might be made to the Magistrates' salaries. In many cases it will seem, when the estimates are come to, that the policeman gets more than the Magistrate, who is his superior officer, and both of them living in the same place; and we can therefore realize that it is time that something be done. Magistrates have to have a certain amount of dignity. They have to wear clothes that other people need not wear and they have to keep up appearances on a small scale, and however poor it may be must be compatible with the dignity of the office which they hold, and I am sure that some of them find it very hard on the small salaries that some of them get. Sometimes the salaries are small because they happen to be the doctor as well as the magistrate, but considering the work they do, and how essential they are and what they save to the department by their work in the outports, and taking this all into account, I hope that the Government, either this year or next year, will add something to their salaries.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I thank the honourable member for having given me an opportunity to state to the House my ideas on this matter. I, too, strongly subscribe to the idea expressed that the Magistrates should be given an increase in salary. I have had a petition

from every Magistrate in the island asking that something be done in connection with this matter. The salaries are very much under what they ought to be. It is impossible for these men to keep up a position of dignity and independence with the miserable pittance they get. Unfortunately I have been unable to get the Government to agree to an increase, as the estimates show. I have succeeded in another matter of the same kind, in the increase given the policemen and firemen, who are a class equally deserving. There are two or three matters of this kind in my department which I hoped to have adjusted. The Magistrates, there is no doubt, are underpaid. It is not fair to expect to get a good class of man as magistrate who will be able to preserve his independence for the amount that is allowed them. I hope that conditions will become such that the Government will be enabled to do something in this respect. The matter was brought to the attention of the Government. The petition was under consideration, but I regret to say I have been unable to get what was desired. I tried also to get an increase for the policemen and firemen, who were also very deserving of it. I did get that, but, unfortunately, I was unable to get the other.

MR. ASHBOURNE—I would like to bring to the attention of the Minister of Justice and the Government that since Mr. Mifflen came here to act as Controller of the Liquor Board no appointment has been made for the position of Magistrate at Twlilingate. This does not speak well for the efficiency of the Government. It is a matter for the consideration of the Minister of Justice and I would like to have information as to when the Government intends to make this appointment.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —We have applications for the filling of the position of Magiistrate of Twillingate, but at present Twillingate is very capably and well served by two Justice of the Peace, Mr. White and Mr. Rice, and fortunately nothing of consequence has occurred that they have not been able to handle, and the position has not been filled for a reason that I can assure the honourable member for Twiliingate is a sound and good one. I hope that the honourable member will find, however, that inside of a fortnight the recommendation will have been sent in for the appointment of a Magisitrate there.

MR. HALFYARD—Do I understand from the Minister of Justice that it is the policy of the Government not to appoint any more Magistrates after the decease of any of them?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —No, that is not it. There is a reason that the appointment has not be made but I cannot very well mention it in the House.

MR. HALFYARD—I don't think it is possible to cut out some of the Magistrates, but by extending the jurisdiction of some it might be managed to get along fairly well.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —The policy of extending the jurisdiction of the Magistrates and thus give a better opporunity of giving larger salaries is what we have been trying to do to some extent.

MR. HALFYARD—The Magistrate at Grand Falls at present is Mr. Fitzgerald, and I want to say a few words just now in connection with a matter referring to him. I know him personally and we are the best of friends. He honored me as an opponent in Fogo district but we were sane enough not to allow political differences to prevent us from being on friendly terms. He holds the position of Relieving Officer at Grand Falls, and copies of a petition have been forwarded to different members

of the Legislature asking for their support in a request for consideration for work performed up there in that capacity. Grand Falls is an industrial centre and the Relieving Officer there has to deal with different sections of the country. A great many people appeal to the Magistrate as Relieving Officer and I don't know what they would do if they didn't have a person like the Magistrate to look after their wants and necessities. I trust the Government will accede to Mr. Fitzgerald's request for an increase in the stipend. There is only a nominal amount allotted now, and something should be done to take the place of compensating these Relieving Officers from time to time by Minute of Council. This does not apply directly to my district, but there are a lot of my constituents who go over to Grand Falls looking for employment and who, at times, appeal to Mr. Fitzgerald for assistance, and I want to support the request made by Magistrate Fitzgerald, and I hope the Government will see their way clear to increase the stipend.

HON. MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES—I would like to add a few words to what has been said with regard to the petition of the Magistrate at Grand Falls. During the past five or six years I have had occasion at different times to request Magistrate Fitzgerald to go out of his way to help constituents of mine. At times when they have been stranded he has helped them to get to their homes, and I know of cases where he has assisted men from his own private means. I want to add my support to this request of Magistrate Fitzgerald's.

The magistracy at Oderin is one of the oldest magistracies in the country, at least on the South Coast, and since the retirement of Mr. R. T. McGrath there has not been any new appointment made. The people there have been trying to secure the services of a suitable medical man, but have not been successful. The salary vote, it appears, is not in the estimates this year, and I would like to know what has been done about the position of Magistrate at Oderin.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Oderin is now under the juriisdiction of Presque, the Magistrate at Presque now handling the business of both places.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, I am glad to see that the pay of the police and firemen is being increased, and there are only a couple of things I want to comment on. I notice you have increased the salaries of the Inspector General and the Superintendent. Now I drew attention to the pay of the Superintendent last year, and am glad to see the increase, and think it ought to be greater considering the work and position, and more in proportion. One thing has always occurred to me and it is that policemen and officers in St. John's have much more work than those in the outports, and incur more hardship. I don't know whether it would be a matter of internal arrangement, but I think the St. John's officer earns more than the outport man, who has a "cushy" job. I have often thought, when going home perhaps at a late hour on a stormy night, and seeing the policemen on duty, what a different life they led to the men in the outports, who have a comfortable home and a comfortable bed in the night. I think it is a matter for consideration.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —I am afraid it is a matter for internal arrangement. We can't draw the line between the outport man and the city man, because they are continually being transferred. I do feel that there might be some method of internal arrangement of financing

such a thing out of funds taken, and I think the hon. gentleman's point is well taken. The police duties in the city are more continuous and exacting than in the outports, and it is a matter which can be brought to the attention of the Inspector General. Regarding the Superintendent's increase, I think it will be found that in comparison with salaries in other places and other increases, this is a fair one. As far as Mr. Hutchings is concerned, when he received the appointment his salary was on a par with that of the Judges of the Central Court, and now it is well below. My answer to that is, of course, that his emoluments help bring his salary up. Another point that must be borne in mind with regard to the work of the police in St. John's is that they participate in fires in addition to doing police work, and are almost as active as the firemen. I am glad to find that this House accepts this tribute to a really fine force.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, I wish to add a word of appreciation to the fact that the Government has seen their way clear to do this for the police. We have all read and heard of the corruption existing in police forces in other places; I have never heard of any corruption existing in our force. I think that point about the police in the city is a good one, and am glad to see the increase in the salaries of the constables, sergeants and superintendent. I also notice that the Inspector General has received $400.00. Now, sir, I might as well be honest and say that I am not altogether in favor of that amount. I think some years ago the present Attorney General, when in opposition, made some remarks about the amounts paid this office in excess of the salary. This gentleman's salary amounts to approximately $10,000 a year—he gets his fuel, light, motor car and other things, and is practically on a par with Government House. The other day when discussing pensions we raised this point as to the computing of emoluments of such officials, and, sir, you will find that if the Inspector General lives 20 years more, as I hope he will, his salary, with emoluments, will be equivalent to $15,000 a year. I don't think you have raised the Superintendent's salary in accordance with that of the Inspector General. Your raise of $450.00 is very small when you consider his work is practically as arduous as that of the Inspector General.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —It is a percentage increase.

MR. CASHIN—I know the Superintendent gets his house, as well as the Inspector General, but I go so far as to say that there are few houses in St. John's to-day as fine as that in which the Inspector General lives. And he doesn't have to pay for fuel, light and other things. He has his janitors and orderlies. It is a little kingdom on top of the hill, overlooking the city, and I don't think he earns it.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Chairman, I have just one remark to make. We have undertaken a general increase, and the conduct of the Inspector General is not such as to warrant giving him a black eye, and that is what giving everybody but him an increase would mean. There was no reason to draw the line, and I endeavoured to scale them as fairly as I could. That advance of $450.00 to the Superintendent is practically 30 per cent, and that of $400.00 to the Inspector General is only 20 per cent., and I was trying to meet the position in making them. I would like to see the Superintendent's salary increased still more. As far as the motor car is concerned, that is for depart-

mental use, and of course it can't be helped if once in a while it is used for private purposes. But when men are sent out for special purposes, it is always used. As regards the computing of pensions, that will be met by the Board when it is necessary to do so.

MR. CASHIN—In reply to the last speaker, Mr. Chairman, isn't the Inspector General on a par with the deputy heads of other departments? And none of these are getting a raise. I am not opposing the Inspector General getting more, or casting a slur on him, but I think his salary should be kept on a level with the other deputy heads.

MR. MOORE—Mr. Chairman, whilst it is not my desire to delay the time of the House, I want to say that while I occupied a seat here for eighteen years I always advocated the cause of the police and firemen. I want to compliment the Government this evening on their action, even though the rank and file are getting only a small increase; but I hope I will be here to see them getting a further and bigger increase and to which they are justly entitled. During the Warren administration I bawled myself hoarse on behalf of these men, but without avail. Now I question the ability of Inspector General Hutchings to go out and direct operations at a fire, because he has had no training in this direction. I was an eye-witness at the Mount Cashel fire and I saw how things were conducted under Captain Kean of the Central and Sergeant McGinn of the East End, and I hope that when the Government are considering the matter of putting a man in charge of the East End Station that they will not forget McGinn, who at all times has proven himself to be a super man as a fire fighter. I again thank the Government for the way it has behaved this evening, and as one who has always espoused the cause of the policemen and firemen, I feel proud and I trust their present increase will be but the nucleus of a further raise of pay for them in the immediate future, and which they will get if my voice has any say in the matter.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to delay the House this evening, but Mr. Cashin has asked why we did not engage the services of the Sebastopol. Last year we had two tenders for the Labrador service, one from the Earl of Devon and another from the Union Trading Company. At the time the Government decided to put a boat on, the Earl of Devon was the only one available; the Senef was at Triton loading herring and would not be available for a fortnight or three weeks, and consequently we got the Earl of Devon at $150 a day, but with the proviso that her freight and passenger money was to go to the railway. For the information of the House I might say that I applied for the Sebastopol and was told that she could not run for that amount owing to the heavy overhead expenses for the crew.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, with regard to the remarks made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries I do not think that Capt. Bragg of the Senef was given any reply to his tender, and I think that his tender was made in sufficient time for the Government to consider whether they were going to accept the Senef or not.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, when I stand up here I do not do so to make a lame excuse. The tenders were only asked for three days before it was decided to send the boat to the Labrador. It was on July 9th, 1925, that I was asked to get tenders, and

the day before that I was in receipt of a message from Port Union asking to send an inspector immediately at Triton to inspect a herring cargo as the Senef was loaded and ready to sail. The tender for the Senef was $130.00 a day, with freight and passenger charges, which brought it over $150.00 a day, so that the Earl of Devon was cheaper after all.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I do not think that Capt. Bragg's tender received the consideration that it should have received. The form of the tender was written out in my office by me quite early in the season, and I can say there was nothing in that tender about passenger or freight rates for the railway concern.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman, the Fire Department and miscellaneous votes come to the grand total of over $47,000. This is a matter which only affords protection to St. John's, despite the fact that the Prime Minister went to the country on the slogan of a "square deal to all." It seems to me to be unfair that the rest of the Island should be called upon to pay its quota for the upkeep of a Fire Department here in St. John's to the extent of over $47,000. I stand here as an outport man to register my strongest protest towards contributing for the upkeep and maintenance of a fire brigade which does not affect the outports. I would suggest that this amount be taken clear of Estimates altogether and that some insurance plan be arranged on property here to meet the charge.

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 Monday afternoon, May 3rd, at 3 of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, May 3rd, 1926.

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

MR. POWER—I beg leave to present a petition from various settlements in the district of St. George's, asking that means be provided to help the development of St. George's coal fields. The development of St. George's coal fields have been a bye word in this country. This Company was formed in 1918, and with the limited amount of capital that has been available, they have done everything that could be done for development. Today they find themselves financially embarassed, and have come to this House to ask for assistance, but the Company does not come on their knees begging for something for nothing. They simply come here asking for a loan and have every confidence that they will be able to pay it back, dollar for dollar, and will be able to lift all liabilities in a short time. I might take this opportunity to inform every member of the House and persons outside the House that this Company, since formed, has been in the hands of Read, Son & Watson, and they, as Chartered Accountants, have annually audited the accounts of the Company, and these accounts may be found in the offices of the St. George's Coal Fields, and can be seen by anyone who wishes to go through them. The President of this Company, Mr. Freeman, is trusted and respected in this community and in other countries as well. The statements, that Mr. Freeman has been drawing a salary

from this Company, is absolutely incorrect. Mr. Freeman, practically, has not taken a solitary dollar from the funds of this Company. He has given his valuable time and energy during the past years simply because he has faith in this project, and hopes that future developments of it will repay him for his trouble. It is my humble opiinion that the time has arisen in this country when it is up to us to find out whether we have coal in workable quantities of commercial value in this country or not, and the only way for us to do that is by having the Government take hold of it. It has been found impossible to get outsiders interested, and the local capital over there has already been invested in it. This is a matter for serious consideration of the Government. As far is I know, the only place we can look to for any development worth while in that respect is at the St. George's Coal Fields. There is a promising future for this enterprise if the Government should grant the prayer of the petition, and if it is proved that coal of commercial value exists there, it will certainly be a day of the greatest importance to this country. There are five factors that should be considered in connection with this project; the financial standpoint, labour, cheaper fuel, the independence of having our own coal, and last, but not least, what it should meant to the railroad. As regards the financial aspect, what it means to this country may be seen from the fact that hundreds of thousands of dollars are annually going out of the country to help give labour and to foster industries of other countries. If all this money were kept within our own country, it certainly would be a great advantage to every man, woman and child of the community. The labour question, unfortunately, is at present one of importance, and not too promising. The Government may find it a matter of necessity to open up avenues of employment somewhere, and it is my opinion that several hundreds of men could be employed to advantage in this enterprise. The promoters of the Company have given serious thought to its possibilities, and it has been figured out that, if successfully developed, the coal fields will be able to supply coal at least $2 a ton cheaper than at present offered for sale at any part of the country, which is a question of vital importance to every householder, who have had to buy coal at exorbitant prices during the last few years. The fact of getting our own coal and cheaper coal would, I think, be hailed with delight by the whole country. Regarding the railroad, which the Government and the country generally are viewing with alarm, I think and feel sure that, if the working of the St. George's Coal Fields were brought to a successful issue, it would, in a large measure if not entirely, solve the financial difficulties connected with the railway, and, in connection with that, I might say also that if this House sees fit to vote a loan to the St. George's Coal Fields Company, the Government would have practically the whole handling of all the coal. Some people are inclined to look upon the matter of the Government's putting money into this as a gamble. If this is a gamble, I feel confident that it is a gamble worth while. There is not much to lose in it, and, if it is successful, the reward will be worth while. There is one point in connection with this petition, and it is, in regard to the development of St. George's Coal Fields, it will be necessary to have a branch line connected up with the main line from the coal deposit which, I think is somewhere about seven or eight miles at the nearest point. The rails that are now being discarded for heavier rails could advantageously be used in that respect, but, even if the Government

would not agree to that, we have there already a line of road which has been surveyed some few years ago, and on which, I think, some $5,000 has been already expended. It would cost very little to fix this road and put it in a condition that machinery could be transported over it. There are practically no brooks of any size to be bridged, and, in building this road or expending any money on it, the Government would be opening up one of the best pieces of agricultural lands on the coast, and I certainly think it would be availed of by a good many settlers up there.

For a number of years I took a deep interest in the St. George's Coal Fields and I spent a great deal of time in endeavouring to enthuse members of this Government and previous Governments towards taking this matter up. I trust, therefore, that the present administration will give their whole-hearted consideration to the prayer of this petition and that some means will be devised whereby those mines will be developed. There are several other points that I might dwell on; but, understand, that simliar petitions are being presented today along the same lines so I would ask that this petition be referred to the Department of the Colonial Secretary for consideration. Meanwhile I give the prayer of the petitioners my hearty support.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker, supplementing that petition I have just been handed a similar petition signed by a large number of people of Ferryland District and I wish to endorse the sentiments expressed by the honourable member for St. George's in this connection. I might say that on previous occasions I have advocated and asked that an attempt be made to find out for certain if the St. George's Coal Fields could produce coal in commercial quantities. If that could be ascertained, it would be a great asset to this country, as there are approximately three million dollars spent by the people of this country every year, and it would be a saving of two million dollars that go out to the United States and Canada, if we got coal in commercial quantities in our own country. On top of that we got the railway, losing one million dollars a year, credit with a haulage of two and a half dollars a ton, which is supplied from the West Coast would have its deficit decreased considerably. I feel sure that the future of this country depends largely on the development that takes place within the next few years of our coal areas. During the past few years the greatest countries in the world—and Newfoundland as well—have been confronted with coal famines. We have heard of the coal strike in the United States and there is a prospect of a coal strike in Canada now. Well then, is the development of the St. George's Coal Fields a gamble worth while in this country? I say it is. The government has gambled in projects with less promising outlooks and why not in this? I say it is the duty of the Government to find out if coal can be got in Newfoundland in commercial quanities. We are spending two millions of dollars annually for coal and we have been fleeced by the Nova Scotia people, as coal can be mined in Newfoundland to-day for two dollars per ton while we are paying $6 per ton for it in Nova Scotia. Now, Mr. Speaker, if the Government fails in their duty to give this project their assistance they have not got the welfare of the country at heart. I have very much pleasure in giving this petition my hearty and unqualified support.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, I beg to support the prayer of the petition; and I also beg to ask that a petition that has been handed me from the district that

I have the honour to represent be incorporated with original petition. As has been pointed out by the hon member for St. George's, the question is one of very great importance and is one that to which the Government ment will give a great deal of sympathy so that the very best expectations of those interested in the project are realised. I notice that there are twenty-five hundred people of the country interested financially in the development of the St. George's Coal Fields and as the years go by I feel sure that the importance and the need of coal areas in this country will become magnified. I commend the work of the promoters of this Company to the whole House because I think that their sincerity of purpose is unquestioned and they have not sufficient backing to carry out what they have on hand. Last year a delegation from this Company had a discussion with the Executive Council on this subject and I think they will realise that we were in sympathy with them. The Government is up against all kinds of financial problems at the present juncture; but in the solution of that coal problem the question of employment for our people must predominate and for that reason alone, if for no other, one is rather inclined to take a chance in hastening the develpment of those coal areas. The possibilities are enormous, the risk is not very great, and, therefore, I do not see why the Government should not determine shortly once and for all whether coal can be found at the St. George's Coal Fields areas in commercial quantities or not. I have every sympathy with this project.

HON. MR. CRAMM—Mr. Speaker, I have on my desk a series of petitions signed by voters of three or four sections of Bay de Verde district on this same subject. As has been indicated by previous speakers, there are very many circumstances to be considered in dealing with a question of this kind and I would not be prepared to say what my attitude would be until I get more information than I have to-day. It is a matter of very great importance and one that requires serious consideration, and I would require to have some expert guidance before deciding what my attitude would be. Meanwhile I present the petition to the House and ask that it be given, as I feel sure that it will, serious and sympathetic consideration.

MR. LAKE—Mr. Speaker, I have also on my desk a petition from the people of Burin district and a feature about it is that it is largely signed by the ladies there. That to my mind speaks for itself. I think like previous speakers that this country should consider its coal fields. It seems to me, according to the report we have before us, that coal of considerable quantities is to be had in this country. I have listened in the past to discussions on what is known as the Besco contract and it appears that this House have paid a great deal of attention to Besco and Bell Island, and no doubt wisely so, but if we have mineral wealth to attract gentlemen here from all parts of the world, it goes to prove that our coal areas are well worthy of our most serious consideration. If we can market coal in paying quantity I think it would be a wise move for this or any other Government to give the matter their serious thought and earnest consideration. I have much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in presenting similar petitions from the inhabitants of New Melbourne and New Chelsea. As has been remarked by the member for Burin, these petitions are largely signed by ladies and it shows the keen interest they take in matters affecting the requirements of the

country. Consequently, the petition is more worthy of my support. This is a national question and should be treated as such both by Government and Opposition.

If we have coal seams of a workable nature, in sufficient quantity in quality, an effort should be made to try and work those seams. Coal is one of the greatest assets to any country. As has been pointed out they are next in importance to our fisheries. It has been remarked by one of the hon. members who had the honour of presenting the petition as to why the other Governments had not taken any interest in the matter. I would like to tell the hon. member who offered these remarks that in 1920 in August or September the Railway Commission who took over the Railway at that time on behalf of the Government in conjunction with the Reid Nfld. Co., were concerned over the supply of coal. Coal was at that time at an exorbitant price, and it was even difficult to procure at all, and it was thought then that if we had coal in this country an effort should be made to produce it. Without wasting any time whatever the energetic members of that Railway Commission with the Government Engineer asked me to go along with them. We had quite a holiday and a pleasant experience, and we visited the coal seams at South Branch. Perhaps it would not be out of the way if I gave Mr. Hall's report on the adventure. If an attempt is made in this country to develop our natural resources and turns out to be a failure, the parties responsible are held up to ridicule and abuse, but I am glad to hear now that those who have spoken in support of this petition this evening are of the opinion that even if it is a failure it is worth while, even if the Government in 1920 tried to do something which they thought would be good to the country and did not meet with the success anticipated. The chief object of the Commissioners was to develop our coal areas. Anyhow an effort was made at that time and we spent about $77,770, and the amount of coal obtained was two thousand five hundred and ninety tons, worth 45,900 dollars. The net loss was $35,000. There is no need to take any more of the time of this House, and I trust that the Government will give these petitions their serious consideration, and if it is at all possible find the money to develop this coal.

HON THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the district which I have the honour to represent, in connection with the same matter. And I would first like to congratulate Mr. Freeman and the gentlemen associated with him for what they have done in connection with this mine. I think personally that if the coal fields are developed and coal is found there in commercial quantities, it would be a great thing for Newfoundland. But I certainly would like to say this that the Finance Department and the Finance Minister thinks that the Government should give the gravest consideration to this matter and anything that could be done to help the Colony should be done. As I pass this petition over I assure the petitioners that I shall do everything that I can to assist in any way or to help out these coal fields and to make them of commercial value to Newfoundland.

MR. DUFF—Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition on the same matter, from the inhabitants of Carbonear, asking that the Government take this matter in hand. It is a vital matter. And I certainly support it. We should do all we can to help the producers, and produce is what the country needs today. This country has wasted money in hotel facilities and docks and other

things, and we feel that $100,000 spent in the St. George's Coal Fields would not be wasted. Some reference was made to the late Mr. Howley. These men travelled the country extensively and they gave statements in reference to these deposits. I understand that the present administration have in mind the appointment of a geologist, and I hope that they will not catch him too old, and I hope that they will not go too far afield for him. I support this petition and I trust that the St. George's Coal Fields will be a great success and that in the near future we will be burning our own coal.

MR. ASHBOURNE — Mr. Speaker, I wish to present a petition signed by the electors of Twillingate. With regard to the matter now before Chair. I would like to say that, situated as we are in the Arctic circle, the question of fuel is of an amount importance to us. I understand that $100,000 were expended on the development of Bell Island before the ore was exportation of fuel is of a paramount importance. If the Government considers this petition, and I have not a doubt that they will give it their earnest consideration, I think that we will all admit that the value that will accrue to the country from the opening up of these coal fields will be a real one. We know that there is coal in Newfoundland, whether in commercial quantities remains to be proven. Placed as we are in close proximity to Nova Scotia there is every reason to believe that some of the strata which formed during the carbonaceous period and of which the Cape Breton Coal Mines form a part, may have been extended to our own shores. I believe that a certain amount of money spent by the Government would place this matter beyond the shadow of a doubt. We know that Newfoundland is of volcanic origin, and an up-to-date geologist would be able to advise the Government as regards the matter of coal to a certain extent. Nevertheless here in Newfoundland we are considerably handicapped by the lack of capital. I believe that, if the Government saw its way clear to put a certain amount of money in this to encourage this coal field, they would get it back twofold, or perhaps a hundred-fold. We know that we have Bell Island Ore Mine—perhaps one of the richest in the world,—and if we could find a coal mine in Newfoundland that would help us to render out our steel, it would be a means of giving this country a great amount of labour. I believe the spending of a certain amount of money on this property would be an excellent move, because it would be a good thing to prove conclusively whether there is coal there in paying quantities or not. And that alone would be for the benefit of Newfoundland; invest, because if it was found out that coal was not there in any quantity they would not be called upon by the people who have prospectuses and bonds to offer, and who may be going around the country offering shares in the coal mine to the people who perhaps cannot afford to lose their earnings. I give the petition my hearty support, and I want to say that should the Government decide to place certain money or give certain concessions to the St. George's Coal Fields, that the Government should participate in the profits if coal is found there in paying quantities, and thus the money granted the company and the Colony's interest would be protected.

MR. GRIMES — Mr. Speaker, it was only in the early part of the session that we were discussing these same proposals and I take the same stand then as now, and that is that the Government after careful investigation, should lend all the assistance that is necessary to develop this coal property. As for St. George's I have heard five reasons why the Governshould give this their earnest consid-

eration. It was pointed out by the Colonial Secretary that the main one was the question of employment. Because despite all the money that has been spent during the last twelve months or more, we are still up against it in the matter of trying to find employment around the country to relieve those who to-day are feeling the want of work. The number of people who have been working in coal mines in the United States and in Canada, and who have come to Newfoundland and have seen the soil around St. George's have all been unanimous in their statements that there is coal there. We have the opinion of men that have been over the areas and who are supposed to know something about the matter. Not only do we find this in the report of the late Mr. Howley, but also in the report issued by the Coal Field's Company. These reports are worthy of the consideration that they deserve. The matter of $100,000 or more is after all only a small affair, when we consider what is at stake in the matter. The Finance Minister has stated, that before he can commit himself to this project he will first of all have to find out how the finances of the country are at the present time. But as I said we have expended lots of money within the past couple of years, and the question now resolves itself into a matter of finding out how best to spend the money that is placed at our disposal. Here is something that affects a possible industry in this country. We have been spending money on other purposes that have not yielded anything, and why should we hesitate where a matter of such importance is concerned. And looking at it from that standpoint, I think that the prayer of the petition ought to be given the earnest consideration of the Government, and at the earliest opportunity somebody should be sent up there, and decide the matter. I am inclined to be a-bit optimistic from what I have heard from men who have worked in the coal fields of the United States and Canada, and who have been over the coal fields in Newfoundland. If the Government gives that $100,000, and this means as I understand that the St. George's Coal Fields Company will give their rights over to the Government for the money that is advanced, I don't think that would be of much use. If the Government finds out that there is coal there of commercial quantities they should take some shares in the Company and let the Government share the profits as well as those interested in a private way.

HON LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Speaker, I want to put myself on record as supporting this petition. If the Government now finds itself in the position to help the development of the coal areas they will have no opposition to the scheme. The petition has been supported by the Minister of Justice, the Minister of Finance and Customs, Mr. Cramm, a member of the Executive conditionally, Mr. Power of the Government, by the members of the Opposition party and by all the members of both the Independent Parties. So if the Government has any desire to help the development of these areas, as I said before they will have no opposition. In view of all the support that has been given the petition it does not need my support. There seems to be some difference of opinion as to whether there is coal there or not, and I think now that the Government should find out if there is coal there of sufficient quantities, to warrant development. The earnestness of Mr. Freeman the president of the Company, and his Directors, is sufficient to make the Government or any body of men help along an industry of that kind. They have worked at it. They have put their money in it. With one

thing in view and that is the development of the area and making it of commercial value. Of course the story has been circulating around for many years throughout this country that there is lots of coal in the area, but that certain commercial interests have always taken a hand, and in some way have prevented the area from being developed. Whether that is true or not I do not know. Now that it is probable that development will be undertaken I would suggest that the Government allocate some money for that purpose, and under Government supervision have a correct survey made, open up some of the seams and see if there is coal there. Mr. Power,the member for St. George's in presenting his petition stated that this money was needed in the nature of a loan, so that if the Company made any money out of the venture, the money could be paid back on this loan. I don't want to delay the House, but I simply want to put myself on record as supporting this petition, whereby a scheme may be evolved, and something may be done.

MR. SULLIVAN—Mr. Speaker, I would like to have a word in connection with the petition that is now before the chair. A petition has been handed me by Mr. Freeman, from a certain section of the district of Placentia. It is signed by about five hundred voters, among whom are a number of lady voters, who have taken an interest in this question and I think rightly so. If there is coal there in commercial quantities it will mean a great thing for Newfoundland. Now if there are reasonable grounds for supposing that coal is there in commercial quantities, then I think that this Government or any other Government would be justified in assisting the St. George's Coal Fields Company to ascertain once and for all what the possibilities are as regard making it an industry. As the leader of the Opposition stated, they are not asking for a gift. They are asking for a loan. I presume that the people would be prepared to give a first mortgage on a loan by the Government, and then if the proposition turns out as it is hoped it will, the Government would be paid back In the event of any money being voted by the Government to help this industry I agree with the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition that this money should be spent under strict Government supervision. Perhaps a mining engineer should be called out, as it is of no use to go around haphazardly, but the thing should be done systematically. All the work done in connection with this coal field should be done with a view to the future working of the coal fields. The sum of a hundred thousand dollars has been mentioned here. Now that is not a big sum if it is proved that there is coal there; $100,000 will give employment to a hundred good miners for perhaps 10 or 12 months of the year. We badly want some industry to start. Personally I am prepared to take a chance in finding if there is sufficient coal there to develop a new industry in Newfoundland. If it was discovered that there was coal there it would be a great thing for the country at large, and not only for the country but also for the railway. I doubt very much if the railway would make very much in hauling coal from St. George's. They certainly could not make anything at $2 a ton. But even if they paid $4 a ton, the coal could be mined and put on the cars for $4.50. Then even with a profit of a dollar fifty a ton for the management and other things, it could be placed on the market in St. John's for $10.00, including the coal company's profit. Look what a great benefit that would be to the country at large. And I say that we ought to take a chance if the money can at all be provided to ascertain whether there is coal there or not.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, I beg leave to present a petition from two or three places in the District of Bonavista Bay on the subject of Coal Fields in St. George's District. Now, Mr. Speaker, I may say that there are a great number of my constituents living in Bonavista Bay who are shareholders in the St. George's Coal Fields, and these men are the labouring class—the fishermen, that have most of these shares. Taking that into consideration, and also taking into consideration the enormous price we have to pay for coal, I think it is the duty of every member of this House to consider this petition in the light that it ought to be considered in. Fiirst, that is, as the hon. member for Ferryland has said, considering the enormous amount of money that has been invested, and by the poor people of the country, and secondly, that it will give us much cheaper coal to burn. As has ben stated, when outsiders come in looking for concessions, they always get consideration from any Government that happens to be in power, now it is the poor men, and particularly the fishermen, who have come in, and I believe the Government will come to their assistance. I have heard several people who have surveyed this district and have come to the conclusion that we have coal there, and if this proposition is properly carried out, that coal will be produced for all time, and much cheaper; therefore I give the petition my hearty support.

I shall do all in my power to see that everything possible is done as far as the Government is concerned to help this thing. I don't consider we are helping these people entirely. If the Government spends $50,000 or $100,00, it will be more for the benefit of the country at large than of the shareholders; and even if it doesn't turn out as we could wish, it will show that the Government, the Opposition and the Independent parties are prepared to do all possible to see if there is coal there or not. Therefore I have much pleasure in presenting this petition.

MR. W. BROWNE—Mr. Speaker, I think I may be pardoned for taking this opportunity of saying a few remarks on this subject, since nearly every member in the House has spoken, otherwise it might be construed that I was not in favour of this venture. Now, sir, I realize as thoroughly as all the other hon. members how important coal is in every household. It is a domestic, industrial and social necessity and convenience. Up to now we have been looking to Nova Scotia, Pensylvania and lately to the United Kingdom for our coal, but as the hon. and gallant member for Ferryland has pointed out, the United Kingdom isi now almost in the throes of Civil War; there are nearly a million miners on strike, and if we figure out how much each would mine, the resulting rise in price and scarcity, we can see that coal will be very short indeed and the prices high. And since there has been a strike in Nova Scotia, and an anthracite strike in America, we are all the more forcibly led to the thought that we ought to have some supplies to fall back on in our own country. And since this petition has been numerously signed and well received in all parts of the country, I think it will receive the attention of the Government. I agree as to the confirmation of the report of Mr. Howley. While I have great faith in the abilities of that gentleman, he was a Newfoundlander, enthusiastic and devoted to the welfare of his country, and so perhaps over-optimistic. I think it will be wise to have an outside geologist to confirm his report,

and I believe that he would find the coal there. I also believe that the Government will do what they can to procure this confirmation—they have given an assurance to that effect in the Speech from the Throne, and I believe that when they see the course to adopt they will adopt it. They can then decide what form that assiistance will take, whether as a guarantee or not, or whether they will assist in the erection of a spur line to where the coal is situated. But I do believe that it will receive the consideration of the Government and that they will adopt an attitude which will realize the hopes of investors, the energies of the promoters, the efforts of the directors, and especially of Mr. Freeman. That the House is interested all the members will agree. I have no petition to present, but I am in sympathy with and deeply interested in the work.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—As the Government head in the House of the Department of Agriculture and Mines, I would like to say a word on this important subject. It is gratifying to know that on a subject of this sort the members of this House can all agree, and it is refreshing to see that we can scrap our differences at such a time. Without attempting to mitigate the importance of our industries, especially the fishery, I am of the opinion that the time has arrived when we must depart from our old policies and measures. In my opinion that time has arrived—of course our fisheries will always be of importance, the cod fishery, herring fishery and others, but they can no longer support the whole country. If we had no Humber; if we lost Grand Falls; if Bell Island closed down, what would be the conditions of things in Newfoundland. We have a great deal of unemployment, and it is only by opening up new avenues that this can be met. Perhaps I am the only member of the House who has had experience in practical mining. I spent seven years of my life working underground, on hard minerals, and sometimes in the coal mines of Cape Breton, and one of the first duties I had when I took charge of the Department of Agriculture and Mines in 1924 was to visit in company with the Manager, the Coal Fields of St. George's. I had heard something about the property and had seen samples and reports, but I was argeeably surprised that they had over five feet of solid coal, and I was surprised that the efforts of the past Government had not been spent in that locality. I don't say that the members who were responsible were actuated by any other than the best motives—we all make mistakes, the best of us and the best of men. But I feel, and I think that all will agree, that we in Newfoundland must open up our own country. When outsiders come in with propositions they are always considered, and usually get concessions, and go away, some of them coming back and others not. Here is a place where much money has been expended, and by the poor people of this country, and we will be killing two birds with one shot. And I don't think it is altogether a gamble—there is a solid five feet of coal there, and when I went to Cape Breton in one place we went down to 1000 feet before we struck an ounce of coal. At Dominion No. 2 nearly three millions was spent before one scrap of benefit was derived. At St. George's you can see 5 feet of coal. Samples have been tested by Mr. Davies and others away, and found to be a superior grade of coal to that brought in this country. In what better way can we spend a day or night than in devising ways and means to develop this industry so that we could get work for 200 or 300 unemployed. And I look forward to the condition in the future to which some members referred when they claimed

the fisheries were failing—that Notre Dame Bay was going to bring back our prosperity. I have unbounded confidence in the mining possibilities of Newfoundland. I worked in Little Bay and in Pilley's Island, and I say that Little Bay could be working today if it were not for the inefficiency and dishonesty of the officials—and Pilley's Island is also closed down. As I said before, the only hope I see for the future of Newfoundland is the development of new industries—the fisheries are alright in their way, but they are not enough to give us any degree of comfort. This debate this afternoon is going to have a wholesome effect not only in this House, but throughout the country, where the people take up the Press and read that practically every member has spoken in support of this industry—it is wholesome to know that we can come together on some subject, and here is one that applies to every creek in Newfoundland. I have much pleasure in giving my hearty support to the prayer of the petition, and I want to assure the promotors that anything I can possibly do will be done, and not wholly in the interests of the promotors of the petition but of the people of Newfoundland. I feel that if we can turn out two or three hundred thousand tons of coal annually, we will benefit very greatly, the whole country. With the development of our coal areas of St. George's Bay—our copper of Notre Dame Bay—and our lead ores of Placentia Bay—the problem of unemployment will no longer exist.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Chairman, I want to place myself on record as being absolutely in favor of the prayer of these petitions. I believe in furthering local enterprises and in the development of the mineral resources of our country. For a number of years now men have been meeting and discussing the St. George's Coal Fields, and I have often heard it suggested that there was a "Nigger in the woodpile," that certain outside influences were brought to bear upon somebody or something in this country that have prevented the development of these coal areas. I don't know whether that is so or not, but the Government ought to be able to discover whether there is any vestige of truth in it or not. Possibly when they get at the bottom of the situation they will discover this "nigger." Abe Lincoln once said, "I don't know much about the tariff, but I do know this—that when you buy foreign goods you have the goods, but the foreigners have the money, but when you buy goods in your own country you have both the goods and the money." That statement had reference to the tariff, but I suggest that it also has reference to such an industry as this. I have nothing more to say than that I absolutely support the prayer of the petition.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSOTMS—Mr. Speaker, I beg to leave to introduce a petition from the United Church of Canada regarding incorporation, and would ask that if the rules of the House have been complied with, this be received. I also have a petition from the Newfoundland Conference and ask for the same treatment.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting these petitions. There are many reasons why a bill should be introduced to incorporate the United Church in this country, and when the Bill is before the House I shall have some further remarks to make. I give the petitions my support.

On motion these several petitions were referred to a Select Committee for Report as to whether the Rules of the House, as they relate to Private Bills, have been observed.

Mr. Speaker appointed the follow-

ing as the Select Committee: Hon. the Minister of Finance, Hon. Mr. Bradley, Hon. Mr. Cramm, Mr. Lake, Mr. Hickman, Mr. Halfyard, Mr. Grimes.

Mr. Cashin gave notice of question.

Mr. Halfyard gave notice of question.

On motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the notice respectin the Bill "An Act to Regulate the Whaling Industry" was discharged from the Order Paper.

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 Harbor dues payable under Chapter 181 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of Harbor Master and Harbor Regulations for the Port of St. John's."

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 Light Dues payable under Chapter 25 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Light Dues.'"

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 Fees and Dues payable under Chapter 40 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Board of Health, Health Officers and Quarantine."

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 Water Rates payable under the St. John's Municipal Act 1921."

Hon. the Colonial Secretary tabled Report of Newfoundland Director of the Newfoundland Power and Paper Co.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Colonial Secretary the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of discussing the action of the Governor-in-Council in consenting to the raising of £1,000,000 by the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company secured by First Mortgage Prior Lien Bonds ranking in priority to the "A" and "B" Debenture Stock guaranteed by the British and Newfoundland Governments respectively.

Mr Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, it will be remembered that on the 28th of April last the Hon. Member for Trinity, Mr. Godden, put a question on the order paper, which for the information of the House I would like to read as the answer that I propose to make is to this question. The question reads as follows:

(Reads)

As this question, Mr. Chairman, was of more than of ordinary importance I asked that the matter might be allowed to stand over for a day or two because of the necessity of getting some statistics that would answer the question, and I trust that it will be answered to the full satisfaction of the House. There has been a great deal of criticism and a great deal of comment taking place during the past months with regard to the transaction of the British Government and the Newfoundland Government guaranteeing the prior lien bonds of one million dollars for the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company. The answer that I will give to-day, I think, will prove that the position of the Newfoundland Government has been materially improved as far as security for the bonds that we have guaranteed is concerned, and in moving the House into the Committee with the consent of the Speaker I have done

so, so that this question can be ventilated and perhaps spoken to by some of the hon. members, because it is very important that the whole country should know what the position is between the Government and the company. The question asked by Mr. Godden I propose to answer in this way:

(Reads statement)

That is the position, Mr. Chairman, as far as I have been able to ascertain from those who are in a position to know and I think that it will be appreciated that the situation is one that we need have no misgivings about as far as the future is concerned with regard to this very important industry. I might say that I intend to table to-day the report of the Government director on the Board of the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company, and I think that the report will emphasise the tremendous success that has attended the efforts of this company at Corner Brook. As I said in speaking of the hotel, there are too many knockers in this country and I am afraid that outsiders have very much more confidence in the resources of this country that we have ourselves. When one commences to realize that this country has only a guarantee of ten million of dollars out of a total expenditure of forty-eight millions, and that so far every dollar practically that has gone into the construction in Newfoundland, and in giving labour to the people of Newfoundland and in making more earnings for the railway and the receipts of the Customs have got back the ten millions already from that project. And I might say, Mr. Chairman, that a good deal of harm has been done, or if it has not been done it is likely to occur with regard to the carrying out of the work at Corner Brook. Early in the session I was asked to table the statement of the number of people employed in Corner Brook and their different nationalities, and I think that it showed conclusively that out of thirty two hundred people working at Corner Brook that twenty nine hundred of them were Newfoundlanders, and it is to be expected that at the starting of a new project that we cannot hope that our working men will be able to take the senior jobs at the very outset, but there is no doubt that as is the case with Grand Falls that after they have got practice and experience they will get better and more lucrative positions. Although they have only got three machines going out there, the fourth has not been put into operation because of the loss of the grinding stones and some of the other parts, and if that had not occurred the four machines would be turning out the the maximum amount of paper, and as a matter of fact Mr. Lake's report says that they have turned out as much as a hundred and three per cent. Over a hundred tons a day from each of these machines is a fact that stands out in the paper world to-day. Some of the leading papers in the United States are using the Corner Brook paper for their front pages and their editorial pages, and that is an unprecedented thing, as no paper company attains that position until they have been in operation for at least two or three years, and therefore, I think, Mr. Chairman, it is the greatest endorsation possible that can be given for the wood of Newfoundland for its paper making qualities, and the effect of this is already been seen because there have been already enquiries from different paper making companies about the timber tracts in Newfoundland. A little while ago we had the contract with Mr. Crowe, and I think that the transfer of Mr. Crowe's interests to a company of the standing of the International Paper Company is a good thing for Newfoundland because when these people come to a place they do not go

away without properly testing out the possibilities of the place that they have visited. I think, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that this country is to be congratulated on the outcome of this project. It is a project that has been very severely criticised. It is a project that can be looked back upon with a great deal of satisfaction by those who were responsible for the starting of. Personally I never opposed the Humber proposition, and I hope that I will never be one to oppose anything that will be the means of giving some employment to the people of Newfoundland, rather I hope that I will always give my endorsation and backing to anything that will help to give remunerative employment to the people of our country. I trust therefore, Mr. Chairman, that this action on the part of the Government will be followed by a better understanding with regard to the position of the Government with regard to the Newfoundland Power and Paper Co. As pointed out in the report a million dollars of this money is to be spent on town construction, six hundred thousand pounds on paper making during the winter, and to the carrying on the business, and two hundred thousand pounds of a balance will be left in the Treasury for possible interest charges for the first year, and therefore I do not see that there are any grounds for any anxiety or any misgivings, because when the four machines are put into operation I think that the results of the enterprise will justify every dollar that has been put into it. I desire, Mr. Chairman, before taking my seat to table the report of the Government representative on the Directorate of the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—It will be impossible for us to discuss this matter to-day because we have not yet seen the report of the representative on the Board of Directors which has only just now been tabled, and the House would like to have the answer to Mr. Godden's question which has been given by the Hon. the Colonial Secretary and which we have not been able to follow very closely during the reading of same. I would like, however to make one point: The Hon. the Colonial Secretary told us that it is no business of ours what interest the Armstrong Whitworth Company is receiving for their preference shares, and he leaves us to believe that it is no interest of ours as long as we are liable for the ten million dollars that we were originally responsible for that was invested in the undertaking. I think it makes a very great deal of difference to us. The interest has to be paid on the capital that is invested. Interest has to be paid on forty five or fifty million dollars, and if it is only at the rate of five per cent. it brings the interest charges up to two and a half million dollars, and since the Hon. the Colonial Secretary does not know how much interest the Armstrong Whitworth Co. is getting on its preferred shares it is more likely seven per cent. than five. This company will be unable to exist under this enormous overhead expense. There is the interest charge on all the money whether it is on the bonds or on the preference shares or whatever it may be, and then provision has to be made to pay the running expenses, the salaries and upkeep, and the question is, is that company able to make sufficient profit to pay the interest on the investment. If it is not able to make sufficient money to pay the interest on the investment something has to happen to it. The company will have to readjust its capital. Now we notice in the "Daily News" report that the two steamers belong to this company are still blocked in the ice somewhere in the Straits. They have not yet been able to get into Corner Brook

and take away the paper that has been manufactured, which means that this company has to be able to carry over large stocks of paper for four or five months of the year without being able to realize on anything of it, and get any returns for it, and the point is that the Government before they made this agreement with the Newfoundland Power and Paper Co. should have taken into consideration the whole capital of this Company and decided if it had not been better for us to hold the security that we had and let the capital of the company be readjusted. Let the money that the Armstrong Whitworth Company invested in preference shares be readjusted, and the Imperial Trade Facilities Board, the Nfld. Government, could still hold the security for the money that they had guaranteed, because in the event of the company going into the hands of the receiver we would realize sufficient from the company that buys the enterprise to satisfy our guarantee and that of the Imperial Trade Facilities Board. That is one of the particular points of the whole thing, whether it can pay this enormous overhead expense. The Colonial Secretary said that the people in this country are too apt to knock every kind of industry. I do not think that they are, but I think that they have a right when the country is obligated to find out just what is going on, and the Government has a perfect right to give us all the information. I think now in view of what the Hon. the Colonial Secretary told us this afternoon, but listening to that report, I cannot figure out where we stand. I think that the proper thing is to have a thorough audit and see where the money is gone. When this venture was first introduced into this country, $20,000,000 or four million pounds was the amount that was required. The whole structure was to cost about $17,000,000, which would leave about $3,000,000 of the funds for the carrying on of the work of the company. Now we find that that $20,000,000 that was guaranteed by the Newfoundland Government, has been all used up, and a further four million that was guaranteed has also been used; and then we are asked to give up the guarantee to them, so that they can raise another ten million to carry on the work. Now there is something wrong about this, as between the estimated cost and the actual cost, there is a great difference. And I think that the country is entitled to an independent audit, in view of the fact that the Government have been called upon to give up their first lien, which they had upon the assets of the property. Now the fact of the International Paper Company coming in here has nothing whatever to do with this. They are not operating in White Bay and therefore that is no argument to use in this connection. What we want to know is the particulars of everything in reference to timber. What we want to know is why the Government do not bring before this legislature an agreement to give them the first lien upon the assets of the company, instead of taking upon themselves the responsibility of doing it without the authority of the legislature. Now, Mr. Chairman, I propose to move that the Committee rise and give us an opportunity to see the report of the Government representative, and the answer to the question given by the Colonial Secretary to Mr. Godden.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say a word. I fear that the honourable gentleman, the Leader of the Opposition, to-day finds himself in the position of one who would like to say something in criticism of the Government, but who does not know how to express it; he is not able to clothe it with language that will meet the case. I presume that the Committee is rising, and I have no doubt

that when he analyses the precedents that he made, and when he appreciates the figures that he has put forward, he, himself, as a business man will come to the conclusion that the premises of his argument are quite sound. Now, let us take the last point that the honourable gentleman raised, first. The idea of the Committee sitting, as the honourable gentleman who introduced the resolutions said, was so that we should avail of the first opportunity of discussing the whole matter. There need be no alarm at all about any desire of stopping this Committee rising, and keeping it risen for as long a period as desired. I merely wish to say, as I said on a previous occasion, that, as regards this matter, there is nothing required in the way of legislative authority, and I also wish to say to him to-day that, so far as the Government's position is concerned, I think he will find that every care and caution that he suggested ought to have been taken, was taken. From the correspondence that has already been laid on the table and published dealing with this matter, it will be seen that this Government in this case did more than any other Government did under the circumstances. We have an industry there, and the question to decide is whether we are going to have that industry, in which so much hope has been expressed, suddenly stopped and put to the hammer. Now, I would like to take the last point of the honourable gentleman; he does not state, but he suggests that it might possibly have been wiser for the Colony to have let the premises go, so to speak, into liquidation. I would like to invite his attention and the attention of the honourable members of the House to the point that was developed by the Colonial Secretary. In his presentation of facts, he said that in point of fact and law, the guarantee of the Government to-day, that is the real guarantee on the ground, pro rata and as a matter of fact, is better to-day than it was under the original arrangement. The honourable member will see, when he studies the correspondence and the presentation of facts contained therein, that this Utilities Board, because of over expenditure, were faced with the necessity for further capital. As the Colonial Secretary has pointed out, there has been spent to-day, in labour, in the different works, since the industry was started, probably an amount equal to the total amount for which we are liable, so that, after all, our position to-day is a great deal better than the position of the British Government, which only got the benefit of the expenditure which actually went into the material. A considerable portion of the expenditure that went into the work on the other side was in the manufacture of a class of article that did not give the same general distribution of labour as Newfoundland got. It is not unusual or remarkable that an industry of this magnitude should find itself liable to go to this tremendous over-expenditure. I feel that it will be found that this Humber proposition, as regards the liability that has been suggested to have been incurred, has not been an extra liability at all. There has been no moving back except in matter of pure theory. Now, I don't think so far as the Government side is concerned, that there will be any difficulty about rising the Committee, for, as the honourable gentlemen who introduced the resolutions and who spoke for all on this side of the House, said that the only reason for bringing these resolutions before the House and laying them on the table, was to give the members an opportunity of getting all the information that could be obtained about the matter. The last point made was in regard to the position concerning the Preference Stock. I think that the position that the Colonial Secretary

took was that it not a matter of concern as regards the situation under the present arrangement.

MR. CASHIN—Might I ask the Colonial Secretary or the Minister of Justice when this time expires so that the Newfoundland Government will be responsible for the interest on the debentures. I think when the contract went through this House, it was stated that the interest would be payable on the bonds out of the principle for the first two or three years.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Interest will be due next January.

MR. CASHIN—Because I myself am of the opinion that we cannot lose even if we had not a guarantee. Because the amount of money which has been expended in this country has no doubt found its way back into the coffers of the Customs, in different ways. But my point is this, that no doubt next year when the Minister of Finance brings in his budget, he will ask us to vote the interest on these bonds, and we will have to do it. But looking at it now from a business standpoint, I would like to know to whom this $50,000 at five per cent. interest, has got to be paid to. The interest has got to be paid to someone. And even if the Company manufacture 120,000 tons of paper a year and they make a profit of twenty dollars a ton they don't make enough to pay their interest. Besides that there are royalties to be paid and I don't know what else.

Mind you, I am not knocking it, and I am glad that the matter came up before the House, and while there may have been a certain amount of squandermania out there it is not well to advertise the fact, because it might make it more difficult for the promoters to develop the Gander. I understand that the ownership of the transmission line has been transferred to the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I would like to say in justice to a previous administration that the moment that the knowledge came to them that the Utilities Corporation was taking that position at once action was taken. I do not know if it was in Mr. Warren's time, but immediately following his time, Sir William Lloyd was the Attorney General for a short period, and I know I discovered in the office evidence that a message had been sent by him in protest against it.

MR. CASHIN—I think that we knew in 1923 that the plant was going in Corner Brook, because after the House closed every member in the House went to Corner Brook. Special trains took members from both sides of the House, and I am aware that construction had already commenced. We knew it then, every one of us, and we made a mess of it. There is the position in justice to the members who were in this House.

MR. ASHBOURNE—While we are on this discussion I would like to ask the Colonial Secretary whether or not the Government asked any advice from the Colony's financial advisers or their solicitors in England as to what action they would recommend the Government should take in the matter.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I tabled a letter from our solicitors and their advice.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Is that all the correspondence there is in that respect, because I perused that correspondence, and I do not see anything in that correspondence pointing out what they would advise the Colony to do. It just gives the three alternatives and leaves it to the Government to decide.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The representative of the Trade Facilities Board came out here and explained the whole position to the Government and gave us a memorandum of hom the money would be spent. He

advised us of the position and the three alternatives were considered by the Government, as they had been considered by the Trade Facilities Board and the British Government, and we followed the advice which they gave, and it happened to be the only sensible course to pursue. Otherwise it was a case of putting the company in the hands of a receiver, and that was a course that everybody agreed was a very unadvisable proeedure. Consequently the government is not anxious to derive any prestige from what they have done, because the same course would have been followed by any other Government that might be in the same position.

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:

Finance Dept.	$5,817,489.38
Colonial Secretary's Dept.	61,757.00
Dept. of Justice	372,017.92
Dept. of Education	892,977.53

The said Resolutions being read a second time it was moved and seconded that the House concur with the Committee thereon, and the said Resolutions were agreed to.

Replies to questions No. 1 and 6 were tabled. Questions 2, 3 and 4 were deferred.

Notice of Question

(1) MR. ASHBOURNE asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the Table of the House the petitions presented to His Excellency the Governor in Council signed by over ten thousand women of Newfoundland requesting the Government to introduce legislation at this session of the Legislature for the prohibition of the sale of alcoholic liquors as a beverage in Newfoundland.

(2) MR. HALFYARD asked Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing what is paid per trip, during the Winter season, to each of the following Mail Couriers for services on the route from Clarenville to Thoroughfare; the Couriers are Allan Smith, Stephen Blundell and Solomon Marsh.

(3) MR. HALFYARD asked Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs if it is the intention of his department to make an extension of the telephone line from Deer Harbour to Random Head Lighthouse this year.

(4) MR. HALFYARD asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing the allocations made for the Main Line between Thoroughfare and Deer Harbour for the calendar years 1924 and 1925 respectively; give the names of the parties to whom any allocations were made and for what specific purpose, and if any returns have been made to Table the copies of same.

(5) MR. HALFYARD asked Hon. the Prime Minister if the Government has given any consideration or has come to any decision, or has any intention of providing any steam or motor boat service for transportation purposes for the section of Trinity District from Clarenville to Trinity.

(6) MR. SCAMMELL asked Hon. the Colonial Secretary what special services were rendered by one Josiah Gosse for the amount of $150.00 which was paid him by the Colonial Secretary's Department under Contingencies Account for the year ending June 30th, 1925.

In reply to question 5, the Prime Minister said: We have not come to any decision with respect to the ser-

vice between Clarenville and Trinity up to the present.

MR. HALFYARD—Arising out of the reply given by the Hon. the Prime Minister to question No. 5, I find that there is one part not inserted, and that is if the Government has any intention of providing a steam boat or motor boat service.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—We can't give a reply to that. We have not discussed it.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Two directors of Besco are here today, and we are to have a conference with them this evening, and I ask to have this Order (Committee on Besco Resolutions) deferred until we have this conference.

Second reading of Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Railway and Shipping."

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—In moving the second reading of this Bill, I would like to explain the Bill to some extent. It provides merely for the constitution of a commission to take charge of the railway affairs. The Commission in charge of the railway at present, and for some time past, has been operating entirely illegally, and the object of the Bill is to legalise the Commission in charge of the railway's affairs. Most of the earlier clauses are for the purpose of defining the duties of that commission. It will be noticed that it is proposed to change the name to the "Newfoundland Railway," in place of "Newfoundland Government Railway." Possibly the less "Government" expressed in the management of the Railway the better for the management of it. Various classes relate to the question of cattle on the line and define the liability of the Railway in connection therewith. Clause 10 refers to giving passes on the line and to whom they shall be given. Altogether I think that the Bill is one which can be discussed in Committee as we go through the various stages because it is nothing more than the result of the necessity to give power to the Commission for the management of the various affairs of the Railway.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier if it is the intention of the Government or not to furnish estimates to the House in connection with the management of the Railway.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The intention of the Government is to furnish estimates, but not in detail. The salaries will be voted in globo as I understand they do in Canada, where they find it impossible to give every detail in connection with the expenditure and don't give it. The Government does not see any necessity for furnishing every particular in connection with the expenditure at the railway. The Estimates will be voted in globo. The payment or remuneration, if any, of the Commissioners themselves will have to be voted by this Legislature. Naturally, it would not do for them to appoint themselves and prescribe their own remuneration, and that is provided here that the salaries of the Commissioners shall be voted by the Legislature.

MR. GRIMES—If I understand correctly from the Prime Minister, the estimates are to be presented to the House, but votes are to be put in globo, and the precedent that the Government are going by is what is being done in Canada and other places. I would like for the Premier to give exact information as to really what happens in Canada, and those other places with regard to Government Railways when the Minister of Railways presents his budget in connection with the railway. I think the House is entitled to full information.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The Estimates, as I understood it, would be open for discussion as they

would be in Canada, as they would be anywhere else. They will be open for discussion just as much as if brought in in detail, except there will not be disussion of the particular salary of some particular clerk, having specified amounts at hand, but it will be possible to ask any question as to what salary such a man is getting, if it is one which should be reduced, and so on, just exactly as if it was down in detail.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Railway and Shipping" 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. HALFYARD—Arising out of the question asked by the honourable member for Twillingate as to whether the Estimates for the Railway are to be tabled in detail, I presume the object of having any vote for salaries passed in this Legislature is to keep a check on them and know just what is going on, and unless the Estimates are tabled in detail it will be very difficult for this House to know whether good returns are being got for the salaries. It may mean quite an addition to the Estimates, quite a few more figures of Estimates would have to be considered, but the principle I presume of tabling Estimates is to enable the House to have full knowledge of how the money is being spent. It would be comparatively a small undertaking to give a detailed statement of salaries of the Newfoundland Railway when we consider the number of officials in the Canadian and such railways. I cannot see why the Government should refuse to provide the whole of the Estimates in detail. They could simply take the pay sheets and copy them out. If the Government, in their wisdom, however, think that it is not necessary, well alright, but why depart from the principle. I cannot see why the Estimates would not be put in, in detail for our consideration. Officials are being paid for service done and possibly the House might think that in some particular cases the payment is a little too much or that re duction should be made in different ways.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—As regards the inclusion in the railway estimates of a detailed statement, I think it should be considered that the Railway is not exactly in the same class as an ordinary public department. I think myself from the standpoint of the proper control efficiency and discipline of the railway it would be better not. By interference in the House of particular Members on behalf of a constituent employed in the railway the whole spirit of business efficiency of the railway might be destroyed. What we have to do is vote the estimates but not the salaries in detail, and so prevent any interference with the efficiency of the management by such a case occurring that someone might say that the section foreman at Tilton or somewhere else is not getting enough salary.

MR. GRIMES—I have my opinion with regard to this matter, and I think that there is a great deal of truth in what the Minister of Justice says that the railway should be kept free from interference of politics. There are two sides to the question whether Estimates should be tabled in detail, and of course we want to see that the railway is managed in the best possible way, and perhaps it might be the best way for the railway to keep the salaries clear of political interference and still the Legislature could hold the railway responsible if there was anything wrong. Probably as we go along we may be able to elicit more information on the

subject that may help to make matters clear.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, May 4th, 1926.

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

Petitions were presented by:

Mr. Sinnott from St. Joseph's re Public Wharf.

Mr. Power from Corner Brook re Water Supply.

Mr. Cashin gave notice of question.

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 Harbour Dues payable under Chpater 181 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of Harbour Master and Harbour Regulations for the port of St. John's."

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 passed the said Resolutions without amendment, and recommended the introduction of a Bill to give the effect to the same.

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 181 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Harbour Master and Harbour Regulations for the port of St. John's" 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 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 Light Dues payable under Chapter 25 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Light Dues.'"

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 passed the said Resolutions without amendand recommended the introduction of a Bill to give effect to the same.

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and the Bill entitled "An Act to 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 on motion of the Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions respecting Fees and Dues payable under Chapter 40 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of the Board of Health, Health Officers and Quarantine."

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 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 to Amend Chapter 40 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Board of Health, Health Officers and Quarantine" was intro-

duced 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 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 Water Rates payable under the St. John's Municipal Act 1921."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—The purpose of these Resolutions is simply to give power to give back money when ships are entering here with sick men, for the purpose of landing dead bodies, or for purposes of that nature. We have had one or two cases of that nature where this has been done, and it has now been decided to introduce these Resolutions for the purpose of allowing it by law.

MR. WARREN—When the Speech from the Throne was read about two months ago, we observed that it contained quite a formidable array of legislation, and amongst the Acts foreshadowed was an Act for the better control of the harbour of St. John's by the institution of a port authority. Do I understand that these constitute what we were led to expect, or is there a Harbour Board Act coming on?.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—The other act of which you speak is drafted now.

MR. WARREN—Is it the intention of the Government to introduce it?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—It is.

MR. WARREN—Why not have what is to be effected by these present resolutions provided for in that act? Surely all could be consolidated in the one act, instead of having four different acts to deal with the situation now, and then bring in, in a few days, another act for the control of the port?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—The matters dealt with under these four Bills differ somewhat from matters and affairs that it is the purpose of the Harbour Board Bill to deal with. The control of certain things will be given under the new act, but certain things will have to be controlled by acts such as these and by the Governor in Council. Take the matter of boats coming in for water. We have got the Municipal Council's permission in connection with that before introducing the Bill to-day. The Bill that is coming on rather provides what kind of duties shall be ascribed a Board with authority for the control of the harbour, more particularly in connection with wharves, obstructions, shipping in the harbour, and so on. Matters connected with the payment of revenue are really more directly connected with the whole colony and are not in the same class as those matters of the control of St. John's harbour which it is the particular purpose of the Harbour Board Bill to deal with. The Bill which is now about to be printed is creating a Board controlling the harbour of St. John's in connection with the erection of wharves, obstructions in the harbour and such matters. As regards collection of revenue that should be a benefit to the country at large these matters are naturally still left to the Governor in Council.

MR. CASHIN—I presume that this Bill on Light Dues will also effect ships coming in to repair. If a ship arrives to go on dock and lands her cargo and after repairs takes it again and takes no new cargo from the port what Light Dues, if any, has it to pay now?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—That is provided for in the original act, and of course there was no necessity to mention it in this amendment again. Section 2 of Chapter 25 of the Consolidated Statutes reads:

"Any vessel arriving in the port of

St. John's for coal, food, or supplies, or for repairs, and not bringing cargo for delivery in the Colony and not taking from the Colony any cargo which such vessel did not bring into the Colony shall pay only one half the Light Dues provided by Section 1 of this Chapter."

MR. CASHIN—Are the Government taking any steps to let the shipping world at large know that these acts are passed? Take the Norwegian ships for example. They know the port charges of this country. They know them of every country. It might be advantageous to advertise the fact, when these resolutions go through the House, because the city has been already known to lose on account of its high port charges.

MR. SCAMMELL—There is one point that I would like to draw attention to and get information why it is placed definitely and made law that there is a remission in the payment of Light Dues in the other Bills and in this with regard to the Board of Health, quarantine, it is made discretionary for the Minister of Finance. Is there any particular reason for that?

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—There is no particular reason. It is the same as in the old act that is all.

MR. WARREN—In case this Bill might have to go on to be amended in another place, I would like to draw attention to the wording of it.

(Reads)

It says that "in the event that such ships shall require or be given only a partial supply, etc." It should be "required and be given."

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 Water Rates payable under the St. John's Municipal Act 1921" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Replies to the following questions were tabled, with exceptions to Nos. 1, 2, 5 and 7, which were deferred.

(1) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the Table of the House statement giving the following information: (1) The total Revenue from all sources from July the 1st, 1925, to April the 30th, 1926, this information to be given for each month separately; (2) The total Expenditure from July the 1st, 1925, to April the 30th, 1926, this information to be given also for each month separately; this information not to include operations of the Newfoundland Government Railway.

(2) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the Table of the House statement giving the following details: (1) Total Revenue from all sources from July 1st, 1924, to June the 30th, 1925, this information to be given for each month separately; (2) Total Expenditure for the same period, information, to be given for each month separately; these details not to include operations of the Newfoundland Government Railway.

(3) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister if it is the intention of the Railway Commission to run a daily express across country this year as well as to have a daily boat across the Gulf; and if not, why not.

(4) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister: (1) If it is the intention of the Railway Commission to ask for tenders this year for the Marine Insurance of the Newfoundland Government Railway steamers; (2) Why were not tenders asked for all of them last year.

(5) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the Table of the House statement showing the Gross Earnings of the Railway for the months of March and April together with the Expenditure for the same period.

(6) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the Table of the House the following information: (1) If it is the intention of the Railway Commission to re-rail the division between Clarenville and Bishop's Falls this season; (2) Have any arrangements been made for the purchase of steel for that purpose; if so to lay all information on the Table of the House.

(7) MR. HALFYARD asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing the number of persons in each case who paid the Income Tax, under the different percentages, for the year 1925.

(8) MR. GODDEN asked Hon. the Minister of Justice if a married woman who does no work except her duties as housewife and has no income except that received from her husband is qualified to serve as a Member of the House of Assembly.

In reference to No. 3.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—It is not the intention of the Railway Commission to operate a Daily Express. Extra trains will be put on when conditions warrant it.

In reference to No. 4.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—It is not the intention of the Railway Commission to ask for tenders on Marine Insurance. The difference in cost is practically nothing. Lloyd's Rates prevail and it is perfectly easy to get lowest rates without tenders for them. That is the reason tenders were not asked for last year.

In reference to No. 6.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—It is hardly a matter for this House to decide whether any re-railing will be done between Clarenville and Bishop's Falls, as it can't be done without a loan for that particular purpose by the House.

In reference to No. 8.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—In answer to this question, strictly speaking, I should tell the honourable member to go and ask his lawyer. It is not a question that our Department can accept the onus of giving an opinion. As far as I read the Act, woman is equal to man. She is no better or no worse, and as mere man has got to qualify by income or property so likewise a woman has to qualify. She would have to have income or property in her own right. I give this opinion not as Minister of Justice nor as a lawyer, but as Member of the House of Assembly.

MR. CASHIN—Arising out of the answer to my question No. 6, if it is the intention of the Government to re-rail between Clarenville and Bishop's Falls, that it was up to the House, I would like to ask if it is the intention of the Government to bring in a measure asking leave to borrow money for that purpose.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—It is the intention to bring the matter before the House.

HON. THE MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—I beg to table answer to question of Mr. Halfyard, No. 3 on yesterday's Order Paper.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I beg to move the Order of Supply for today stand deferred.

Besco Resolutions

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of moving that these resolutions be stricken from the Order Paper, and in doing so it is necessary to make some explanation. I don't suppose there has been any subject that has been more contentious, and more misrepresented and the public generally more mystified over than this Besco con-

tract and resolutions. A paper that is supported by the members on the other side of the House has actually come out and suggested that the Government should forcibly take possession of the works of Wabana, and hand them over to somebody else to run, and put the Company out of business altogether. Now, anything more vicious can hardly be conceived, and which might have a very damaging effect on the introducing of new industries into this country. Further, we are told "Watch the Government; watch Besco; watch everybody." Now, Mr. Speaker, we are not afraid of being watched, because we have nothing to hide. I was asked not long ago "How much did Besco contribute to the party funds?" That was a fair question to put, and when I replied that this party had never asked for anything and never received anything from Besco, I was told that this was the first Government that had not got a contribution from Besco. A gentleman came in to me the other day and expressed an apology for having stated in a public place that he believed that every member of the present Government was bought by the Besco Company. He said it was generally believed that Besco bought everybody, and he supposed that we were in the market the same as everybody else was, and that he did not consider there was much harm in making the statement. However, nobody took much notice of what he said, but now he sees that it might be harmful, and he wished to apologize for it. I just state these matters to show the spirit in which this matter is discussed publicly, and how the whole situation stands to-day. Now, when I brought in these resolutions at the beginning of the session, I told the House that it was the best contract that we could arrange with the Besco Directors when they were down here, and so it was. I have been challenged across the House with the fact that my party went back on me, and I could not bring these resolutions in, and so they were hung up. Now, I want to state to this House that the party did not go back on the Government. I want to state to this House that this is one of the Governments that do not use their party as a mere voting machine. This Government consults the party, and when resolutions are drawn up, they are brought in and considered at the party meeting, and when there are any suggestions made for minor alterations in that agreement, we naturally listen to them. We listen to suggestions that are made from the other side of the House, and we would more readily listen to suggestions made by our own party, as long as the suggestions that were made were not sufficient to alter the main points of the contract, or to alter the contract in any material way whatever. Some alterations were suggested in connection with the housing problem, and some alterations were suggested in connection with the continuation of work at Bell Island. We thought that these points might be further defined, and we made one alteration in the wording of these clauses. We submitted them to Besco, who were, at first, very much disinclined to consider the alteration. When they showed their disinclination to consider this alteration, I was of the opinion that they really did not mean what they proposed in the first resolution, and the Government at any rate as far as I was concerned, were very much incensed, and I was very disinclined to make any contract whatever. While we were negotiating this matter, Mr. Wolvin sent a message to me to say that Mr. McLurg and Mr. Gillis were coming down to talk the matter over. They came down here, and, in the meanwhile, while they were coming down, we got copies of the Halifax papers and a lot of Canadian papers, and they gave us to understand that this Dominion Iron

& Steel Company was going to be reorganized, and, as the Nova Scotia Steel Company and the Dominion Iron & Steel Company are the two companies with which we are making the contract, I was very much concerned to find that the Dominion Iron & Steel Company was going to be reorganized. When Mr. McLurg and Mr. Gillis came to my office and discussed the details yesterday morning, Mr. McLurg said: "I want to preface my remarks with respect to this contract by telling you that it will be necessary to curtail operations in Bell Island, and it is only fair to tell you this to begin with." He said, in quite a natural way: "We have only been able to sell 300,000 tons of ore to Germany, and, in the ordinary course of events, we would use about 350,000 tons in Sydney. There is another 100,000 that were sold to Germany last year, but were not delivered, so that altogether we would have 750,000 tons more to take care of this year. Of that quantity of ore, we have already taken out 390,000 tons, so that only leaves us about 400,000 tons. Those, we will take out the remainder of the season, and that gives us 100,000 tons on hand at the end of the season. I want you to understand that that is the position, agreement or no agreement." I must say that I was very much impressed with Mr. McLurg in the conversation that I had with him. He seemed to face the situation in a fair minded manner, and I think that the Council, last night, who had a conversation with him up to eleven o'clock believed, in spite of statements to the contrary, that he was putting his cards completely on the table as far as he knew. Now, the situation as Mr. McLurg has given it to us, is that we can only operate the mines to that extent. Having given us that information yesterday morning, I began to discuss these various clauses that were contentious. I have found that there has been a good deal of misunderstanding brought about by the messages that crossed between Mr. Wolvin and myself, and they were not as contentious as it might appear. So, after about two hours' discussion of the matter, we should probably have been able to come to an arrangement that would have been satisfactory to the Government and the Company. Perhaps it would not be satisfactory to both sides of the House, because it is quite possible that some members of the Opposition would take a political view of the situation. However, we discussed the matter freely, and, when we came to one clause in which Mr. McLurg wanted inserted the words "If any power to do so"; I asked why he wanted that put in. He said it would be just possible that within a few months time the management of the operation of the Wabana may be in the hands of the National Trust Company. I don't say it is likely, but the position is, as we have seen by the papers, that the Dominion Iron & Steel Company is re-organizing, and their interests will be affected, and if the proposition that may be brought by Mr. McLurg and his Besco associates before this Trust Company is not accepted, then the Trust Company may have possibly to take control. It was when Mr. McLurg mentioned this that I thought we should call a Council meeting, and consider, under the circumstances, whether we would be justified in making any contract at all at the present juncture, and the Council decided that it was not advisable to make any contract at the present time. I had Mr. Gillis and Mr. McLurg down, and told them so. They were very fair minded about the matter, and they said that, while they would have liked to have had the contract, they could quite see our viewpoint, and they were quite prepared to look at things from our standpoint. We have agreed with the Bes-

co Company that we will continue the tentative arrangement that has been made for the last few years. We will continue that for another twelve months, and no arrangement will be entered into in the meantime. That is how the matter stands to-day. Local newspapers have insinuated and they have congratulated us this evening on the fact that we have thrown the Besco agreement. We don't claim to have thrown down anything. As soon as we find out who we are dealing with, who the owners of this mine are, and who are going to control it, then we will make the contract, and we will make a contract that we think is fair and just, and somewhat along the amended lines of the contract that we have already before the House. That is the position just as it stands to-day, and that is what I want to explain to this House, and now I beg to move that these resolutions be discharged from the Order Paper.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Speaker, perhaps there is some excuse of justification for the long harangue delivered by the Prime Minister just now, in telling the House his reasons for asking that the Besco Resolutions be discharged from the order paper, and while the Globe newspaper may have been somewhat caustic, in its comments, and somewhat vicious in its attitude towards an agreement which affects everyone of us, yet I don't think that he need brand all of us on this side of the House as subscribing to what appears in the Daily Globe. But I do say this, that I am very glad to see that the Government has taken the step that it has. I strongly opposed that contract that was put before this House. I have had something to do with Besco for the last three or four years, and I know what I am talking about. Now before I set down a proposition and indicate to the House and the Government, the course that I think that they should pursue, in the light of what has happened, I wish to make a few preliminary remarks. The Prime Minister has said that this contract had been misrepresented, that the public had been mystified about it. I would like to draw the Prime Minister's attention to the fact, that the contract had never been discussed by this side of the House. In the desultory discussion that took place on the day that this matter was brought up, I think that the member for Ferryland said something. On that day we asked that for the consideration of the contract be postponed. From that day to this we have never discussed it in this House. And it has never been misrepresented by any member of this House and certainly not by any member on this side of the House. And no word has been spoken by any member on this side of the House that could possibly have brought about the present condition of things. And the same thing cannot be said as far as Besco was concerned. But Besco has not treated us that way. The Government papers, in defence of the Government, and I will say in defence of everybody in this House, have to a great extent answered a statement made by the President of Besco. This has been published in the public papers, paid for by public money. (Reads)

Now this has not been contradicted. It was an unjust statement. It was an unfair statement. It was absolutely untrue and unwise. Let us look into the truth of a statement of that sort. The Government made a contract with Besco. They put it before their Party, the Party agrees to it, and then they bring it down to this House. It is never discussed in this House, and the next thing we know is that somebody wants this contract amended in some shape or form. I need not discuss as to who sent the information from here as to

the nature of the opposition, but I do say that that was a threatening bluff on the part of Mr. Wolvin. And anybody who falls for that sort of thing is to be blamed. It is purely a threatening bluff or a bluffing threat which ever you like to call it. And it shows a certain nervousness on the part of Mr. Wolvin. The Prime Minister said that the people had been told to watch the Government, and Besco. I have not heard very much about watching the Government, but I certainly do say that there is some truth in the statement that you should watch Besco, in view of what has happened in the country during the last four years. We know that $51,000 came from the coffers of Besco to someone in this country, I think it is time that we did watch Besco. The Prime Minister has said that the idea was conveyed to him by a gentleman who apologised to him afterwards, that Besco bought exerybody. They don't buy everybody, but there is a nasty suspicion around that they do buy some people. And let me say this now, which is the gist of what I have got to say, that before the Government of Newfoundland make a contract with Besco, the latter ought to put all their cards on the table. I would not take their word. The Prime Minister comes in here and reads a letter from Mr. Wolvin as to what they can do and what they can't do and on top of that comes this. You should not take their statement. When the question arose up there some months ago as to how much they could pay their miners up there, who wanted to strike, Mr. Rhodes started in and made them put their books on the table. The Government found out what they could pay and things went on smoothly after that. But this Government in making a contract with Besco as the Prime Minister outlined that he will make, if they cannot agree on it, they should make an enquiry into Besco, its methods, its liabilities, and what it can actually pay this country for the tremendous asset that it holds in Belle Isle. They are threatening the Government with the closing down of the mines, they have done it already. They said that Sir Newton Moore had been only able to sell 300,000 tons of ore to Germany. I can't believe it. But you believe it, and immediately the Government gets the impression that the mines are going to be closed down. Let me tell you this that if they ever had a chance to close down the mines, it was in the time that Sir William Coaker made a contract, in 1920. They have been dishonest to my knowledge, and it is your duty to find out. Nobody knows what is happening to that mine, except what is told you by the Directors of Besco. But I think that we should take steps to find out. We should not trust any statement from the Directorate of Besco. The Government ought to be looking out for the interests of this country. If ever there was a chance for closing down the mines, and I am not saying this now in criticism of the Government, I am saying it because I believe that the Government ought to act along the lines that I am suggesting, if ever they had a chance it was in 1919. In that year their contract with the Government expired, and it was intimated in the paper of the Fishermen's Protective Union that they might be charged one dollar a ton for the ore. If ever there was a chance for them to throw up their hands and say that they were going to close down the mines, there was their chance. Sir William Coaker was an influential member of the Government of that day, and I think that if ever they wanted to climb down it would have been then, for they had sufficient excuse for it. Did they do it. They sent their representatives down here and after negotiating for some time, they came to a contract, which I understand they never had the

slightest intention of carrying out. And I have not the faintest doubt that if the present Government make a contract with them and it does not suit them, they will not carry it out now. They had a chance to shut down the mines, but they never threatened to do so. Further than that, at that time the Besco people had 750,000 tons of ore on the surface at Belle Isle they used it as an argument to us in this way. "Here is 750,000 tons of ore, which we can't get it out of here. We can't sell it. Yet you want to charge us 25 cents for the ore mined, and you also want us to operate the minimum number of mines." But they finally agreed to do it, and they did it. With 750,000 tons of ore on the surface they could have put the Government of that day in a very awkward position. They need not have mined any more for a year, and they could have shipped only what they had on the surface. But they did not. They did not threaten to close down the mines. They did not say to the Government "We have enough ore on the surface to last for the next year and we will close down." They would have put the Government in a very bad position. Now to-day there is nothing to be seen of the 750,000 tons of ore that they had at Bell Island. They have sold all that they mined and they have sold the 750,000 tons besides. We know that they have chartered their steamers, and I say seriously that when the Besco people come to this Government or to any other Government, to make a new contract, in view of their record in this country, and in view of the fact that as I stated, they had no intention of carrying out the contract which they entered into in 1920, and in view of the fact that there has been an annual lock-out in January of every year since the contract was made, and with only one intention, and that was to get out of the export tax for the year, in view of all this I want to say that I don't think that the Government will be doing its duty either to the miners over in Bell Island, or to the general public of this country, who after all are perhaps the natural owners of the iron mine: I say that they will not be doing their duty unless they have a thorough investigation into the affairs of Besco, as to the possibility of selling ore to Germany, and to the amount of tax they would really be able to pay, etc. All these things should be thoroughly investigated before entering into any contract with Besco. And now I am not criticising the Government. I congratulate the Government. I think that it is a happy state of affairs, that this contract was never consummated. And I trust that as the contract would not have brought in an export tax to the Government for three years, that the Government will make use of the time at their disposal to thoroughly explore the possibilities of Besco, and see that it is really on an economic basis, and then make the best arrangement they can with the Company, and one that will be in the best interests of the people of this country.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker, I have listened with interest to the remarks of the Hon. Member for Fortune, and also to those of the Prime Minister who to-day has moved, not that this Order stand deferred, but that it be wiped out. It has been becoming almost theatrical, Mr. Speaker, to see the Prime Minister and you play the daily part concerning the resolutions regarding Besco. And the Prime Minister has made some possibly insinuating remarks in dealing with this subject. I remember, he said on the day he brought these in that they were the best the Government could do, and I remember trying to get some explanation of some clauses in the contract, and that I pointed out with regard to Clause 8, covering the expenditure of $150,000 yearly for five

or six years, that this was only ordinary overhead, and that even if there were no agreement that expenditure would be carried out. That it was only a bluff to get the Government to think they were going to put in some labour. I also drew attention to the terms of Clause 11, also to Clause 9, and to the fact that there were only 3 or 4 people in the country who control the coal from North Sydney. And I feel that if my remarks had any effect on the Government, and if the remarks of the Daily Globe, or the Evening Telegram, have had any effect on this contract, it is a matter for congratulation. But the point is this, that the Government did make the contract, and sign it—in the persons of Mr. Bennett and Mr. Higgins, and apparently they have run into opposition. Why can't they be honest and say they see their mistake? Besco has put it over the Executive ,and whether it be the influence of the party, or the Daily Globe or the Telegram, someone is to be credited with it, and it isn't the Executive Government, for they had signed the contract with Besco. The Prime Minister has said that they don't use the voting machine—I don't know whether they do or not, but when I was in the party we were looked upon as that and no more. But that is apart from the point—the Besco contract has been killed, and someone is to be congratulated, and I congratulate the Executive Government for its death, for they had signed it and have been turned down.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Speaker, I feel that I should like to offer one or two observations in this affair, although perhaps they will not be informative. I realize that the Prime Minister has performed what was obviously a distasteful duty with the best grace possible, but he couldn't sit down without having a few remarks on the newspapers and the people on this side of the House, and in reflections on past Governments. I am glad to see that the Government has dropped this—they have had to eat crow, and they themselves are responsible. When the Prime Minister says that his members are not mere voting machines, he seeks to leave the inference or insinuation that the members of previous governments were, and I throw back that accusation. I was a member of the Government on that side of the House from 1919-1924, and I tell the Prime Minister that if he had taken his party into consideration as we were, there would not have been dissatisfactions or patent ruptures in their ranks to-day as there are in the ranks opposite. I am reminded again of a philosopher where he says: "A unity of discords is the sweetest of harmonies."

However there has been a disagreement, and that has been responsible for causing you to change your mind. That may have been caused by the Press, or by your own members or by the members on this side, but whoever it is they are worthy of the thanks of the country. As Mr. Warren has pointed out there is a contract to-day with Besco, and one which they do not love, and based on the belief that Besco ought to give something back for the large assets they have at Bell Island. And they have kept on operating. I could show sheets of correspondence (but it is not germane now) about their condition and such things, but that doesn't enter here. The Prime Minister has referred to a conversation had with him, and has left the insinuation that Besco has bought previous Governments. But I want to tell the Prime Minister that I was a member of a previous government (we all know to what he refers) and I want to say that no contribution from Besco has even gone to pay my election expenses —he may as well have spoken out. I have had a seat in this House since 1919, and in the Government from

1919 to 1924, and I tell the Prime Minister, and any others that no part or portion of Besco's filthy money came to me. I am a member of an organization which can pay its members' election expenses, and that is made up of the fishermen of this country. And I hope, Mr. Speaker, that I will never occupy a seat in this House by any assistance from this corporation we are discussing this afternoon. If that ever happens it will strike a blow at the Parliamentary government in this country, and against the rights of the electors. If I want to be elected I will find the money for my expenses. I have done it in the past and will do it in the future. I want no money from Besco, and I throw back the challenge to the Prime Minister, Besco never did anything for me. If any member on this side is tainted with Besco money he can speak for himself.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I have never made any insinuation that the hon. member was paid by Besco.

MR. SCAMMELL—It was not said in so many words, but the Prime Minister said that other governments had received party funds from Besco and the insinuation was in the comparison, and I wanted to make the thing clear. In conclusion I am glad to see that the Government have dropped this—they have been asleep, and someone has aroused them. We didn't discuss it from this side—as a matter of fact we asked for time when it was brought up, and while it is true that the Daily Globe is supporting this party I personally do not agree with all it says. It is not because it supports us that we see eye to eye in everything. I am glad to see that this thing is finished, and wish the Prime Minister all the speed possible in discharging this from the Order Paper.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, this matter is of the greatest importance to the district which I have the honour to represent, and I should not like the occasion to pass without making my views on the matter clear. I exceedingly regret that the day has arrived when the future of Bell Island affairs is so precarious and uncertain—I exceedingly regret the condition of things that has caused the Prime Minister to come in and ask that the contract be withdrawn. And the decision to withdraw the contract is in no way caused by the difficulty of making a contract with Besco or passing such a contract through this House. The whole thing evolves from the special circumstances surrounding the company at this time, and when the re-organized company comes into existence it will enable the Government to make a contract for the continuance of things at Bell Island. The part I deplore seeing is the uncertainty of conditions over there financially, but the Government could take no other course than to ask for withdrawal. I regret that the future is so uncertain.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, I have one or two observations to make on this matter, while the subject is before the House. The Prime Minister will try to cause his audience to believe that this matter had previously passed a party meeting, having been considered by the whole party. Well what has transpired between the time he brought this agreement into the House and now would contradict that. I can hardly believe that the party was really consulted and the different clauses explained, and that as soon as it came before the House there was a different attitude on their part. We are led to believe that there was opposition to the agreement within the rank and file of your party, and that that opposition was justly and honestly made, and this caused the Govern-

ment to defer and hesitate. The object of the Government was to make an agreement with Besco, and the fact that you could not have that agreement ratified shows lack of support on your own side. You have made a blunder and what has been done lies at the door of the Government for introducing resolutions they could not pass. It was an impossible agreement, for one thing the length of time was absurd and would not be tolerated. The Prime Minister was susceptible to the arguments of the men with whom he dealt, and was impressed by them—as late as last night, he says. But let us refer back to 1919-1920. I happened to be a member of the Government at that time, and no doubt every member of that Government received a copy of a letter I have, which had been sent to the then Acting Prime Minister, now Sir William Coaker. That Government was planning to derive some benefits from the output of Besco ore, and Besco was trying to impress on the Government the benefits they derived and would derive from their operations. So they sent a letter somewhat similar to that addressed to the Prime Minister the other day, and which he read to the House, and suggested an agreement.

(Reads)

They actually wanted the Government to put a bounty on ore sent from Bell Isld. for a period of 25 years—that gives you an idea of what they will ask for; they never expected to get it. Now this Company made statements as to what would happen in the future, stating that wonderful things would happen if they got an agreement of this nature—they were going to have a wonderful output of ore, and no question of markets.

(Reads)

This is what this country was going to derive. Well History has shown us that it was useless to arrive at any such conclusion. And in spite of that we made a contract with them in 1920, and they were asked to pay a duty on ore of 25c. per ton; and it shows the type of men they had to deal with, that we wouldn't fall for any measures of that kind. We made the contract, and the unkind suggestion has been offered by the Minister of Justice that we never expected it to be carried out. Now if that is the opinion of the Hon. Minister of Justice, in his experience of corporations and governments, I am glad to think that up to the present I have not been closely associated with him. He has been moving in bad company, and if he had that idea before, I fear his present company hasn't caused him to change it, or the influence has been very slow in acting. Now the Executive Government has blundered badly in this matter, for they had signed it, and when I first read this agreement I said it would never pass the Legislature. Apparently the rank and file of the Government had some consideration for themselves politically and for the welfare of the country. What right have you to tie up this country for 25 or 30 years—how do we know what will happen during that time? The Executive Government was very foolish to enter into this agreement—they should have first found out whether the Legislature would ratify it or not, and whether their own party would ratify it. They had to eat crow, Mr. Speaker, and a good dose of it. What was the sense of the Government introducing a measure which they might have known would never be ratified — they could have told Besco that it was no good for the Government to sign that agreement, that was just a waste of time. That they couldn't sign unless they had reasonable expectations that it would be ratified, and that their own men did not want it. Let us go on as we are going, and we won't be as badly off as if we had made this

agreement. But I suppose it was reasonable to expect it from the Minister of Justice, for when he was on this side of the House he was always saying "Why don't you make an agreement?"

However, I suppose we will have the old agreement for another year, and it is the only thing that could be done, and wait and see if we cannot get the Besco to agree to something that is half decent and half reasonable. For three years they were not going to pay any taxation, and we hope next session there will be an agreement submitted that will be acceptable by this House.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—I have just a few remarks to make. It is the second time during the session that the Prime Minister has thrown the responsibility of what has appeared in certain public papers on this side of the House and I want to tell the Prime Minister that we are not responsible. As far as I am concerned I have never given anything to the papers, and I am not responsible for anything that has appeared in them. Now in reference to these Besco resolutions, we never had an opportunity to speak to these resolutions. The matter came up before the House and we were expecting an opportunity to speak to them. I went to a lot of trouble looking up a lot of correspondence and getting the Hon. the Colonial Secretary to get for me the report of John Forbes. This report was made at the request of the Government, of which the Hon. Member for Fortune Bay was a member at that time. Mr. Forbes was sent throughout the United States to visit the mines and report on the conditions of them and as to the amount of royalties that were paid by these mines to the Government, so that the Government would be able to come to an understanding as to what would be a reasonable tax to put upon the Dominion Iron and Steel Company and the Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company who operate on Bell Island. I also went to the trouble of having the old contract that is now in existence dug up, and I also had an amendment in my desk which I intended to bring in to the resolutions, which I did not have an opportunity to bring in as the matter did not come up before the House. In view of that the hon. members on this side of the House are not responsible for any reports or rumours or anything of that nature that may have taken place with reference to the Besco resolutions. These Besco Resolutions being discharged from the Order Paper is not the fault of the Prime Minister or the Executive Government. The Executive Government must have satisfied itself with regard to this contract. They must have gone over it and thrashed it out and decided that it was good enough for them. They got the signature of the Colonial Secretary put to the agreement and sent it off to Montreal while the House was in session to get it signed by the officials of the Dominion Iron and Steel Co., and the Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company, and brought it back here to be ratified by the legislature. It was wholly and solely a Government measure and it was brought into the House by the Prime Minister, and they were defeated on it. They were defeated on a measure solely by their own party. What would Prime Minister Baldwin do if he were defeated on a measure brought before the House. He would resign. The Hon. Minister of Justice tells us that the reason that the contract is cancelled is on account of the financial condition of Besco. I take the Minister's word for it. I am not in a position to know, but I simply want to make the point clear that we have not had an opportunity to discuss these resolutions and whatever has taken place and whatever criticism has been given

it has not eminated from the criticism made by the members of this side of this House.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—May I be pardoned for adding a remark or two to the number of orations heard this afternoon at the burial of this famous Besco contract, and I want to say here and now sincerely that I trust that the people about whom members on both sides of this House were very anxious, I mean the labourers on Bell Island, the two thousand men whom we hope to see employed there, will have no reason to suffer because of the action of the Government this afternoon in asking that the measure be discharged from the order paper. I wish to say here in reply to a statement by the Leader of the Opposition that the Executive Government was not defeated by its own party. Every member of the Government Party and the general public of Newfoundland have absolute and explicit confidence in the sincerity of the present Prime Minister. They had absolute confidence that what would be done would be done having regard to the best interest of the people of Newfoundland. I do not think that any party in this House or out of this House would attempt to insinuate that Mr. Monroe had participated in the givings out that have been referred to this afternoon by the hon. member for Fortune Bay, Mr. Warren. Mr. Warren made reference to the large amount of money that the Besco is supposed to have given to somebody occupying a prominent place in this House a few years ago. I am glad that an opportunity is going to be given along the lines that have been suggested by Mr. Warren so that we will have an opportunity of going into the details of the various transactions of the Besco in their operations in Newfoundland. I trust that the Leader of the Government will adopt some plan along the lines suggested by Mr. Warren that a commission be appointed something similar to the commission appointed by the Rhodes Government, presided over by Sir Rae Duncan, a commission qualified to given us full information of al Besco-Nfld. transactions. I trust as I said in starting that none of the people on Bell Island, who are depending on this industry for a living will suffer because of no contract.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, and with leave of the House, the Besco Resolutions were discharged from the Order Paper.

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 relating to the encouragement of shipbuilding and rebuilding and bounties on ships.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—In reference to these bills it will be remembered that the last time that these came before the chair there was a good deal of objection to the clause in section four. Since then the Select Committee met and the bill was drafted again and reads as follows: (Reads)

MR. SCAMMELL—Of course when a man is going to build a schooner with a view to securing the bounty he will very naturally ask the department to send him a copy of the act, and he would find there in the section for the inspection as provided for in the act, and as he would be in possession of a copy of the act he would know the schedule. I think, Mr. Chairman, that since the bill has been redrafted it seems to be much more satisfactory and to meet the objections that were raised to it. We will see how it works out by experience, and if we live I daresay we will be able to amend it a lot more in the

future if we find circumstances call for it.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I would like to say that I did not like the section referring to a man receiving half the bounty. I think that if a man were going to build a ship to get the bounty the first thing that he would do would be to get the book of rules. Suppose a man got the book of rules and because of unforeseen circumstances the surveyor could not get down to him, and he would have to come to St. John's to get the bounty. I think that the bill as it now reads will cover that and will suit the purpose required.

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 "An Act Relating to the Encouragement of Shipbuilding and rebuilding and bounties on ships" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, and with leave of the House, the Bill entitled "An Act relating to the Railway and Shipping" was discharged from the Order Paper.

Second Reading of Bill "An Act Respecting Immigration."

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I think that this bill has been distributed for some time. Shortly the purpose of the bill, as is probably apparent already to some of the members is to give power to handle immigrants which we have not at present. Under the act as it is at the present time there is no possibility of keeping a certain class of immigrants out of the country. The position is all along that when these undesirables get in here they have to be deported again at the expense of the country. The purpose of the present bill is to put the liability for the return of these undesirables upon the steamship owners or people like them. I beg to move the second reading.

Pursuant to order and on motoin of Hon. the Minister of Justice the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Immigration" 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 Colonial Secretary, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 15 George V. Cap. XIV., entitled 'An Act for the Confirmation of an Agreement between the Government and the Newfoundland Hotel Facilities, Limited'" 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 have passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act Respecting the Operation of Wireless Telegraphs in 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 the Seal Fishery Act, and other Acts relating to the Seal Fishery," with some amendments in which they request the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the said amendments were read a first time, and it was ordered that they be read a second time on to-morrow.

Second reading of Bill "An Act relation to Newspapers and Books."

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—In moving the second reading of this bill

which is already in the hands of the members, I would like to say a few words of explanation. The bill in the first clauses deals entirely with the forms of registration and the form necessary that every newspaper office must go through in order to be registered. When Chap. 69 of the Consolidated Statutes, Third Series, was being drawn up there were practically no newspapers being conducted here under incorporated companies, and now it is quite possible for incorporated companies to run newspapers and mortgage their property fully, and therefore there is little responsibility on the part of anyone in the case of libel suit. There is the necessity of making somebody responsible in case there is a libel action successfully fought against them. The only clause to which I think there might be some contention is clause 13. Section A is as follows:

(Reads)

Now the object of that is to prevent any paper from abusing His Excellency the Governor over a nom-de-plume. It does not prevent the newspaper from making any reference they like to the Governor on their own responsibility, but this prevents them from publishing a letter over a nom-de-plume and I think that we will all admit that from a spirit of British fair play the Governor's name should not be used by somebody who does not sign his name when the Governor cannot defend himself. He is the King's representative, who demands our respect, and therefore it is felt that he should be protected by this clause. In clause 2, section B:

(Reads)

Now that clause simply means that anybody over a signature other than his own is not permitted to write scurrilous or abusive language about any candidate for parliament during an election campaign. The editor can do it. He can say anything at all he likes on his own responsibility. The Telegram last night seems to have entirely misread this whole section of the bill, because they said that if a candidate for election were objectionable, or if there was something against his character that in the opinion of the public he should not be allowed to stand for election, nothing could be said against him. They have absolutely misread the whole section because the newspaper can say anything they like if they take their own responsibility. The only point about it is that nobody can write a scurrilous article about a candidate for election over a nom-de-plume. And those dodgers that have been sent around in former elections must be signed or they cannot be distributed. I am not going to refer to the past except that it is something to guide us for the future. It is not right that during an election campaign that a lot of scurrilous matter be written up in some printing office and distributed without responsibility to anyone. In Australia, one of the most democratic of the Dominions, that is the law to-day. If a man wants to write anything about another man during an election he must sign his name under it. If you take up any of the Australian papers during an election you will find the signatures to all letters referring to candidates.

I do not see that anyone could possibly claim that this is a curtailment of the liberty of the press, and there is no intention or desire on the part of the Government to curtail the liberty or freedom of the press, but we do think that the public should be protected to some extent from the articles that appear about candidates in the press during election times. Sometimes some scurrilous abusive article comes out about a candidate that does not give him time to defend himself before the election. So, Mr. Speaker, I simply submit the bill to the con-

sideration of the House and we will take up the various clauses as we go through them.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Speaker, this is one of the bills which I think on general principle should be debated on the second reading. I regard this myself as nothing but an attempt to muzzle the press, and I am going to ask the Prime Minister now if he will be good enough to defer the second reading. We have been altogether very lazy in connection with the business before the House. We have been studying the estimates and have a lot of other things which we are however gradually getting cleared off, and I think that there would not be much time lost in deferring the second reading.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I have no desire to rush the legislation through until the members are ready for it.

Hon. the Minister of Justice presented the Report of the Select Committee on the petition of the Newfoundland Atlantic Fisheries, Limited, as follows:

The Select Committee appointed to consider the petition of Newfoundland Atlantic Fisheries, Ltd., beg to report that they have considered the matter to them referred, and that they find the Rules of the House with respect to notice have been complied with.

(Sgd.) JOHN C. CROSBIE,
T. W. G. ASHBOURNE,
W. W. HALFYARD,
W. J. HIGGINS.

On motion this report was received and adopted.

Hon. the Minister of Justice gave notice that he would on to-morrow move the House into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions respecting an agreement between the Government and Newfoundland Cold Storage Fresh Fish Corporation, Limited.

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow move the House into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions relating to the Railway and Shipping.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, May 5th, 1926.

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

The Minister of Finance and Customs presented the Report of the Select Committee appointed to consider the Petition of the United Church of Canada and the Newfoundland Conference of the Methodist Church, as follows:

The Select Committee appointed to consider the Petition of the United Church of Canada, and the Newfoundland Conference of the Methodist Church, beg to report that they have considered the matter to them referred, and find that the Rules of the House, with respect to notice, etc., have been complied with. We recommend the introduction of the attached Bill.

(Sgd.) RICHARD CRAMM,
F. GORDON BRADLEY,
JOHN C. CROSBIE,
GEO. F. GRIMES,
A. E. HICKMAN,
W. W. HALFYARD.

Assembly Room,
May 5th, 1926.

On motion this Report was received and adopted.

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the United Church of Canada" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Mr. Halfyard gave notice of question.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions respecting an Agreement between the Government of Newfoundland and the Newfoundland Cold Storage Fresh Fish Corporation, Limited."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, these Resolutions originate because of the petition presented to this House reported upon by a Select Committee a few days ago. Report of the Select Committee was made to the effect that the Rules of the House had been complied with. As a private bill the Select Committee had only to deal with seeing that notice as required had been given. The petition of itself from the Newfoundland Atlantic Fisheries Limited sets out that the Newfoundland Cold Storage Fresh Fish Corporation was incorporated on the 14th of April, 1917, for the purpose of carrying on the business indicated by its name, and on the 27th of November an agreement was entered into by the Company and the Government as printed here. In the next month that is December, 1917, this Corporation was reconstructed with larger capital stock under the name of Newfoundland Atlantic Fisheries, Limited, which is the Company we have been practically looking upon all along as the Company doing the actual fresh fish or cold storage operation. The original company, the Newfoundland Cold Storage Fresh Fish Corporation Limited, was only practically called into being when it went out of existence into the form of the Newfoundland Atlantic Fisheries Limited. This company completed the erection of the Cold Storage Plant in the Railway Yard, and from time to time earned the bonus referred to here. As we go along I mean to elucidate other facts not referred to in these resolutions. The petition states:

(Reads extract from petition)

That brings us to the first fact for our consideration of practical interest. The parties referred to there are the Hudson Bay Company who are taking over the premises with an option of purchase at the end of two years. This explains the reason for the Bill.

(Reads from Petition)

Now the additional information that I wish to supply to the House is this, that the Newfoundland Atlantic Fisheries Limited have arranged with the Hudson Bay Company to take over these premises for a lease of two years, with the option of purchase at the end of two years, and as said when entering into these negotiations it was discovered that this agreement which never came before the Legislature and which did not have to do so, in fact or in law might have to do so because of the technical point that the agreement did not state that it was drawn up under the War Measures Act.

They did in fact have power to make such an agreement but apparently never stated that it was done under that act. It is of importance to have this matter straightened up as far as the Hudson Bay Company are concerned, because they claim that the situation may possibly make it impossible to feel that they have good title. It will be remembered that the Reid Nfld. Co. only had the right to convey lands for the balance of the term up to 1951, and it will be noticed in the agreement that that fact is referred to. When the agreement was made with the Nfld. Cold Storage Fresh Fish Corporation Limited that sub-let for a term ending 1951, the site at the Railway Yard, this agreement was made in November 1917 and was to confirm that action of the

Reid Nfld. Co. The reason for that confirmationl mainly was because it was held that as the Reid Nfld. Co. only held property for railway purposes, it was doubtful if they had the right to lease any portion of their premises for a purpose not connected with the Railway. The Govt. confirmed their act in that respect, and secondly indicated that on the expiry of this sub-lease from the Reid Nfld. Co. to the Nfld. Cold Storage Fresh Fish Corporation Limited that they would grant to the Cold Storage Corporation sixty-five years further to make a ninety-nine years lease. The agreement made in 1917 had this result that the petitioners here or the reconstructed company, the Newfoundland Atlantic Fisheries, Ltd., carried on business and was paid from time to time by the Government the bonus referred to in paragraph 4 which bonus as a matter of fact expires in 1927. In this connection the honourable members will remember that there is an act on the Statute Book by which any company can come in and get that bonus for periods of ten years. Having made this agreement with the Government the next step that altered conditions was the passing over to the Government of the day by the Reid Newfoundland Company of all its right and interest in the Railway, under the act of 1922. The position that the House is in to-day is that it is asked to pass Resolutions which really do nothing more than confirm the Act of the Government of that day. I can authoritatively say that the impression and intention at the time was that this action was done under the War Measures Act. I wish it to be understood that, whilst it never came before the Legislature at that time, there was no neglect of duty on the part of Sir William Lloyd, who was the Attorney General, and Mr. C. O'N. Conroy, who was the solicitor for the Company, and who had the agreement executed and made up; and I might add in justice to those who drew up the contract that the whole point of the construction of this proposition was to supply food to the British arms. An arrangement had been made with the Imperial authorities to take our fresh codfish, and the explanation of the starting of this industry in St. John's West is that it was going to be a big element of assistance in the war, and, as a matter of fact, a considerable quantity of fresh fish was sent overseas. I think also that the Atlantic Fisheries Company, because of a disappointment that had come about by reason of the curtailment of their operations at the close of the war, received a certain amount by way of compensation from the Imperial authorities. I cannot say definitely what the figures were, but I do know that the contract was made, under the War Measures Act, for the purpose of helping in the war. The other point that I would like to remind the House of is that, however much one might, under ordinary conditions, consider or hesitate about leasing a premises upon a railway yard for a long period, I think that is destroyed completely now by two causes. Firstly, the premises are all there equipped and suitable for this cold storage work, and secondly it is probably the one real chance that we have of people, who have practically unlimited capital behind them, trying out this cold storage plant. In other words this is an agreement taken up for two years on trial by the Hudson Bay Company, and it certainly will receive a better chance than it ever had in its life before. The name and reputation of the Company both as to their business capacity and as to their standing in the world are such that we can all trust that, in dealing with the agreement, they will be looking for the purchase of the property. I am instructed by the solicitors for the Hudson Bay Company that the arrangement made is that they are tak-

ing a two years' lease with an option of purchase during the two years. I think there is a definite reason for making it two years. The Company have a new method that they purpose trying out, and they feel satisfied that two years will make it clear whether the proposition is commercially sound and worthy of going on with or not. The Resolutions shortly mean to confirm the contract in the Schedule and provides that the benefits and privileges conferred upon the Company by this agreement shall be subject to the same obligation as before, making clear two points, one that the agreement is confirmed as to its period, and two, that power of assigning is legally and definitely established. I do not think that there is anything further I can add, and I move the reading of the first section of the Resolutions.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, whilst I agree with the proposed legislation contained in the Resolutions, it sounds funny to me that a big corporation like the Hudson Bay Company, or any other Company can come in here and can get a bonus on cold storage salmon shipped to Europe, and our own people cannot get a bonus on our own dried codfish, despite all the talk and promises by members on both sides of this House as to the bonus that was going to be given on codfish. I have not heard any member of the Government get up and say if this bonus is going to be paid on codfish.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, I welcome the Bill, although I can hardly welcome it because the agreement contained in the Bill is no stranger to this House because it is nine years since it was first made. But in passing I would like to point out to the honourable member for Ferryland the reason why there is a bonus paid on cold storage salmon and none on codfish. In the first place at the time this bonus was first given this cold storage system was in its infancy. At that time the Government of the day, of which Lord Morris was Leader, and of which I was a member, were anxious to encourage the establishment of cold storage factories here; but for the payment of the bounty on the fish the Company were obliged to give a quid pro quo for the bounty offered by the Government, as is pointed out in the subsections of section four of these Resolutions. This Act is really part of the general Act which was submitted to this Legislature and passed at that time, and I think that the shipping of fresh fish should be encouraged a thousand fold more than it was then. I am very glad indeed to hear that such a well known and wealthy Company as the Hudson Bay Company are taking such an interest in the fisheries of this Island. I spoke at some length in the earlier part of this session upon the Address in Reply upon the position of our fisheries, as I could not understand the refusal of the Government to vote a special sum for the encouragement of the fisheries, beyond the regular vote of $20,000. We have been told that we cannot sell any more salt fish than is caught and cured to-day. If that is the case, surely it is up to the Government and to every member of this House to find markets for our fish of some sort and in other ways. Take Mr. J. Allan Taylor's report, and I might say that I never replied to any criticisms to my remarks in that respect. Now I do not know Mr. Taylor to begin with. The Board of Trade invited this gentleman out here and it seems to me that his suggestions were not worth while. I happened to say that, according to Mr. Taylor, that fish should not be cured by the same people who caught it. Immediately that was grabbed up by certain gentlemen and the Prime Minister and the member for Carbonear took this as a reason that Mr. Taylor's suggestions were no good;

but, strange to say, that this suggestion was endorsed in the articles of Mr. Baxter Burry, who does know something about fish. Mr. Taylor, I understand since, was associated with this cold storage proposition in its infancy here. He showed that there was a market for other kinds of our fish, and I was endeavouring to point out to the House that if we could not sell any more salt fish that we got to do the best we can for the man with traps and nets and encourage him to sell the fresh fish as well as salt, otherwise you are going to have a vast amount of unemployed people on your hands. We have been paying ever since that agreement was originally made a bounty to cold storage people upon all their cold storage stuff exported. We have been paying Job's and the Atlantic Fisheries Company; and I think that a Company coming in here with the prestige and the capital of the Hudson Bay Company and with the markets they have already for their products should not be thrown down. If we cannot sell any more salt codfish than we are selling, then by all means sell our fish fresh; and I think we should sell other fish such as trout, lobster, salmon, haddock, etc., which I am sure would be very inviting to tourists that come here, if the present cold storage scheme cannot put money into the pockets of our people. I think that this Company should be received with open arms and I have no hesitation in giving my entire support to the Resolutions now before the Chair.

MR. DUFF—Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to this fresh fish business being established in our midst. I never met Mr. Taylor referred to by Mr. Warren, but I read his report and there is nothing in it that is going to benefit the people of this country. What he advocates may be alright in practice in other countries; but not so in Newfoundland. In this country the men catch the fish and other members of their families cure it, but that does not happen in other countries. Owing to the way our fishermen are scattered all along the coastline, it is impossible for our fishermen to catch all their fish in the one place and make it. The big difficulty in marketing our salt fish at the present time is the high cost of producing; but we have been losing our markets. I remember when we exported 530,0000 quintals of Labrador fish to the Italian market but we have lost that market in a great measure and the same applies to the Greek market. Why? Because it is too expensive for Newfoundlanders to compete with people of foreign countries. The tal qual system in vogue is ruining the country and ruining the shippers and evidently the shippers and fishermen cannot get together on the point. I contend there is any amount of room in this country to produce more salt codfish for market. We can produce fish as cheaply as any other country and be able to send as good and superior an article of food, provided shippers will wake up to that fact. I intend to support the Resolutions and I trust that this fresh fish industry will be successful.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, for the information of the House I want to give the history shortly of this Cold Storage Act. In 1910 the Cold Storage Act was started, giving the Governor-in-Council power to do exactly what was done in this agreement and which the House is now asked to confirm.

(Reads Act of 1910)

In 1917 a readical departure was made and is rather illuminating at the present time in the light of the arguments that have taken place.

(Reads Act of 1917)

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, it will be observed that there has been in existence a definite policy since 1917, in which year was begun a special bonus for fish, which has been referred to

by the previous speakers. And the explanation given is as suggested by the Hon. Member for Fortune, for the purpose of assisting in marketing our fish. I trust that the information may be of some value and will help the members in continuing the discussion.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a suggestion in connection with this matter. It is the first time that I knew that the Cold Storage Company had a space reserved up there, for the Government to store bait for the use of the fishermen on the Grand Banks. I am not sure, but I doubt very much whether the supply of squid has been kept up in that Cold Storage. We have many vessels coming in off the Grand Banks in the month of August, looking for squid. They are often laid up in the harbours along the Southern Shore and in St. John's Harbour, for days and sometimes for weeks, looking for bait to go back on the Grand Banks. I merely wish to suggest to the Government that if it is at all possible they would see to it that when the squid strike the land in here next summer, there will be a sufficient quantity of them caught. They can be bought from our local fishermen at so much a hundred, say fifteen or twenty cents, and they could be put up in the cold storage. Because the chances are that the vessels will be coming in from the Grand Banks looking for bait, and besides, as happened to our local fishermen, the other year, in Petty Harbour and various places around the coast, they may not be catching fish because of the shortage of bait. If you go to places around here now and ask the fishermen what they are doing to-day they will say that there is no bait. That is the general reply. I would suggest to the Government now, that they will see to it that as an encouragement to the fishermen, and it might possibly be good business for the Cold Storage Company as well, that the Nova Scotia vessels be allowed to buy bait here in St. John's.

They had telegrams sent all over the Southern Shore to try and locate some place where bait was being caught, for they were anxious to get bait, and get back to the Banks and finish up their trips. I merely suggest that the Government should see to it that next year squid would be purchased from the fishermen here in St. John's. Lots of fishermen here in the Battery can catch squid, and make good money putting it up, and it can be sold to the local fishermen, both Lunenburg Fishermen and Newfoundland fishermen, who come in here, and are held up for days and weeks looking for bait. I am glad this matter was brought up, beause I think personally it is a good suggestion even if it does come from me. I think that the Government would be wise to do something in that direction, to help out our local fishermen, and the Bank fishermen.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, the member for Ferryland has anticipated me in bringing up a matter that I had intended to bring up when we came to Subsection E, Section 4. He has raised a rather nice point. Perhaps if we went now to that section seeing that the point has been raised, we may be able to clear it up.

(Reads)

I need hardly point out to this House that the Lunenburg Vessels are manned by the people from Fortune Bay, or ninety per cent. of them are. They have to go to Lunenburg because there are very few Newfoundland bankers to go in. If this Company is bound to sell only to Newfoundland vessels see what a position we may be placed in.

(Reads)

According to that we can't sell to the crews, we can only sell to the owners. Now that is the point that ought to be cleared up. Now that is a very serious point. For I see two sides to it. Fortune Bay fishermen

are naturally bankers, but they can't get in the Newfoundland bankers, for there are not enough of them. They go away to Lunenberg, and they come back to Newfoundland in the Lunenberg Bankers, and under this Act we may be discriminating against them, as under this agreement in the strict reading of it, the Company cannot sell any bait to Lunenburg Vessels at all. Now that point was already raised before under the Customs' Act. I have had to give my decision, at that time rather against my conscience. There was an American vessel that came down here looking for bait outside the treaty limits, and the point was put up to me to decide. The Captain was a Newfoundlander and every soul on board was a Newfoundlander, but it was an American registered vessel, and owned by an American. Therefore they could not get bait. I was placed in a very awkward position, and I received a very stiff telegram from the Captain of the vessel, asking me if I was going to stick by my constituents, and asking me to persuade the authorities to give him bait, in view of the fact that every soul on board was a Newfoundlander. I have refused consistently to do it. Now this point is bound to come up again, and if the cold storage facilities are taken advantage of, I would ask the Government to take the matter into consideration, and see if that matter cannot be amended. Surely it is too bad to have Newfoundlanders going to other countries and foreigners, catching fish on our own shores, and taking it away to sell it in competition with us. What are we going to do about it?

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, before reading any more I would like to give expression to my feelings on this matter. I say that the country ought to be congratulated on having here a company of the reputation and the financial ability of the Hudson Bay Company. I feel that that is a matter for congratulations, and consequently there can be no opposition on that point. It appears to me at the present time, however, that these people only mean to specialise in salmon. I don't know whether anyone is able to inform me as to whether they are going to interest themselves in the taking of fresh codfish as well. Because if we have some such company as that here, it would be fortunate. But if they are only going to specialise it salmon, it would not be much more fortunate than the older companies made an effort to buy up the fresh fish and sell it from cold storage. Now I am rather inclined to support the view that was raised by Major Cashin, and Mr. Warren. I feel that in the case of the selling of bait, it is a manifest hardship on the fishermen of Fortune Bay who man the Lunenberg vessels, and in some cases even captain them, and yet if they come to their own country and there are bait supplies there, they cannot buy them. And it would be a good feature if that corporation stored up bait supplies in the space that is going to be reserved for the Government. There is absolutely no question about bait being required. If such a thing happened that bait was not required at any time, it would be a comparatively easy matter to dispose of it to the farmers for fertiliser, or for other purposes. I quite agree with what Major Cashin has said, as regards the fact that at certain seasons of the year, in certain sections you will find no boats on the grounds, because of the scarcity of bait. Now if the space up in the cold storage is utilised, and one hundred thousand pounds of bait are stored up there, you would have no difficulty in sending that bait to the most remote sections of the country, if it was required. Most of us have seen at certain times in the fall of the year, the boats at their moorings, and the fish running on the grounds, and have

heard the cry of "No bait." Hand in hand with these resolutions, I think that a movement should be started to have bait supplied to those places in the Fall of the year. We are making a great step forward in dealing with the matter of bait supply. That is about the extent of the observations that I have to make, and I trust that by the time the two years are up that the Hudson Bay Company will have been so far successful in its efforts, in this connection, that it will be able to remain as a permanent feature in the fishing business of this country. I trust that we shall see this company go into the fish business, because if it did, it would without a doubt be encouraging the fisheries of this country. At the present time if more fish is caught we are up against the difficulty of disposing of the surplus. The more fish that can be taken care of through these channels, the better it will be for those of us who are interested in the export of salt fish. So I say that on the whole if we have the interests of the country at heart we cannot do better than support these resolutions, and I wish the company every success in its new venture.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, I was reading the paper and listening with one ear. But with regard to the resolutions now before the Chair, I must admit that I had not an idea that there was any space in that Cold Storage plant provided for the Government, or that there was a bonus being paid on salmon. But I certainly do think that if there is a space at all up there, and room for one hundred thousand pounds of bait, it could be used to the advantage of the fishermen of this country. No later than last year several times I had occasion to go out to Bay Bulls, and I saw several boats there day after day, and when I asked them how much fish they had caught, the answer was that there was lots of fish but no bait. I know one or two instances where the men sent down to St. John's to get bait. I know one man who left Bay Bulls late in the evening, came to St. John's and got bait. He was back there at eleven o'clock, put out his boat and got five or six quintals of fish with the squid that he got from Job's Cold Storage. I think that this House understands that there has been a petition presented from the people of Bay Bulls asking that a cold storage plant be erected there.. I gave my support to that petition and I said that something would be done in that matter. I remember some seven years ago I was down in Wesleyville, my home town.

We don't go fishing there very often after we come back from the Labrador as the distance is so great. But there are occasions when you can get food fish there. I went out one time with a couple of men; we caught anywhere from fourteen quintals each day. Then we ran short of bait. I sent over here, and they sent down to me a package of bait. We went out again and we caught nine quintals more. Now that we know that this space is there, it could be used to good advantage, I think, to this country. And as one of the members said, even if we could not sell it all, we could sell it to the farmers in the Spring of the year. But I have no doubt that if it is known that there is bait there at any time that you send for it, you will use a great deal of it. And I hope that the cold storage space will be partly filled with bait.

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 adopted and the Bill "An Act to confirm an Agreement between the Government

of Newfoundland and the Newfoundland Cold Storage Fresh Fish Corporation, Limited," 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 on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions relating to the Railway and Shipping.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I should just like to explain that I brought this measure in a few days ago as a Bill. I lost sight of the fact that Sec. 8 necessitates the bringing in of this first as a resolution. I have already explained the force and effect of the bill.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, had I been in the House a few evenings ago when this matter first came up I would have moved that it be given the six months hoist—I might not have had a seconder, but I would have made the motion anyway. These resolutions will soon be incorporated in the shape of a bill, and are to create a Department of Railways. It is true that there is not a Minister of Railways, but when one examines and looks into this bill, he will find that there are five ministers instead of one. Now I admit that some provisions of this Bill are necessary; I have repeatedly said in this House that the Railway was run illegally and have been reminded that I constituted it—that I was Prime Minister when it was taken over, and the other Government has been carrying it on on the same basis ever since. Now circumstances to-day are little different, and I believe that the Government would still be carrying on the Railway by Minute of Council, if I had not drawn their attention to this point. In 1923 I was suddenly called upon to take the leadership in the administration formed by Sir Richard Squires, and while he was still leader the railway was taken over by the Government. We all agreed to that, and it was done by a vote of the House. Within a short time I was forced to take over the administration, and by this time summer was here and advanced to August. Yes, in Hansard of Thursday, August 16th, 1923, I announced to the House the policy that was going to be adopted by the Government of that day regarding the administration of the Railway, but I distinctly said that the appointment of the commission was purely temporary, and that when the House met again further arrangements would be made. As everybody knows, when we met I spent an hour in the House, and that was an end of the administration.

Now there are some points about those resolutions that the Prime Minister did not discuss or explain. I quite agree that it is necessary to formulate a measure to make some one responsible for the administration of the railway, but to do it in this form or under the Act which was submitted to the House a few days ago is another matter. It is unreasonable, unnecessary, and I might almost say uncalled-for, and further, vicious. First, I do not see why it is necessary to have five commissioners doing practically nothing, and who do not have to report to this House. This administration differs from the last in the matter of Minutes of Council in this respect, that the administration I was associated with had to do things by Minute of Council, but having done them we came back to the House and were indemnified, and whatever we had done was explained and criticized. But this administration is wiser in its day and generation than we were—it comes in the House and says "We want you to give the Governor-in-Council power to do these

things," and the House is apparently ready to do it, and lets the Governor in Council go ahead. Unless there is a deficit in the operation of the railway there will be no necessity to come into this House at all. As far as the Railway is concerned we might as well shut the doors of this House unless there is a deficit, when they will come back and ask the House to meet it. They even go farther, and if the Railway makes a profit the Governor in Council can go ahead and spend it without coming to this House, and I say that is vicious—absolutely vicious! Every cent earned by the Railway belongs to this country and not to any commission, and it is absolutely wrong to say that if there is a surplus in any year the Governor in Council can spend it without coming into this House. Now, Sir, that is the main objection that members will take to this, that we are asked to delegate our powers, and say in effect "Shut the doors of this House and open those of the Commission—let them spend the surplus as they like, but if there is a deficit they have to come back here." That brings me to the point as to why there should be five members of a commission to run the Railway? There are five now, or four (Major Cashin not being an operating member), and I say there is no necessity for four commissioners, because not one of them knows anything about a railway—they are good business men and that is as far as it goes. Why is it necessary to have four men? Personally, I am quite in favour of having a Railway Department, and having one man responsible, whether he knows anything about a railway or not, as long as somebody is responsible to this House. The people up there at the Railway are experienced, and the commissioners are absolutely in their hands—all they can do is receive tenders and give them to whom they like. If they want to improve their political position they give them to their supporters. I am not casting any aspersions against anybody, but the door is open to that sort of thing. Put in a man responsible to this House without three unnecessary salaries, and put it on a proper basis by having those who know how to run a railway.

Another thing I object to is the combination of the dock and the railway. They have nothing to do with each other. It is true that Reid's took over the Dock when they took over the Railway, but the operation is quite different, and they should be run as separate concerns. You are bound to have a certain amount of jealousy between those managing the dock if they have to take orders from those who know nothing about the dock, and I say that the combination of the two is a mistake—they should be run absolutely separately without combining.

We come now to Section 3; I have already spoken about sub-section 1—there is no need for a Board of Commissioners in view of the fact that they are going to be paid a salary for the first time in this administration. Now there was some discussion about salaries on the Liquor Control Board—by that Act the salaries are to be named by the Governor in Council, and approved by this House at its next Session. Here it is a little different. And I notice that some gentleman outside this House has stated that it was intended that the Board of Liquor Control pays itself out of its revenue. I think when the Committee comes to that portion, they will add the word "Yearly" to the sub-section. I think it will be a source of grave disappointment to supporters of the present administration who expected so much from them, to find that this Government has seen fit to bring them back to a similar condition to the Board of Agriculture, that our Government dispensed with.

You can now appoint to the Board men anxious to get a salary and not go back to the legislature, and who know nothing about the railway. When I think of the outcry of members now on that side at that time, and now see them calmly sit down and let this go through, I am amused, Sir. I did away with that Board. True, I created it, but I was following the advice of heads with more gray hairs than mine—but I did away with it. And if it was wrong to appoint a Board of Agricultural Commissioners then, it is wrong to appoint a Board of Railway Commissioners now. I hear a great deal about "What did you do?" "Where were you?"—one gentleman in particular is very fond of saying that when criticized. The Prime Minister said on opening that he can only keep office because the previous government was hopeless. The people of the country are hopeful that the present Government will not prove hopeless. But I must say that I have sat here and seen the Government who were like Caesar's wife, almost above reproach, approving the same things they criticized a few years ago. Now I want to refer again to that argument "What did you do?" And I found a certain amount of amusement in the remarks of that gentleman outside this House that the reason why there is rotten whiskey at the Control Department is that 5000 cases of Roderick Dhu was imported by a previous department, and that sort of argument doesn't pay.

Section 8—I agree with that; that is what is done in Canada, and I don't think this House should go into details of management and expenditure in the railway, but a report should be made to this House by the Railway Commission of matters of general information to the public, and some chance ought be given the members of this House to oversee the administration of that really big department of the government. I shall be very much surprised if members on either side agree with Section 8. I am not worrying about the surplus, but evidently the Government are. Talk about Warren and his Minute of Council Government, and Squires and his Minute of Council Government!

I haven't had time to go into the present law regarding the killing of cattle, nor has it been explained.

I notice that it is being made a little harder for a farmer or anybody else who has had his cattle killed to get compensation. Why this is going to be I do not know. It has not as yet been explained to this House. As I said when I commenced had I been present when this bill went into the second reading I would have moved that it get a six months hoist.

There is another thing. I have been asked what did you do when you were in charge, when you were running the railway. It will be of interest to some of the members of this House to hear what some of the present members of the Government and of the Railway Commission said and thought when they were on this side of the House, about the railway. It will be remembered that the railway was suddenly taken over by the Squires Government and I had to provide for the running of it after I succeeded him in the Leadership. They said that no politics should enter into the operation of the Railway. I suggested to this House the appointment of Mr. Halfyard, the Colonial Secretary, who was responsible to this House, he was the only member of the House that I suggested. I suggested the Auditor General because he had been up there auditing the accounts of the Railway and was fully conversant with the financial obligations and the financial resources of the railway. I also suggested to this House the appointment of Mr. Hall, who was brought out to this country as the Government engineer to keep a tab on the railway by Sir Robert Bond. He is a thor-

oughly qualified railway engineer. The criticism was made that we were merely making them the political tools of the Government. That it was partisan. That the Government would be making political use of the railway and finally I had to come back to this House with another commission. There was only one man from the House on it. That was the Colonial Secretary, and since all public matters in this country must be run on religious principals, I appointed Mr. George Shea, Mr. Tasker Cook and Mr. Halfyard who was already there, so that as far as religious representation went the commission started out alright. But that was not enough for the members of the Opposition of the time and on the occasion of the appointment of that commission they again criticised it as a political commission. Mr. Higgins was the Leader of the Opposition of that time, and listen to what he says:

(Reads)

Now how does the Attorney General live up to his words? What has the Prime Minister done with regard to lifting the railway out of the position of a political machine. How is that an outside commission is not taking charge? Mr. Higgins objected to the Auditor General "Because it is shoving him about here, there and everywhere." And "the Government Engineer is a very competent man, but he has not the time to devote to the Railway Commission." I said before we want one railway commissioner, and make him the Minister of Railways, because this is creating a department, and cut out the other four.

(Reads)

I do not want to go into details, but I can inform the House that there have been appointments made up there since the present Commission took charge that would certainly give the people to understand that politics have something to do with things up there.

(Reads)

Why did not Mr. Sullivan appoint a commission from both sides of the House?

(Reads)

Do we not also want to get a fair share for our constituents. I think that is the first time that I heard of the policy of Square Deal. I suppose that the Prime Minister having read Hansard and having the words "square deal" he thought that he would add it on to the "Clean Up" business. If it was not a square deal to appoint Mr. Halfyard, Mr. Burteau and Mr. Hall as the members of the Railway, and if the appointment of the Prime Minister, the Colonial Secretary and Mr. Sullivan and Sir John Crosbie is a square deal, then I will take off my hat. And now this is what Mr. Sullivan had to say:—

(Reads)

Of course it is not being run by Government men now! I have only read this out to the House, Mr. Chairman, because it affords me some little satisfaction. It is wonderful to think how quickly one's ideas change when he moves from this side of the House to the other side. The Prime Minister has already told us that some of his impressions have considerably changed since he went to the country as the Leader of the Opposition, and it is only after he became the Prime Minister that he found that some of the things that he thought possible when he was not the Prime Minister were not possible at all. But I do not use that argument with regard to these resolutions. I want to state that while I admit and agree with the general principals of these resolutions that you have got to have some legal machinery for the operation of the railway, but when you get down to details I am opposed to the thing and think that it should be thrown out. And I think that the dock should be separated from the railway. I think that the four commissioners should be cut out and one

commissioner appointed, call him a minister or a commissioner or a chief commissioner or anything that you like, and it will be just as good as four commissioners. Pay him just the same as any other departmental office and amend "Carter's Purge" to deal with him as any other Minister.

Again I disagree with the principal that any surplus earned by the railway shall be disposed of by the Governor in Council. There has been no argument advanced or reason given this House for this remarkable change and under this bill it is just as well to appoint a commission, shut the doors of this House and then let them run the railway as they like, and do not report to this House unless they have made a failure of it and they have to come back and ask for the money to run it.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I would like to make a few remarks in response to the hon. member. He has criticised the railway and we are glad to get criticism. The object of this bill is simply to legalize what we have been doing already. Four members of the Executive Government, four members with lots of other things to do have gone in there and given their time for an hour a week without asking for any remuneration whatever for their services. I do not look upon myself as a railway man. I think that a little knowledge may be dangerous. It is just as well not to know anything of railway matters, because otherwise there might be some interference with the management, and the management knows how to run the railway a great deal better than any ordinary citizen, or any body of ordinary business men that may be put in charge of that particular operation. We act as nothing else but a Board of Directors, just like the Board of Directors in any industry in the town. A Board of Directors for the Railway is of little use, but for the defining what shall be the general policy of the railway. It is for this reason that four, or three, or five as the case may be, the bill reads from three to five, are appointed to act as directors—simply to discuss with the management the general policy of the railway without interfering with the details to any great extent. We interfere with the management of the railway under Mr. Russell as little as possible, provided that in our opinion Mr. Russell is running the railway rightly. Mr. Warren referred to the last clause of section eight.

(Reads)

I am sorry that the Law clerk is not here this afternoon because he might be able to explain how these words got in. I never saw them there in the bill. It is intended that if there is a surplus that it will go back in the general revenue of the Colony. It is something that can be very easily altered. I know that it was not in the bill when I saw it last, and I am at a loss to understand how it got in there now. The hon. member also said that he thought that the dock ought to be separated from the railway. I do not understand just what he means. He says that he thinks there should be a minister of railways instead of a commission, and he says that we ought to have the dock run separately from the railway. He did not express the view that we ought to have another minister for the dock, or he did not tell us under what jurisdiction the dock should be run, but I claim that the same Board of Directors or the same Minister can very well have jurisdiction over the dock and the railway at the same time. I cannot see any reason for having a separate board or a separate minister for that particular purpose. Now we come to this matter of a minister. I have no desire to stop on the railway commission and do the work for nothing. We have not made any provisions for any salaries for ourselves

in the Estimates on this account. We have never entered into any discussion about taking anything. But if we do not take anything there may be some future board that may possibly like to receive some payment for their work. It is not generally supposed that gentlemen give their time for nothing. As far as I am concerned I am perfectly satisfied to have a Minister in charge, but what I felt about putting a minister in charge of the Railway was that there would be just one howl from the Opposition that it was another four thousand dollars salary added to the burden of the taxpayers. Mr. Warren talks about members sitting on this board without receiving any remuneration, and that they should be paid a few hundred dollars and have to go back to their districts for re-election. It would be as well to ask the members of the Board of Works to go back to their districts for re-election. When they are members of this House I do not see why we should not put the provision in that they should not have to go back to their districts for re-election, because it is nonsense to think that they should get a very large salary, not more than a few hundred dollars, and if they get that I do not see any reason why they should have to go back to their districts for re-election.

I do not remember any other particular point that has been brought up by the member for Fortune Bay. But if the Opposition is really in favour of a minister being appointed to take charge of the railway, the only thing I can say is that the Government will give the matter every consideration.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—I am going to ask the Prime Minister if he will be good enough to raise the Committee this afternoon and give us an opportunity to look up several things in reference to this bill, because we would like to have a little opportunity to discuss it intelligently when it again comes before the House. I notice from the remarks of the Prime Minister that the Government has given some consideraiton to the appointment of a Minister of Railways, and the reason that they did not bring it in in the bill is because of the opposition that it would get from this side of the House. I will say the proposed opposition from this side of the House. There has not been any opposition so far, although there might be. I suppose that the Givernment did have it in their minds about appointing a Minister. I am going to tell the House a little story. When I was coming home from Montreal the end of February—coming down on the train from Montreal to Halifax—there was a gentleman there who approached me and said "You are from Newfoundland?" I said "Yes." Then he asked me: "Do you know the Minister of Railways of Newfoundland?" I said that I did not know there was any such Minister. But he said yes, there was because he had come over with him on the S. S. Montrose from England and landed at St. John, N.B. I said that I did not know anything about it; and he said 'Yes, it is the Hon. Sullivan." My point is just to show that the Government must have had it in their minds.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Just a reference to the famous Board of Agricultural Commissioners. The truth about the commission was that the vote was so reduced that all that they had to expend was sufficient to cover their own salaries, and for that reason they had to be done away with.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—We are perfectly willing to raise the committee. If the Members of the Opposition think that it is in the interest of the country that there should be a Minister of Railways I have no doubt whatever that Mr. Sullivan, who seems to be a very popular man on

the other side of the House, would not be at all afraid to go back to his district for re-election. I did not think it necessary to explain all the clauses with respect to cattle claims to the House, because if one wants the proper explanation the best way to get it is to read it over carefully and digest it properly.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, rather than have five Commissioners there should be a Department of Railways with one Head, who should be responsible to this House and responsible to his constituents for his Department. This is a most important matter and should receive the most serious consideration of this House. You are creating five important positions which will demand big salaries. The agitation and importunities of the needy men of any Government will demand these positions. We are creating, under these Resolutions, increased expenditure, which we all know should not be entertained at all, to satisfy and placate rank and file members of the Government, and to keep the Government together. Speaking of the members of the Board of Works, what men worth anything to the Railway or to the country is going to act as Railway Commissioners for $250, which is the amount paid to members of the Board of Works. Although it is hardly worth our while criticising it, the probable amount of salaries to the Railway Commissioners will be about fifteen thousand dollars per year. I appreciate the voluntary services given by the present Commissioners. But what is the good of having a Commission when no one expects them to do anything worth while and when they do not expect to do anything themselves. That is pure fallacy. They should be paid just like the heads of any other department in the public service and give absolutely the whole of their time to the work. If it is necessary for some one to be responsible to this House, why not appoint a ministerial head at the least cost for office help and you will have greater efficiency. Take the Government Engineer, Mr. T. A. Hall, who has already got a salary voted him, and associate him with the management, and under that arrangement you would only have to pay the salary of the Minister and a typist.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, I understand that the Prime Minister is considering the appointment of a Minister of Railways, in view of the fact that the Opposition and Independent parties are practically as one in connection with it, and if that is so I take this opportunity of extending in advance my congratulations to Hon. Mr. Sullivan, and I feel that my small efforts some days ago is responsible for his appointment. About a week ago I think I pointed out that Mr. Sullivan, in my opinion, was the best man in the Government capable of performing that duty, and the Prime Minister has evidently announced his intention and the intention of his administration now of acting on my suggestion. In view of Mr. Sullivan's proposed appointment, I shall reserve a few comments I have to make on the operation of the railway until we get into Committee again on these Resolutions, provided that no attempt is again made to put a padlock on my mouth. At the same time I would like to point out for the information of the House that an answer to a question of mine was tabled here a few days ago showing that the Government has been lacking in its duty in connection with certain matters. I find that for collecting $20,000 salvage a Minister of the Crown was paid $2,250. Surely that is not good business. Two years ago the "Prospero" was stranded in Bonavista Bay and the steamers "Senef," "Susu" and "Malakoff" took her off. It was not necessary to employ a lawyer to collect that money, provided the officials

of the railway knew their jobs. The three ships for salving the "Prospero" got $30,000. The railway commission received $10,000 as their share and refused to pay Cashin and Company $250 for services in connection with the collection of $10,000, but they managed to pay a Minister of the Crown and a member of the Executive Government $2,250 commission for collecting $20,000. That is the gentleman who got up here and interrupted me a few days ago because I said that a certain Minister of the Crown might be corrupt. I shall have something further to say on this matter when the House goes into Committee again. This is the same gentleman who tried to get $4,000 in 1924 from the Railway Commission when I was a member of it and we knocked down the bill to $2,500.

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.

Notice of Question

(1) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Justice to lay on the Table of the House the following information: (1) Was the Bill relating to newspapers, now before the House, framed by any official in his Department or by the Solicitor of the House; (2) If not framed by them by whom was it framed; (3) What was the approximate cost of framing this Bill.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—The Bill referred to was prepared in our Department and there is no fee to be paid therefor.

(2) MR. WARREN asked the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs to lay upon the Table of the House a statement showing the amount paid by the Newfoundland Power and Paper Co., Ltd., to the Government on account of electric power at 25c. per horse power and royalty on paper at $1.00 per ton.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—The Company have not yet paid any tax.

Second Reading of Council's Amendments to Seal Fishery Bill.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—As I have already intimated to the House, this is a case in which the amendments, made when the Act was sent to the Legislative Council, amount to nothing more or less than a substitution of verbiage, except in section 12, which is broken up into two sections and says that any person may take action under the Act, instead of a master watch or other officer or three members of a crew. Except in that particular subsection of that section the Council has simply transposed the words. The present law permits only a master watch or other officer or three members of a crew to take action. That is as it was in the old sealing act and stated again in the Bill as passed in this House. The Upper House evidently is availing of the opportunity to make this amendment to the law on that particular procedure. I think the idea when the original act was passed was to have the master watch or some responsible person be the one enabled to take action, or else three members of a crew instead of any one, so as to stop indiscriminate prosecution. There is a good deal of force in the argument of the council that if the law is in force any person ought be able to come in and take the procedure. Personally I have an open mind on the matter. I can't see any objection to the amendments; possibly the House may take exception to them.

HON. THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—With regard to the amendment in the clearing and sailing dates, the clearing date does

not make much difference with regard to the killing of seals, but many years when ships are going to the Gulf they can't get into Channel, and it might be found a hardship to say that they can't sail before the sixth instead of the fourth or third. Two days may make a lot of difference to them, but it does not make much difference in the killing because the seals are protected by their not being allowed to kill until the thirteenth, therefore the sailing date does not have an effect in that way, but I think that any ship that wants to go to the Gulf should be allowed ample time and be able to sail on the 4th. They might sail and try to get into Channel and may not be able to get there in time. I think it wrong to penalise these boats going to the Gulf, when it would not effect the fishery of the Colony. It seems that the Upper House wants to amend every Bill we pass. If we can't make a Bill the only thing for us is to go out the door. I see here they have the "so-called Seal Fishery." If they don't know what to call the sealfishery I can tell them.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY — In connection with Subsection 2, section 12, the wording seems to be faulty "within forty days of the arrival of the ships."

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I think that that should be "the arrival of the offending ships." As it reads now it might be held that it meant until forty days after the arrival of the last ship. We may get an opportunity to send a message back to the Legislative Council to correct their English. Certainly "ships" is wrong.

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 Act 15, Geo. V., Cap. XIV., entitled 'An Act for the Confirmation of an Agreement between the Government and the Newfoundland Hotel Facilities, Ltd.'"

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 the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 181 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Harbor Master and Harbor Regulations for the port of St. John's,'" 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 Marine and Fisheries 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.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 40 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Board of Health, Health Officers and Quarantine'" 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 Marine and Fisheries, the Bill entitled "An Act respecting Water Rates payable under the St. John's Municipal Act, 1921," 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 Marine and Fisheries, the Bill entitled "An Act 15 and 16, George V., Cap. 23 (1925), entitled 'An Act respecting the Encouragement of Shipbuilding and Rebuilding, and Bounties on Ships," 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. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker, before the House adjourns I would like to draw the attention of the Prime Minister, and also the Minister of Public Works, to the fact that not alone in my district but in many other districts, there are bridges broken down all over the place, and now is the time that we should avail of the opportunity of getting them repaired. I have had numerous letters from my constituents advising me that there are roads and bridges that have been torn up. At the present time there is no sum voted for having this work done. I would like to know if the Government will be able to get these estimates through, within a few days so that it would be possible to get these monies allocated. In another three weeks or a month the men will be going to the fishery, and the end of May or the latter part of May it would probably be too late to get this work done. I think it is only right than an effort should be made to-morrow to carry out the legal end of the matter and try to have the money voted so that this work might be performed before the men go to the fisheries. After that the men do not want to go to work on the roads. Consequently if it is not done now it will have to remain over until the Fall, and the Fall is the worst time to do that work. So I hope that the Minister of Public Works will see to it that the necessary money is allocated.

HON. THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—In reply to Major Cashin I may say that if the hon. member is aware of any particular bridge that is in need of repairs, and requires immediate attention, I will do my best to have it repaired.

MR. CASHIN — Mr. Chairman, I would like to refer the Minister of Public Works to a bridge on the other side of Cappa Hayden. There are two people living on the other side, and they can't get across except by paddling. That is one, and there are numerous small bridges all over the place that need repairs. But I know that if you start in one place you will have to start in every place.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Speaker, it is not any fault of mine that these Estimates are not going through whatever. The reason that they were deferred to-day was because there are some other important matters on the order paper to be dealt with. The reason that we are not sitting to-night is because there are some gentlemen who cannot be here to-night for some special reason. That was why I asked to adjourn until to-morrow. I am ready to stay all night as far as I am concerned.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, I did not mean my remarks to be taken in that light. I am perfectly satisfied to be here all Summer. But I said if it was at all possible for the Minister of Public Works to act in the near future, we would like to get this work. However, we are perfectly satisfied to wait until the money is voted.

HON. THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Speaker, I would like for Major Cashin to furnish me with the requirements of the district in that respect, and I will see what we can do.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to stay here until the middle of the summer or until the Fall if it is necessary, but I consider it is hardly fair to outport members

to have no night sessions. We have been sitting for eight or nine weeks, and have had only two night sessions. I do not consider that we are doing a day's work in coming here from 3.00 o'clock in the afternoon until 6.30; we do not get a chance to get through any business. I do not advocate rushing through the business, because I believe it should be debated to the utmost, but I would like to point out to the Government that three hours work in a day is not sufficient.

Furthermore, I should like to point out that Mr. Grimes and I wrote a letter to the Executive Government regarding a bridge that needed repairs badly. That was written in March, and it has not been answered yet. As a member of the House I do not think that is proper treatment—that letter should be dealt with, and we should get a reply in less than a month.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—The hon. member must be mistaken as to the length of time. I got it only a week ago.

MR. ASHBOURNE—I passed the letter into his hands myself some time in March.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I think Mr. Ashbourne is incorrect as to the time. Regarding getting through the business of the House, I am disappointed that we have not been able to have more night sessions, but I hope to be able to expedite matters and get down to work.

I would like to say before the House closes that we had a meeting with the Legislative Council regarding delegates going to Australia, and it was decided that one go from this House and one from the Upper House. The question of expenses was raised, and if these were to be paid, and a message was sent to the Secrtary of the Delegation at Melbourne to which he answered "Yes." That settles the question of expenses. Now there may be more than one member desirous of going, and if so they should immediately notify the Speaker so that we can have all names before us, and have it settled by a vote of the House as to who is to represent us. The Australian people are anxious to know who will represent us.

MR. ASHBOURNE — Mr. Speaker, did I understand the Prime Minister to question my word?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—By no means.

MR. ASHBOURNE—I understood him to say that this matter was not brought up until some time in April. I don't want any aspersions cast on my word, and I say that it was before Easter that I discussed the matter with the Prime Minister. The House closed about the first of April, and, as far as my recollection goes, it was some time before Easter that I discussed this matter.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I want to take it all back. I wouldn't doubt the hon. member's word in any way. I said that possibly it was later than he thought. If he says it was March by all means let it be March.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Speaker, I don't want to take up the time of the House, but regarding the matter of a bridge at Twillingate, this is a question the Department of Public Works had up last summer. Mr. Ashbourne and other gentlemen asked to have it repaired, and there was no mention of a concrete bridge. As Mr. Ashbourne will recollect an amount of $1,700.00 was ear-marked for the purpose of repairing this bridge. Since then Mr. Ashbourne and the other gentlemen interested suggested that the bridge be made a concrete one, and that is the reason why it is now brought to the attention of the Department and Government. A concrete bridge will cost a great deal more money, and that is why this letter was suggested. I think Mr.

Ashbourne will admit that this statement is correct.

MR. ASHBOURNE—The bridge is one that serves to connect the two islands of Twillingate. Some years ago Sir Robert Bond appointed Mr. Burchell, who was engineer at that time, to go to Montreal and buy the new bridge. Since then it has fallen into disrepair, and I took the matter up with the Minister of Public Works, and he last summer telegraphed that he expected to be in Twillingate shortly. I was expecting him, and if he had come I believe the matter would have been attended to, but unfortunatly he did not come. I told him afterwards that he might be summoned to a post-mortem for somebody that may have fallen through and may have been killed. Now that it is called to the attention of the Government I believe they will give it some consideration and we will hear something further in a few days.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, May 6th, 1926.

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

Petitions were presented by:

—Mr. Grimes from Bridgeport re: coastal service.

Mr.Grimes from Springdale re: roads.

Notice of Questions:

Mr. Godden gave notice of question.

Mr. Grimes 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 have appointed a Select Committee to consider the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 143 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Keeping of Dogs,'" and request that the House of Assembly appoint a number of its members to be joined with the members of the Legislative Council in connection therewith.

The Select Committee from the Legislative Council to be the Hon. Messrs. Morine, Anderson, Murphy, Davey and the Hon. Dr. Robinson.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they have appointed a Select Committee to consider the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to Secure the Better Training of Midwives and to Regulate their Practice," and request that the House of Assembly appoint a number of its members to be joined with the members of the Legislative Council in connection therewith.

The Select Committee from the Legislative Council to be the Hon. Messrs. Morine, Bishop, Dr. Mosdell, Gibbs and Alderdice.

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the request of the Legislative Council was complied with and Mr. Speaker appointed the Select Committ- from the House of Assembly on the Bill "An Act to amend Chapter 143 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series), entitled 'Of the Keeping of Dogs,'" as follows: Hon. the Minister of Justice, Hon. the Colonial Secretary, the Minister of Public Works, Mr. Scammell, Mr. Warren. It was ordered that a Message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting that body that their requests had been complied with.

Mr. Speaker appointed the Select Committee from the House of Assembly on the Bill "An Act to Secure the Better Training of Midwives and to Regulate their Practice," as follows: Hon. the Minister of Justice, Hon. the Colonial Secretary, Mr. Moore, Mr. Grimes, Mr. Godden.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Colonial Secretary, the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Act 15 George V. Cap. XIV., entitled '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.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker: Before proceeding with the Orders of the Day, I would like to pass over to the Prime Minister and to the Government a telegram I received to-day from Deer Lake, addressed to me as Leader of the Opposition. I might say that I do not know the man who signed the telegram. It has reference to labour conditions at Deer Lake, and, with your permission, sir, I shall read it to the House:

(Reads telegram)

The telegram is signed by George G. White, who was Chairman of the meeting. I replied to him in effect that I received his telegram and was bringing his complaint before the Government.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker: I might say that I received exactly a similar message from the same person. I repeated it to the Management at Deer Lake, and asked them to give me a report upon the matter.

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.

Public Charities Estimates

MR. HICKMAN—On what basis are these salaries paid?

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—They were paid the same way long before I came in charge, and I have no idea. I think that a lot of these salaries were got by political pull. I don't know any other way.

MR. HALFYARD—The question has been raised, why the difference in these salaries. I think that a commission was appointed to inquire into the functioning of the Public Charities Department, and this is one thing that the commission might have interested itself in. There are numerous places where the question of pauper demands made upon the Government and of poor relief distribution is of importance. If there is one vote that should receive the attention of the Government it is the vote for relieving officers. When new appointments are made the salary given it at least in the neighbourhood of $100.00 and appointments made years ago have still the same, despite the increase in the work to be done. It is very unfair to have to work for such a small pittance, especially when others get more. I think it is worthy of the consideration of the Government. I think salaries should be adjusted according to responsibility. Not altogether the amount of money expended but the jurisdiction should be taken into consideration. I don't suppose the work of some new appointments is any greater than the work of some other men with appointments for ten years past. But the man who was appointed ten years ago still gets much less than the hundred dollars which is about what is given in cases of new appointments, at least. Probably as has been suggested, politics has something to do with it.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—This is a matter the Government have lately been considering. There are a great many relieving officers doing very good work who are possibly not getting well enough paid for it. The

votes are certainly in need of re-adjustment. A general survey of the whole thing has to be made. I was talking to the Poor Commissioner about the question, only the other day. I think that some police inspector of common sense ability should be sent around the Island to size up the whole situation and report as regards the various districts.

MR. SCAMMELL—With regard to the vote of $39.00 for Deadman's Cove Relieving Officer, that official is relieving officer for the Straits of Bell Isle for a distance of coast line extending from Eddy's Cove sixteen miles north of Flower's Cove up to Port aux Choix, or whole district of seventy miles. When we consider that it is such a large and isolated section, it is worthy of more than the ridiculously low vote of $39.00. From Bonne Bay to Flower's Cove, on the west of St. Barbe district, a section in the vicinity of one hundred and fifty or two hundred miles there are only two relieving officers, so we are not over stocked with Government officials in this respect. The relieving officer at Bonne Bay has about seventy five miles of coast between Bonne Bay and Port Saunders and he is paid at the rate of $78.00 and the man with the responsibility of the Straits of Belle Isle, where the facilities of getting in touch with the relieving officer are fairly well uniform, I thing ought to be on a par with the man at Bonne Bay. He has just as much work to do and it is under more arduous conditions. I commend this point to the notice of the Government and would like to see that increase granted, though in the main I am not going on the principal of urging increases.

I thought some time ago Margistrate Fitzgerald of Grand Falls petitioned the House for some extra remuneration or compensation to be granted for his services as relieving officer in the centre of the island. This matter, I suppose properly applies to the District of Twillingate but his operations extend further than that district because the representatives of nearly all the Northern districts have had occasion to apply to him to help people stranded about Millertown Junction. I wonder if the Government has received and considered his petition?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — I might say that his application came to the Government, which was one of many hundreds. We have not seen our way clear to do anything with it.

MR. WARREN—The Prime Minister stated earlier in the session that the Government were considering some re-adjustment in connection with the work performed by district surgeons and doctors coming under this vote of $15,000 for medical attendance in the outports. Have the Government come to any decision as to what they propose to do with regard to that question? I understand that the system of medical attendance arranged last year had proved unsatisfactory and that the Government were contemplating a change.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—We were very much frightened at finding the large extra amount asked for by the Poor Commissioner for the purpose. Expenses seemed to be increasing instead of decreasing and we thought that an alteration would have to be made. Dr. Forbes, President of the Medical Board came from Bonavista and we discussed the matter with members from the Medical Board and it transpired that there was no increase at all and that any extra money spent had come from the supplementary supply of the year before, and that though there was no material decrease there was no increase. We decided therefore to let the present system work along as now and see how it would result. It was rather a false alarm.

The vote of fifteen thousand dollars

does not cover it.

The payment of travelling charge of twenty five cents a mile was increased. The Medical Board argued that because of the smallness of this amount there were a great many cases sent on to the hospital that would have been attended by the doctors if a larger remuneration was given them per mile for travelling. A sick person might be at a distance of four miles from a doctor who would not go to him for a dollar and in consequence the patient was without attention until a clergyman or some influential person got him moved into the hospital in St. John's.

We made arrangement to pay surgeons a dollar a mile for their services but they had to go the first mile free. Some started to charge a dollar a mile without taking off the first mile and this had to be adjusted and their charges cut down in that respect. It is found that the more doctors in a district the more poor relief. In some districts where there are no doctors the poor relief is very small and where there are a lot of doctors the poor relief goes up accordnigly. It has been said that two lawyers in a town can always make a practice though a one cannot, and it seemed that the doctors equally bring work for one another too.

A suggestion was made by Dr. Fitzgerald of Trinity Bay. He undertook to do the work of a district surgeon, be paid a little more then formerly and attend to all cases in the district. It struck me as a very good idea, but someone else pointed out that if an arrangement like that was made, allowing so much a year, there might be a lack of attention and the pauper patients would not be looked after at all. It is a very difficult question and the matter is being watched closely by the Government and by the Board of Health that the best arrangements possible may be brought about.

MR. BROWNE—May I ask if we are to have a report tabled from the Board of Health?

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY —It is a difficult and important matter. We found that expenditure on account of medical attendance to paupers was going up by leaps and bounds, and on the other hand we found a continuous congestion at the hospital of people coming in. The Committee of Council appointed to look into the matter and as to why these conditions existed found that there was a disposition on the part of the doctors to get clear of patients by sending them on to town as they found it would not pay to go to patients for the small amount of money they received for their services. A Medical Conference was held and waited on the Government and an arrangement was made increasing the fees. It has been tried out now some ten months and I think that the congestion has been lessened, but I think that the arrangement and working out of it are still far from satisfactory. Dr. Forbes the President of the Medical Association came here from Bonavista and discussed the situation, and whilst we did not have statistics compiled to show definitely, we found approximately, that there was a decrease though not much, though the doctors got more. There will be a medical conference next summer, and possibly the matter might be let go until then when there will be an opportunity to try to come to some solution as regards this question. It is a difficult problem and it depends a great deal on the honesty of the doctors. A man can make as much work as he likes. Of course, he has to go to the Relieving Officer to be able to go to a patient, but it may be understood that Relieving Officers are under the domination of the doctors very often. I think that only the Medical Board can look after the penalizing of doctors if they

are making improper charges in this way. To pay them a dollar a mile is apparently a lot compared to what they got before, but if the work can be done and the congestion at the Hospital relieved,—it may be worth while. It has been suggested by the Prime Minister, to send a surveyor or inspector to see the different Relieving Officers and size up the work. We want a competant man to go from place to place to view the situation and estimate the value of services being done, and on the other hand there should be a surveyor of the work of the doctors. I hope that in the near future a considerable amount of money will be saved. It is not because of lack of interest on the part of the Government that it has not been saved. A large percentage of people cannot afford to pay for medical service. They are only making two ends meet, and if serious illness or accidents comes along they depend on the Government. Too much thought cannot be given to the matter and nothing has been left undone to bring about retrenchment in this direction.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—As regards increasing of fees for doctors, I don't see why a doctor cannot get paid the same for attending a poor person as a person who is not poor, and in reference to people sent to the Hospital and who die there and have to be sent home, I think at least they might be sent off a bit better than they are, and that when patients come in the nights by boat to go to the Hospital care ought to be taken to receive them, for two nights last week I had to go down to boats that came in to meet patients, constituents of mine, going to the Hospital.

MR. BROWNE—Mr. Chairman, I want to make a few remarks on this subject, because some matters have occurred recently that have brought this matter more or less into the lime-light. I may say that, about three years ago, when I was Secretary of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, I was a little instrumental in the appointment of a veterinary surgeon. The appointment was made, and for a long time he did not know what his powers were. One day he came to me to enquire what he could do. I pointed out to him that, under the Act constituting the Board of Health, the Governor in Council had power to make regulations. Apparently these regulations were made and the veterinary surgeon then began his work. He succeeded in destroying a number of cattle around St. John's, which were supposed to have been infected with tuberculosis. It seems unfair, Mr. Chairman, that the city alone should suffer through these regulations. I think that this matter should have the attention of the Government as to cattle coming into this port. I think that these cattle should be guaranteed pure or should be examined when they are landed here, and the people should not buy cattle and pay $80 or $100 for them and have them destroyed by the veterinary surgeon and only receive $30 or $40 for them. I know a number that have been destroyed, and up to recently no money at all has been received for them. I think the Colonial Secretary will bear me out on that point, or give me some further information. I asked whether a new Board has been appointed. I don't think there was any report from the Public Health Department last year, and I was expecting to see a report from the new Board of Health. There was a new arrangement in the staff of that Department. The Hospital Clerk, Mr. Bartlett, last year had his salary increased from $1500 to $2,000. This year, Mr. Rennie has been put there as Secretary. I think he is now doing most of the work. Mr. Bartlett's duties are not quite so onerous as last year, but his salary is the same.

The scope of the duties which the Board of Health has in this country seems to me to be a wide one. There is an inspector there. I do not know what work he does or has been doing. That is why I was so much interested that a report should be published which might give us an idea of the scope of his duties. I believe the Inspector's name is Mr. Lawlor. I question whether he works anywhere outside of St. John's, and I also question whether, if an epidemic like the one that occurred at Corner Brook last year, could not have been prevented if the scope of his duties extended to other parts of the country outside St. John's. I would also like to know what work the doctor in charge does in order to prevent an outbreak of that kind. Those are a few of the remarks which I have had in mind for some time, and on which I should like to be enlightened upon. I think it is a matter that ought to be fully ventilated.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY —Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that, with regard to the duties of the veterinary surgeon, (Dr. Bishop I think it is), he has been engaged continuously in inspecting cattle for tuberculosis, and he has discovered an appalling condition of things here, which the Minister of Agriculture and Mines will bear me out in saying. It was quite a surprise to all of us last year to receive a report from him that a great many of the cattle, which were supplying milk to the town, were infected with tubercular disease, and had to be destroyed. That might be considered, perhaps, a great hardship to those who own the cattle, but there was no case brought up that was not sufficiently investigated and where it was proved conclusively that the cattle were tubercular. This, of course, is work that has to be followed up and completed, and not alone in St. John's, but the whole Island has to be brought under survey. Dr. Bishop is doing great work, and was assisted by Dr. Brehm who is a high medical authority on such work.

Now, with regard to the Health Inspector, Mr. Lawlor. Mr. Lawlor's work takes him outside St. John's. He did extra good work at Corner Brook last summer. He conducted the work very efficiently, which I think will be verified by Mr. Russell, who was out there at the time in connection with the outbreak, and can corroborate all I say.

Now, with regard to the Board of Health, I must say that I think this Board of Health is capable of doing a tremendous amount of work in the community, but it wants re-organization. The Secretary of the Board, Mr. Rennie, is undoubtedly a most efficient and conscientious official. I just want to say this in justice to Mr. Rennie. He went into that Department practically untrained in that kind of work, and he has certainly given as much satisfaction as is humanly possible. I think the coming year will show a marked improvement in that connection. Mr. Bartlett's work today is not what it was. Mr. Rennie now looks after the patients that are going to the Hospital. At any rate, Mr. Bartlett did a great deal of work that Mr. Rennie now looks after. However, I think that a re-modelling of the staff would do a great deal of good. However, the Board has only been appointed within the past few months, and it has not yet had time to get down to business and properly function, but, no doubt, this coming year a much better condition of affairs will be seen. I think that we are now on the right road, but I don't agree with the honourable member that the activities of the Board of Health are confined to St. John's. This very day and yesterday I have been in touch with Mr. Rennie respecting the condition of things occurring on the

West Coast. In Burin there is a very serious outbreak of influenza and pneumonia. This morning I got messages from Burin asking if I could not send a couple of nurses down there. There are two nurses ready to go at the first opportunity. Another outbreak has occurred in Mr. Chambers' district.

At Burgeo there was another outbreak. I got Mr. Rennie to have the doctor from Channel to go there. These are some of the duties of the Board. As regards the efficiency of the Board I think those of us who are most closely in touch with it will say that it is such that the country will benefit materially. I am very glad that this has been brought up.

MR. BROWNE—One other question. Has the Board decided on any amount of compensation to be paid to those whose cattle have been killed. It was through no fault of theirs. Also I should like to know if any measures have been taken to prevent importation of diseased cattle.

HON THE COLONIAL SECRETARY —Yes, the Board has decided on a ⅔ compensation; the value will be assessed by the veterinary and another authority and two-thirds of that given. I don't know if the Government will continue this but that is what is being given now. On the matter of importation, there is inspection, and I told Dr. Bishop that was of importance to prevent cattle being brought in and then having to be slaughtered. I know of a case of that sort in Corner Brook, where a man imported two cows in 1923, and had them only two months when they had to be killed under the regulations. This think has to be followed up because one will realize what a serious menace this may be to the children of this country, and I am glad to be able to assure the House that it is being attended to.

MR. HALFYARD—What vote is Mr. Bartlett under?

HON COLONIAL SECRETARY—Hospital Clerk.

MR. HALFYARD—I would like to have the Colonial Secretary give the names of the New Board if he can do so.

HON COLONIAL SECRETARY—Yes, they are Mr. Joseph O'Reilly, Dr. Roberts, Mr. Rennie and Dr. Brehm.

MR. HALFYARD—Are the members of the Board receiving any remuneration?

HON COLONIAL SECRETARY—Not so far, outside of the Secretary.

MR. HALFYARD—I would like to know how this Board functions. Supposing for instance a man from Chance Cove wires me and wants to get in the General Hospital, and I ring up Mr. Rennie—will he handle it without consulting the Board?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—No, he will refer it to the Relieving Officer, who will certify that the person is unable to pay.

MR. HALFYARD—What are the real functions of the Board. Do they meet weekly?

HON COLONIAL SECRETARY—Yes, they meet weekly, for two hours a week.

MR. HALFYARD—What do they consider at their meetings. Are there any matters referred for their consideration.

HON COLONIAL SECRETARY—Yes, accounts, Doctors' bills, correspondence and such things. They check up these things and frequently cut down the bills; there are two medical men who know about these things—Dr. Roberts and Dr. Brehm.

MR. HALFYARD—Some of us are inclined to believe that the Board is useless. I had an actual experience of a man at Hillview, a poor man whose friends wanted to get him admitted to the Insane Asylum. Numerous telegrams and letters were sent the Board of Health and the Minister of Justice and the Department referred it to me. They came to me and

said "You are the representative of the district, and you have to take it up." I hope this is an exceptional case. There are so many new Boards we dont know where we are—there is the Commission of Public Health with its officials, and now Mr. Bartlett with his assistant, and a new Board with a Secretary, Mr. Rennie, who is supposed to do the actual work of the Board. There is some overlapping of officials, and if the Colonial Secretary can give us, perhaps in consultation with Mr. Rennie, a verbal report of the actual functions of the Board no doubt it may be acceptable to the House. I notice you are increasing the salaries—well, I hope in this respect the benefits will be commensurate with the increase.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, I don't want to criticize too much, but the members and the general public might think this is the total vote for Public Charities. As a matter of fact the total is $1,112,491, made up by this amount, and that on page 111 of the Estimates for the upkeep of institutions, and to this must be added the old age pensions, making a total of $1,112,491. Let us see how that compares with other years. In 1923 it was $1,058,130 and in 1923-24 $1,072,-049. The difference is made up practically by the increase in old age pensions. Our income is only 9 millions, and it is very alarming to find that we pay out this amount in Charities.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, apropos of the matter under discussion, I want to say that things are assuming a serious and alarming situation. I have just received a telegram from Harbor Grace and this matter of able bodied relief is giving serious concern to the officers in that district. The people are becoming more and more difficult to handle. This telegram has just been handed to me. (Reads). Now, Mr. Chairman, I don't read this message to ridicule these people, but they have been getting relief periodically, and now it has come to the point where the Relieving Officer has to give it when they say, and not when he says so. We have arrived at the point where this has to be dealt with, and I am going to hand this to the Attorney General for his consideration.

MR. HICKMAN—I might say that only a few days ago I was told by a man from Harbor Grace that someone is prompting these people to come in and get relief. The Colonial Secretary will probably know that also.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Yes, I heard that. And the great majority of these people have plenty of food in their houses. That is the reason outport relief is costing so much to-day.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, I don't want to monopolize the time, but I would like to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries one question. Last year the House and the Government made a close season on the lobster fishery for three years. I agreed to that and thought it a good thing, but I made the suggestion that while there be a close season, that steps should be taken for the propagation of lobsters, while that close season was on. The closing down of the lobster fishery affected some of my constituents very much, and I have had repeated letters asking if they can catch now, and have told them that is impossible. But I was up there last summer, and felt with them that if they had to do nothing but let their traps and gear rot for 3 years, that the Government should do as much as it could to assure them that at that time there would be fish to be had. I should like to ask the Minister if any steps have been taken as to the propagation of lobsters during the three years?

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—In reply I may say that was

discussed by the Fishery Board, and decided that the lobsters themselves were sufficient to do that.

MR. WARREN—May I ask if the learned gentlemen who comprise that Board made any study of the question or made any enquiries to find out from any Canadian biologists or from the Department of Marine and Fisheries in Canada. I would like to find out if the Board took any steps to find out if lobsters would increase sufficiently in three years naturally or not.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—For the information of the hon. member I may say that there will be a biologist here from Canada this year.

MR. WARREN—Too late!

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Better late than never.

MR. WARREN—If that is so, Mr. Chairman, the Board ought to be criticized and condemned for its decision. They know nothing about the subject. They decide to close up the fishery in Fortune Bay and leave it to nature whether they will increase or not. It is poor comfort to the men to find that the Government and Board who close it up are doing nothing to help it out.

I would like to ask with regard to the inspection of Turbot and Herring. Now the Board has recently made rules for the inspection of turbot for export; the rules regarding herring have been there for some time. Now these rules are alright, and nobody kicks, but the trouble is that we haven't got enough inspectors. I have had a couple of letters from Fortune Bay from men who fear that the turbot fishery will go smash, for this reason, that they can't get inspectors unless there is at least 25 barrels to be inspected, and the inspector has to come from somewhere around here, from the department. That seems a little hard for the West Coast where you can't get as easily as other places from here, where the train goes.

MR. CASHIN—With regard to that item for the Boiler Inspector and his assistant. I take it that the inspector must be a first class man, and Mr. Forbes is. Now I take it that if you pay first class wages to a man without a certificate, as in the Railway Department, it is very poor encouragement to anyone to learn Marine Engineering and get a first class certificate, and these men are usually the favourites. Now here is a first-class man only getting $1800 a year, while the Chief Engineer of the Prospero and Portia, the Kyle and Caribou and such ships are getting more and getting found. Here is an inspector doing this work and giving these men certificates and not getting as much as they are. I would like to know if you think that fair? Is the Assistant supposed to have a first-class certificate? I think it will be found that he is. Is that so? And is it a fact that the Assistant went to the icefields for the sealfishery in the Beothic this year? Was he under pay while he was out from the Department?

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—It is a fact that he was out. I will find out about his pay. It never occurred to me before.

MR. CASHIN—If a man is a Boiler Inspector he shouldn't be allowed to go to the Ice and get two or three salaries, and I also say that the Assistant is supposed to be a man with a first-class certificate. I also submit that the Inspector is not paid sufficiently. Some engineers on the Dock without a certificate are getting twice as much.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—We can't help that.

MR. CASHIN—You ought to try to help it.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, about the Assistant Inspector going to the Seal-

fishery, I wish to point out that it was not his wish. It was found impossible to get the Beothic out to the fishery without it—they couldn't get a man to go to the Ice, and Job's asked if it would be possible to get a man. I gave the Engineer's Association two days, but they couldn't get a man, so rather than hang up the ship I let him go. It was a busy time —there were not many ships requiring inspection, and we could afford to let him go. I don't think the country at large will blame me for letting the Second Engineer go out—the seals brought in and the wealth gained merited it. I will find out about the salary and let you know.

MR. CASHIN—I don't know if there are no second engineers, but I do know that there are plenty of first engineers, and all you wanted was a Chief to clear the vessel. Possibly a second engineer with a ticket was necessary. But I do know that you have a second class man in a job which calls for a first class man.

MR. WARREN—I am going to make a suggestion to the Minister. I do not intend to make it here in this House, but I am going to ask him if he will consider trying to make it easy for inspection for my constituents. I will privately tell him what the suggestion made to me was by my constituents, and I urge him now that he will take the matter into his consideration and see if there is not some way to make the inspection in Fortune Bay easier than it is at present.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—In reply to the Member for Fortune Bay I can tell him that about the business of herring I have got more abuse about it than anything else, some of it from the members of this House and some of it from the people of the outports. I am aware of what was taking place in Fortune Bay. The same thing happened on the Labrador. I intended to leave that matter until we come down to the herring inspection a little further on, and if the hon. member has no objection to my taking my seat I will give him an explanation then.

MR. GRIMES—I would like to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if he has lately had his attention called to the fact that lately salmon is being brought into this country and quoted at a very low price, and that it is likely to interfere with the canning of salmon in this country. I was given to understand that the quotations here in St. John's are as low as five dollars and four fifty a case, and the Minister knows as well as the other members of this House that at that price it is impossible for the industry to be maintained in this country. If that has been brought to his attention has he brought the matter to the attention of the Executive Government, and is there any protection going to be given to the industry. I understand that this is not the market value of the salmon in the country that it is produced in, but it is merely dumped in here as the surplus product. I think that it is important that this matter should be taken up immediately because if this low price is quoted here you cannot expect people to continue canning salmon during the summer months. I think that this is a matter that should receive the attention of the Government.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—When we made a trade agreement with Canada some time ago part of the terms of the agreement were that we had to take off the import duty from Canadian salmon as well as other fish, in order that our fish might be permitted to go into Canada duty free, consequently there is no duty on canned salmon coming in here from Canada, and the Government could not consider putting a duty on canned salmon without mak-

ing ourselves liable to have the duty put back on our fish going into Canada.

MR. GRIMES—I think that there is an anti-dumping clause in the Customs Act providing that there shall be nothing dumped into this country below the market price of the country where it is produced. I can understand the agreement that is made between the Canadian and the Newfoundland Governments but I cannot understand that it should leave out of sight that products can be sent to Newfoundland below the price of the country from which it comes. I think that that is a thing that ought to be considered. It should be understood that the prices at which they are sold in Newfoundland should be the same as in Canada. But when they sell it here considerably below the cost price to get clear of their surplus I think that the Government has grounds for some action.

HON THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I might say that there is a dumping act coming in here this session that might make matters a little clearer than they have been and if this matter comes under that it will naturally be heard about.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman, while the vote for herring inspection is before the chair I would like to have a few words to say on the matter. I notice in adding up the total to be voted for herring and codliver oil inspection the salaries and Herring Board expenses come to a grand total of twenty-one thousand dollars. There are nine inspectors. Mr. Chairman I want to make my position clear before this House. I am not in favour of split herring regulations and I consider that the money that is spent on the inspection of split herring could be saved to the Colony and to the fishermen who put up the split herring. If you want to institute regulations, want to have a man get a license and get his own branding iron and have their own affixed package, all right, that will not cost very much. Take lobsters or salmon for instance. They are put up by the fisherman and on each tin there is put the label with the number of the man's license and there is no necessity of having inspectors going round opening tins and seeing if the salmon and the lobster were good. So I do not see why we should be called upon to vote salaries for men to go around opening up barrels of split herring when the merchant who buys the herring can open it up himself before he ships them and see that they are all right. It is on account of this and because of the large expenditure we are asked to vote for, that I am voicing my protest against it. I am a member of the fishery board. This spring we have had two meetings. Most of the discussion at the meetings was in connection with the herring fishery and I have yet to be convinced nor have I heard any feasible argument put forward that there is any necessity for the large amount that this House is asked to vote. I believe that we could cut it down considerably. The inspection of Scotch herring may be necessary but I contend that the inspection of split herring is unnecessary and the expense which we could save could be better devoted to something else, but instead of that we have the inspectors going around to every nook and corner of the bays where the fishermen are packing these split herring. You can imagine these fishermen out in their boats during the day hauling their nets and when they come in seeing these men come around paid by the Government to inspect their work and see that it is alright. Last year I am sorry to say that the export of herring dropped from 2,833 barrels to 437, and that the total value of the herring exported during that last fiscal year was less than three hundred and fifty thousand dol-

lars. The value of the herring exported last year was not enhanced by having this inspection and I for one Mr. Chairman protest against it. As regards the vote which will come up in a few minutes I see that there is an amount of twenty thousand dollars for improvement to the fishery and I might also say here that I am doubtful as to whether the compiling of the statistics which was done last year might not be done in a very much more efficient manner and at much less cost. To my mind Mr. Chairman the proper way to find out the amount of fish caught is to get an amount of salt that has been supplied to the fishermen. I think that it would not be difficult to evolve a plan whereby the postmasters or the customs officers in the various outports could send in returns which they get from the merchants in the various vicinities as to the quantities of salt that they have sold to the fishermen from week to week, and in this way I think that we would get a more accurate statement as to the amount of fish without interviewing the fishermen from one side of the bay to the other and asking them how much fish they had caught and find out in that way. I bring these matters to the attention of the House, Mr. Chairman, because here to-day I see that we are called upon for a very much larger vote this year than we have been asked for up to the present, for these services, particularly for the herring fishery.

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—I do not think that the amount of the vote is any greater than last year, but I want to give the hon. gentleman to understand that I was not the man who suggested the herring inspection. That was brought in before I came here. It was brought in by the Government that I suppose you and a good many others thought was a perfectly good government. The change this year has made little difference as far as the statistics are concerned, and I am sure that I did not ask for that, it was brought in through the representation of the Board of Trade and I may say that there are letters in my office that highly approve of what is being done and that it is a very satisfactory solution of things and they say that in another year they will have what they have been looking for for years.. And I should say that if anybody in this country knows that statistics are any good for this country it should be the exporters of this country. The hon. member, Mr. Ashbourne, wants his own way and if ten men come to his premises nine out of the ten of them will want their own way and if it costs twenty thousand dollars to collect the statistics the way that it is done now it would cost one hundred and fifty thousand to do it the way that the hon. member suggests by finding out from the fishermen how much salt they used. You can give a man a hundred hogsheads of salt in the month of June, you may not see him again until November. He does not come back until the fall of the year. And then they come back in the fall of the year and you might get the fisherman if he had five quintals to tell you within a quarter of a quintal how much he has. I may say, Mr. Chairman, that there may be a change this year when the Board meets that may cut down the expenditure somewhat, but I say right here that if the inspection is to be made of the Scotch pack and the split herring and the lobster and turbot and the various other fisheries of the country we have not got half enough of inspectors. There were fifteen hundred barrels of herring packed on the Labrador this summer and what happened because there was no inspection. They came up on the Home and some of them were to be reshipped that night for Montreal. I happened to be there myself. The

agent came to me and said that he understood that there had to be an inspection before the fish could be shipped out of the country and I told him that he was quite right. Well he said that he had fifteen hundred barrels there and he wanted to ship some of them, because the letters that he had from the buyers in Montreal said that they wanted samples before they bought the goods. I told him that they could not go out until they were inspected. We got forty barrels inspected that evening and out of the forty barrels we found that they were from fifteen to forty-seven pounds short and it is only the other day that we had a message from Halifax saying that there was a shortage in the weight per barrel in some they had bought there. Imagine what would have happened if that man's fifteen hundred barrels had gone to the merchant in Montreal averaging twenty-five pounds per barrel short. Mr. Warren, the member for Fortune Bay came and asked me for an inspector for some of his constituents. I had a man come in my office and he wants to put up codliver oil and he cannot sell codliver oil to any in St. John's without inspection and he cannot get the inspection and therefore he cannot go into the manufacturing of the codliver oil. Three of the inspectors are told off for the inspection of codliver oil. That means there are six left. We have two men down there and one of them has one leg in the grave and the other is seventy-five years of age and as I stated here before I am not going to send these men down to Green Bay or out of St. John's during the month of January or February. So that we really have three men, and Trinity Bay wants two men, Green Bay wants two, Bay of Islands wants a man and Placentia Bay wants one and Fortune Bay wants one and the Labrador wants a man. I note that Mr. Grimes wants an explanation of the reason for the increase of that vote from $2160 by $700.

These men with the exception of one man which was a new appointment were all there before and their salaries were not voted in the estimates and were paid out of contingencies and the contingencies that were voted for me to spend had to go towards their salaries and expenses. When I went down to the department three-fourths of the men down there were being paid out of contingencies. And I made all the inspectors salaries the same. There were two men I do not know what happened to them three or four years ago. They were penalized by somebody and they came back to me and I found out from the Deputy Head of the Department that as far as he knew they were good men and we had them put back there with the same standing as before. Anyhow I say Mr. Chairman that if the inspection of herring is to be carried out you have to give me more inspectors. Mr. Ashbourne says that there is no inspection of salmon and lobsters. Well now if Mr. Ashbourne were down in my office he would hang his head in shame. Scores of cans of salmon come down there that are filled with codfish instead of salmon and then you tell me that you do not want inspection for salmon and lobsters. You may be alright about it yourself. I think that you would be but it is a different thing when you are dealing with one or two thousand men. Mr. Barr nearly keeps a horse employed bringing down cans of salmon and lobster that are filled with codfish. It costs about four cents to fill the can with a pound of codfish and I suppose it would cost about twenty-five cents to fill it with salmon or lobster and there is the faultiness of no inspection. Look at Norway, every week there comes into my office reports of every codfish

caught in Norway. To give them credit they have the best fishery system in the world. They are doing their utmost to improve their fishery and I am sorry to say, Sir that they are beating the Newfoundlanders all hollow. Personally I don't care if the herring inspectors are cut because I will not be going back to the herring fishery, I will go back to the codfishery and make the fish to suit myself. Take the turbot last year in the district of Trinity. In 1925 at least 65 per cent. of the turbot shipped from the District of Trinity was condemned. And during the present year since the inspection came in there has only been one claim. Or that is all that the department has heard of. That claim was from Halifax for one or two hundred cases shipped up there, I am not sure how much. It was sent back to Mr. Green of Trinity and said that the Turbot was no good. We sent an inspector down there and consequently the man had to pay the full price that he had promised to pay.

I think that Mr. Halfyard and also Mr. Godden, the two representatives for Trinity Bay if they will not admit that the inspection of Turbot is good will admit that the turbot saved Trinity Bay last summer. The fish was scarce and the turbot was plentiful and it was the means of the people of that district being able to make a good summer's pay. We had a case last year when messages came from five men at the same time asking for inspectors, all on the same day. And then a man came into the office looking for back pay because he had to keep his schooner lying at the wharf for three or four days with three or four men on board idle. Conditions of this kind arise every now and then. And if the member for Fortune Bay wants an inspector for Fortune Bay this summer then some other district will have to go without one. I may say there that the other day a reference was made to the inspector of Trinity Bay and that he knew no more about inspecting lobsters than he did about flatfish and I say that it is only a personal spleen that you have against the man that was down there.

MR. HALFYARD—I rise to a point of order. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has stated that a remark I made about inspectors sent down to Trinity last year was made through personal spleen. I object to that statement.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—I will take his word it was not, but I have proved he is ly ing. Out of one thousand barrels of turbot shipped out of Trinity last year, inspected by one of those men who had never inspected turbot before, because we do not have them inspected, there was only a claim of one hundred dollars. I think that is a proof that it can't be said that he didn't know a turbot from a flat fish.

MR. HALFYARD—If he never inspected turbot before that is good reason for my statement.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—I say that one of those men was appointed Fishery Inspector by Sir William Coaker, and he ought to have a good idea of a capable man because he has been in the fishery business the past ten or fifteen years, possibly longer, and Sir William Coaker and myself agree on these two points, possibly the first time in the history of the Colony. I may say for the information of the member for Trinity that if I had my choice I would have two or three young men from school go around with the inspectors to learn the business. If an inspector dies I have to pick up a man to take his place on chance and do the best we can. I was surprised this afternoon to hear Mr. Ashbourne, the hon. member for

Twillingate, make a statement that he was against herring inspecting. Why didn't he state that he was against it at the Fishery Board the other evening? Since he didn't, he must have thought it was the best that could be done. I do not agree with him that there should not be an inspection. In all parts of the world they are trying to turn out the best article they can put on the market. I am in favor of inspection. We have an inspection on cows, and I am glad I am living in St. John's, because they haven't got it in the outports, and I agree that it should be extended to the outports. I agree with inspection on salmon and lobster. I agree with helping out the lobster industry all possible. I agree with Mr. Warren as to the propagation of lobsters, and I hope and feel sure that the Board, one and all, will be prepared to do all that is possible with what money they can spend to help the lobster industry. The trouble with all these things is lack of money. In connection with the Fishery Board, I am sorry that all the members cannot always attend, and sometimes meetings have to be put off for lack of a quorum; but with the Inland Fisheries Board, I am glad to say, members attend very well.

MR. ASHBOURNE—The Minister of Marine and Fisheries just said that I did not state I was against the herring inspection, and supported it by voting for the regulations at the Fishery Board Meeting. I would like to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to carry his memory back to the time when Mr. J. Allen Taylor was here, who thought inspection of split herring would be a good thing; I pointed out that it was absolutely unnecessary and that we could sell our herring without inspection. The stand that I took then is the stand that I took consistently and the stand that I take to-day. When the House opened this spring and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had gone to the sealfishery, I went down to the Marine and Fisheries Department and asked Mr. Goodridge if there had been any meeting of the Fishery Board, because I had received no notice of any meeting of that Board. I was informed that there was a meeting shortly before the House opened, and they had passed a law making a close season on herring from the middle of May until the first of July. I said that I would not stand for it, and asked him to convene another meeting. Another meeting was called and the matter discussed, and it was decided that a report be procured from the herring inspectors as to what should be done as regard when the close season should be. Another meeting was called to consider that report, and, as a result of it, it will be allowed at the present time to catch herring up to the middle of June. If it had been left as it was before I complained the close season would have started in May.

I content that if any man packs bad herring, then that man should have to stand the loss. We have been told that there will be no regulations about codfish brought into this House while Mr. Monroe is Prime Minister, with regard to fishery regulations. As I said before, the fishery of this island is a very important problem and there are a great many matters that are down there in the Fishery Department to come before the Fishery Board, and I have been wondering why we have not been called together again since the Minister has come into town from the sealfishery. We naturally cannot be expected to attend meetings if we are not advised of them, and, as the Minister says, there were several meetings that had to be ad-

fish caught around the country. And journed on account of the lack of a quorum. The Minister also said that there were lobster tins opened up and that codfish was found in them. That would be a situation that could be handled if the people who had the license to pack lobsters had their license numbers on the tins. If it is necessary to inspect canned salmon, that should be no reason why split herring, when the man who buys them has just to loosen the hoops and take out the head to examine them for himself. Now, Mr. Chairman, it is not a matter of politics with me, but I want to justify my existence in this House, and if matters come before this House concerning the expenditure of money that could be reduced, then it is my duty to point it out to the House, and I want to assure the Minister that as regards myself there is nothing political at all in what I am saying this afternoon. I had hoped that the suggestion that I made with regard to the getting of statistics might be taken into consideration, as regards the shore fishery particularly. The Labrador men take salt and go off to the Labrador, and when they come back home the Customs officers in the various outports could telegraph in and say just how many quintals of fish had been caught by the floaters.

I still think that a plan might be evolved similar to the one that I have spoken of, because every fisherman has a merchant with whom he deals and that merchant is not going to give the ordinary shore fisherman a hundred hogsheads of salt, but rather he is going to give him a few hogsheads during the week and he will not have any great amount on hand at a time, and I think that in that way statistics could be gathered and be an improvement on the present method| I would like the Minister to take that into consideration.

MR. CHAMBERS—Mr. Ashbourne is a member of the Fishery Board as well as myself, and I am a little surprised at some of his remarks. If inspection is a good thing for the Scotch cure, then surely it must be all right for the split herring as well. And if the fishermen will not take advice and ideas, then I think that is a reflection on us as a Government if we do not see that the laws are enforced. You cannot expect a man to work for charity. He has to be paid. I do not altogether agree with Mr. Warren that we have done altogether wrong about the lobsters. I think that it is just as well to let nature take its course for a year or then shut down in sections and carry on artificial propagation, but I do not think in this country it would be advisable when we closed down all around for three years. When the close season expires we must see that rules and regulations are brought in respecting the propagation and made to work out properly. And no man should get a license unless he is a competent packer. When Mr. Grimes was the Minister of Marine and Fisheries this is what the Board had to say:

(Reads.)

The Board thought that there should be wardens appointed for the protection of the lobsters, and there were filchings in several parts of the country, and it would have continued if the wardens had not put a stop to it. Now the same wardens also look after the small mesh codtraps, which are becoming a nuisance around this country, and I think that the Minister has acted wisely and well in protecting the fisheries in this way. It has been considered for some time that there should be statistics of the fishery and we made an attempt to get accurate accounts monthly of the

what we have done is done all for the best. So I think that on the whole the wardens have done their duty. I think it is time that there was something done with the herring fishery, because for years we have been handling thousands of barrels of herring that cost the packers four or five dollars to produce and when they were shipped out of the country they have not been worth more than two dollars to two fifty per barrel, and this is because of the bad pack and the lack of inspection.

MR. CASHIN—I have listened to the remarks from members on both sides of the House. I do not propose to know anything about herring but I gather from the remarks of Mr. Chambers and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and from the manner in which the Prime Minister advocated their cause at the time that the Prime Minister himself is in favour of inspection. From listening to the speech of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries about the inspection of codfish and I thought at the time that if there was anything that wanted the inspection it was the codfish, and I think that sooner or later standardisation will have to be enforced in some way. I am a member of this Fishery Board and I go to some of the meetings occasionally but I do not think that this Fishery Board is much good because any time they made a suggestion to the Executive Government they have been turned down, and therefore, Mr. Chairman as far as I am personally concerned I think that it is just as well for me to remain away.

On two or three occasions suggestions have been made from the Board composed of members of both sides of the House and some of the gentlemen outside of this House and these suggestions were sent to the Executive Government and all they got was sarcastic letters in reply. But while we are on this I want to show that the point has been made by the Government themselves that we must have standardisation of fish if we wish to hold our markets.

And that is the position to-day? We are losing our markets, and why? To-day you find the fisheries of Norway are from 15 per cent. to 20 per cent. better than last year—you find Norway standardising her fish; you find Canada standardising her fish in British Columbia—her salmon. And you allow it to be exported off the coast of Labrador, caught on Monday and consumed in Mediterranean ports in two weeks from that time. You allow it to be shipped away in cargoes of 20,000 quintals, and you don't know what the quality is, and some people don't care. It is like a race! You find people rushing to try to be the first foreign going cargo off the Labrador. Forgetting that by rushing they are glutting the market! Forgetting that their fish is not properly cured! Forgetting in their rush to be the first to make money that two or three or four cargoes are going to arrive at the same time and find the market glutted. And the fish has to be placed in cold storage on the other side, at the mercy of brokers and people who own the cold storage plant! And eventually in many cases it is dumped overboard as not being fit to sell, and whose fault it is, Mr. Chairman? Is it our fault? Is it the fault of the exporters? Or is it the fault of the people on the other side who refuse to buy because it is not fit for consumption? I think the time is opportune to work out a method to regulate shipments and standarization of quality. In this administration you have men who are interested in the fishery—the Prime Minister himself is one of the largest exporters in this country. And we have to forget our personal interests and think of the general interests of the country.

Last year the Minister of Marine and Fisheries called a meeting of fish exporters in the Grenfell Hall to discuss methods of shipment and standardization, and if a foreigner had come in Newfoundland and gone to that meeting, he certainly would never have thought that the main industry of the country was the cod-fishery. The people on Water Street paid little attention to it, except perhaps Mr. Hepburn, who is a member of the Fishery Board and has been in the business for years. We must have co-operation, Mr. Chairman, and I say we cannot have it under existing conditions. Any why? Because they are all out to grab all they can and do each other. There is only one way we can have co-operation, and that is by getting it here in this House. Some of the gentlemen opposite were associated with the infamous Coaker regulations, made in 1919, which were not so infamous as we would be led to believe. The one thing wrong about to my opinion was the set price. If Sir William Coaker when making these regulations had omitted the compulsory price, that piece of legislation would have gone down in the history of Newfoundland, in my opinion, as the best measure ever put through this Chamber. And I feel that it is a measure which ought to be re-introduced to-day, in a certain sense. And there are members on the other side now who would vote for it. But cut out the compulsory price. You con't compel me to put a price on my fish unless I am up against it. The Law of Supply and Demand fixes it in this as in every other country. But I do feel that the time is opportune to introduce something in this Legislature—that something must be done for the standardization of the cod-fishery, and I suppose that I have the support of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the member for Burgeo and LaPoile in that. He stated that the inspection of split herring was necessary (and I might say that I know nothing about salt herring). And he was backed up by the Prime Minister of this country. Well, Sir, it is a very simple problem in Geometry, that is if inspection of split herring is necessary in order that those goods may find a sale in the markets, it would also follow that inspection and standardization of codfish is necessary. The same argument applies to both. And my view of standardization is this—that if I had the power to-day I would put a law on the Statute Book outlined something like this: If I had a cargo to go to Brazil to-morrow the Inspector would come down, and the fish be marked No 1 and No. 2, and it would be No. 1 and No. 2! But under existing conditions you may find that No. 2 has gone for No. 1 and vice versa, but seldom vice versa. You will find that fish is going into Spain to-day which is not fit for that market and fish going into Italy which is not fit for or wanted there. And it is because of that sort of thing that the fishery is demoralized in Newfoundland, and who demoralized it? Ourselves—and you admit the necessity in the case of herring and lobster, but admit nothing when we talk of codfish. We are going to vote $20,000 to-night or to-morrow to inform the Board of Trade how many quintals of fish we will catch this summer, and when we tell them that what are they going to do? They will know how much is on hand and figure out the markets accordingly. I say it is unnecessary. If we had only a hundred thousand quintals they would export it in the same way. I have heard it said that if too much fish is caught we can't market it. Mr. Chairman, there never was too much production —the more we produce the more wealth we have. What we have to do is to see that our fish will be cured as well and cheaply as we can, and then see that it is marketed properly. And are we doing that? It is true that

this year the fishermen possibly made more than the merchants, but if it had been handled properly the merchants would have made a profit. I remember years ago when we would be found with three or four hundred thousand quintals on hand at this time of the year—to-day if we have one hundred thousand we go to wing. And we have 150,000 quintals in the town, and possibly 250,000 in the country to-day, and the markets are glutted. And who glutted them? A combination of merchants who are flooding the markets. I say that there is a group of four or five who have formed a combine to drive the rest out of the market, and one way they have of doing it is by glutting the markets of Europe. Mr. Chairman, I see it is half-past six, and I will stop.

Committee rose till 8 o'clock.

Mr. Chairman before we adjourned for supper, I had risen to the occasion and I had pointed out to the Government the fact that they were now supporting the policy for the compulsory inspection of split herring in Newfoundland. And the point that I was endeavouring to make was this that in view of that fact and in view of the attitude that the Prime Minister had adopted towards the efforts of Mr. Chambers this afternoon, that no doubt that the Government would also take a similar attitude towards the enforcement of the inspection and standardization of codfish. And in making that point I was endeavouring to go on and show that unless some policy of that nature were acted upon that the future of Newfoundland codfish was most uncertain. In the very few remarks that I made before supper, I had failed to to ask the Government if they had made any arrangement with the Canadian Government or the West India Government in connection with the export of this fish into the West Indian markets. At the present time I understand that an agreement has been made between the Canadian Government and the West India Government and in reading something about the debates in the House of Commons in Ottawa not long ago, it stated that the agreement had been ratified. And I am informed sir, that the agreement gives the Canadian producer priority over any other producer, of a similar nature coming from any other country. And in return the Canadian Government gives the West Indian producer similar rights in Canada. Now, sir, I think that out export of fish to the West Indies is somewhere in the vicinity of 150,000 to 200,000 quintals per year. And I would like to know in passing if the Government made any arrangement with the Canadian Government or the West Indian people as to the future of the West Indian markets. Perhaps the Minister of Marine and Fisheries would inform me on that point.

HON THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES— Not right now.

MR. CASHIN—Perhaps the Prime Minister could give me that information.

HON THE PRIME MINISTER—I will tell you bye and bye, we have made some negotiations.

MR. CASHIN—I am glad to hear that the Government have made some negotiations. And I would like to hear them. And no doubt the people of this country would like to know if the interests of our fisheries have been protected by the administration that was elected on the policy of protecting the main industry of the country. Because if Canada has got a certain agreement ratified with the West Indian people we are very anxious to hear what this Government have done with regard to the same matter. Now sir, I am trying to prove that it will be necessary for the future welfare of the fisheries of this country, to take some steps towards the standardization and I will go as far as to say that certain steps will have to be taken in

connection with the exportation of fish out of this country. I think that I pointed out to the House that this year and last year large quantities of fish were exported from Newfoundland, sent into foreign markets, piled in as it were on top of each other by the exporters of Newfoundland. But that piling in of the fish on top of each other, caused congestion and in some instances no doubt the fish became deteriorated. And as it was not fit for consumption it had to be sold for fertiliser or destroyed. I feel Mr. Chairman no matter if the present Government does not feel that way, that one of the remarks of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries goes to prove that this Government is in favour of the standardization of fish, because that is the same as inspection. Because they have laid a policy before us for the improvement of split herring, and it is only an ordinary problem in Geometry that if it is necessary to inspect split herring it is also necessary to inspect codfish in order to have it fit for human consumption. People have told us as I said before supper, that if we catch too much fish we won't be able to sell it. I don't agree with that at all. As I said I believe that we can't produce too much. We have never failed in Newfoundland or in any other country, on account of over production. And I would like to see the Government come in here with some kind of a policy to protect the fisheries of Newfoundland. Yesterday a bill was put through this House with cold storage people and that the Government had overlooked in the old agreement with this Company, the fact that a clause had been inserted whereby the Government would store bait for the consumption and the use of the fishermen. And never sir, in my recollection have they taken advantage of it. And boats and vessels have been tied up on this coast for days and weeks at a time on account of the scarcity of bait. It is not my intention Mr. Chairman? to hold up the estimates for any lengthy period but I would like to hear some announcement from the Government as to the future fishery policy in this country. It has got to be done sometime and it is just as well for this Government to start it. Because if what an Executive Minister of the Crown has said, is to be believed, and next thing we will be having in this country will be not a Government but the people of Newfoundland will be governed by a British Commission sent out here for that purpose. In other words some of the Ministers of the Monroe Administration are advocating a crown Colony, and some of us were attacked in the next chamber yesterday because we advocated the abolition of the Upper House. And these people are the ones who are advocating a Crown Colony in Newfoundland. There are the people who are attempting to get this country into such a financial position that we will have to go on our knees to Canada, now it is quite as well to call a spade a spade. That is a fact. An undeniable fact. But it is a fact that these utterances have been made by a member of the Executive Government. And they are to the effect that this country is gone, and the sooner we realise it the better, and that we will be governed by a commission sent out here from England within the next six or eigth months. Now sir I would like to hear from the Prime Minister what arrangement with the Canadian Government in connection with the West Indian agreement made with the West Indies. I think the people ought to know, and I trust that now that the Government has seen its way clear to have inspection of split herring, to prosecute the codfishery to better advantage than at the present time.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER— Yesterday I stated that I was not an expert on railway matters. Of course

the hon. member for Ferryland has very clearly demonstrated that he is almost the last word in railway matters. I contend that whatever he might know about railway matters, he knows mighty little about the subject of the fishery and fishery interests as regards export markets of which he has just been talking. He said that he sat on a fishery board and that a recommendation sent to the Executive Council had been turned down, and in consequence of that he left the fishery board and has not been back there since.

MR. CASHIN—I rise to a point of order. I did not say that. I said that I was a member of the Fishery Board and that I am still a member of the Fishery Board, but that I am not very much interested in it, because we made a recommendation to the Executive Government and got for a reply an impudent, impertinent letter, which I shall ask to have tabled tomorrow by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. The only reply was what was considered by members of that board an impertinence, was considered so by members who are now sitting on that side of the House. I have been back to meetings since, but I do not look upon these meetings as of very great importance because any recommendations may only receive the attention that that one did. We might have got a reply, in a gentlemanly manner at least.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I still repeat the assertion made that the hon. member said that an impertinent letter was sent back by the Government to a recommendatioh by the Fishery Board, and that he had been so disgusted that he had not gone back to the Board since. That is as I understood his remarks. Well, I am going to tell the House what that recommendation was. It was that we should appoint a roving commissioner to go and explore the markets of any country in the world—a roving commissioner—not a commissioner for any one place as had previously been suggested, but a roving commissioner to be an official in the fishery office. This same proposed commissioner roved to Oporto with Capt. Perez many years ago, after that he was again appointed and roved to Liverpool and later he roved to Peru. He came back from Peru and I have yet to learn of a single codfish sold as a result of this expedition. Because that proposition was turned down by the Executive Government we are accused of writing such an insulting letter that the hon. member for Ferryland would not continue on the Board. I have stated in this House and I take this opportunity of stating again, though I am not so fond of repeating myself as the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, that in my opinion the settlement of the question of standardization is one for the fishery trade, and for those who are directly interested in it. Numerous attempts at a settlement of this question have been made but have been proved unsuccessful, but perhaps it will be of interest to this House to learn that I am one of five who have imported an expert on the subject of standardization and we are paying him ourselves, probably over a thousand dollars a month. We expect he will prove just as good as any Aaron Shapiro. He has worked in connection with the standardization of other products, and he is here now to explore the possibilities of standardization of codfish on behalf of the shippers. The shippers are considering the proposition of pooling their interests on that proposition. I feel that it would be detrimental to the interests of my firm to join in a pooling proposition, but I am sinking my personal interests to make a beginning of this pooling proposition. If we can arrive at a form of standard-

ization any member of the fish trade or any importer who desires to come in on this culling proposition or even a pooling proposition may be given the opportunity, without necessarily confining themselves to the same consignees. That is what is being done in connection with the fishery proposition. I assert again that this House is not the place for the settlement of it. It is an extremely difficult problem. It is a much more difficult problem than the hon. member for Ferryland knows, as he has not the knowledge of it that some of the rest of us have. The fishery has produced so many difficult qualities that vary from time to time that it is an extremely difficult matter to deal with its problems. I consider standardization an absolute necessity. It has never been accomplished, but we are hoping that the present attempt will be successful, and I can assure the House that I am doing a great deal more towards bringing it about than the hon. member for Ferryland has ever done by his addresses on the subject. The hon. member has also spoken about the West Indies contract and what has been done in connection with it by the Government. I have not been idle in connection with that matter. If there was no other reason, I am too much interested to be idle. The Canadian Government is about to ratify an agreement —I have no advice that it has been ratified or if it is soon to be actually in force, and I think that I should have heard if it was. The fact remains that we have a treaty with Jamaica, which country is one of the markets, that we deal with probably more than any other of the West Indies and takes quite a quantity of produce from us and they have told us that the agreement we made with them was only a joke—only a bluff—because we have not taken any produce from them. They have reduced the duty on fish but have not got any benefit because we only buy from them a few cigars. I told the Government of Jamaica that until we can get some shipping facilities and establish communication there would not be much sense in going to discuss the treaty, and they see that position and understand it. I communicated with the Government when this discussion between the West Indies and Canada took place and asked that a representative of ours might be allowed to be present and they refused to allow it, but Mr. Robb, acting Chairman of the conference, made a statement at the conference that there was no inteition of excluding Newfoundland and on the contrary they wanted Newfoundland to have any privileges that were being granted. There is therefore no difficulty to anticipate in the making of an agreement with Jamaica, and it can be made at any time that suits us to make it. I don't think we can accomplish very much until we know what the steamship line is going to be and where it is going to run from, and that information is not yet obtainable. Those are the few points that I simply wanted to make in response to the hon. member who has just sat down, and I don't want to delay the Estmiates one minute longer than is necessary. I only want to correct erroneous statements and assure the House that the Government is just as much concerned about the fishery as any gentleman in the Opposition, and are doing all they can for those interests.

MR. CASHIN—It is a good thing that something is being done. My point is this, that it has taken a long time to get that out of the Government. It is the duty of the Government if they have made negotiations for an agreement with the West Indies to come in here and tell us about it. It is like pulling teeth to get the infor-

mation out of them. Surely we have a right as British subjects to come in here and ask a question without being sneered and slurred at. True I am no expert on the fishery. I regret that there are very few experts on the fishery, very few. I am glad that the Prime Minister has come round to my way of thinking that standardization is necessary, and I am also glad that even by these few remarks he has been brought to get up and tell us that he is attempting to bring about standardization of fish. But he adds that this is not the place to talk about the standardization of fish. Where else is it?

The Prime Minister says that this is not the place to talk about standardization of fish. Where else is the place? Surely the Prime Minister is not going to tell me that this is not the place in view of the fact that last year the Minister of Marine and Fisheries called a meeting in the Grenfell Hall and there was only one reprsentative of Water Street who made any remarks at all on the fishery question. I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that by repeating a thing often that it does any harm. I am sorry that any remarks of mine have hurt the feelings of the Prime Minister, and I regret that he saw fit to reply to me in the manner he did. By the way I would like to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if the Government is in negotiation with a biologist?

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Yes, with Mr. Paton of the Memorial College to secure a biologist.

MR. CASHIN—I understand that his duties are, when he arrives here, to regulate the hatching of lobsters.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—There has been nothing yet decided in that direction.

MR. CASHIN—These are just little items that I brought up and I would like to know something about them, because after all I am not in here as an ornament. When we get this biologist here I suppose we will have to engage a physchologist to find out what his duties are.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—As soon as we get him here we will give you that information.

MR. SCAMMELL - Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of making a few general observations on the Estimates now before the House. I feel, Sir, that it is the duty of every member within the confines of this Chamber who has this country at heart to devote some thought and some study to the annual bill which is being presented to the taxpayers of this country to-day. I feel, Sir, that there should be a time during the discussion of the Estimates when we ought in duty bound to give expression to any opinions we may hold as regards the general drift of expenditure of the Colony, whether it be at the outset of the discussion of the Estimates or at the closing up but that is a question of opinion which individual members can decide for themselves. For my own part, in a fishing country like this, a country that is depending for its prosperity and for the general well being of its business upon the fisheries, there is no more opportune time for rising to express an opinion than on the vote for the Marine and Fisheries Department. If there is one vote more than another in the Estimates that ought to be seriously considered, and if there is one vote more than any other that ought to draw from members on both sides of this House their very best attention and their very best consideration I submit that that vote is the one concerning the Department of Marine and Fisheries; and I submit further that if there is one departmental head more than any other who ought to be a member of the Executive Council it

is the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. In no other British Dominion is the gentleman, who has charge of the staple industry, without a seat in the Cabinet of the country. Notwithstanding what may be said by members opposite in the way of precedent, I submit and maintain that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, without reference at all to the personnel of the man, occupies the most important position in the country and ex officio should be a member of the cabinet. If I remember aright it was always a cardinal point of policy with the Liberal Party and a cardinal point with the Fishermen's Union is that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries should be a member of the Executive Council thereby giving to the fisheries department that prominence in the affairs of the country which its importance seriously warrants and merits. I have to make at the outset a few general observations. I have first to castigate the Government for delaying the introduction of the Supply Bill as long as they have. It was a point urged by the Government party when they went to the country that sessions of the Legislature were held too late in the season; but it was left to the Opposition members to suggest to the Government that they ought to get down to business and consider the advisability of holding night sessions in order that the business of the House will be finished in three months. The House is now in session over nine weeks. We were told that the reason why the opening of the House was deferred was that the Government wanted to be in a position that when the Legislature met that they would come here with their legislative programme so that the business of the country so far as this House was concerned would be transacted with the utmost satisfaction and despatch. We were two months in session and the hope of the Government was to give serious consideration to the most important legislation which were to be brought on during the dying moments of this administration. But this was deferred and I ascribe that to nothing else but an ulterior motive on the part of the Government. We have discussed all sorts of things in this House even from the dog question to the old fashioned granny, namely the Midwives Bill. I think therefore that the Government have been negligent in its duty and unfaithful and remiss in this regard and that its whole thought of trying to facilitate business has been a mere camouflage of the highest order. We should have had these Estimates down here about a fortnight after the House met. Every kind of legislation that came up here since we met shows that the Government was not ready with their programme upon which they so hastily called us together upon. Legislation has been passed in this Chamber and passed over to another Chamber to people who represent nobody but themselves and legislation by which we shall have to put our hands in our pockets for the supplying who are at their wits end as to the tricks that the fates are going to play with them with respect to the Budget Speech of the Finance Minister. Coming to the second point. I quite well realise and am very well aware that the Government is not going to seriously consider any suggestion we make from this side of the House for the purpose of pointing out that this is a serious contract with the people of Newfoundland and coming from a Government which has been two years in office in dealing with the financial affairs of the country.

The Government has had the responsibility of dealing with the financial affairs of this country for three sessions. It is true that when they came in in 1924 the Estimates had been prepared—last year the responsibility was your own, and this

year it is your own as well. The first session you put up the argument that you had no other alternative than to accept the Estimates as you found them; you came into office in June 1924, and a previous Government had supplied the Estimates for that year, and it was only fair to expect that you should not be asked to alter these Estimates. Last year was the first opportunity you had to keep faith with the people of this country by reducing your Estimates. Can you see what that meant? It was your first opoprtunity to show as a Government that your faith that the Estimates could be reduced could be justified. And last year we saw the Estimates increased by $500,000. This year you have another chance to decrease your expenditure and again we see an increase, and you again leave yourselves open to considerable condemnation. Your policy was not positive but negative. You did not go to the country and say that you proposed to do something, but you said you were going to show ways and methods of doing something, of doing without certain things—you were going to do away with parts of the civil service—you were going to do away with overlapping. And you had the opoprtunity last year to do that, and you had it again this year. And my second point is that you have been weighed and found wanting. Now the expenditure this year shows an increase of $138,000 or $140,000, and amounting to $9,744,000. In other words you are asking the people on the current account of your administration this year to pay a bill of $9,744,000. Last year your Estimates were to the amount of $9,605,000; just how much you are going to be out in that I canont say, because we have not yet got the figures; but I doubt if it will be less than half a million dollars, and that is a conservative amount. And when you ask for Supplementary Supply it will very likely be for that figure. Taking all in all you are increasing your Estimates for this year by $138,000, and that in itself is not an alarming amount—an amount taken up practically by your charge on the two millions you borrowed. So from your point of view you may shrug your shoulders. But let me point out that this is not the viewpoint from which you are going to be judged—it was not your job to shrug your shoulders and be satisfied, and point out to the people that you are really not asking for more money. It was not your job to come in here and congratulate yourselves on not asking more from the country. You may say that $140,000 is not a striking or alarming increase, but it represents 50c. per head of every man, woman and child in this country. And it represents $2.50 for every man with a family of five, and that is an average family, and that amount is not easily found in the conditions of this country. $2.50 may not seem very much to some people, it may not seem worthy of directing a criticism from; but let me point out that if I were in the place of the Prime Minister or the Finance Minister I would rather send out and say they are reducing taxation $2.50 per family of five than increasing it to that amount.

Now I want to take this oportunity to say that when the Liberal administration, of which I was a supporter, sat on that side of the House, they never went to this country with such promises as this party has. I have in my hand three different lots of correspondence, and I am going to show you from these as to which party is more in touch with the common people of this country. The first document I would like to refer to is what is known as the Memorial of

the United Fishermen's Movement. I need not take any time up in explaining who they were or in describing the activities of that organization. It will ever be my contention and opinion, Mr. Chairman, that they came into existence purely as a political organization, that the men who headed that movement manoeuvred it so that they would be able to bring about the defeat of the Government of that day, and they also manoeuvred it so that they put into that memorial or manifesto something that would appeal to the rank and file of the people in this country. This memorial which I have in my hand, this manifesto, this petition, this prayer—call it what you like—which was so largely talked of by certain men North in 1922, contained a clause praying for the reduction of expenditure and taxation. I am going to repeat myself, at the risk of being tedious, and say again that the movement of the United Fishermen was manoeuvred purely for political purposes, to further the political aims and ambitions of certain men. Now I am going to admit frankly that I believe many of those who supported the movement were serious, the men of the north side of Bonavista Bay; many of them who supported it were serious and honest. They were sincere and believed that their stand was well taken, and there was a good motive in their demands. They were unable to see at that time that the policy they were supporting and advocating was nothing more nor less than the political camouflage of designing manipulators. The fishermen were sincere; I cannot say the same of their delegates. The delegates knew what game was being played and that the object of it all was really to defeat the Government of that day. But I reiterate that the object of the majority of the men who supported the movement was laudable. They went to the Government in 1922, the Liberal Government, of which I was a supporter, and through their memorial pointed out certain things. They drew attention to the fact that in 1920-21 and 1921-22 the natural products of this country did not exceed sixteen million dollars per year in value and that in the same years the public expenditure of the Colony was more than three-fourths its whole earning power. They pointed out that an average of seven million dollars per year were in those same years collected from the people in taxation and the annual average expenditure in those years was three times greater than it was in the year prior to the Great War. It deals with the exodus of the younger men of the country. I mention these things because I want to come back to them later. (Reads). These men referred to the rise in the price of food and clothing . (Reads). Mr. Chairman, I have directed the attention of the House to the salient points of that memorial—and look at conditions to-day. If I mistake not, and if I heard him accurately, the Prime Minister stated not long since that he owed his election to the men who supported that movement.

He owed his election to those people who took him seriously and to those men who took his Manifesto seriously as well as to that memorial. Virtually speaking, what was contained in that Manifesto was a repetition of what was stated in that memorial. I propose to produce the answer to that memorial and the answer that I got can be substantiated by the Journals of the House and from the Budget Speech from which I propose to quote.

(Reads.)

Now the document which I propose to produce here is one of recent origin. In this respect I want to say

that I am somewhat of a loss to understand the Prime Minister. The Hon. Mr. Monroe is a man who has been lauded to the skies of this country as possessing all the essentials of a gentleman. We have been led to believe that in reference to him the old saying might apply that nature might stand up and say to all the world "Here was a man." Mr. Monroe as the Prime Minister and the leader of the present Government has as I say been lauded to the skies as the last word in courtesy, in everything pertaining to gentlemanly deportment and manners. Now I trust sir, that I will never be obliged to cast personal aspersions upon the leader of this House, but I am very much inclined to believe that Mr. Monroe has been very much overestimated and very much overlauded. Mr. Chairman, it is not a pleasure to me at the present juncture to refer to the letter which I propose to read, because I figure in it in a sort of personal way. I would rather refrain from reading it were it not for the fact that I want to draw another contrast between what the Government listens to when it comes from its own supporters and when it does not. Last year there was a convention of the Fishermen's Protective Union, which organisation is much larger and certainly more influential than the United Fishermen Movement. I submit sir, that we are not a political organization. We have banded together to assist the fishermen of this country whenever the occasion may arise, but the man behind that organization, and the achievement of that organization goes to show that it is representative of the fishermen of this country, and that it has greatly helped to advance the cause of the fishermen of Newfoundland. And yet as I am going to show you now this organization has been treated with discourtesy by the present Prime Minister. At the Convention last Autumn we discussed the question of expenditure and taxation. Did we not have as much right to discuss that matter as the United Fishermen on the North Side of Bonavista Bay, and were we not entitled to the same courtesy at the hands of the present Prime Minister as those men received at our hands in 1922. As it happened it was my duty to send the letter to the Prime Minister, Mr. Monroe, and here is the letter that I sent him. I sent it in my official capacity, and not as a member of the House of Assembly. Mr. Chairman, I venture the assertion that that letter as far as the present executive Government was concerned never say the light of day. And Mr. Monroe has never been man enough to reply to my communication. Again I ask you to contrast that attitude which you have adopted in dealing with organizations in this country, and the attitude which our party took in 1922. The men who appealed to us in 1922 were opposed to the Government of that time. But how did we answer them. We answered them by taking their representative into the Executive meeting, and by reducing expenditure in one department by one-half. By remitting the taxes on all fishing supplies, and by doing everything possible to encourage them to go back to the fisheries. I ask you to contrast that Government which was sent out of power, with the Government which came into power pledged to give a square deal to all. Now sir, when he received that letter the Prime Minister should have brought that letter before his party, and before the Executive Government, and they should have got together and seen where they could have made a substantial reduction in expenditure, in order that there might be a reduction of taxation which that organization called upon you to do. We in 1922 did just that very thing. We were not obliged to do it, or pledged to do it. It was your duty in a great measure to

take serious congizance of the problems put before you because you were bound to do it by every moral law.

You are down here to-day congratulating yourselves that you have only got a very small increase in the estimates. But you stand condemned in that you have not shown that you have made one serious effort to reduce expenditure, I know that the Prime Minister stated here on opening day that he had altered his views now as to what could be done with regard to taxation. He has found that it is not so easy to take the pencil and reduce expenditure by 25 per cent. as he said that he was going to do, when he was discussing it in the Board of Trade Rooms in 1922. But I do say that the Government could show that they have made at least an effort in trying to reduce expenditure by even a paltry $100,000. A reduction of $100,000 in expenditure may be the means of this year of assisting some fishermen who is going to prosecute either the Labrador or the Shore Fishery. But in discussing big things as this Government has been and is doing, we are liable to forget, or to fail to appreciate the great amount of good that can sometimes be done in dealing with small figures. Is it not just as easy for you to contribute this amount towards decreased taxes this year, as it is for you to go to England and borrow millions of dollars to squander on your pet schemes. We have the estimates before us. And if we are worth our salt we should be able to point out to the Government where they can make a reduction in taxation. But the rank and file of the Government party have never been called into consideration, and the financial situation put to them as Sir John Crosbie knows it to-day. If he would stand up in this House to-night and give out those facts about the situation of this country, not only would the outside public be stunned, but in the rank and file of the Government Party there would be nothing short of consternation. Now I am going to say here that I believe that we can effect a substantial reduction in those estimates. And Mr. Chairman, if those estimates have been rushed up here without the due consideration, I for one am prepared to stay here for another two months if necessary, and let the Prime Minister if he is conscientious about the matter, go back again and make a real effort to pare those estimates down, and I believe that he will find that after a week he will be able to reduce them by $500,000. Some time or other it has got to be done. And remember that if you are only thinking of your political position, and you are only considering what effect a certain action will have on the way that you stand with your constituents, if that is the spirit that it actuating you, then God help Newfoundland. But I do believe that there are men over there to-day sitting on that side of the House, who believe, sincerely believe that what I am saying is correct, and who are prepared to welcome free discussion, and to see the best thing that can be done. And I say that the Executive Government should take those men into their confidence and give them an opportunity to discuss these matters with them. I sat on that side of the House for three years, and I was called some names. And in that respect I am almost glad that I am on this side of the House now. But I fail to see how any man can sit over there, and not be consulted about making any effort to improve the financial condition of this country. You have there to-day in the person of Sir John Crosbie, Finance Minister, a good man perhaps. Probably a man who knows as much about finance as any man in that party. But because you have that does your responsibility cease there. Are you to

take obediently from him or from the Prime Minister, everything that he tells you about the financial position of the country. Is it enough for him to tell you that the expenditure cannot be reduced. I say it is not enough. I say that it is the duty of every individual member of the Government to criticise and inquire just as it is our duty from this side of the House to do the same. I believe and I reiterate that reduction can be made in taxation, and in expenditure.

I do not pose to be a financial expert but I do wish to offer some suggestions and state that expenditure ought to be reduced in this country. I shall begin with Government House. I am not going to attack the representative of His Majesty the King but I am going to say that an effective saving of five thousand dollars can be made in connection with the Governor's salary. Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and Ontario are of considerable more importance in the scheme of things on the North American Continent than we are in Newfoundland. They have larger populations in some cases ten times as large; larger institutions; larger outlays, and the Lieutenant Governor of Nova Scotia gets a salary of ten thousand a year only. The time has come when you should consider reduction on these lines. You are the men who came in here to do the job of retrenchment and reduction. If I apply for a job the manager expects me to do that job. The people of the country expect you to do your job. You can begin right there. If you want a man you can get a man, well qualified to take the position for ten thousand a year. Five thousand can be saved there.

Next the other Chamber of this Legislature. It is a Chamber I shall designate as absolutely useless. Abolish it by all means. Don't be afraid to legislate it out of existence. I fail to see how it has justified its existence. The only thing I can say about it is that it contains within its four walls, two men who are dominating the country to its detriment, downfall and utter ruination. If you want to get clear of those men, and I believe there are men on that side of the House who do, wipe out the Legislative Council. By abolishing this Chamber you can save ten or fifteen thousand dollars to the country. By doing so too you will have brought about some efficiency in the conduct of Government. We have had to submit to nothing from that Upper House but insults during the last three years. Nothing is done in this House but they think that they have to alter it. We at any rate go back and face our constituents, but they do not. We are self sufficient and we carry the responsibility and face our constituents when the time comes. They are responsible to nobody. Wipe out the Legislative Council.

I have only mentioned a few of the reductions that might be made, but if the twenty-three or twenty-four members on the other side of the House got together and seriously considered reductions that could be made, might it not be reasonably hoped that half a million dollars could be saved to the country.

Referring to the Marine and Fisheries estimates and the vote for lobster and herring inspectors, there are nine thousand dollars voted for such officials and I am going to call them political heelers, doing more to disseminate the gospel of Toryism and of Monroe than they are doing to export good herring. I agree with Mr. Ashbourne, though I am not in a position to speak as a herring exporter, that these inspectors are absolutely unnecessary. They are an eyesore to the country and sent out more or less to get political support for the Government that is supporting them. If you eliminate surplus

officials see that none such as these are kept on. What are you keeping a lobster inspector for? The lobster industry has been ruined in the district of St. Barbe and I doubt very much if it will be possible to restore the industry in the country again. You came down with your policy of a close season on lobster and knew no more about it than I know about handling an airship. You had no scientific data; no facts or data that if there were three years of close season on the lobster fishery, that you were going to find the propagation of lobsters increased. You don't know one thing about what you were doing and closed down the industry giving no facts, figures or data of the experience of other countries. That is the situation and then you come in and ask for money for a lobster inspector.

Now you are going to bring down a biologist and what is he going to do when he gets here? You will bring him down and before he has finished he will have cost the country twenty-five thousand dollars and I doubt if there will be twenty-five more lobsters in the country, anyway, on his account. It is time to get over these oligists. Soon, as has been said, a physiologist will be needed to discover what kind of mentality you possess.

I come now to the most beautiful spectacle of all. Twenty thousand dollars is voted for the encouragement of the fisheries. Were it not for the seriousness of the thing I would be inclined to approach it in a jocular mood. Here we are at our wits end to know what best to do with regard to our staple industry. We have a Government pledged to encourage the fisheries and the most they can find is twenty thousand dollars a year to encourage the fisheries.

Interest can be guaranteed on four hundred and fifty thousand dollars to build a hotel, and two million dollars on a dock that could have been put there at four hundred thousand substantially for our needs, and two million dollars on high-roads, but when it comes to the staple industry of the country, the most important thing of all, the most the Government can find is twenty thousand dollars.

I cannot believe that the Prime Minister sees right, in connection with that. I do not know what mischievous spirit or fairy can have slipped into the Prime Minister's make up to allow a thing like this to happen, after pledging himself to the encouragement of the fisheries, he allows all that expenditure to go on and only twenty thousand dollars is to be voted for the encouragement of the fishery. Cut it out of the Estimates altogether and save yourselves the disgrace. I know it will be said that Mr. Scammell got up in the House and advocated that the vote for the fisheries should be cut out. I do advocate that, in view of the facts; for one thing in view of the way it is spent. We asked for information as to how this twenty thousand dollars vote was spent. I have not got the reply here at hand but I will never forget it as long as I live.

There were placed in our hands four sheets, big long sheets with a list of names with amounts after them ranging from one hundred dollars down to two or three dollars. Twenty thousand dollars absolutely thrown away. Twenty thousand dollars frittered away for salaries to men to go around as herring inspectors for this country, and then they are not satisfied with doing the herring inspection and out of the twenty thousand dollars they got their finger in the pie and drew out another two hundred and fifty dollars. I charge that the twenty thousand dollars voted in this House for the encouragement of the fisheries last year has been used by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries

as nothing but a fund to pamper party supporters and to give to any of them that wanted it a little job. I suppose that it is hardly worth while to become personal, but I will go so far as to intimate that a great many of the intimate relatives of the Minister are attached to the Department of Marine and Fisheries to-day. And they are not satisfied with receiving salaries for herring inspection we find them down here for fifty dollars for another job, and thus get something out of the vote. Twenty thousand dollars for the encouragement of the fisheries and thrown away in thirty, and five and ten and twenty dollar lots. I charge that the vote of twenty thousand dollars was frittered away; that it is a disgrace of the highest order; and if that is the extent of the attempt towards developing a sound fishery policy, cut it out of the estimates and save that much at least to the people of the country. Down in the district of St. Barbe two gentlemen figure in that; two merchants sons; the present Government appears to have a liking for the higher ups. "To those that have much shall be given, and from those that have not much shall be taken away." That seems to be the policy of the Government right along. Mr. Taylor of Bonne Bay. If I were on a platform down there to-night and that young man were in the hall and I mentioned his name he would not be in the hall two seconds after. Taylor is a big merchant down there, but that was not enough and his son had to be appointed a fishery inspector and go up and down the district of St. Barbe, and it is a wonder to me that he has not been dumped into a codtrap and hooked up dead long ago. Measuring traps down in the Straits and he could not tell the back of a codtrap from the doors, and if you asked him what was a span line he would be found down in the bottom of the boat frightened to death. On the French Shore there is another young fellow, Reid. His father has passed away, and he was a very estimable man, but as far as this young fellow is concerned it is absolute rot to have him going up and down the French Shore collecting fishery statistics. I wonder how many more quintals of fish were caught last year than before by the expenditure of twenty thousand dollars. Mr. Chairman, there would not be enough halls in the city to hold the crowd that Mr. Monroe would address if Sir William Coaker were guilty of an outrage of that nature.

Now I pass on. I pass on to the civil service. Now, let me say right here that I am going to stand by what I am saying. Considering the circumstances under which the people have to struggle you could afford to come in here and reduce the salaries of the civil servants. It was only yesterday that I took up a copy of Punch and saw a cartoon there. The British Government was cartooned as a dog. He had a tremendous tail. The body of the dog was the Government. The tail was the civil service and an hon. member of the Commons was addressing the dog saying, "I like the look of your dog, alright, but I am afraid that your tail is much too long." The tail was waging the dog. We are going to conclude to-morrow, a vote for nine million dollars to carry on the affairs of this country. Something like three and a half of this is the interest on the public debt. This is a debt that we cannot get clear of and which we are in honour bound to pay. The next charge in these estimates is one of one million eight hundred thousand dollars for salaries for civil servants. I do wish that some divine spirit would enter into Mr. Monroe that he would come in here and make a reduction of twenty-five per cent. of the

bill that we are called upon to pay in these civil service salaries. If you do it you will not make yourself secure politically, I admit, but you would be held in the estimation of men of value as one who had done his duty to his country, which would be a greater gain to you than a mere matter of political success one way or the other. If you reduce the salaries beginning at the highest, I do not mean for you to inflict hardship on the men with the small salary, but if you made a serious attempt to reduce the salaries on a percentage basis from the highest to the lowest, on a ranging scale, I have absolutely no doubt that without inflicting any hardship on anybody, you could effect a saving of two hundred thousand dollars. There are other avenues in these estimates whereby savings could be effected I have no doubt. But it is not within my province, and I do not claim to possess the ability to take up the estimates and go through them and point out every item in which there could be a decrease, but I say that there could be a saving of at least two hundred thousand dollars in the civil service salaries.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I stood up here this evening because I felt that it was my duty to make some general observations on the estimates that are now placed before the country to be paid. In a few days the Finance Minister will come in here and tell us where we are going to get the money to pay these bills. He is going to tell us how deeply we are going to have to put our hands in our pockets and how we are going to pay the bill and who is going to have to pay most of it. This is a practice that to me seems to be absolutely contrary to good business. The bill is brought in first and we do not know how we are going to pay it. I could never understand why the Budget is delayed until the estimates have been disposed of and I think that the Budget should be introduced concurrently with the votes for expenditure. Now in conclusion I want to say a few words again in reference to the fishery. Major Cashin made some reference here to the important question of standardization of fish. Mr. Chairman, I submit that there is not a problem to-day before this country deserving of more attention than the fishery problem. With all due respect to the Prime Minister and what he and four or five other men propose to do with regard to the pooling of fish, I am going to tell him that that is not enough. He cannot be brought to see that it is the province of this legislature to concern itself about this problem. I say that the Prime Minister is being imposed upon to support views which under other circumstances he would absolutely disavow. I do not believe that last year the Prime Minister would even have the words "pooling fish" written on his writing tablet. He is being wheeled and with a few men on the street, among themselves, is going to make a move towards pooling fish. I wish the Prime Minister, as he is sincere, as long as he is moving along the lines in which we believe, I wish him well, but I am of opinion that he will have to go much farther if he is going to take up the problem of standardization and of marketing and of the exportation and conservation of markets, and that he will have to deal with it in a great deal bigger way than that referred to this afternoon.

Mr. Chairman, there was a meeting of the fish exporters called in the Grenfell Hall and only a few turned up. In the days of Sir William Coaker, and the days of the infamous, or whatever you call them, fish regulations, when he called a meeting of the fish exporters in the Grenfell Hall every fish exporter came, from the North and West, and it was one of the most business like meetings that was ever held in this country. If there is anybody in the House who

would like to have a copy of the pamphlet with the speeches made at that time I will be glad to furnish him with one. If I mistake not the Prime Minister was at that meeting. I believe that he made a speech there. The great trouble with our proposals is that there will be too many speaking. That is the trouble all along. That is why I say put one man in the position in this House and let him speak for the general good of all concerned.

If we do not do something you have no authority, no sanction, except insofar as a few of you will do by co-operation, from that point of view, and if you don't get everybody to co-operate you will be in the same position as you were before. I notice the Prime Minister talks of a stabilization expert and in his way of making little remarks, says that he will be better than Mr. Sapiro—he will never be as good as Mr. Sapiro. Mr. Sapiro is a better man than the two gentlemen in the Upper Chamber that I referred to. And I say to the men in high office that the people are looking to them to fulfil their pledges or get out. And if you can't reduce expenditure or taxation,get out and make room for someone who can and someone who did it before, under harder conditions. If you can't keep your contract with the people hand over the charter and give it to someone who can. If you were desirous of doing what you pledged you would not remain in office 24 hours longer. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have finished, and as far as the votes are concerned, except in one or two small instances I shall have nothing more to say. In my opinion I have done my manifest duty, and I think and know that the country is awakened to what the country is awakened to what they did when they elected the Monroe Party in 1924.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, if the whole story of the member of St. Barbe is so untrue as the financial part of it, I greatly discount it. He made the statement that they sat here and worried over the Estimates —now that may be true, but he has also said that their Estimates were approximately seven or eight millions.

MR. SCAMMELL—No, I stated that I was quoting from the Memorial, which said that we had collected an average of 7 millions that year. That was considerably below the taxes.

HON MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Oh, quite. What I was going to point out was that there was a deficit every year during your administration, and the last year of $1,700,000.

MR. SCAMMELL—We know that.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—He also made a remark in connection with the reductions of Sir William Coaker in Lighthouses, or in the Marine and Fisheries Department. But I would like to point out that the result and expense of that has fallen on the hands of the present administration. If what Captain Winsor says is true, we are paying now for the repairs resulting from that curtailment. The hon. member says we ought to make an effort to curtail, and I can assure the hon. member that any Executive that gets up and tries to curtail is up against a big job. I have my friend, Mr. Ashbourne, looking at me so seriously to-night, who has been advocating $5,000 extra for a Hospital also preaching reduction of expenditure, and he comes in here asking for a bridge for Twillingate. We are asked for steamers, telephones, and how are we to curtail? We are asked to curtail, and every day are called upon for bridges, telegraphs, telephones. And I say it is very hard to curtail. To-night we have a message from Lamaline that there is an epidemic of "Flu," and have to send a ship with doctors and nurses. At Harbor Grace there is a breach of the law, and we

have to send a detachment of police in the morning. These are some of the demands of a Government and an Executive, and I tell you it is hard to curtail. When I was in the Government of Sir Edward Morris, approximately $200,000 was voted for education, and now it is $970,000. And what are we going to do? It is very easy to get up and criticize—I did it myself when I was over there. But it is very difficult for any Government to reduce expenditure in a way that a country will benefit. Take Mr. Warren's statement this afternoon that Charities are costing us over a million yearly. I remember in Sir Edward Morris' Government the total revenue was $3,000,000 yearly—to-day it is $9,500,000 or $9,700,000. And my experience as Finance Minister and in charge of the Custom House tells me it is a very difficult operation. Mr. Scammel asks what we are going to do with the Civil Service—I have no brief for them, but I say if we cut them down below a living wage we have another problem on our hands. I was very much amused at this talking about the Marine and Fisheries Department in view of the fact that his party appointed Mr. Frank Archibald Minister of Marine and Fisheries—they couldn't have thought so much of it then. I didn't think he was qualified, and neither did Mr. Scammel. What I do feel and what the Government feels—

MR SCAMMELL—Did you say Mr. Archibald was a friend of mine?

HON MINISTER OF FINANCE—No, I said I didn't think he was qualified, and neither did you if the story you told here to-night was sincere. Now we hear a great deal of talk about standardization of fish—there are men here very keen on that. I remember when the Regulations which have been spoken of were brought in I was of the opinion that they were bad, and I fought them as hard as any man, and I did it because I believed I was right. And the Hon. Member for Ferryland, Major Cashin, absolutely proved I was to-night when he said nobody could fix a price.

But he thinks there should be some regulation. I say it is going to be very difficult. If I know anything in this country it is about shipping fish. During the past ten years I have been shipping to Brazil, and have not had one claim against my fish; I paid more attention to it than most men. If you ship an article that the people want there will be no trouble. Take Italy—it is not because the fish is not good; I don't care how you standardize it, you are going to have claims if the market is glutted, because that is their nature. And take Spain—it is simply in this position. No one wants to block Spain, but fish is an article that will not last forever, and if you have a half million quintals and the requirements are only for a quarter of a million, you are going to have a quarter of a million which the market there cannot handle.

The handling of the fish business in this country, Mr. Chairman, will never be done through this House of Assembly. I do not want to drift into this matter now as I intend to have something to say when the estimates are finished.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, Arising out of the ramarks of the honourable member for St. Barbe and of the Honourable Minister of Finance in connection with the financial standing of the country at the present time we will, have no surplus actually for the country this year. The Government put on a new tariff last year, amounting to an increase of approximately fifteen per cent. Now what business did the country do after increasing the tariff? One would ordinarily think that our revenue would increase after increasing the tariff. Our revenue from July 1st, 1925 to December 31st, 1925 was $4,652,807.53. Our revenue for the same period was $4,722,222.10

or $69,414.67 more despite the increase in the tariff of fifteen per cent. Our expenditure for that time was $3,789,-00 and for the same period 1924 was $3,105,700.50, a difference that sounds to me as appalling and that means that this country has gone in the hole in 1925 over 1924 by $702,411.97. That looks serious from a business standpoint Mr. Chairman. Now let us see where we stood at the end of the fiscal year 1925. We find that for January and February 1926 we collected $1,115,727.45 and for the same period 1925 under the old tariff we collected $1,161,615.35. Therefore, we are still short, despite our new tariff of $45,-877.90, and that is not taking into consideration the deficit on the railway. This country is in debt to-day eighty millions of dollars and I think that the time is not far distant when we will be called upon to pay the ten millions of dollars in connecti the Humber proposition. That means that every man, woman and child in the country will have to pay $320.00 each or about $15.00 per year in interest. The Finance Minister knows this just as well as I do.

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman: I have listened for quite a while to the remarks that have fallen from the lips of the hon. member for St. Barbe. As to the $20,000 voted for the benefit of the fisheries that is disbursed by the Fisheries Board. I challenge Mr. Scammell to find better men for the job than those comprising the fisheries board. Mr. Scammell has claimed that Mr. Coaker had reduced the expenditure of that Department by $400,000; but for four years he left his office and drew a salary of $16,000 besides a salary of a Secretary amounting up to $20,800. Mr. Coaker's reductions in the maintenance and upkeep of lighthouses has resulted in the lighthouses all over the country being left in a tumbled-down state and many of them have had to be replaced. In one lighthouse at Bonavista Cape the keeper had to cover his family over with canvas when it rained.

They had a lot of tumbled down shacks down there, and they'll come to ruin. And Mr. Scammell and the rest of his party who stand up over there and charge this Government for making expenditure that was not justified, they are like a lot of hens crowing "Save the money for the fishermen, you are doing nothing for the fishermen." They say that to any Government that comes into power in this country. But the lighthouses are the greatest benefit to the fishermen and the sealers of this country and they should be kept in good condition.

Now Mr. Chairman, there is another matter that I want to talk about. I was sent this year across to Canada on a fishing Commission. What happened. I was scarcely twenty miles across the country, when every paper in the country bar none attacked me. I don't now refer to the Fishermen's Advocate anymore than to any of the rest. They charged me with going over on a holiday. They said that I was illiterate, and they gave me all kinds of abuse, that could be poured on one man. All I have to say is that if I am illiterate it was my misfortune instead of my fault. Now I did not go to Canada of my own free will. I never asked to go there. I was down on the French Shore when I received a message from Mr. Monroe saying that there was a fishery conference to take place between Canada and Newfoundland in Montreal, and asking me to attend it. I came up and obeyed my master's orders like all good servants should do. Now I am sorry Mr. Brown is not here to-night. Mr. Brown asked me a little while ago what my expenses were in connection with the trip to Canada. Now the situation was this. Last year some of our fishermen went down into the Straits of Belle Isle, to fish. What did they

find. They found that they were not allowed to put a codtrap into the water within three miles of any part of the Canadian Coast. They sent a message to the Department in St. John's. I was not there at the time and when I was coming back I saw the message that had been sent me by those people. Before I had done anything the Prime Minister had wired to Ottawa to find out why the fishing laws between Canada and Newfoundland had been altered. The reply that he got back was that there was no alteration in the fishery laws between Canada and Newfoundland. We then wrote to the fishermen concerned and we got a reply saying that they were not allowed to fish and that the fishing officers had strict orders that no Newfoundlander was allowed to put his trap into the water in that sea. After consulting with the Government I was ordered to proceed to the Canadian Coast. There was no express going out until Sunday. I had to go to Bay of Islands first. I think if I had asked the Government to give me a parlour car they would have given me one, but I took a freight car and arrived in Bay of Islands at 12 o'clock at night. At 6 o'clock I was amongst the fishermen. When I got there I found that there were forty two schooners over there but not one was allowed to fish in the Canadian water. That was six o'clock Sunday morning and before Monday morning I had made arrangements with the Quebec authorities, so that our fishermen could go fishing as usual. Now I have been criticised for the spending of five hundred dollars. But what did the fishermen lose only fifty cents a fathom. And if I did not get over there last year this country would have lost $25,000 and I will prove it to you. There were 23,000 quintals of fish caught out of the Straits of Belle Isle, and if I had not gone across there would not have been any fish caught at all. And all this fish has been sold, practically. I say Mr. Chairman, that my trip over to Canada turned into the coffers of this Government more than the trip of any other minister, since Newfoundland got responsible Government.

The Prime Minister took the matter up with the authorities in Quebec, and they wired down and they said that it was of such a serious nature that they were going to hold a conference in Quebec sometime during the month of December, and they said that they would like for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to attend it. Consequently I left here on Thursday and arrived in Quebec on Tuesday morning at four o'clock. Then the conference started. There was there the Director of Fisheries from Ottawa and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries from Quebec, and two or three other officials. On the desk of the Minister of Fisheries there was a pile of letters making all kinds of charges against the Newfoundland fishermen. And I claim that if another member of the Government had gone up there bar none, he could not have settled the question as I settled it. Because I spent 27 years drawing the fish out of the water side by side with the very fishermen who were now fighting for their rights. Consequently there were few men who knew as much about the situation as I did, and no one in the Government. I knew what the Newfoundland fishermen had done for the people who had written these letters from which the Minister had quoted, and therefore I was in a position to contradict every letter on his desk. I was turned down flat at the first conference. The only satisfaction I got at the first conference was that the Director of Fisheries at Ottawa said that when he came there he thought that the Newfoundland fishermen were being discriminated against, but after being there for half an hour he

thought that such was not the case and he put on his coat and he walked out. I was left alone with these three or four officials to fight the battle for the Newfoundland fishermen. These letters were written by people on the Canadian coast. They said that the Newfoundland fishermen were claiming every berth on the coast and they said that they were not going to stand for it. They claimed that the Newfoundlanders were taking all the good berths and consequently they had to take the poor ones. Also that they could get no fish and they were starving. They showed several of the letters to me and they asked me what I had to say about it.

I said "Mr. Tachereaux, you have no one to blame for the berths being picked but your own Government."

I said to him "You have no one to blame only your own Government," and he said "What do you mean?" I said "You have a law that no birds be killed but you allow five hundred Indians to go in on the islands and give them guns to kill birds and as a consequence they do so and that is the solution of the birds being destroyed. He believed that the Newfoundland fishermen took all the prime berths and I said to him "Turn up the fishery rules and see what that says about." The second or third paragraph says that Canadians will have the first pick of the prime berths of the codfishery. I said "I can prove to you that our men cannot get a chance to set a trap before they go to the inspector and he has all the berths marked out for the Canadians and we have to take what we can get of what is left. The Canadians could have got more fish if they knew how to get it and they would not have got what they did get if the Newfoundlanders had not taught them how to get it." "Your people are only an injury to the fishery, down there," he said. I said to the Deputy Minister "Let me explain what Newfoundlanders have done for Canadians in regard to the codfishery. Ten years ago there was not a solitary cod-fisherman on the coast. They were all salmon fishermen. Then somewhere about ten years ago a man asked me if I would bring down a codtrap for him, and I brought down a codtrap. After that some times we Newfoundlanders spent as much as ten and twelve days showing them how to mend their traps and not asking a cent for it, and if you ask those Canadian fishermen 85 per cent. of them will say that they want the Newfoundlanders to continue to fish on that coast." In the first instance they would want it because if the Newfoundlanders are shoved out they can't get any help." I told him to ask the Fishery Officer about it and he sent for him and the consequence of it all is that our fishermen will be allowed to fish as heretofore. The next question was that the fishermen never had to pay more than fifty cents a fathom for leaders, and last year they charged $1.00 a fathom and that meant quite a lot to the fishermen and it was a big proposition to get that cut down to fifty cents again. It was necessary to get that done because some of the fishermen said that if it was left at a dollar they would not go there to fish. I saw first after I got there that I had a pretty hard job. I was under the impression and told the Minister of Fisheries from Ottawa that it was only the Newfoundland fishermen that had to pay a dollar a fathom and I found that every Canadian born in Canada except those from Quebec has to pay a dollar a fathom for every fathom of leader. I thought that it would be pretty hard to get those people to make the change for Newfoundlanders fifty cents a fathom when they were charging the rest of Canada a dollar. I thought the problem of getting that done was impossible to solve. The next day the

Prime Minister said to me "You are asking for something I cannot consider giving and you cannot expect to get. We cannot allow you to fish for fifty cents a fathom when the rest of the Canadians have to pay a dollar." I said "We are only asking you to give us the same privileges as your people who can come to Newfoundland and fish the summer." Then he came back the next morning and says "Well, we will give you that privilege." It may seem a strange thing but every Province has its own fishery rules and regulations and anybody coming from Nova Scotia down there has to pay a dollar a fathom and Newfoundlanders pay their fifty cents.

I was gone about thirty days and I expected to get back about the eighteenth. I expected to get through in Quebec in at least five days and it took ten and therefore I had to wait. The rest of the trip was taken up at New York where there was an exhibition going on of all sorts of navigation devices.

There were men there from all parts of the world. There were lighthouse men from all parts of the world. When there I may say that they treated me like a prince and I am only an ordinary fisherman of Newfoundland. They would not allow me to pay train bills or hotel bills and they took me to the different shows and would not allow me to pay for that either. I went to see all those latest ideas in navigation. I had to buy three bell buoys with lights attached, two for Port au Basques and one for Catalina. We saw there different types of bell buoys with lights attached and bell buoys with fog whistles. What I wanted cost quite a price and from what I could see it was not possible to get them for less than $7,000.00 a piece. They showed me the different lights and how they worked and when I got back to Baltimore the Commissioner asked me if I was satisfied and I said that I would like to see some smaller types. The next day they had a ship ready for me and brought me back to New York and took me round spending another day inspecting them and that trip saved the country at least five thousand dollars, and my trip cost the colony six hundred dollars altogether and I was gone thirty days, so you can figure it out and see what was spent on expenses.

Speaking of Quebec I may say that the Government there and the different representatives of the Government treated me as well as any person could expect to be treated. The first day they kind of gave me the cold shoulder, but afterwards when they found that I was justified in what I was claiming it was altogether different. They offered me to come down at their own expense and go over the coast in June and let the Minister see for himself whether they wanted Newfoundlanders or whether they did not. I was wondering if I could get back the money that had been paid by reason of that extra fifty cents and only a few days ago I received a letter from there asking me to tell them how much had been paid and the chances were that we would get it back. A man Anstey at Little Bay has fished there for twenty seven years and I suppose has paid practically up to $1,500 license during that time and some three years ago his berth was taken away from him by one of the Canadians, and the other day they wrote me a letter and asked me to produce the letter from the Admiral telling him to fish there as long as he wanted to fish and they would return him his berth and that means quite a lot to old man Anstey.

All I have to say is that I leave it in the hands of the fishermen who go in the Straits of Belle Isle as to whether the six hundred dollars that I spent on that trip was well spent or not, and I know which way the decision will go. There are people on

the North side of Bonavista Bay and on the North Side of Trinity Bay who made thousands of dollars during the last few years on the trip to the Straits of Belle Isle in the first of the spring while the others make one trip only to the Labrador, and if that spring trip were closed off it would be a great loss to this country. I understand that it is the Brazil fish that they catch up there, and the Brazil markets have been good for the last twelve months and I think that it paid the Government of Newfoundland to send me there. Now Mr. Chairman I will not delay the House very much longer to-night but I will have something else to say to-morrow. Remember to-night when the hon. member for St. Barbe was speaking he was looking at me very hard and when he was talking about the United Fishermen he was also looking hard in my direction. I may say that the committee consisted of eighteen men in the first place, fifty of the United Fishermen were staunch supporters of Mr. Scammell's party, but what made me laugh was when he said that he would meet the leader of the United Fishermen in the summer and he would hear the tale from him. However, Stuart Winsor was drowned over the dock last fall, and so I am afraid that he will not see him next summer.

MR SCAMMELL.—I had sincerely intended not to join further in the debate, but the Minister of Marine and Fisheries went up to Quebec and spent six hundred dollars to settle matters that might just as well have been arranged with an expenditure of half or quarter that expense from here, as satisfactorily as outlined here to-night. If he had not gone however we would not have the burlesque to which we had to listen this evening. The Minister presumed to state that since Newfoundland had responsible Government nobody ever brought back to Newfoundland such an important decision as the same Captain Winsor did when he went to Quebec, but let me tell the Minister that his knowledge of things since Newfoundland had responsible Government must be very limited. Now I have got something to say to you. I was coming up the corridor just now when you were referring to me and to the Winsor family just now. Now out of respect for decency I did not mention the Winsor family in its associations with your department, but I thought that I went as far as decency would permit me to go. But the Minister mentioned my name and said that I had paid nothing into the revenue of this country and that the Winsor family had paid into the revenue a hundred thousand dollars. Suppose that your family did pay a hundred per cent. I will take off my hat to the Winsors as fishermen but I only started to criticize the Winsors when the Winsors become the public servants of this colony at the expense of the colony. Not that I deny the Winsors the right to hold office in this country, but if the Winsors paid a hundred cents to the dollar in this country, and if they paid a hundred cents to the dollar in every other case our company at Port Union and others would be a great deal better off than they are to-day. Mr. Chairman, I admit that I have never been a fisherman. I only went down to Labrador for four or five years, and I admit that I am not a fisherman, but I do not owe the colony of Newfoundland one cent. I have never drawn a salary from the country and I have been sent here as an independent member and I have drawn my sessional indemnity as such. But the Minister places no faith in anybody but the fishermen. He wishes that we had none but fishermen. I do not know that I would be much happier if I had gone on and kept to the fishery and looking at the other

position I do not know that you would be much happier if you had continued. But the Minister made the important discovery and came down here this afternoon and told us that on his return from his mission to Quebec he brought back decisions of more import than has been brought back since the Colony of Newfoundland got responsible Government. I merely draw attention to this, Mr. Chairman, and in view of the award of the Whiteway Commission to Halifax, I take off my hat to Capt. Winsor, Sir William Whiteway and his million dollar award notwithstanding.

CAPT. RANDELL.—I have listened with much interest to the address made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and I was very interested to hear what he had done on his trip away from the Colony, but I am inclined to think that he made one or two rather extravagant statements. I do not mean in connection with the lighthouses. I did not know that there were 252 lighthouses around the coast. I know that some of them are in a very bad condition. I think that we need a live Minister of Marine and Fisheries in connection with the lighthouses. Now I have long wanted to give my views in this House on the manner in which our coasts are lighted and in connection with the aids to navigation. I have been interested to hear that the hon. minister made arangements to purchase some bellbouys for some places around the coast. While I am on the matter I would like to bring his attention to the fact that there is scarcely a buoy around the coast with the exception of one or two at the entrance to harbours. We had a case here a few years ago where a vessel was lost on Freels Rock, and had the weather not been good there would have been a serious loss of life. I consider that if there had been an automatic bellbuoy and listening buoy there she would not have been lost there. I was talking to the Captain and he told me that if the conditions had not been favourable there would not have been a half dozen lives saved out of the ship. That is a case that I should like to bring to the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I also bring to his attention that half of the lighthouses around this coast are camouflaged in respect to the colours they are painted showing up against a clear sky line or in a half twilight of fog you cannot see them at all. They should be painted black or red where they are painted white. I have been going around Conception Bay and I have seen a motor car coming around the bottom of Harbour Grace and that motor car light had more brilliancy than the lights on Harbour Grace Island, Carbonear Island and Cape St. Francis included. Now that is a fine state of affairs. These are several things I had in mind for some time, and intended to bring to the notice of the Minister of Marine and Fisheriess. But in opening my remarks I made the statement that in my opinion the Minister had made some extravagant statements to-night. He said, I think, that he or some people connected with his family has contributed 100 per cent. more to this country than any one on this side of the House had ever turned in. Now I take issue with the hon. gentleman.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—I didn't say that — I said some people. You weren't one of those I meant.

CAPT. RANDELL.—I haven't been very successful either in the prosecution of the seal fishery or the codfishery, but I don't want anybody to make such a statement as that and include me in it, without giving some facts to prove it. I have worked as hard in the affairs of this country as any member of this House, and I

would like for that gentleman to understand that it takes all kinds of people to make up a world, and it takes all kinds of people to make up those that do the work of the country. Fish or anything else is not of much value if there is not somebody to take it out of the country. I was in that work until five years ago, and no member of the Winsor or any other family worked any harder than I did. I wasn't engaged at the fisheries, but every fisherman has some time idle, and I have been wearing my finger to the quick when fishermen, Captain Winsor included, were safe in bed. And for that reason I take issue with him when he makes the statement that he has been the means of bringing 100 per cent. more into this country than any other man on this side of the House. Before I sit down I would like to make reference to another thing. I have noticed that the hon. gentleman in his remarks said his trip cost the country $600.00 and that he probably was the means of bringing in more for that expenditure than any other member, or words to that effect. That may be—I quite agree with him that the trip was one that was very important, and I want to say here that if his trip cost the country only $600.00 he is not good company for some of the gentlemen on that side of the House. And I take notice that the gentlemen on that side who have had legal training have been very well paid for their services, and for their trips to other countries, and the Minister is quite as much entitled to be well paid as the Minister of Justice. The bills of these legal gentlemen go into thousands of dollars. I think the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was somewhat lax in charging only six hundred dollars for his trip to Quebec. And I want to assure this House that if ever I become Minister of Marine and Fisheries and have to take a trip my bill will not be as low as that because I feel that the time I have given to qualify for the position makes my work just as important and valuable as any lawyer, and I am afraid that if I ever become Minister of Marine and Fisheries I will be quite in accord with the Minister of Justice, and will figure out my bill somewhat after his style. I would like to say before taking my seat that I think the main issue regarding fishery affairs of this country has been more or less neglected by the Government. Very little has been done to help the fishermen, and I am in accord with any policy whereby the fishermen should be more looked after in connection with marketing and prices than they have been. I have heard a lot since taking my seat this session about the fishery regulations that we had a few years ago, and I could tell a little story about these regulations. We hear a lot about people who lost money, but we seldom hear of the people who made money out of these regulations. I was in Brazil for about fourteen months while the regulations were in force, and I can tell where the merchants made sixty thousand pounds by shipments to Brazil before the regulations were rescinded; the prices went to one hundred shillings per drum, and wouldn't have been higher than eighty-five shillings, and the merchants made fifteen shillings per drum out of the regulations. And I have heard, also, the honorable gentlemen talking about fish markets for this country, and a little while ago I heard one gentleman talking about finding a market in Great Britain for our fish. If the gentleman who made that remark knew that Great Britain was a fish exporting country, shipping to the markets that we have neglected and lost, he would not have made that remark, and know more of what he was talking about. Gt.

Britain is now shipping to those places; in 1920 Aberdeen shipped forty odd thousand quintals to Rio, and I have never seen better cured fish, and still we hear people talking about finding a market in Great Britain while there are exporters there. We hear a lot of foolishness about the fishery, a lot of nonsense by some people that don't know what they are talking about. I want to say that I am in accord with any project that may be taken up by this Government regarding producing or exportation for the betterment of the fishermen, I don't care if it is a bonus or what it is, so long as it helps the industry.

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, Friday, afternoon, at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, May 7th, 1926.

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

Petition was presented by

Mr. Cahill from Avondale re road.

Notice of Question.

Mr. Cashin gave notice of question.

Mr. Hickman 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 Public Charities, $463,761.11.

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. WARREN—I want to draw the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to this vote for the Game and Inland Fisheries Board. It is not a vote that I think well repays the country for the money spent on it. I consider it of importance in view of the money that is being spent on the purchase of salmon by the Newfoundland Atlantic Fisheries, Ltd., lately, and in view of the increased importance of the exportation of fresh salmon. I would like to say this in connection with it, that I think that Board could be improved by the addition of some other members. I don't want any member of the Board to imagine that I am criticising him, or the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to imagine that I am criticising him. I look upon the Game and Inland Fisheries Board as a most important Board, and I was glad to hear from the Minister yesterday that when he calls a meeting of that Board he hardly ever fails to get a quorum. Very different from the Fisheries Board which sometimes had to adjourn for that reason. That speaks well for that Board—the Game and Inland Fisheries Board, which was, I think, appointed a good many years ago. I am not now altogether directing my remarks to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, as he has nothing to do with the appointment of that Board, but I am

more or less directing them to the Executive Government. It was, as I say, appointed some years ago and consists of, as per last year's Year Book:

(Reads from the Year Book.)

Some of that Board have hardly had the experience of the game and fisheries of this country, and of the hunting, as the shooting of partridge and of caribou that some other members of this community have. I do not say that anybody should be put off that Board. Some of the older members of the Board were appointed at a time when they were doing a great deal more in the way of shooting and fishing than they are today. They have advanced in years and while their knowledge may be very useful to the Board, they have ceased to have the actual experience that they used to have before. I know of men in this community who have actually made a study of this sort of thing and they are not on the Board, and I suggest now to the Governor in Council that that Board could very well be improved by the addition to it of a couple of men who know something recently about the sporting game of killing salmon. A tourist policy has been introduced into the country, and while those members of the Board here at present make very useful members, I think that the Board needs perhaps a little new life. I would suggest to the Government the advisability of adding to the Board some young blood, some new life, as, for example, some of those who have recently been interested in the getting of tourists here, the Tourist and Publicity Association, and have also spent a great deal of time in the studying of the various habits of salmon around this country. I make this suggestion in justice to that Tourist and Publicity Association which is functioning without remuneration in the hope of getting tourists here. I know there are men in that Association who ought to be of the Game and Inland Fisheries Board, if only to keep in touch with that Tourist Associataion, and outside of that I know of others who have ideas, good and strong ideas, as to the protection of our rivers and the propagation of salmon and trout, who would be, I think, very valuable additions to the board. I take this opportunity of making these suggestions. I don't know whether or not the Board is limited in numbers, but I suggest, if possible, the addition of certain men in the community, who fish for salmon, study the habits of trout in this country and have helped in the propagation of trout, and whose knowledge and experience would be a valuable aid to that Board.

MR. SCAMMELL—With regard to the appointment of fishery wardens, I suppose that comes within the province of the Game and Inland Fisheries Board. I would like to know what policy is being proceeded with in this respect, as to whether the appointment of wardens is being left to the Board exclusively or if the Minister is consulted, or if it comes before the Department at all, or comes under the direction of the Minister as official Chairman of the Board. I would like to know how much politics has to do with the appointment of these wardens.

HON. THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—With regard to the appointment of fishery wardens, I may say that I have never been asked for a position by anybody. I went there with the impression that it was a non-political board. I had on one occasion, when first attending that Board, to make a charge that there were political appointments, but I was given to understand by the Board that it was not the case. As far as the Board is concerned I think that every individual member will say that politics are not considered at all.

In my opinion if there is one Board in the country that politics are kept clear of it is that Board. Generally, as I understand it, if they want to appoint a fishery warden they apply to the supervisor. There are three or four supervisors with so much space to look after, and if one of the wardens drop out they ask the supervisor if he knows a good man to take his place. In many instances the supervisor recommends a good man, but his services cannot be obtained because of the small pay. I think that the pay runs $50.00, $75.00 and $150.00 for six months. Every member in this House can well understand how hard it would be to get a good man to spend the best six months of the year for the sum of $150.00. Nevertheless that is how it is carried on. The supervisor is asked to recommend a man and he does so. I have no doubt that if any member knew of a good man and the supervisor did not ,they would take his recommendation. I may say that it is as non-political as it can properly be.

Speaking of extra men, only last year four or five new men were added, mostly politicians. The idea of the Game Board, as far as I can learn, in asking for these appointments was because of the difficulty of the Board doing all that it would wish for lack of funds, and it was thought it might be a good plan to have a few politicians on the Board who might be able to get it a larger grant. I do give a good deal of credit especially to the older members of that Board. They come night after night, no matter what else is on, if it is possible at all to come, and they give their time free, and they do all that is possible in the interests of the country in connection with their duties down there, and if it were not for lack of funds they would do even better.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, for many years the question of the Game and Inland Fisheries Board has occupied the attention of this House. As a member of the Board I quite agree with the remarks of the honourable member for Fortune Bay. For twenty years I have found it impossible to give it the attention I would like, and I feel that somebody else should take my place. The efforts of the Board are not as what some people think they are, particularly towards the protection of the salmon hatcheries. This fishery could be second only to our codfishery, and now that our game resources are to be turned into a revenue producing factor through the tourist policy, I feel that the infusion of new blood on the Board would be an improvement. I approve of the appointment of members to the Board from the members of the Tourist Bureau, as their present work brings them into connection with fishing, shooting, etc. Through the efforts of one fourteen year old club much has already been learned as to the habits of salmon and the time of their appearance at various points, as well as to the details with regard to flies, etc., to be used in catching them. This knowledge must be of benefit towards assisting tourists to have good sport. I think that the Board is doing good work but I think that the infusion of new blood into the Board would be an improvement.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—Mr. Chairman, I think that the time is opportune that more attention should be paid to this subject. One of the greatest attractions for Tourists are the salmon and trout rivers. I do not profess to have first hand knowledge of conditions regarding trout and salmon rivers on the West Coast, but I think that these rivers should be properly protected. It has been said in the past that most of the poaching of the rivers

has been due to the people living nearby them. I claim that such is not the case. A great deal of the damage done in that direction has been done by so-called sportsmen who go in the country for the week-end and who with sunken flies and other apparatus do more damage in one afternoon than the residents of the place would do in a year; and it is absolutely impossible to expect the wardens to properly police the rivers because of the small wages that they get and the large territory that they are expected to cover. If men are paid they will do their work properly. Better wages should be paid and it should be seen that when an offender is brought before a Magistrate for an infraction of the Game Laws that he does not get clear by reason of political influence. I know of cases in which lobster cans have been filled with almost everything else except lobster, but the offenders were not sent to the Penitentiary, as they should have been, because of their political pull. The trout and salmon rivers should be properly safeguarded and protected so that tourists who visit here would have reason to report to their friends that Newfoundland is a Sportman's Paradise. I trust that the Tourist Bureau will be well represented on the Game and Inland Fisheries Board and that offenders of the law will get the treatment that they deserve meted out to them, irrespective of pull or influence.

MR. MOORE—Mr. Chairman, I know very little about salmon fishing, but I was appointed by the present administration to act as a member of the Game and Inland Fisheries Board. The trouble is that we have not got enough money to properly police the rivers. Why $20,000, which is the total vote for fisheries, is only a drop in a bucket. At LaManche, on the Southern Shore, a few steps at the mouth of that river would send salmon right up through that country and it would cost but a very trifling sum. I have heard that the same can be done in other districts, and I trust that this House will take this matter into serious consideration and vote the money for that purpose. I endorse the statement of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines that it is the so-called sportsman who spends the week-end and jigs thirty fish over night that is doing all the damage to the rivers.

MR. WARREN.—Mr. Chairman. — I am glad that this subject came up for discussion. I think the Colonial Secretary struck the crux of the whole thing when he intimated that the main object in protecting the salmon rivers of this country was for the further propagation of salmon. Salmon is a fresh water fish and if it is not allowed to go to its natural spawning grounds, you are not going to have any more salmon. I agree, as has been pointed out by Mr. Walsh, that the vote for the protection of the salmon rivers and the salaries voted to the Wardens, is not sufficient. Now with five members of the Executive Government on the Game and Inland Fisheries Board and in view of the importance of protecting our rivers, particularly from a tourist standpoint, I feel that the Finance Minister should consider the granting of an additional vote. To-day we have a big cold storage corporation handling salmon in quantities that would not be dreamt of a few years ago, but they can only carry on through salmon being propagated. With regard to penalties for breaches of the law, I know that when I was Minister of Justice several prominent citizens were fined and in my opinion this should apply to every offender. The Rod Tax is out of all proportion. A tourist is charged now

$10 for the privilege of fishing for, maybe, a week, but it is generally about two months. I fish on the West Coast, and up and down the rivers there and up at Long Harbour, Fortune Bay, and in Bay du Nord, you find bungalows built all along the rivers. Now, the people who can afford to build bungalows on the side of these rivers, and hire men for that period of time, I say, for those people a Rod Tax of $10 is nothing. It should be increased, it should be doubled, and there is no reason whatever why it should not be doubled. No man is going to come down here to fish salmon for less than a fortnight, and $5 a week is nothing. If he is charged $1 extra for board, which is $7 a week, he does not mind it a bit. He spends so much to buy a fishing outfit, fishing clothes, and to hire guides, that $5 a week for the privilege of fishing means nothing. I trust the Fishery Board will take up the question of increasing that Rod Tax. The member for Ferryland, I don't know whether to call him the senior or the junior member, Mr. Moore, referred to the salmon ladder at Rocky River, and I understood that the Government Engineer told him that the salmon could not get up the river. I quite agree with him that the salmon ladder that is there now should be considerably altered. I have seen that salmon ladder, and when the water is shallow, no salmon could ever get up that river. What I got up to say first, when we started the discussion on this vote, was that in addition to putting on the Board members of the Executive who may have a pull with the Minister of Finance, I think that we ought to put on the Board some new blood. Now, there is a gentleman in this town who has studied salmon, and I know one particular idea he has, which is worked out in other countries. Now, the object of policing the river is to see that there is plenty of fish in the rivers. One of the troubles with this country is salmon are not permitted to go into the rivers on account of the nets. Rules and regulations have been drawn up to prevent the putting of nets in the estuary of the river. I know that, in other countries if nets are put within a reasonable reach of the mouth of the river, they have to be taken up Saturday night, and not allowed to be put down until Monday morning. This allows a lot of salmon to go up the river that would not otherwise do so. That man has studied this matter thoroughly, and he has got figures gathered from other countries. I shall give the Prime Minister and the Colonial Secretary the name of the man I mean. But I do say that jiggers and nets in a river may damage a river to a certain extent, but, after all, if we get as much salmon into the river as we possibly can, I don't think the use of jiggers and nets in the river would do very much damage if the greater percentage of salmon were allowed to enter the river, although jiggers should not be allowed at any time. I have ideas upon the habits of salmon, which I will not delay the House with this afternoon. We are not discussing the habits of salmon at the present time, but I am discussing the advisability of the Government realizing the fact that if a vote of $20,000 gives us a revenue from the salmon fishery, which we derive to-day, then a vote of $40,000 would more than double the revenue derived from the judicious expenditure of that money.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to see this discussion on one of the most important departments of the Government. This is certainly a very interesting and very edifying and a very instructive debate that has taken place to-day in reference

to the salmon fishery. The Government has embarked upon a tourist policy, and the protection of the salmon fishery should be a part of this policy, and certainly it should be protected. I agree with the Honourable Minister of Agriculture and Mines as regards what he said in reference to the greater protection on our rivers. I was once at Salmonier fishing; I was fishing in a pool and could not get a salmon. There were two gentlemen from St. John's fishing in the next pool getting all the salmon they could land. They hooked a salmon and it ran down into my pool. It was caught by the tail, so I told the sport that he had better hurry up as the salmon had swallowed the hook and it was coming out at its tail. They got, perhaps, twenty or thirty salmon by jigging, whilst I could not get one at all with the fly. I have heard a great many stories about people going up Salmonier River and getting a lot of salmon. One young man was up there fishing salmon and had jigged one; another sportsman saw him and said "Unworthy son of a worthy father." This same gentleman who made that remark has been noted for landing eighty salmon before breakfast.

I rise this afternoon particularly to make some remarks in reference to the fisheries. I do not intend to cover the estimate, but I wish, as briefly as possible, to make some remarks in reference to the debate that took place here least night. It was very animated, and I am sure we should often have debates in this House of Assembly of that nature to find out exactly where the different members stand in reference to the different votes. Mr. Ashbourne, who is a practical man from Green Bay, touched upon the herring fishery. Mr. Ashbourne claims that the present regulations in force in reference to split herrings are a great drawback to the herring fishery. I claim the same. We should be encouraging that industry instead of thrivelling at it. Only to-day I met a man from the district of Harbor Main who came to me with the complaint that he could not put up any herring this year. He told me that he had sent a petition in here to one of the representatives of his district. It was not presented to this House. The petition was asking the Government to permit these people to put up their herring in pork barrels. Now this man told me that he put up quite a number of pork barrels and beef barrels of herring each year. Then he brings his catch into St. John's and out of the proceeds he is able to buy from two to five barrels of flour. He told me it was impossible for him to go to the trouble and expense and time of cutting down barrels to the size of the regular herring barrel, which he must do now, as he cannot put up the herring in pork barrels on account of the present law. I have seen in the spring of the year, however, in different parts of the island thousands of barrels of herring put up in regular iron bound beef and pork barrels. The barrels in some places cost nothing, and, in other cases, you can buy them for twenty or thirty cents. The men catch and cure the herring themselves, and the only cost is the salt. They make considerable profits and out of the proceeds they are able to provide for themselves for the early part of the summer. Now I know that the herring fishery down in Green Bay is carried on all around the bays and up in the arms and nooks of the bay chiefly in the spring of the year. The quality of the herring is poor, but very suitable for markets in the West Indies. The split herring fishery last year dropped off 12,000 barrels. Now I claim that that was principally due

to the fact that the herring regulations called for a branding iron to be purchased by the persons who were putting up herring there and the obtaining of a license. These men were not able to obtain a license. They lived away down in the bottom of the Bay, and do not come in contact with people very much, and they are unable to go to the trouble of getting those things. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries knows as well as I do that if the outport man, when he is fishing, has to have any trouble with getting something like that from the Government or any particular department, rather than have that trouble he throws up whatever he is at. I want to impress upon the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the Marine and Fisheries Board that this should be thoroughly looked into. The herring fishery in Notre Dame Bay is falling off every year, and it is the duty of the Government to encourage that industry. They ought, if necessary, encourage the people to put up herring or pay them a bounty. If our herring fishery is dwindling down by 20,000 barrels a year, what is the good of that industry to this country? Our herring industry, properly encouraged, could be as much as 25,000 or even 50,000 barrels a year. Unless you encourage the people to produce wealth to this country we will be going back all the time. The sale of herring has been hindered somewhat by the agreement entered into between Canada and the West Indies and the duty put upon herrings by the United States. Consequently the people are not catching the herring because they cannot find a market for them, but I am very sincere in telling the Government that they should take this matter into consideration, because it is the part of our fishery which is dwindling and which might be revived. There is no necessity for inspection of split herring, as the inspection of split herring has been done by the merchants. I shall name several in Green Bay—Ashbourne, Ltd., Osmonds and Manuels—who buy their herring from their own fishermen, two or three or five or ten barrels as the case may be. They go through and inspect the herrings on their premises and get them all coopered up. These split herrings for the last number of years have always been satisfactory. Several thousand barrels were sent to Halifax and New York, and thousands have come into St. John's to be marketed and they never had to be gone over. When herrings come from these large reliable houses it is not necessary to have an inspection. But I claim, sir, that if any inspection is necessary to give employment to these herring inspectors, the herring should be inspected on the premises of the merchant just as they are, in the bay where they are collected, and not to burden the small fisherman who puts up three or four or five barrels with getting a license and a branding iron. The Scotch cured herring is the herring that we should inspect, because it is put up differently. Scotch herring is a mild cured fish, but the split herrings require plenty of salt so that they will not become rusty or rancid. I agree that the Scotch cured herring should be inspected severely.

Now there is one commodity in Newfoundland which has benefited greatly by inspection. That is the Cod Liver Oil. Newfoundland Cod Liver Oil to-day is as good as any Cod Liver Oil in the world. In fact it commands better prices in New York to-day than the Norweigan cod liver oil. But a few years ago the quotation on Norweigan cod liver oil in New York was several dollars a barrel more than the Newfoundland oil. This has been reversed at the present time. If the manufacturer of oil in the

outport puts up poor oil and brings it into St. John's he has to take the consequences. He cannot throw it over on the buyer because it has to be inspected and passed first, the inspector has to decide whether it is number one or not, but I don't agree with the inspection that interferes with the production of the article. Take the position of a man like Mr. Ashbourne, a man who has been engaged in the herring fishery for a great number of years. He and those associated with him know what is required or if there is any necessity for the inspection for a better product. I am sure that Mr. Ashbourne would be one of those, who would advocate inspection of split herring very strongly if he thought it necessary. I would suggest to the Government that they take this into serious consideration, and in no way hinder the packing of herring, because every dollars worth of herring caught in this country, is a dollar produced out of the sea and it is more valuable than anything else. Because every dollar that is realised outside of the package and the salt belongs to the men who puts up the article. The fresh fish industry is one industry that the Government should encourage. Our salt fish industry is costing too much. It is costing too much today to produce salt fish. In the markets to-day we have a lot of last year's codfish still unsold because the cost is too big, and the selling price is too high. We would be able to sell in the markets of the world, twice as much fish if the price was right, but the cost of catching fish is so high the fishermen cannot live unless they get a good price, that makes it impossible for them to export and sell and realise a profit in the foreign markets. All our customers in the foreign markets are virtually bankrupt because they have to pay such high prices for anything that they bring into their country. Their exchange has gone so low that it takes a large amount of their money to buy a pound sterling. And the people are trying to get away from the fisheries. If people could find something else to do the catch of fish this summer would be very small. One man who supplies a large number on the Labrador came to me a few days ago and he asked me what I thought of the fishery. He was undecided whether he would go down to Labrador this summer and supply for the fishery like he has been doing in the past. He had helped through his supplying to keep perhaps thirty or forty families each year. And he was actually discouraged with the outlook. He is a fairly independent man, and I told him to go to the Labrador, and catch all the fish he could possibly catch and that whatever happened he would make two ends meet. And one of the fishermen of Bonavista Bay, and a constituent of the Prime Minister one of the finest fisherman in Bonavista Bay, who is good for fifteen hundred and two thousand quintals each year worth seven or eight thousand dollars to this country. This man is undecided to go to the fishery this year. Because he says the cost is so high. He states that the price of all kinds of provisions have gone up, and the prices of lines and twines have gone up, and to get a new trap it would cost him one hundred and fifty dollars more than last year, at least that is as he had figured out. Now in view of the fact that the people do not want to prosecute the fishery on that account, and are looking for other avenues of labour, the Government is still burdening them with further taxation, and the way things are going now, in the very near future you will not be able to get the people to go to the fishery at all. They will be leaving the country. Now the Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs went so far as to say that the standardisation of fish could not be done

through this House of Assembly, I disagree with the hon. minister. This is the only way that you could standardise fish.

When a proper line of action has been thought out and that is workable and feasible, I have in my mind to-day an idea that would do away with all the evils we suffer from at the present time in that connection. In the discussion last night the regulations that were in force some few years ago were mentioned. Now I was opposed to these regulations, as everybody knows, and I was responsible for the breaking of these regulations, and I don't mind telling the House now the whole story of the regulations and the whole cause of the mischief. In my opinion much money had been lost in Italy by the merchants on Water Street. They tried to force the sale of fish in Italy through one man, and that man's name was Mr. George Hawes who came to this country and got in the good graces of the people and tried to monoplozie the trade. He came here with a contract all formed up and wanted to get every merchant to sign, to the effect that he would pay Mr. Hawes a commission on all fish sold, whether sold through him or not, and that commission would amount to considerable, probably 50c. per quintal. At that time when fish cost high in price I was one of these who refused to sign that contract and the Minister of Finance and Customs was another. I read the contract and to my mind it was ridiculous, to pay a man a commission whether the fish was sold through him or not. I put the contract in my pocket and went down the street and asked a member of the Hawes supporters what he thought of it, and his reply was, "I didn't read the contract—I would sign anything Hawes puts before me." I put it in my pocket again, and said "Good-afternoon." After that the merchants formed up a commission or a combine to control the shipment of fish under the regulations and the man appointed to make the sale of all fish in Italy was Mr. Hawes. And according to the law of the land noboby could sell in Italy except through Mr. Hawes, the reason was that if they sold through anyone else they were still liable for the 2½ commission to Mr. Hawes.

Mr. Hawes went to Italy and spent almost a whole summer before he made a single sale, the fish merchants of Italy had forced a combine under Goernment protection to import fish, it was called Consorzio, and the man at the head of which was Signor Ragnoli. Mr. Hawes and Signor Ragnolia did not get along very well together, and the result was that a small quantity, and not a large quantity was sold. The next year the same thing happened. Mr. Hawes went to Italy and Signor Ragnoli made up his mind that he wouldn't buy from Mr. Hawes and Newfoundland fish was barred from Italy. Water Street had formed into an organization and this man Hawes was at the head. I was not a member of the organization nor was the Minister of Finance and Customs, the two of us were the only ones who refused to join. There were 30 or 40 cargoes of fish waiting for oders and no market to take them. Greece was full; Spain was full, and we were barred out of Italy. I came to the conclusion that even if Mr. Hawes could sell it would only be a small quantity, and that would not include mine, and I made up my mind what I was going to do and dispatched a man to Italy. He found that Ragnoli had all his requirements filled except about 10,000 quintals, which he was arranging to buy in France. We succeeded in selling that to him. That is the history of the regulations and their breach. I had one instance of a cargo of fish, shore fish, which I

had in Malrya, I sold it to Hawes and was instructed to send it to Spain. I sent it there and Hawes refused to take it and I was stuck to the tune of $5,000. This is the story of the regulations and the breaking of them, and in my opinion the greatest menace that ever came to this country was Geo. Hawes as far as the fishery is concerned. I have no hesitation in making that statement. Now I do not agree with the Minister of Finance in his remark that fish will never be standardized through this House of Assembly; it is only through this House that that can be done, and it is only a matter of putting the right ideas into existence. You will have no trouble when it is binding on all people. Any man who wants to may buy fish at any price he likes. My whole point is that he will be free to do as he likes except when exporting but the inspector will be a guarantee to the buyer that he is getting a certain quality of fish, and that will get over the difficulty, because when the export merchant has nothing to do with the quality for export he will be very careful in buying and will not pay Merchantable price for West India grade as they have been doing in the past, that is the source of the whole trouble. The law will interfere with nobody's business, but the inspection will be much the same as cod liver oil is now. When people find that the question of quality of exports is not in their hands they will not buy talqual. Who knows today what returns he is getting? Who knows whether his receipts are correct, whether he is getting value or not. No one? You ship fish over to the markets and put in a man's hands to sell on commission the temptation to be dishonest is very great, he's handling a commodity that anyone can criticise and fault. I have in mind an incident that happened in this country, of a large cargo, some 7,000 quintals, shipped some years ago. It was shipped from a port where there was always supposed to have the very best shore fish. It was given on consignment to a gentleman in Spain, given to him because he was the only one who would make any advances against it. He advanced some $40,000 or $50,000, and took an undertaking from the Bank of Nova Scotia that it was No. 1 fish. As far as I know the man who sent it has never received a cent, and the man who made the advances made the bank pay same back. He had certificates to show the fish was not No. 1. That is why there is a necessity for standardization. It will disappoint some people, and there will be some kick but it is feasible and can be done, and I have no hesitation in saying that in the not far distant future it will be done, because the necessity of the trade calls for it. Now the Government this session have done nothing for the fishery—the only intelligent debate we had has been the one about the salmon fishery to-day; it was a very instructive debate and the Government should follow it up. Captain Winsor has done the best he could in his Department, but his experience has not been in all lines, and he must admit that he has a great deal to learn. There is one thing I want to impress upon the Government regarding herring, we have been having them shipped in pork and beef barrels, and it has been quite satisfactory, and I think the government should arrange that this could be continued and inspected in such barrels. If you don't pay any attention to the fishery what are you going to do? I agree that last summer the Government gave considerable work to men, but you are not going to build a dock each year, or a hotel, or the highways. What about the people of Conception Bay, who are getting away from the fishery—when they get away

they will not get back.

If the country had no fishery but that with hook and line we would be very much better off. I remember some years ago I used to go to the Gaspe Coast; in one section the fishermen used nothing but hook and line, and they were all prosperous and contented, and their fish was splendidly cured. They did not have the expense of traps, motor boats or nets, and such things. And if the people in this country used hook and line their fish would be better and they would be more prosperous. No doubt there are a few people who have made money on traps, but I doubt if there are very many. A man gets a large catch of fish in one hawl in a codtrap he has to put it in codbags to be looked after some of it is sunburnt after he salts it in his store, he can only dry a small quantity at a time on account of his limited space for the drying season and most of it is salt burnt, and not worth when dried a quarter of what it would be, if it were caught in smaller quantities and properly cured. The fishery is in a bad state at the present time, and if it is necessary for the Government to spend money to encourage it they would do so. If necessary pay a bounty or buy the herring, suppose they had to send them to Russia, and loose a dollar a barrel on them. If the country gained a million dollars from the herring fishery it would be better to spend a hundred thousand dollars to make that sum.

Some reference was made last evening to the Canada-West India agreement, which has been ratified during the last session of the Canadian Legislature. There was an agreement in existence in which Newfoundland was included, but the present agreement excludes Newfoundland. We would like to see Newfoundland come in under such an agreement. Canada does not want Newfoundland in such an agreement in competition with them, and there was no reasonable effort to have us included. It is said we do not import enough from the West Indies—if we imported rum from Jamaica, that is the best fish market we have, put it on the free list if necessary—you won't lose any money—what the Customs loses you get at the other department of the Government which charges $1.50 and $2.00 per bottle. I can certainly see nothing against it, and think the Minister of Finance would be wise in considering it. Today Canada has a preference of 30c. a quintal on fish, and if we put rum on the free list we might counteract that. There are numerous commodities we could get from the West Indies which we do not get and could very well get. There was an agreement with the West Indies before this House, and it was brought in by Sir William Coaker. I did not agree with him in all things, but I did support that. He would have built two steamers of two thousand tons, deadweight each, and carry on the West Indies Trade for a subsidy of $120,000 per year, and that amount would link us up with the West Indies. I know that was damned, but it was damned, not because it was not good, but because of the persons of Water Street, who thought their pockets would be touched. These boats could have gone to the sealfishery and brought in each year ten times the amount of the subsidy. I do not believe that you could get a similar proposition today—to get two steamers built by private enterprise—at the subsidy asked at that time.

Now I do not know what the Government has ever done, but I would like very much to know what it has ever done in the matter of the Canadian-West Indies agreement. I would like to have some member of the Government give us some advice on that. When the Prime Minister was in

Canada on the Labrador Boundary Commission he tells us that he was enquiring about the Canadian West Indies agreement, but what the result was I do not know. But if the Government has not taken any interest in it, it should do so. They should get someone to go to Canada, and if necessary to go to the West Indies, and have us included in this agreement if possible.

Now one of the terms of the agreement is that Canada subsidizes a steamship service. Newfoundland is not able to do that, I admit. But Newfoundland is able to put a boat on between St. John's and Halifax to make connection with these boats plying to the West Indies from Halifax and take our products down there if we are not able to pay those steamers a subsidy large enough to make St. John's a port of call. I think that someone should be sent to Canada and if necessary to the West Indies to see if there cannot be some agreement entered into, even if we have to put Jamaica rum on the free list.

We have a practical man as Ministetr of Marine and Fisheries. It is a pity that we did not always have a practical man head of that department. Last year the Government found it necessary to put a close season on lobsters. I stated in the House that the regulation for the protection of lobsters if properly carried out would have done away with the necessity for the close season. If the laths at the bottom of the lobster pots were kept proper distances apart, so that the small lobsters would not be caught, there would have been plenty of lobsters to carry on the fishery. The same thing applies to cod traps. In the fishing around the coast the law is being broken continually by using traps of small mesh. I have seen fish seven and eight inches long, and small schooner loads of them, and so have other members of this House who are in the fish business seen the same thing come into St. John's, particularly from Trinity Bay. It is killing the young fish and destroying the fishery and the result is that there are no fish in the bays in the summer because the young fish have been killed. The same thing applies to the lobsters, because all the young ones are killed and the propagation cannot go on. While the question of the Marine and Fisheries vote is going through I want to refer to the Labrador service, and I am going to point out to the Government that they have a very serious position on their hands. I am gaing to make this statement in this House right now.

I put a question on the Order Paper during the session and I was given the list of the trips of the S. S. Meigle to the Labrador last year and the number of passengers carried each trip, and the other question was how many life boats were carried on the Meigle and what was the accommodation of the lifeboats. The reply that I got back was that the Meigle has carried as high as 389 passengers, and the accommodation on the Meigle consists of four lifeboats carrying thirty persons. If an accident takes place and the steamer sinks what is going to become of the rest of the passengers and the crew if she strikes a rock and has 389 passengers besides the crew on board with lifeboat accommodation for a hundred and twenty. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries should take note of that, because one of these days there is just as likely to be an accident on the Meigle as on any of the other boats around the coast, and if a serious accident takes place, and two or three hundred people meet a watery grave the Government will have to take the responsibility. It is proof positive that the fishermen on the Labrador are not taken care of properly and do not have sufficient accommodation

provided for them. Not long ago I was speaking to a man who told me that he went to the Labrador on the Meigle last year and she was full of passengers, people could not get accommodation and were lying around on the decks. Down in the hold of the ship there was a lot of coal and the men, women and children were lying around on that, and on deck there were two cows over which there was a wood shed built. This man said to the Captain why do you not put the women and children in there and put the cows down on the coal? He replied that there is a law to protect the cows. That is exactly the state of affairs, and I think that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries knows what I am saying is pretty well true. He knows that the fishermen are not provided for when they go on the Labrador, and worst of all is that they go without sufficient lifeboats to save them in case anything should happen. I trust that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will take a note of what I have said because the facts that I have stated are those that I have had given me in reply to questions that I have asked in the House since the session started.

Now at the early part of the session the Prime Minister made the statement that enquiries for fish had been made at the Wembley Exhibition and had been passed along to the Board of Trade in St. John's, who had in turn sent the enquiries to the merchants and exporters. After the Prime Minister made the statement I wrote the Secretary of the Board of Trade because I had never received any enquiries and I asked him why he did not include our name, and he replied:

(Reads.)

31 March, 1926.

Messrs. A. E. Hickman Co., Ltd.,
City.

Dear Sirs,—Yours of this day's date received.

I did not at any time receive enquiries for codfish from the Newfoundland representative at the British Empire Exhibition at Wembley; if I had I would have notified you and all fish exporters of the fact.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) ERNEST A. PAYN.

My point is this, we have spent on the British Empire Exhibition at Wembley, according to the figures that I have been furnished by the Minister of Finance and Customs, about seventy-five thousand dollars. I asked him for the correspondence that took place between Mr. Davies and the commission or committee here, and after a while I received some of the correspondence, but not all, and not as much as I should, because I understand that there was one enquiry for five thousand quintals of fish, and the reply went back that this committee was not in the fish business. The correspondence that I have before me conveys to me that there have been many enquiries and they have never been given out or broadcasted, and I think that it is a disgrace for us to vote seventy-five thousand dollars for the exhibition of the Newfoundland products and send a man over there to look after it and pay his salary and when the enquiries are received about the products of the country that were exhibited there these enquiries are not passed along to the men who have these products to sell. I have some of the correspondence here, and, as I said in this correspondence, there are a great many enquiries, and as far as the trade of the country is concerned I have never seen any enquiry. I do not intend at this time to have anything to say on the estimates in general and will confine my remarks to the Marine and Fisheries Department vote which we are now on.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I would like to make a few remarks in reference to the speech that has just been delivered

by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, and that is in reference to the number of men taken on the Meigle last summer and also in reference to the number of boats. Now, Mr. Chairman, as you may remember, last year there was a new bill brought in this House covering the inspection of ships, and in connection with the bill there were inspectors to be appointed and see that the rules and regulations covering the number of passengers and boats were carried out. As far as I am concerned I am going to take any blame that I am responsible for, but I am not going to take any blame for which I am not responsible.

Last year these boats were put into the water, which was never done before, and the number of men that they could hold was also put into them at the dock premises, and the boats were loaded down to prove that they did not leak any more on the top sides than they did at the bottom. Lloyd's inspector, Mr. Macfarlane, with the assistant inspectors, Mr. McGrath and Capt. English, the Harbour Master, inspected these boats and gave the certificate that these boats were in good condition, and they also gave a certificate that the ship had enough boats to carry the passengers that she was supposed to carry under the law, and that certificate was posted up in the saloon of every ship. Once that was done, Mr. Chairman, my duty was accomplished as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries of this Colony. The Meigle and a lot of other boats sail from St. John's for the Labrador, and nine out of ten times they have not more than half the number of passengers that the law allows them to carry, but as they go along they take on more and consequently by the time the Meigle leaves Conception Bay it is perfectly true that she has twice as many as she has boats to carry. But I do say that I cannot see how I can be responsible for that. I cannot get aboard every boat and go out of town and see that they do not take on board any more than they are allowed. I could only be on one boat at a time even if I did not attend to the ministerial work of my office. But, sir, I have no doubt that the very man who made this report to the Leader of the Opposition would be one of the men if they wanted to go to the Labrador would go if there were already five hundred people on the Meigle, and get on board in spite of orders. Now there was an instance last year. The Prospero came in here with twice as many passengers as she was supposed to bring.

I called the attention of the captain to this fact and first he thought that he was not responsible and that it had nothing to do with him. I reminded him of the rules and regulations and I told him that it was his duty if he knew that he was bringing too many passengers than he was allowed to carry that he should report to his owners and then the responsibility was off his shoulders. The next trip when he went down and when he found that he had as many on board as the law would allow, he closed off the gangway and while he stood at the gangway they were climbing in over the stern and bow and he could not stop them unless he took off his coat and started in to fight, and he was not going to do that; and so that shows that it is not altogether the fault of the captain of the boat, and it is not the fault of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, because it is their duty to see that the inspection of the boats is properly carried out and that there are enough boats to carry as many passengers as the law allows the steamer to carry. Then my work is finished. It was reported to me last year that the Meigle arrived on the Labrador with not half enough boats to carry the passengers. I made enquiries from the captain of the ship and he gave me to under-

stand that there were more boats on the ship than the passengers could fill in case they had to get out and take to the boats to save their lives. He argued that they had quite a lot of trap boats on board, which I know in some instances is correct. But I must agree with the Leader of the Opposition that not only the Meigle but every other boat in the country leaves port with more passengers than the law will allow them to carry. But I have to stand up here and defend my own self and the Department of Marine and Fisheries and prove that as far as the Department is concerned we have done our duty, and we can do no more. But this is just an inspection for the city alone. I put up a proposition to the Government last year and it would not cost the Colony one cent for the inspection of ships, but this I am sure of as I am standing here that some fine day an accident is going to happen. Last year the Prospero went ashore and there was a row about the boats, but as far as the boats were concerned they were in good condition, and there were boats enough to take care of the number of passengers that the law would allow them to take. The captain cannot help it in many cases, and in ninety per cent. of the cases it is not the fault of the Dept. of Marine & Fisheries and not the fault of the Government. We sent down a steamer to bring up some of the sealers and she was allowed to bring up two hundred and twenty, and she brought up five hundred, and the captain said that if there had been room for them to put their feet on the steamer, five thousand would have come if they were there; and the only way that he might stop them was if he took off his coat and began to fight, and he might perish at the end of that.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—I have no intention of making a speech but I want to defend myself and my colleagues and to make an explanation in reference to a statement that was made this afternoon about a message from a man in Harbour Main to the effect that because of the regulations they were not allowed to use pork barrels to pack herring in and they had to stick to the standard barrels. A few days ago, sir, a man came into my office and made the explanation to me, and yesterday morning when I got time I made it my business to go down to see the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and I had an interview with him. I thought that it was a very serious matter alright, because the herring are very plentiful along the shore this spring and the reason for this, according to the explanation of one of the residents of the locality, is that it is because of the calm weather that has prevailed and because there has been no northwest wind, and the herring are around the shore this spring and not up around the head of the bay, where they go when there are strong winds from the northwest. This gentleman asked me if I would interview the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and see if he could get the law changed and have them allowed to use the pork barrels for the packing of the herring instead of the standard herring barrel, and I said that I would certainly do my utmost. The reason for this is that the pork barrels are rather plentiful and cost only forty cents, and standard herring barrels cost two dollars, and probably a litle more than that, so that there would probably be a dollar and eighty cents in the difference in the price, and that was the reason that they asked me to get the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to get them the privilege of using the pork barrels to pack their herring in. I interviewed the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and during the interview he told me that it was the law but that he would do this for me. He said that he would send out a cooper

to show the people how they could cut down the pork barrel and make it the standard size. I said that that would probably be of some help and that the assistance would be very much appreciated. He said that I would have to pay the expenses. I said that we would arrange that some way. So we agreed that if the people were satisfied we would send out a cooper on Monday morning next. As I came down from the Minister's office I met the very man to whom I referred and who had sent the petition praying that the privilege be granted. I knew nothing at all about the petition until the man handed it to me. The petition, I understand, was typed down in Mr. Cahill's office. I said, "All right, my man, I have just interviewed the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and he says that if the people are satisfied we will send out a cooper on Monday morning." He said that he would go back and tell the people and see what they say. He said that he would let me know Saturday morning. That is tomorrow. In the afternoon as I was coming up to the House I met two others and they made the same enquiry, and I told them what I had told the other man. I make this explanation just to convince you, sir, that we have not been neglecting our constituents in that respect and when the demand was made I immediately went and interviewed the Minister. The two men whom I met gave me to understand that the probable buyers of the herring would be yourself and Mr. Murray.

They fetch a bigger price than any other kind of package. The Minister informed me that as far as he knew the standard size package was about fifteen dollars. I must confess that I know nothing about the value of a package of herring, but I thought it was my duty to explain this so that my explanation might be published in the Press so that our constituents may see that we are not neglecting the demands that are made upon us from time to time.

Now while I am on my feet I would like to say that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition made a very interesting and valuable address this afternoon with regard to the fishery regulations and how Mr. Hawes endeavored to control the monopoly. For years I had put the blame for that infamous deed which everyone looked upon as one of the greatest crimes that had been perpetrated in this country since the advent of Responsible Government upon another, and, sir, Imust congratulate Mr. Hickman and Sir John Crosbie for having the courage of their convictions and being so enlightened as to see thru the little game that Mr. Hawes was endeavouring to carry out at the time. The hon. gentleman also made reference to the West Indies trade. Now in connection with that matter I remember that many years ago we were importing into this country Jamaica rum and Jamaica cigars. The rum was the very best quality that was ever imported into this country. Why not buy all the products that we can from Jamaica and give these people the privilege of allowing these things to be imported into this country free of duty? I think that to-day you are encouraging your trade with Spain by admitting their wines and onions and all their others products duty free for the purpose of endeavouring to create a Spanish market for fish. I think that there is some trade regulation to that effect. I think that it was largely arranged by the British Government. Now a great deal has also been said in the recent debates about the salmon fishery and the lobster fishery, and I understand that the closing of the lobster fishery for three years was to allow them to propagate themselves. No artificial means was supposed to be used. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition stated

that next to the codfishery stands the herring fishery and that this fishery could be made almost as valuable as the codfishery itself. I quite agree with him for the number of remarks that he made in that way, and I am ready to listen and to learn from anyone that is able to give good advice on the other side of the House, and I feel that we should appreciate his remarks very much, and I want to say that the hon. gentleman should give lectures oftener than he does. I hope, sir, that I am not out of order for making these few remarks, but I thought that in justice to my colleague and myself that some explanation was necessary.

Now if it is possible, altho I don't know whether it is possible or not, to alter that law so that our fishermen could sell their herring in pork barrels instead of being compelled to put them up in regular herring barrels, or else cut down their pork barrels to the size of a herring barrel I should be very glad.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the hon. member, I may say that that matter has been discussed at least twenty times during the last eighteen months, and we find that outside buyers are sending us telegrams day after day complaining about the barrels. They say that they want the standard barrel and if they don't get that they won't buy the herring at all. You will find that that is the correct position and Major Cashin will tell you that the question has come up several times. These are the reasons for it. I understand further that most of the herring that is put up in pork barrels is re-packed in regular herring barrels again. And one of the contentions of the Board is that quite a lot of herring goes down to the West Indies and it is not fit for consumption when it reaches there. And I may say for the information of the Hon. Mr. Woodford that I don't think the law will be changed unless the Board has changed its mind since we last met.

They have lots of puncheons and barrels to pack their herring in, and when herring shrinks down it has to be re-packed, and there is no reason why this can't be done. I have had some experience during the last two years, and if we were to change the laws every time anybody wants it we would be changing it twenty-four and a half times every twenty-four hours for every day of the year. The Board makes it rules only on information from markets where the herring is sold. Why only last year a tub and a suit of clothes was found in a barrel of herring shipped in Trinity Bay. We have had them shipped out with cods' heads in them. The Board makes its rules for the good of the industry and as an attempt to get more shipped out than in recent years. It is that sort of thing that is responsible for the falling off of our fishery. The year before last the Board sent out the law, and because some of the people said they didn't learn of it in time we arranged it for them, but this year they know of it, it has been in the papers and the post offices; and I am afraid that the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs has little chance to get that law off the books.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman, there are members of this House who have wondered why I advocated the inspection of Scotch cured herring as being important and why I did not think it necessary to have an inspection of split herring made. I took the trouble to write to firm in New York, one of the largest firms connected with the herring fishery in the States, and this is the reply that I got back: that they are able to buy Nerwegian herring at 15 Norwegian kroner, that is $3.30 U. S. A. currency. The freight to New York is $1.15, and the duty $2.00, which brings the price delivered to New York to

$6.45. For Newfoundland to compete we would have to sell at $3.45 per barrel f.o.b St. John's, deduct from $3.45 the amount of 5c. for inspection tax and you get $3.40, and from that 60c. for Government charges to bring it here on the coastal boats and you get $2.80 per barrel for split herring. They go on to say:

(Reads manuscript.)

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. members will see why I supported inspection of Scotch cure, which is worth as much as $20.00, and did not advocate inspection of split herring. I think that completely answers and vindicates my position. I thought it advisable to make these remarks because the Executive has to pass on the resolutions of the Board, and if they find that the recommendations are not to the best interests of the country, surely something will be done. I undersatnd that Iceland is going to have a large output of fish this year and that Norway is going to have more codfish than last year, and I think that everything possible should be done to aid our fisheries, for the outlook is not pleasant.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I don't intend to speak long on this vote, but I wish to make a few remarks in the way of protest on one or two items of expenditure. I notice the vote for the improvement of the fisheries, $20,000. Why, sir, on an important vote of this kind, the estimates for the fisheries, soneone on this side of the House had to call the attention of the Chairman to the fact that there was not a quorum present——only three members of the Executive were in their seats. You may not have any interest in the subject, but it does not look well. The Leader of the Opposition was making a practical address, free from anything political, and speaking from experience, and I don't think in the main that anyone will disagree with his remarks. It is a pity that we can't get more practical speches like those of Mr. Hickman's from someone who knows what he is talking about. Another thing I can't understand is, why the report of the Department is not tabled—and this goes on from year to year, with a typewritten copy put on the table and the printed copies circulated when the House is closed. When we are discussing the fishery vote we should have these.

Now the Minister of Marine and Fisheries made some remarks last night in the course of his speech that may be regarded as exaggerated and uncalled for. I was somewhat the subject of his remarks, and his remarks in that connection did no good to the debate. I am not a fisherman, but it is only by accident that we are fishermen, farmers or school teachers—accident and environment. Some men move out of their environment and seek a living elsewhere. But such remarks do the discussion no good—we are apt to forget ourselves and hit harder than we intended to, and I do not believe the Minister would wish to injure anyone. For members of this House to tell what they have done or have not done is very cheap—how many seals or how much codfish they have caught, everybody cannot be sealers or fishermen.

As to the statistics provided of the catch of fish, I think that Trinity district was down for 49,688 quintals for 1925, while another report for the same district gave 30,848 quintals. I question, therfeore, if value is obtained for the money spent in getting such figures. If the returns are no more correct for other districts, they are absolutely misleading.

(Reads from Fishery Reports.)

It will thus be seen that some sections are not credited with catching any fish at all, although it was generally known that the people in those places did well with fish last year. I think

that the statisticians engaged by the Marine and Fisheries Department and paid by the Government are not worth the money they were paid.

Committee then rose till 8 o'clock.

MR. HALFYARD—Before the Committee rose I was endeavouring to draw its attention to the matter of reports sent to the Fishery Dept. on the catch of fish of different districts. I don't intend to dwell on that subject any further, but if there have been any irregularities as to figures not being reliable, I trust that my remarks may be of some help towards the bringing about of the doing away with such irregularities.

I know the Minister of Marine and Fisheries expects me to say something about the inspection of turbot in Trinity district. The impression made upon certain men in the district was that the inspectors did not know very much about the job that they were supposed to perform, and that impression was confirmed to some extent by the remarks made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries last night. He said that they did the best they could; that the inspectors never inspected turbot before; that they wanted some inspectors because they had to be provided because of the rules and regulations with regard to exportation that said there should be an inspection, and they had to provide them in the best way possible, and the only thing to do was to pick them off the street and do the best they could. Therefore the conclusion we would reach is that the men were not as well qualified as we would wish, and it is not to be wondered at that some of the men in Trinity district would form that opinion. The inspection of fisheries at any rate, whether herring or turbot, has not recommended itself in any way to the people of Trinity district. The catch in a great many instances has been small and the inspectors going round from place to place in the summer months were regarded by a great many poeple as an eyesore and incumbrance, a hardship that they could not endure without uttering a protest. I have heard this report more or less by chance. I did not ask for this information but people when they write or come into one's office give their opinion on public matters, and in that way it was that I got this information. I do not consider the personal element in it at all. I am not considering in any particular who the inspectors were. I suppose it is just as well to send one man as another. Without being misunderstood, I have heard it said that in connection with the appointments of persons in St. John's in the civil service, "If we don't do something for those related to us, who else is going to do it." All other things being equal, why should a man discriminate against his own relatives. That is the other side of that and we are not finding any fault in that respect. I have heard the case of a man being so conscientious about this for fear that it might be said that he was providing too much for relatives, that relatives have been actually discriminated against. I am speaking only of the qualifications of the inspectors in Trinity district and I don't know about the inspectors in other districts; and as I said the information about Trinity was not sought by me but was told me as a matter connected with general affairs down there. The personal part of the matter does not enter into it with me.

In conjunction with that, to make the objections of the people in Trinity even stronger, we cannot get anything for the district. The district needs a 100 bridges, but we can't get money for the purpose, and the district regards this money as needful, and therefore it is only natural for the people of Trinity to have those objections. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries need not take this as a re-

ference to his management. With regard to the expenditure of money in Trinity district the people are unsatisfied, having regard to the treatment meted out to the adjoining district north of them. I am only showing the country and the Government the opinion of the people of Trinity district, who are supposed to know what they are talking about and have their opinions on the actions of the Government in connection with these matters.

We are going on with voting nine million dollars for the general expenses of the country and we don't know where we are going to get that money. Major Cashin stated that according to the information supplied him in reply to the financial condition of the country with regard to the revenue and the expenditure, that for the first half of the fiscal year up to Dec. 31st, 1925, the expenditure was greater by $632,997.30 than the corresponding period for the six months of the previous fiscal year, and that the revenue for the same period was $69,414.67 less, which made a difference of $702,411.97, and this the Finance Minister can explain no doubt. And it would not take him long to explain. And I trust that he will be able to explain this, for after all what good is it for us to contract this debt or liability of over $9,000,000 if we don't know how we are going to pay it, unless we get the revenue under the old tariff to meet it. But if not we should reduce expenditure, for it is hardly possible to conceive of a higher tariff. Now we cannot continue on as we are going. It has been suggested that we ought to use the pruning knife and cut out expenditure. Now I don't know whether you can curtail on the districts with regard to transportation. But if every district in the country was treated in the same way as Trinity district in that respect, and have to put up with the same sacrifices, if you like, a great saving could be effected. That applies particularly to Bonavista district. We have had the service of the Malakoff confined to that district only. And when the Malakoff was doing service on both Bays motor services were inaugurated in Bonavista Bay, and these motor services I believe are allowed to remain when the Malakoff was put back. Now cannot some of those services be cut out? Cannot some of the telegraphs be combined with the railway telegraph offices. That was the argument that Mr. Morgan put up when he was the manager of the railway. He got the idea that the railway under Government management, a great saving could be effected to the expenditure of this country by combining the telegraph offices. That is where there is a railway telegraph office for railway purposes only, and a postal telegraph office. Now I don't know whether the Government has considered that matter. We thought also that some of the telegraph offices could be closed down and telephones substituted. As the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs I set the example and made an attempt to cut out some telegraph offices. Some of these now are working as telephone offices under reduced salary. As I have already intimated I tried to impress upon the Prime Minister to do something towards reducing taxation and expenditure, the first year, and not postpone it until the second, third or fourth year of his regime.

You had the opportunity during the first year of your regime to bring about a reduction in expenditure. I admit that it is no child's job, but you had the opportunity. I know what we had tried to do, but the people were prepared for a sacrifice, and believed that it was time to reform. But it is said what is the good of reducing the Civil Service below a living wage, and encouraging dishonesty. If a man is dishonest he will not wait for such an opportunity as that. Back

of the unfavourable report this year we have to remember that there is going to be another big deficit in the railway. Unfortunately the Railway is a public utility the same as the Post Office is, and we have become used to paying for the Postal Service, and we can't do without the railway. It is a liability we have to meet, and that makes it harder for the Minister of Finance to balance his budget. I might go on and elaborate on this—I might tell the Prime Minister on what policy they were elected and how they have kept their promises—how the country relied on their promises. I might refer to an incident which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries must have fresh in his mind, of the deputation of fishermen that waited on the Government, impressing the necessity of reduction—how the members were drawing down a salary of four and five thousand each year, and some of them coming in here and acting as dummies, while they were toiling in the fishing boat and coming home tired out in the evening—he was one of that delegation.

Mr. Chairman, my talking on this is absolutely unnecessary, because the people of the country are the jury and they have already judged the Government on their policy and their actions, and the verdict is "guilty"—guilty of broken promises. What a gloomy disappointment—what a contradiction of broken promises. "We must have a reduction of expenditure—we can't pay for our fishery; expenditure must be cut." And instead we find an increase from year to year, with an increase in taxation. I seriously ask "Where are we and whither tending." The Government has made a complete failure of all the promises they have made. We find that the wealthy well-to-do is relieved of some taxation. While the fisherman, the laborer, have to bear a corresponding increase. If we cut off our source of revenue it must be found in some other place. The Minister of Finance must certainly think that I don't keep my promises, therefore I will conclude. I sympathize with him as to the conditions of things in the country; what will happen to us during the next six months I do not know. Whether we will find money to pay our bills I do not know, but the administration of affairs in this country, as in many other countries, is no picnic and not a desirable job. It requires men of nerve and determination to handle it, irrespective of party and personal interests. But in our minds there is only one regard and that is for the country to carry on. The question may be asked "Why Worry?" No one else worries. But that doesn't apply under the British constitution—there is a love of independence, and the people are interested as to these things. That is why we hear the question "What is going to happen." And that should emanate from this House, and from those in responsible positions.

Mr. Chairman, speaking on the vote before the House, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries said there was a great necessity for an increase in the vote for aids to navigation, and I notice the $50,000 vote of last year is cut out this year. I suppose that means that he has purchased all the lights and alarms necessary. Otherwise a vote will have to be made in the additional estimates. These are general remarks—I do not wish to appear to dictate.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, I quite agree with some of the remarks that have been made, and if I am spared I hope to have the fishery reports made up earlier, and with a greater degree of accuracy than they have been made up in the past. Last night a statement was made in this House that a previous Minister made a reduction of $400,000 in the Marine and Fisheries Department in 1921. In that year the expenditure of that department

was $1,293,000, the greatest in the history of the Colony. For the year 1922 it was reduced to $455,000 and there are some people who might be inclined to think that this is economy, but I propose to show that it was not. This reduction was made through the cutting out of fish boards, standardization, commissioners, etc. Those expenditures consisted of Marine Works (Special) $39,500; purchase of new steamers $50,000; export codfish of Board $8,300; trade commissioners $71,200; standardization $48,700; harbour improvements $80,000 and purchase of fish $400,000. That is a total of $697,600.00. In 1921-22 the total vote for the Marine and Fisheries Department was $455,-453.52 made up of Marine and Fisheries expenditure $233,469.30 and Lighthouse expenditure $221,535.10 and Lighthouse Maintenance $215,070.27 or a total of $727,605.37. In 1924-25 the figures were, expenditure $466,000, and for the year 1926-27 the proposed vote is $430,992.39. Since I assumed office fog alarms have been erected at places where they were required for years and have been of great benefit to the people. When the people consider that such alarms cost about $17,000 each and extra lights have been erected it will be seen that we have done fairly well, although I do not look for any credit for the reduction of expenditure in the Department that I am in charge of.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, I would like to remind the Minister while we are on this vote that I presented a petition some time ago asking that the dredge be sent up at the first possible opportunity to dredge the upper end of Renews harbour, and I feel that after finishing the work of dredging at the Dry Dock that the boat will be sent to Renews.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—Mr. Chairman, I have also made application to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for a similar request some time ago asking for the use of the dredge to clear the channel at Avondale. My object in mentioning this now is to impress upon the Government the necessity of christening our own child first and then afterwards she can be used at Renews.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, I would like to remind the Honourable Minister that Renews is one of the most important fishing settlements in Newfoundland, as can be corroborated by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and a more important fishing section than Avondale.

HON. THE MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the honourable member for Ferryland getting the dredge; neither have I any intention of reflecting upon the fishermen of Renews. Last year there were some very impressive letters on the necessity of a fog alarm on Point LaHaye. However the fog alarm has been granted and built, and is making a noise all the time. Now the little request that I am making is very important. Mr. Kennedy supplies many of the fishermen, and he now finds that he is unable to get a vessel into his premises. So he asked me to take the matter up and see if he could not have the dredge come up there and clear up the place for him. So I take the occasion to make the request now to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries so that he will not forget when he goes down in his office and then when that is done I hope that he will send the dredge down to Mr. Cashin's place.

MR. GRIMES—Following up the remarks made by Mr. Halfyard in reference to the gathering of statistics. Now as to the value of these statistics it is an open question because the information that has been furnished does not show that we can look upon these statistics as reliable. It is shown in the disparity of figures in the two reports in the figures that

have been furnished in connection with the fishery in Trinity Bay. In connection with the figures furnished in connection with Twillingate district all I could get from the Minister was a collection of figures showing the catches for months, but not showing the catch according to settlements. Now I would like to know if any hon. member thinks that the present method of gathering these statistics is an improvement on the old method of getting them from the Custom House, and I think that they were more reliable. The members of the Board of Trade have said that it is good. Have they any other information or do they simply trust to the figures that are furnished to the department. There is no doubt that if there were no figures down there in the department but those furnished by the inspectors the money would be well spent. But when the figures could be secured in the old way some may consider that the money has been thrown away. So far as the figures that have been furnished this House since this session started they have not shown any improvement over the old system. They do not furnish accurate information about Twillingate district.

Now, I agree with the Member for St. Barbe when he says that the Fishery Department of the country is the most important in the Government, and I maintain that the Minister of that department should be in the Executive Government. I will justify that statement by the Manifesto of the Hon. the Colonial Secretary when he was the leader of the Liberal Progressive Party in 1923. He said then that the fisheries have ever been the mainstay of the Country. And he went on to point out the value of the fisheries of the country, and that more attention would be given to that industry than had been given to it by any government up to that time. He went on to suggest in that Manifesto, that had the support of the present Premier, and the present Minister of Finance and Customs that a bonus on fish should be paid not to exceed a dollar a quintal. If that was what the Colonial Secretary thought when he was the Leader of the Liberal Progressive party, he should try to do something to encourage the fisheries by paying a bounty on fish now. He gave as his reason for doing this that it was better to spend the money in this way than by spending it on highways, public roads and the like. And the present Government were all of that opinion because they were all supporters of Mr. Bennett at that time. Since they came into power they have gone back on the position that they took at that time. Instead of spending money to encourage the fishery they have borrowed five or six million dollars not a single cent of which has gone into the fisheries. These were their ideas in 1923, and in 1926 they spend a couple of million dollars on roads. Certainly the people have reason for the position they take that the Government has been weighed in the balance and found wanting. They went on to say in connection with the payment of the bounty:

(Reads)

Now we had the statement made here by the Minister of Finance that the Government of the country could not standardize fish. Mr. Chairman, what is the meaning of saying that a bonus on fish would stimulate the industry if the Government has not carried out any of its promises in that respect that were made to the electors of the country. Since then not the slightest attention has been paid to the fisheries of the country although they have been in power for two years and instead they have wasted considerable money on public roads in some of the districts of the island.

(Reads)

Now Mr. Chairman, I ask the Prime

Minister what has been done to secure the co-operation of all those interested in the fishery of the country to improve our old markets and open up new ones. Is it not breaking faith with the people of the country because after all the fishery of the country is responsible for the greater part of the revenue of the country. They have done nothing to justify the people of the country in reposing confidence in them any longer. A very important plank in the political platform was that—Reads—"We are summoning a conference, etc."

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—That is not the Prime Minister's Manifesto.

MR. GRIMES—It is the Colonial Secretary's Manifesto for the year 1923. He is a member of the Prime Minister's Government and he is as much responsible to the people as the other Members of the Executive Government, and if he believed in that policy at that time, and if Mr. Monroe who was a followed of his at that time believed in it well ought they not still think it necessary to-day to call a conference of practical men for the investigation and betterment of the fishery. That conference was to be called in the Autumn following the election of the Government, and two autumns have passed and that conference has not yet been called.

In the Prime Minister's Manifesto: (Reads) re fishery and bounty.

That sounds very nice in the Manifesto ,but do we see it carried out? How can anybody take any member of the Government seriously in the face of the answer to that question, for in two years they have carried out nothing at all.

They were going to reduce taxation and that has not been done, and they could have got the money that was needed and reduced taxes elsewhere if they had not taken away the income tax.

The fishery is an industry that is uncertain. A man may make a lot of money one year and the next make very little, and if a man has a stated salary he ought to be able to pay an income tax, and he is in a better position to pay a tax than the man who may do well one year but whose average may work out at four or five hundred dollars a year and who should not be expected to pay as every cent he gets goes to keep starvation from the door.

The fishery we know is uncertain, but the same thing applies to Western Canada with regard to applying an income tax to farmers, and to farmers in the United States, but they have their income taxes. Fifty six million dollars was collected in income tax in Canada. That was paid merely by salaried men of three thousand a year and over and by corporations earning from twenty to two hundred thousand a year.

The point I want to make is not so much as to whether a bonus is the best way of helping the fishery, but that the present Government by these manifestoes of '23 and '24 when appealing to the country said that the fisheries was an industry requiring help, and that they would be bound to help it, and they have done nothing. I don't know if a bonus would be the best thing, but I know that the fisheries could be helped by reductions in the tariff, and perhaps it would be better not to have to work the tax payer harder to pay a bonus and rather reduce the tariff on supplies.

With regard to the condition of the fishery to-day, the average catch from 1917 to 1922 was in the neighbourhood of 1,500,000; in 1924 it was 1,250,000; and in 1925 it was 1,165,000. That is a reduction of from (three hundred to four hundred thousand quintals a year. That reduction may be due in part to the fish not coming in on the shore as in former years, but it was not altogether due to that.

It was also due to the fact that quite a number of people engaged in the fishery found that the returns were so small that they felt that they would not stay at it, but would try other interests either in the country or outside of it, and they left the fishery and went to other industries in Newfoundland or in Canada or in the United States, and it was partly because of that, that there was a decline of the fishery catch in this country. And the Government so far have introduced no policy to encourage people to stay at the fisheries. In connection with the herring fishery everybody who follows the returns will see the rapid decline in 1926 of that very important industry. The Department of Marine and Fisheries says in the report of last year:

(Reads)

That is a report made by a Department of the Government in 1925 and it calls attention to the fact that the herring industry is so situated to-day, with markets in England according to the report of the Fishery Department. The cost compared with other countries of sending fish to England may be such that it will be necessary to give a bonus on herring until the markets improve. The Government surely ought to do something for this industry. It applies not only to Green Bay but also to Placentia Bay, and all along the West Coast you have the same conditions existing. I mentioned, Mr. Chairman, that it is absolutely necessary for the Government to get down to business, and get its heads together, and not only those connected with the Government, but also those outside who are interested. Get them together and talk over the matter of the cure of fish, the question of reduction of tariff and the bonus if necessary, in order to formulate some plan whereby employment might be given to the fishing industry. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the Government has not done its duty in connection with the fishing industry of this country. It has played false with the fishing industry of this country, by not living up to the promises that they made in 1923 and 1924. This Government has done nothing whatever to remedy the conditions of things that they recognised themselves as existing in 1923 and 1924. The Government is doing nothing to make this country produce, and it can only remain in the minds of us to-day as an absolute failure.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to criticise the votes for the various items in the Department of Agriculture and Mines. But now that we are on this department I would like to draw the attention of the Minister of Public Works, that the other day in this House, petitions were presented by both sides of this House, and supported by practically every member in the House, that is with reference to the development of the coal fields at St. George's, and I would like to know if it is the intention of the Government to devote any amount of money to the development of these coal fields. I would like to have a pronouncement of the Government in that direction.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—Mr. Chairman, I don't think this is the time to discuss or to be able to discuss the amount that may be spent on that venture. While I strongly support the giving of Government assistance to that industry, we can only give that aid after getting the advice of an expert. I said that although I know something about the practical side of mining I do not pretend to know anything about the scientific side, and certainly I would not advocate taking any steps without taking such advice.

While I am on my feet I want to make a few short remarks on the Agriculture and Mines vote. Last year I made some lengthy remarks, and supported them by statistics

which I had then. Now I say frankly that I have been disappointed in some of my hopes—I was very optimistic about the outlook. I asked that the Department be aided by the appointment of an official geologist, and it is unfortunate that the Government has made very little progress in that direction. I had hoped that a suitable man had been appointed long since; I had hoped that he would have been appointed during the winter to become familiar with the office work, and be able to handle the field work during the summer, but it looks as if another season will go without doing so. It is unfortunate, as I said, and the Government have had the matter up with several men, but have secured none. There is considerable activity in the way of mining this year —the Nfld. Mines and Forests have undertaken some work at Tilt Cove, and on the West Coast gypsum is being developed. In Placentia Bay a local Company have opened a mine and sunk a shaft 300 feet, and I know from knowledge received from members of my own family who were familiar with it some fifty years ago about this, and believe that Placentia Bay will contribute to the future of mining in this country. I welcome the assistance of the member for Ferryland and I am sure the Government welcomes that of all the Opposition in the matter of the St. George's Coal Fields. And the Government has not only the support of the House, but by the number of petitions presented, that of the country, or a great number of people. And looking over the petitions, I noticed one which had the signature of every member of a store on Water Street, from the manager down. A few years ago an amount of money was spent on coal. I didn't see eye to eye with that at the time, but I would not accuse the men who voted for it of ulterior motives. The project failed, but I think the prospects of St. George's are much better than these.

Regarding the Estimates, there is a very small increase incurred, of $1,000 in all departments of the work. Why I propose to make an explanation now is that the hon. members may have occasion to ask questions, and in the state of my hearing, which is more defective than it has ever been, they would not get much result unless they used a megaphone. That is why I take this opportunity to make some remarks. I have been handicapped by the prolonged illness of Mr. Turner, and I take this occasion to express my regret at his illness, which has deprived me of his services. I regard him as one of the most efficient men in the service. He has been associated with the department for 40 years, and has been permanent head for some years. Ministers come and go, but he remains as the permanent head of the Department. He knows the details of the work as no one else does, and it was in anticipation of his aid that I stated I was going to prepare amendments to some acts, which were necessary. I took occasion to refer to the Canadian Acts, and in consultation with Mr. Turner, I tried to get something in shape to put before the Government, and had some progress, but owing to his illness this was retarded—we would get an appointment with the Government, and his illness would prevent our keeping it. I hope still that I can get his assistance in compiling them, but I promise the House that if it is not willed that I have his services, I will undertake to bring down amendments of the Crown Lands Act and the Saw Mills Act. Mr. Noel, the first surveyor, gets a salary of $2500.00, the same as last year. Mr. Duder, who is shifted to chief surveyor, gets a salary of $2200.00. Then last year there was a second and third surveyor; now there is only a second, and the salaries have been divided up, put-

ting in two at $1600.00. Mr. Duder is the Chief Surveyor, and there is no change in the amount of the vote. For the woods ranger there is an increase of $300.00 per year. He has been long in the service. I have been in the department three times, once for 5 hours, another time for 5 months, and now for 2 years, and I hope the rest of the term. He has been the target of political pressure, and when I last came into office I received numerous letters asking for his dismissal, because of his political leanings. I did not do so, I knew that he did not insult anybody, and that he conscientiously did his work, and that was enough for me. Because he has been the target of political pressure he has never received a recommendation for increase, and so I am asking the House to grant this vote of $300.00.

Now a few words about the Agricultural Department. Of the work, I would say, as I said last year, that I do not know so much about this side of the work—I am not an agriculturist, but I am going to confess now that we are going to have an uphill fight in things agricultural. Last year I made a visit to Nova Scotia, and talked with Dr. Cummings, Principal of the Agricultural College, who has a great interest in the affairs of this Colony, and is anxious and willing to render any assistance he can in our problems. When I visited there I found to my surprise that they were confronted with exactly the same conditions as we are here. In spite of all their favourable conditions they had to import from Prince Edward Island a great many articles for local consumption—I was quite surprised. I thought that that Province produced enough for their own needs. After consultation with Hon. J. A. Walker, the head of the new department under the Rhodes Government, I found that one of his first duties on taking office was to appoint a commission of four members of the local legislature, men who were practical farmers, with other agriculturists, to look into the question in the different farming districts of Nova Scotia. I merely mention that to show that they too have their difficulties, and it is no small matter to do anything of an appreciable nature in Newfoundland. The vote is not equal by 25 p.c. to what it has been in the past—my predecessor had a $45,000 vote for the Model Farm, that is now gone. We had to ear-mark $12,000 or $20,000 for the purchase and subsidy of agricultural animals all over the island. Then there was a great demand for agricultural lime, which cost $25.00 per ton. After lengthy correspondence with outside people I succeeded in getting a machine for crushing agricultural lime which could be put on the market for $6.00 a ton. We put a flat rate on it so that a man at Conche, a man in Twillingate, Trinity or elsewhere would get it at the same price as the man in St. John's. I was very much disappointed—we crushed 100 tons, and I thought that we were going to have a rush for it, and I restricted the amount that each man could get. I was very much disappointed to find that we had few applications, and we didn't sell what we had crushed and had to close down—that knocked some of the optimism I had about agriculture out of me. It may have been because the people never had the opportunity to procure it, and hadn't started to use it properly. I hope to be able to move the machine; we are going to crush 40 tons more the early part of next week, and when that is done I am going to move the machine out to a lime quarry where there is plenty of material, and we certainly will be able to supply all the people need. I haven't got the services of a scientist in that department, but Mr. Bayly is well qualified to look after the agricultural end of the work. I hope to have a Newfoundlander properly trained to

take over that end of the work just about when I am ready to move out, and I hope he will serve well and with value.

Now a word as to forestry. Immediately the House closed last year, according to my promise I sent applications to the various people and companies operating pulp mills and saw-mills, and we had several meetings. It was unanimously decided that we form a committee called the 'Nfld. Forest Consultation Committee,' which made some recommendations, which recommendations are now in the hands of the Government. That Committee will deal with forest protection generally, and I hope the vote for forest protection will be handed over to them for dispersion. That is all the explanation I have to give.

CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Prime Minister can tell us whether the Government intends to bring in any additional Estimates regarding the St. George's Coal Fields project?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—We have not come to a decision up to the present.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, every member, or practically every member of this House supported that. And I want to say that this Government and previous Governments have spent money more recklessly than to develop this coal mine. I have pointed out how this country would benefit if coal were found in any part of Newfoundland, and I feel sure that every member of this House will corroborate the statement that I make, that if we found coal in any quantity, we would keep three million dollars in the country each year that now goes out. We purchase three hundred thousand tons of coal at approximately $6.00 per ton—practically two millions of dollars. And we would have the labour in the production of that coal. On top of that there are three million dollars sent out of the country annually for coal, and the development of our coal areas would be a solution of the railway problem. Today the railway is one million dollars per year in the hole. I ask you, Mr. Chairman to-night that if we are voting money here for almost evry other industry is it not right to vote some money for the St. George's Coal Fields. We have had enough trouble in connection with coal troubles. In. fact this country is bound up on account of coal troubles. Last year there was a strike in the anthracite mines of the United States. This year there is a strike in the coal mines of England and which is tantamount at the present time to over five million workers being out on strike and it is all over coal. We have had our rum days; our dog days; our mid-wife days, and now I propose that we have a coal day. Now, Mr. Chairman, I cannot get a definite answer from the Government as to whether they intend or not to make any attempt to develop the coal fields at St. George's. The Minister of Agriculture and Mines says that he believes that we should get a geologist to determine once and for all as to whether we have coal in commercial quantities. According to reports that have been issued by geologists there is coal there. I think that we should take the bull by the horns and vote $100,000 to develop those coal mines. We have been told that there are two million tons of coal in sight. You guarantee bonds for the next fifteen years and you won't grant five cents to develop a coal mine on the West Coast which, if it proved successful, would be the greatest boon Newfoundland ever had, and members on the other side of the House know it. Why not do it now? You don't want to wait and do it by Minute of Council. Why not do it here when you have the support of both sides and not wait and come in next year and ask the House to ratify it. Don't leave it to be put in the

hands of eight or ten men who don't represent the whole country. They represent a third of the country and the other two-thirds can go whistle. I know the stumbling block. Every Minister in the Executive is in favor of it except two, it is regrettable. We ought to be ashamed of ourselves. We have to raise money this year. If you intend to raise money why not bring in another loan bill of one hundred thousand dollars and attempt to investigate these coal fields, and we will compliment you. When I ask a question I want an answer, yes or no. The Government have considered the question. Every member of the Government except three considered it,and supported it when the petition was presented the other day, and now we are going to hear no more about it. Suppose for argument sake that the Government did allow a hundred thousand dollars to be spent under the Department of Agriculture and Mines for this development and that machinery was installed, in about five or six months they would be producing coal on the West Coast, and if it turned out in commercial quantities we would have to come in here next year and congratulate you, and if it didn't we supported you, and both of us have made an attempt at any rate and have failed. We are told that there are two or three million tons in sight. If that is so, ought it not to pay. If a profit of fifty cents a ton is made on three million tons you could not be stuck. I suggest that the Government do the same with the St. George's Coal Fields as they did with the Humber and the Newfoundland Hotel Facilities, and probably you are going to get stuck for both of them. There is not a doubt in the world but that you are going to get stuck for the Humber. I don't know so much as to the Hotel, but you will for the Humber for ten million dollars. If the Humber is worth ten million dollars, which it is, is not St. George's Coal Fields worth the hundred thousand. Another thing, we didn't buy one thousand dollars worth of paper, but we are buying two or three million dollars worth of coal and are sending the money out of the country yearly. You guaranteed $450,000 on the Hotel and ten million on the Humber. Can't the same be done for St. George's to the extent of one hundred thousand. Is it not just as well to spend this money to try and keep two or three million dollars a year in the country as guaranteeing interest on bonds going out of the country. Twenty-seven thousand dollars is being given away on the strength of Newfoundland's name. These are six per cent. bonds worth 108 or 110. At the rate of 100 it is $45,000 at the expense of the country. It is said that goes to the Hotel. Suppose it does, why should Newfoundland give the Hotel Facilities $45,000 worth of money, then when it comes to a question of helping a local company they stop. I understand the objection of the Prime Minister to the whole thing is that if they guaranteed anything for them he says they would have to guarantee money for every mine in Newfoundland. I don't agree with the Prime Minister. I think the coal question is a national question, it is an article consumed by the people of the country who are paying a high price, but as regards the silver and lead and other mines, these other minerals that are found in the country are not consumed in Newfoundland, and are not to be considered the same as a commodity that is imported, and that people are paying high for, and which can be produced in Newfoundland. Surely you should grant this concession to a local proposition after helping those industries of the Hotel and the Humber, when this local proposition has been supported practically by every member in the House, on either side of it,

and surely you are not going to have it turned down by or two or three autocrats who don't want to see it developed. The people have spent their money on this enterprise and it is exhausted, and they come to you as their representatives, and ask you to guarantee them a sum of money, and practically every man on your benches and practically every man on this side of the House, said that he strongly supported it, and then you bring in your estimates and there is nothing in it for that, and you will bring in your additional estimates, and you don't know whether it will be in them or not. My appeals fall on deaf ears and its supporters are silent to-night and you can't say whether you are going to do something or not. I don't believe in the idea of bringing in an expert. There are people who might try to defraud and who would spend money to see that St. George's Coal Fields were not helped by an expert, who are not anxious for its development because they are trying to sell articles of the same nature in this country. Considerable money is going out of the country for coal and a great deal is going out for coal for the railway, and the development of St. George's Coal Fields would keep that money in the country. Those individuals who are blocking this helping of that coal enterprise have not got the interests of the country at heart, and others are being dominated by those who don't occupy seats in this Chamber, and some of them have got the confidence of this administration and would sell them for twenty or twenty five dollars. If the Members of this Legislature want to take that domination, I am not going to take it no matter how big they are.

The Government sent three or four hundred thousand dollars out of the country the other day for domestic purposes in Newfoundland. Mr. Chairman, I have not seen any constructive policy of any kind forwarded by the present administration. The petition from this company is the only thing that has come in here this year and has received the support of both side of this House. To-night we are in the position that the Government is not able to tell us what they are going to do, whether they are not going to do anything at all or not, which means that they are not going to do anything. That is the answer. I say that you have the money on hand now if you want to do it. You do not need to borrow it. There is a million dollars left out of the road money, and at the rate that it was spent last year that amount necessary to develop this industry will not be noticed. If you will not do that, guarantee an issue of a hundred thousand six per cent. bonds, as you have done with the hotel, and sell the issue locally on the open market and the money could be raised in that way. But anything that would be the means of developing a future industry for this colony has been stopped by the present Governmnt. I feel that the Government as it is constituted to-day is most inconsistent. The Prime Minister has made a statement that is tantamount to say that he does not believe in the possibilities of the St. George's Coal Fields. On the other hand the Prime Minister is probably of the opinion that if the Government were to give its support to the development of the Coal Fields men would be coming along to get help to develop silver mines and lead mines and iron mines. But the coal business is a national problem. We do not consume gold or lead or iron in this country, but we do consume coal, and I say here that while we are on the subject that it would be saving the householders in Newfoundland all of two dollars a ton. And I can prove it. To-day in the United States coal is being mined at approximately two dollars a ton, at

the mines, ten per cent. more or less.

If it is possible to mine it in the United States at two dollars a ton surely it is possible to mine it in Newfoundland for the same cost. Suppose that it cost three dollars a ton to freight it across the country, that would be five dollars per ton. Put on another dollar for profit and another dollar for expenses and that would make the price nine dollars a ton when it is going for eleven and twelve to-day. It would mean the keeping of three million dollars a year in Newfoundland. The Government should make an attempt to get an expert down here and the expert will be—I don't know what the expert will be before he gets here. We are told by eminent geologists that there is coal there in commercial quantities, and the job is to deliver it. There is enough money squandered in two lots last year to develop that mine. Why, sir, one of our lawyers got twenty or thirty thousand dollars in the last twelve or eighteen months. The only way that anything can be got out of the Government is to present a petition and say that you do not want it granted. We have been here nine or ten weeks, and that is the only piece of constructive legislation which has been introduced in the form of this petition, and it is supported by all but one or two members of the Government. One of them has not got the interest of this country at heart and who said that this House was made up of a crowd of irresponsibles. That is the statement that was made in the next door place the other day that this House consisted to a certain extent of irresponsibles and demagogues. Mr. Chairman, there is no one on either side of this House that has been practically convicted of writing filthy letters. And there is no one on either side of this House who has sold his best friend for twenty-five dollars. I speak for both sides of the House now. And one of them is stopping Newfoundland from going ahead. One of them wants a commission to come out here from England and rule the country. It is regrettable in my opinion that the Island Cove army which marched on Bishop's Cove yesterday had not been given a left turn and marched into that Chamber next door and wiped them out of existence. The Island Cove army that is now in possession of the strongholds of Conception Bay. Mr. Chairman, it is regrettable that there is not a leader in this House that would lead the thirty six of us into the other place and wipe them out. One of these gentlemen is one that has knocked the St. George's Coal Fields openly in this city. One of these gentlemen in '98 said that unless you pass the contract, Newfoundland is ruined. If she was finished then, I do not know what she is now. He wormed himself into the confidence of the present administration. Not that they wanted him. He foisted himself on them. Mr. Chairman, it is time to call a halt, and here is the place and the time to call it right now. It is a pity that we have not one of the leaders of Island Cove here. There is no law and order here when these two men can run things, men you would not trust with a hot stove. That is apart from the point. I want to come back to the coal question. I want to put it up to the Government, and if I had the power here to-night we would not pass these Estimates until they say either yes or no, the two easiest words in the English language to pronounce. If they said no, we would criticize them, and if they said yes we would compliment them.

Mr. Chairman, the financial situation of Newfoundland is in a deplorable condition, to a great extent brought about by one of the leaders of the Government in the Upper House, the dictator of Newfoundland. Our revenue is short, our expenditure

is increased. And yet they will not make an attempt to increase the expenditure in the right direction.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—Mr. Chairman, I think the severe criticism of the Government regarding the St. George's Coal Fields, as set forth by the member who has just spoken is absolutely unwarranted. Only two or three days ago petitions were presented in this House, and supported by every member of the House. It is well known to the hon. member that the Estimates that are now before the House for its consideration, were laid on the table of this House a very long period before the petitions were presented at all. Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to make one or two very brief remarks. The hon. member seems to be labouring under a misapprehension so far as my recommendation is concerned with regard to engaging the services of a geologist. I never made a recommendation to the Government that a geologist be employed solely for examining the St. George's Coal Fields. My recommendation was that a geologist should be employed, so that his services might be available for examining the mineral properties all over the island. It is a well known fact that people who are thinking about investing their money in mineral propositions in any country as well as in this country, want to have first hand information with regard to the country that they have under consideration. I daresay that a man who would have any intention of making a search for minerals would not go into a country that had not been reported upon by a geologist. It is a well known fact to all inspectors and men who have any knowledge of mining, that the first information that is required by any man who has the intention of investing in a certain country, is that he will want to see what the report of a competent geologist is. It is a well known fact, as I have stated on several occasions, that Newfoundland has a variety of minerals almost all around the coast. Notre Dame Bay is famous for its copper ores, Placentia Bay for its lead ores, and Conception Bay for its iron ores. All the mines that are to be found in North America are to be found in Newfoundland. It is not the intention of having a geologist brought out here for the sole purpose of inspecting the St. George's Fields.

Now I think that criticism regarding the action of the Government with reference to the petitions presented here is premature. The St. Georg's Coal Fields, Limited, has been in existence for a very long period, and this is not the first occasion when the St. George's Coal Fields, Limited, had found it necessary to come to the Government to look for assistance. It was stated by the hon. member for Trinity, who I think was Colonial Secretary in the Government of that day, that they spent considerable amount of money in trying to develop coal. But the Government did not occupy their attention with the St. George's Coal Fields. They did not spend a dollar in trying to develop these coal fields, and I am finding no fault with them there. I don't say that there was any dishonest motive in that connection, but I do say that the St. George's Coal Fields was a much better proposition for the Government of that day to occupy its attention with, and if the amount of money that had been expended by the Government at South Branch,had been spent on the St. George's Coal Fields, I doubt if the officials of that Company, would find it necessary as they did the other day, of appealing for financial assistance. I don't subscribe to the decision that has apparently been arrived at by the hon. member for Ferryland that this Government in its actions regarding the various activities upon which it has embarked, is dominated by individuals who do

not occupy seats in this Chamber. Certainly I am not dominated, not only by anyone who does not hold a seat in this House, but also I am not dominated by any member of this House. As I stated before on another occasion, I am at the present moment head of a department that had to do with the mineral possibilities of Newfoundland. I supported the petition that was presented an evening or two ago, and previous to that petitoin I had made certain recommendations as head of that Department, to the Government regarding what I considered to be reasonable assistance, to be given to the St. George's Coal Fields. And I don't think that the member for Ferryland was serious when he stated that the Government should say the amount that they were going to spend and how they were going to spend it. I claim to have some knowledge of the practical side of mining. And I would not dare to assume the responsibility of passing over any considerable amount of the public money, and we are dealing with money which belongs to the whole public, I would not, I say, dare to pass that money over to the St. George's Coal Fields, Limited, without also seeing to it that money would be used in the development of that industry on the West Coast. If Major Cashin was investing his money in the St. George's Coal Fields as a sound business man, one of the first things that he would inquire would be as to who is going to spend this money. What qualifications has he got? What experience has he in coal mining? And what experience has he in handling large amounts of finance? Now I think that I am as well qualified as any man on this side of the House, but I think that we would be taking too big a chance were we to undertake the expenditure of any large amount of money without expert knowledge. And unfortunately we have not got that in the country at the present time. Now it is absolutely impossible to tell off-hand what it is going to cost per ton to get the coal to the surface; how much it will cost to erect a transportation line from Robinson's, if that place is chosen, to build that eight or nine miles of railroad. It is difficult to tell how much money will be required to be able to put that proposition on a paying or working basis, and these are the questions that will require the advice and assistance of some expert who has had experience in that direction. As I said before, I know something about the practical end of mining, but if you were to ask me what would be the cost of sinking a shaft a thousand feet, I would not be able offhand to give an estimate at all. I think that the hon. member can take it for granted that he is not the only member in this House who is anxious to try and develop this industry. It is the only hope I see. While I do not attempt to minimise the importance of the fisheries, but most men must make up their minds now that the time is gone never to come back, when Newfoundlanders can be supported as they were in the past, out of the codfishery. And as it was said by a Member in this House to-day, it is very difficult to get a man to go to the codfishery at all now. It is hard to believe, but we have here to-day people who are looking for supplies, and they find it difficult to get the wherewithal to catch fish. It is the duty of the Government and the Opposition to help, and it is only a matter of circumstances that you find yourselves on that side and we on this side of the House. I say it is the duty of every man who comes into this House to do all he possibly can in the interests of the country generally. We have to embark on new methods. It is said that this is going to be a gamble. Well our whole existence is a gamble. What greater gamble is there than supplying for the herring,

the cod, or the seal fishery. Our whole livelihood is made up of gambling. And as Major Cashin has said if we make an honest attempt and fail, we are disappointed that the industry did not turn out as we hoped it would. But I don't subscribe to the pessimism of the member who has just sat down. I believe and as a matter of fact, I know, that serious consideration as to the form of financial assistance is going to be given to that very important industry.

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. BROWNE—Before this House rises to adjourn, I would like to re-sation Bill. A Committee was appointed five or six weeks ago, in connection with the Workmen's Compensation Bill. A Committee was to be pointed from this House to join with a Committee from the Upper House. That Committee was appointed but up to this it has not met. In view of the fact that some legislation of great importance is to come up in connection with this matter, I must say at least that I don't understand why some steps have not been taken. I would like to know from the Minister of Justice whether he intends going on with that matter this session, and if he intends bringing in a Bill, on some new lines different from what he had before. I should like to know if it is intended to bring in an amendment to the present state of the law, because I consider a great many hardships result to the working classes of the country. Now, sir, I represent a district which is really the greatest industrial centre of the country, the poorer labouring classes living almost in poverty; and I think the present state of the law is inadequate. I think the Government would be well advised to increase the amount of compensation, and I also think it of the utmost importance that the scope of the present law be enlarged. I have had examples of men working on vessels who have lost their lives, and their dependants having to depend on charity.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I would ask if a discussion of the Workmen's Compensation Act, which is not yet before the House, is not out of order?

HON. THE SPEAKER—I am afraid it is. It is anticipatory.

MR. BROWNE—Well, Mr. Speaker, if I can't discuss the merits, I can at least point out that legislation was promised, and ask if this is not coming down this session. That the scope of the Act needs to be enlarged.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, I might say that before I became Minister of Justice I was a practising lawyer for a number of years, and was familiar with the Workmen's Compensation Act. And there is nothing new in what has been said about the amendment of the law —I made some suggestion to that effect some years ago. I have but to repeat what I said when I moved for a Select Committee, that this is an important thing, and cannot be discussed at 11.20 in the evening. The hours of meeting for the committee must suit the members, and unfortunately there are only seven days in the week, and there has been no opportunity to have the meeting. I am willing to meet on Sunday if the others are.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until Monday afternoon, 10th inst., at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, May 10th, 1926.

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

Mr. Cashin 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 Marine and Fisheries $430,992.39.

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.

Answers to the following questions were tabled:

Notice of Question

(1) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Colonial Secretary to lay on the Table of the House the following information: (1) What is the approximate cost for the operation of the Board of Health; (2) What is the approximate cost annually for medical services rendered to the casual poor of St. John's.

(2) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to Table the following information: (1) What was the total amount accepted by the Government from Sir Edgar Bowring in settlement of his Income Tax; (2) Through what channels was the money received; (3) What were the total legal expenses in connection with the case; (4) What lawyer acted on behalf of the Government; (5) What was the actual nett amount handed over to the Treasury.

(3) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister, as Chairman of the Railway Commission, to lay on the Table of the House copies of all tenders submitted to the Commission for the supply of coal required by the Railway for the coming season.

(4) MR. HICKMAN asked Hon. the Colonial Secretary: (1) Whether it is the intention of the Government to appoint a Conciliation Board to give effect to the provisions of Section 95 of the St. John's Municipal Act, 1921; if so whether such appointment will be made in the immediate future and if not, why not; (2) If the answer to the first question is in the negative, whether it is the intention of the Government to introduce at this Session an amendment to the said Act repealing Section 95 and erecting a tribunal other than the Conciliation Board to adjust the respective claims of landlords and tenants under the provisions of Section 95 aforesaid, and if not why not.

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 the Seal Fishery Act, and other Acts Relating to the Seal Fishery," 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 passed with some Amendments, in which they request the concurrence of the Legislative Council.

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 Respecting Immigration."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of the Committee.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE— Mr. Chairman, in connection with this Immigration Act I would ask honourable members to keep the copies of the Bill in front of them as we go along. The Immigration Act has been so enlarged that there is no further occasion for the use of the words "aliens or other persons" that appear throughout the Act. Consequently, as we come to the various sections we

keep to the term "immigrants." The word "immigrant" covers "aliens and all other persons" that appears throughout the Act. There is a rather important matter in the last section of the Bill, namely, "Of the Immigration of Chinese persons." This Bill does not apply to Chinese as there is a special Act with regard to these people. I propose to add to that section the words "Nor to any British subject born in this Colony, nor to any person domiciled in this Colony." The word "immigrant" now will cover all other persons except British subjects born in Newfoundland and those domiciled here and includes all passengers arriving on ships. This Act gives the Customs authorities the right of rejection in the first instance instead of having to wait until persons are proved undesirables. It has been discovered recently that some of the people who have been giving most trouble were not aliens but people without means and people who have not been passengers on board ship at all, so that the Act has been broadened to meet this contingency. Not long since it was thought that a tremendous number of people of a certain nationality were going to be brought into the country, and it was later discovered that this organized effort was being used as a channel to get those people into the United States. The main object of the Bill is the confirmation of the powers we already had, but it puts the Customs officers in the position to go aboard a vessel and inspect and examine and puts the onus on an immigrant to report himself. I may say finally that this Bill has been the result of continuous requests from the Customs authorities who have experienced considerable difficulty in the handling of undesirables.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—I am not quite clear that under the schedule as provided for under section 16, a, b, c, d, that it covers one of the principal reasons why the Bill was introduced. I think that earlier in the session I brought a matter before the House at the instance of the American Consul, wherein it was shown that organized efforts were being made to bring over a large number of Lithuanians, ostensibly for the purpose of working in the employ of the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company and the Anglo Newfoundland Development Company. I took that matter up with both those companies, and on enquiry was assured by them that there was no ground whatever for that assumption. It was generally conceded that this was merely a subterfuge to get those people smuggled into the United States, and the United States Government were concerned very much over this and took the matter up with ou r Government with a view to getting an embargo put on these people. Before there was a head tax on Chinese coming here, there used to be large numbers of Chinese imported for the purpose of smuggling into the United States, and they would disappear from here in cargoes over night. There was the case of the schooner "Frolic" which had two hundred Chinese taken on board at Placentia, through agents there for the purpose of smuggling them into the States. The schooner was bound for the coast of Maine, but the plot was discovered and the two hundred Chinese were arrested and the agents, I think, were imprisoned. I am not comparing the Lithuanians to the Chinese, but similar efforts were being made, and they too, were disallowed entry by the American immigration laws. We are confronted in this country with a tremendous amount of unemployment, and the fact of those people coming here and working in the lumber woods even for a short time and thereby depriving our own people of employment, did not appear very good. It was therefore considered in the interests of

Newfoundland, and a diplomatical course with our great neighbour, the United States, to take some steps to prevent the importation into this country of undesirables. I certainly think that one of the main features of the Bill is to meet that contingency.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—With regard to that point it is covered by sections 11 and 12. As to section 16 that is only for the purpose of laying down a legal definition of what "undesirable" is, so as to make it clear that no mistake be made in the exercise of discretion.

Section 11 is very clear: (Reads).

That is one point as to requiring a minimum amount of money.

Section 12 is broader still. (Reads).

Power is given there to handle such a situation as the Colonial Secretary has referred to.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—It seems to me rather ambiguous in so far as you have to issue a proclamation and you can't issue a proclamation against a class of persons in particular until some of them come here or you know they are coming. What I mean is that suppose the Sachem comes in one night with say twenty of those Lithuanians that we have been speaking about, we have no power to stop them from landing without the Governor in Council issuing and gazetting a proclamation. Is there no other way that it could be definitely stated that people, say from Asiatic countries and other such countries should be considered undesirables?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—It would be a very dangerous thing to lay down a broad prohibition like that.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Section 11 confines it to immigrants with a certain amount of money but to many that would make no difference and is not sufficient in itself. Many that it might be desired to keep out are very wealthy. According to the representations on the other side, in the case of those Lithuanians, one Lithuanian woman was very wealthy, and many of them are wealthy people, and this particular woman had engaged an agent to get her into the United States, and she was prepared to pay any money to attain that object, and he was employing this means by way of Nfld. I merely wish to say that the Customs Officials will still, it appears, be powerless to prevent such persons landing here before a proclamation issues.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I think that what would happen is that immediately this Act goes into force that certain general regulations should forthwith be made by the Governor in Council. If a certain class is known as undesirables they naturally will be included amongst the prohibited classes.

MR. HICKMAN — It seems from what the Colonial Secretary has told us that this Bill is being brought in to help out the United States. They legislate against us. They put one dollar and twenty five cents a quintal duty on our stable industry going into the United States and into West India Islands under United States administration I don't see why in any case we should concern ourselves about the immigration laws of the United States and giving assistance to themt

MR. DUFF—I would like to say that quite recently I was the means of getting some pass ports for some constituents of mine going to the States, and one young man from Carbonear got as far as St. John, New Brunswick and was turned down by American immigration officials, who would not accept the pass port and he was put to the expense of paying his passage back. I would like to know about that and would like to know what the Colonial Secretary's office will do about it, as this man

has lost his money and he had a pass-port from the Colonial Secretary's office, and they have power to give pass-ports. I would like to know why they turned him down and told him that his pass-port from the Colonial Secretary's office was not valid and was worthless. His brother had an American passport and he was allowed to go on and he with a passport from the Colonial Secretary's office was turned down. The Colonial Secretary's office advertises that they have power to give passports and this man has been put to quite a deal of expense by being turned down by these American officials.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—With regard to what the honorable member for Carbonear, Mr. Duff, has been saying of a passport from the Colonial Secretary's office being turned down, I must say that that could not have happened. What he is referring to would not be a passport but merely an identification letter with the Col. Secty's signature. We sometimes issue an identification letter for a person, saying that the person is known to us is going to the United States for a certain period and other such particulars. These are not issued instead of a passport but as an additional precaution. A Newfoundland passport is recognised all over the world, just the same as a British passport or an American passport or a passport from anywhere else. Passports are international. Our passsport would be accepted in every part of the world so long as it was properly issued. Some people however get those identification letters giving a few particulars and stamped with the stamp of the Colonial Secretary's Office.

With regard to what the Leader of the Opposition has been saying in connection with this immigration bill being introduced to oblige the United States, that is not the object of it. I am not concerning myself over the United States immigration laws, but I don't think that Newfoundland should be made a dumping ground for those who are trying to get in there and into Canada through the back door. The time has come to do something to put a stop to that. When we put on a Chinese head tax it was not merely for the purpose of taxing a few laundrymen but to prevent Newfoundland from being made a Chinese dumping ground. It seems to me that we need this immigration law here, if for no other reason than to protect our own working people. I dare say that the United States will be glad to see us put this on the Statute Book because it helps their interests, but that is not the object of it. We have to protect our own labor, which can be taken by people coming in unrestrictedly, and even if they were only here for a short time there is harm done to our own people who are finding it difficult to get work. It is time we had some sort of protection for ourselves against any and everybody coming in. We are the only part of the world today where people can come in without restriction| Everywhere else you have to satisfy the immigration authorities. I think it is time for us too, to take some precautions and stop indiscriminate permission of immigration. I repeat that I am not concerned about the United States, but I don't think we ought to allow ourselves to be a dumping ground for people trying to get into the United States and Canada.

MR. BROWNE—I quite agree that this Immigration Bill now before the House is a very good thing. It appears to me to be a good Bill in every way. I think too, that it is time that we introduced an immigration law into this country. As a matter of fact, I imagine immigration laws should have been introduced years ago. There have been no restrictions and anybody at all could come in

without difficulty. I can see no objection that might be raised to this Bill and I think that it should meet with the support of members of both sides of the House. It takes a great deal of trouble getting passports to get from here to other countries, and it is time that we took steps to have some protection here also. I can see no objection whatever to this Bill, and I would like to see it go through and become law and give us that protection that we should have with regard to immigrants.

HON. THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—It is said that this Bill, when it goes in force will benefit the United States, it may be only indirectly, but nevertheless it will assist their interests. I want to ask the Colonial Secretary therefore if it might not be possible to make representations to the United States of this benefit that we are giving them by our new immigration law, and try to get them to make some concessions for our people with regard to the regulations now in force against people who wish to go to the United States. It is a hardship on people here, particularly those in the outports who have to pay train fares to the city and spend from one to three days in getting examinations and photographs and so on, to have to follow all those regulations imposed by the American Government at such expense. Charges total up to twenty five dollars after passports and everything of that nature has been procured. I have been wondering if considering this hardship on our people if our Government might make certain representations to the United States Government to have these regulations lifted, considering that we are going to put this law on our Statute Book by which they are going to benefit. In the District of Harbor Grace, which I have the honour to represent, a large number of people travel every year to the United States and they feel this expense very keenly. It might not be so bad for one or two individuals, but take a family man living in Boston or somewhere else in the States and he sends for his wife and family, they are put to all the expense that he was put to and passports have to be got for the wife and all the children, and it amounts to quite a sum of money. Representations have been made to me by some of my constituents to try and have these regulations lifted, and of course I had to explain that the Government of this country have nothing to do with it, but I think now that an opportunity has been given to bring this matter to the attention of the United States Government and to see if some change cannot be made that would give some relief for these hardships on our people going into the United States.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, I just want to say a word. The people of the United States are not worrying very much, unfortunately, whether our people go there or not. The hard part of the whole thing is this, that the anxiety of the people is so great to get into the United States that we have to grin and bear these restrictions. I am inclined to think that the amount that was stated by the Minister of Public Works is somewhat high. I mentioned it to the Leader of the Opposition, and that was his impression also, still, I agree with the Minister of Public Works in his statement that it is, of course, a considerable hardship to those particularly who live outside St. John's. They have to come in and get their passports and go through these regulations, but these are the regulations, and they are so strict in the States that this hardship has been going on for some time past, and I do know that it has been the subject of correspondence for some years past. There is possibly somewhat of an excuse for our asking for consideration

to our people here in the light of the fact that we are amending our Immigration Laws, and this Amendment is of considerable benefit to the United States. Out of respect to those people, who have cause for the complaint which has been brought forward by the Minister of Public Works, I may say that I shall see to it that the Colonial Secretary is advised as to whether or not this matter might be brought up in Council and have representations made. I do not think that anyone will disagree with the statement that, if it is possible to get the regulations altered, it would be a good thing, but I don't think they are much concerned in the United States about views from this country. The Immigration Laws there are very stringent, and they don't appear to worry very much whether people in other countries are put to any inconvenience in the matter of carrying out these regulations. There are companies here to-day doing business, carrying passengers to the States, and they will not dream of touching a person unless he is fully equipped with all the requirements. I can only say, now that the point is raised, that I shall bring it to the attention of the Colonial Secretary.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, I am quite in sympathy with the suggestions made by Mr. Russell, and I may say that there have been efforts made in this direction, and a certain amount of success has been achieved. The United States Immigration Laws provide that a certain quota of immigrants are allowed from certain countries, and when that quota is reached, they cannot send any more for a year. When the quota from any particular country is full, then not a single soul from that country can go into the United States under any circumstances. However, there is no limit from Newfoundland. Any number of Newfoundlanders can go into the United States, and I think the same is true of Canadians. The object they are trying to achieve is to bar out Europeans and others from going in there. They want English speaking people to predominate and be their greatest factor. While they have a quota for England, I think it is very much larger than for any other country. Now there is also the question of head tax. The head tax is exacted from any person going from this country into the United States; but, certainly it is not the action of a country that wants to be friendly with its immediate neighbours. But persons who are going in and come out again get a rebate of the amount they paid, but I see the possibility, now that this Act has been passed and is meeting possibly some of the desires of the American authorities, that it would be a good opportunity to put it up to them, and we could say "We are doing something that is going to be of considerable benefit to you; can't you remove some of the restrictions which you have put on us," I shall certainly see if something cannot be done to make the American Immigration Laws a little easier for our people.

CAPT. RANDELL—Mr. Chairman, while we are on the subject, I would like to bring to the notice of the Government that we have had some public messages coming here, and they could not be too severely criticized. I think that, if the Government is paying for foreign messages daily that we should be entitled to some different kind of stuff from what we have been getting occasionally, and I would like for some honourable gentleman in the Government to take notice of that and have things altered somewhat. I don't see why this Government ought to pay out a lot of money for messages of that class coming here. In going over this bill and listening to the remarks that have been made, I thought it was an opportune time to call the attention of the Government

to what has been happening in respect of those foreign messages.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, I am very glad that the honourable member brought this matter up. In another chamber, this matter was discussed the other day, and some very emphatic talk went on with regard to those messages. The matter was drawn to my attention in my position as Colonial Secretary, and I got all the facts together, and I will be very glad to produce them here to-morrow for the information of the 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 amendments.

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 notice and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions relating to the Railway and Shipping.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, when we had this Bill before us in Committee the other day, the two points that were contentious were in Clause 3, Section 2.

(Reads)

The members of the two Independent Parties and a member of the main Opposition Party both strongly commended to the Government that they should appoint a Minister instead of appointing a Commission, and I undertook, in view of the debate, to put the matter before the Government for their consideration. The Government have considered the matter, and they have come to the conclusion that it would be a mistake to appoint a Minister. It would be a mistake because the putting of a Minister at a salary of $4,000 a year over the head of a Manager at $8,000 a year would take away very considerably from the standing, the influence and the authority of the Manager in charge, and, as long as the Government feel that they have confidence in the Manager that is in charge, I think it is a mistake to put a Minister there. Then again, our opinion is that, if you had a Minister in charge, and I am not saying this of any possible Minister particularly under this Government, but I am referring to the Minister in any future Government, if you had a ministerial office up there, it would be a place for job hunters and everybody else to go to seek employment, and, in many cases, a poor return would be got. The general opinion is that it would not be for the benefit and economy of the running of the railway to have a ministerial office at the Railway. There is a third reason, and that is, we don't look upon the railway management by the Government as permanent. We have got a hope that the railway may, one of these days, be something that we can dispose of. Whether it would be disposed of by selling it outright, or to some private corporation to operate by paying them a subsidy is a matter for further consideration. If we were able to dispose of the operation of the railway, and I think that most members would favour its operation under some private company, if it could be arranged; it would be easier to get rid of a commission than of a ministerial office and the paraphrenalia arising therefrom, so the Government decided that the proposition, which is placed in this Bill, is the best one. However, we are quite willing to alter it, and to make the Clause a little bit more explanatory.

(Reads amendment)

We propose four commissioners at $500 a year, for managing the rail-

way, or a sum not exceeding $2,000 per year for the whole lot. It may be that we will have in the future two commissioners instead of four, or we may have three instead of four; or it may be arranged to divide the amounts by paying according to the attendance at the meetings. That is a matter for the Commission to decide themselves. When the former Commission was there, the Commission that consisted of Hon. Mr. Shea, the Hon. Tasker Cook, and Mr. Halfyard, these men were getting $100 a month. That was what was paid for their services, so that these three men cost the Colony $3,600 when they were up there, and whether it is two men or three men or four, it cannot be five because one of the five has got to be a general manager of the railway, and he would be acting on the commission ex officio, and consequently would not be paid; therefore, there would not be any more than four at a time, and it is proposed to pay them a sum not exceeding $2,000 between them. The other clause, to which an amendment was suggested by the honourable member for Fortune Bay, was Clause 8. That Clause was not in the original Bill when I saw it; I don't know how it got in there, but it is not the intention of the Railway Commission to get in a clause in the Bill to enable them to go for a picnic or a joy ride on the surplus that might accrue to the railway at the end of the year. I do think that, if the members of the Commission in charge were able to bring out a surplus, they ought to be entitled to one. But I propose to amend that sentence to read:

(Reads)

Now, as regards those clauses that have been referred to further on, with respect to cattle being killed on the line, I may say that, when I went on the commission I found hundreds of claims extending for years back that had never been dealt with. We had to lay down a hard and fast rule with regard to the killing. We had to lay down the rule that we would not be responsible for cattle that were killed a certain distance outside of the settlement, and we would only be responsible for those killed in the neighbourhood of the settlement. There were a number of horses killed a couple of miles from the settlement to which the owner belonged, and we had to repudiate these claims. We had to enquire into every case very fully, and we had to lay down a hard and fast rule to clarify the regulations. We can take up these as we go through the Clauses.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, I might say that when this bill was up the last day there was no suggestion from the official Opposition, (I think it came from the Members from Fortune and Ferryland) as to a Minister of the Railway Department. I might also say that we went into this matter and the conclusion we reached is the same as that which the Prime Minister has outlined. To prevent this becoming a Government Department with large salaries, we intended to suggest commissioners receive $500.00 each, and that was one of the real changes that we thought should be made. I presume as the Prime Minister has stated, that will be made. We will see as we go along that changes are made.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, I was the first on this side of the House to criticize this Bill, and apparently a good many of my remarks have been misinterpreted. I still contend and maintain, and I am still of the opinion, that four members of this House, or four people out of this House, are too many to run the affairs of the Railway, and are unnecessary. But perhaps if I run briefly over what I said it will clear up things a little. What I said was that this Bill creates a department of Railway. It does not call it a department in the

Bill, but it nevertheless provides for five members of a commission as a department of the Government—that that amounted to creating a department giving it powers to control, manage, etc. (Reads)

That is practically the creation of a department, call it what you like. And that being so—it being understood and accepted that the Bill creates a Department, I said that I didn't see the necessity for having five commissioners—that one was plenty, call him commissioner or minister or whatever you like. But that undoubtedly creates a department, and I consider that five men are unnecessary—absolutely unnecessary. The Prime Minister said in reply that the Commission was really to act as a Board of Directors, and my answer to that is that your Government, your Committee of Council is really a Board of Directors, and one Board of directors between a department and this House is sufficient. I criticized the fact that members of this House who accept seats on that commission do not have to go back to the country for re-election, and my opinion is that that leaves the door open to corruption. It may not in this Government or in the next, but the door is undoubtedly open to giving support and remuneration to political supporters who may be importunate. Take this case—there is no necessity to appoint four commissioners; you may appoint only two, and those two will get $1000.00 each per year. Now that is a nice little sum to help out a political supporter who hasn't benefited in any other way. He gets that amount, and doesn't have to go back for re-election. I say that it is wrong, and opening a door which I thought this Government at any rate would keep closed. I can't see the force of the argument of the Prime Minister (And I want to repeat that I never advocated a Minister) that if we put a man there getting $4000.00 over a man who is getting $8000.00 it is incongruous. You have to-day the Minister of Justice, getting $4000.00, and men under him, for they are under his department—the Judges, getting $7000.00. You have a man absolutely subordinate to him—the Chief Clerk of the Registry, getting more. Take the Colonial Secretary, we find the Government Engineer drawing a higher salary than the Colonial Secretary. Does that interfere with the efficiency of the Government Engineer, or the Registrar of the Supreme Court. And if that is being used as an argument what is the force of having four commissioners at $500.00 each over the Manager? You are creating a subcommittee of the Governor in Council, which be as much in politics as if you had one member. I still maintain that it is unnecessary to have four men, and that one is sufficient. You needn't call it a commission at all, or you can call him Chief Commissioner, or what you like.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, I was one of the members from this side who spoke, and I probably spoke in stronger terms than Mr. Warren, advocating a department of Railways, and I regret that the Government has not seen its way clear to create a department of Railways. I felt, as I still feel that by so doing the Government would be providing for a permanent head, who would for all time be able to supervise the operations of the railway, and I believe that at the present time that is necessary. He would be able to check the unnecessary expenditure which I consider is now going on. It is not necessary for him to know anything about the railway—the present President of the C. P. R. is a lawyer, and no doubt a good lawyer would be able to take charge of our railway, as Mr. Beatty has of the C. P. R. He has of course, good practical men under him, and there is no question as to his ability, for under him the C. P. R. has de-

.veloped into one of the most powerful corporations in the world. And I am of the opinion that the Government is leaving the door open to corruption—it may not be in this Government, and may not be in the next, but the opportunity is there. If you have one man take it over, or two men, and pay the two $1000.00 each, and your supporters find out the possibility of getting a little of their own back, you will be besieged by them. I regret that the Government cannot see its way clear to adopt my suggestion, or Mr. Warren's suggestion, and make a department. I further regret that Mr. Sullivan will now have to be satisfied with the small stipend of $500.00 a year, and I trust he will appreciate the efforts I made to have him appointed Minister. The Prime Minister seemed to stress the point that by the appointment of a Commission they would be able to keep it away from political influences. We all know that the Railway to-day is operated and controlled by political influences—it has been in the past and will be in the future, and you can't get away from it. It is a difficult task to get clear of the Railway—if you go to a Company and try to sell, they will ask for a statement, and the best statement you can give is a loss of $750,000, and that is not much good, although I am still of the opinion that the Railway could balance up. I said that five millions would have to be spent before the railway would be put in shape, and I am still of that opinion. And with it you have the Dock, which will be a part of the Railway, and I am informed that up to the present moment the Dock has cost $1,900,000—I am subject to correction. But suppose for argument's sake that by the time it is finished it will cost $2,000,000, and that is by far over the estimate of $1,086,000 given by Bishop and Company. If you get a ship of 3000 tons on for 300 days, she will not pay the interest on the amount, at the present rate of 25c. per ton for the first day and 12½c. for each succeeding day. You will find that the amount received from that ship will not be enough to pay the interest charges. So taking everything into consideration, I feel that we owe it to the people who own the railway to have a person responsible for it in this House. It is going to be a great liability, and under this Bill we will know practically nothing about its operations. For you needn't take members of this House, you can take four private citizens and appoint them as Railway Commissioners, and you will find it will be very difficult to get information—true we can ask questions. Now regarding the railway contracts—tenders were called for the other day for a large amount of money, approximately $400,000 for coal contracts, and they didn't accept the lowest tender. I find in reply which I received to-day to a question, that the Government threw away $70,000 or $80,000. They gave it to Besco—no doubt Besco is dear to their hearts, and so they get the coal contract. And the same thing will continue, I maintain, while we have no man who is responsible to this House, we will have no one from whom we can get anything at first hand. And I maintain, Mr. Chairman, that considerable expenditure which is going on at the present time would be cut out. There is very much unnecessary expenditure at the Railway.

But it is just as well for me to talk to myself as to the Government. You are going to give the Railway to three or four gentlemen, who will go up there once a week, and will be responsible to no one—you may say they are responsible to the Government, but the Government is not in touch with them. There is a Minister of Railways in Canada, and he doesn't draw $75,000 a year, as Sir Henry Thornton does; he gets the usual Ministerial salary. Certainly if

the Government have made up their minds they will go ahead.

Furthermore Sec. 16 has been outlined by Mr. Warren. Why shouldn't two men get the job, and go back for re-election, the same as the other Ministers—it is a position of emolument. No, when each Government comes back into office you will find the Prime Minister besieged by men wanting to be "fixed up"—men who will know no more about the Railway than the man in the moon.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, this Government is strong on commissions—if they are weak on anything else, that is certainly their strong point. Now the idea of a Commission for the Railway originated when the Railway was run in a dual capacity by the Government and the Reid Nfld. Co., and there was a very good reason why the Government should be represented. Accordingly the men who constituted that Commission were appointed, with one or two of the directors of the Reid Newfoundland Co. to look after the Railway. But I think there is no necessity to have a commission now—the Railway is owned by the Government, and they cannot be interfered with in any way. It is a Government affair, just as much as any other method of transportation ferries, if you like. And there is no necessity for the Government or the people of this country to entail the expenses of four men in running the railway. Now if I am strong on anything it is on allowing Mr. Hall to do this work. If under this Act you appoint Mr. Hall as adviser to the Government, his salary is already voted, and you have a man who knows something about it and who can be of some service to the country and the Government, and the railway. And the members of the Executive Government could not do better than to give a certain amount of time per week in consultation with him and the General Manager about the Railway. And the Government Engineer is in close touch with matters appertaining to the railway—having perfect knowledge he could report to the Executive Government, and they could not spend a few hours better each week than in considering his report, and then deciding their policy. The railway is a political institution, and you can't get away from it—no difference whether you appoint a commission or not, any member who wants to use his influence to get an appointment will do it. He will do it now, and when you appoint a commission just the same. Give the present Manager a free hand—do not curtail his authority any practical way, and, with Mr. Hall you would find good results. We all have confidence in the present Manager. We talk of Newfoundlanders adapting themselves, and we ought to give one a chance in our own country. He is sober, sane, and has had experience, and is a man of ability—why shouldn't we have confidence in him?

It has been suggested that if there is to be a commission the government will be importuned by its members for positions on the Railway Commission even if they only get $500.00, and that is so, whether you appoint five or two. I think commissions have had their day. You may ask, Mr. Chairman, "Why did the Warren administration appoint a commission"? Well, then we did the best possible thing, or attempted to do it. Men who would know best how to handle the railway were appointed, Mr. Hall, the Auditor General, and the Colonial Secretary, whose duty it was to report back to the House. I thought it was an ideal Commission, leaving out altogether the personality of the Colonial Secretary, who was to report back to the House. I think the plan to follow if you want to get the best satisfaction would be to cut out the commission and appoint Mr. Hall.

Mr. Hall has an assistant engineer

who can see that everything is done satisfactorily as to the cost of bridges and culverts, and Mr. Cochius can see about the road building. It is a great pity that the man is not allowed to do the work that he was brought out here for, and as I said before, if we did not have a man like Mr. Hall here in this country we would be importing him, and have him attached to the railway. The highways policy is most objectionable. It is objectionable because the country cannot afford to be spending money in connecting up the roads between different districts, while the roads through the different localities where the people live are impassible. And then you take Mr. Hall from the railway, which is such a great possible liability for the people of this country. The last clause of this bill should be deleted, and I trust that the House will not adopt the principle of the bill, and I hope that clause will be deleted before it is passed. Instead of making politics purer and doing away with having the supporters of the Government in the legislature given jobs by the Government, you are making it possible for them to receive salary and not have to go back to their districts. My reason for suggesting a Minister was in preference to having four commissioners with a possible salary of four thousand dollars each.

But the best way is to appoint Mr. Hall as the consultant engineer to report to the Executive Government and it will not cost the colony one cent. Under this clause I presume that they will be able to lease the railway or the steamers and do anything that the Government or this House should do. This should not be taken out of the hands of the legislature. I oppose this bill after giving the matter much consideration. I appreciate that the amendment to subsection 1, section 3 is an improvement. We are setting a salary not to exceed a certain amount.

MR. DUFF—I would like to congratulate the Prime Minister and the Government on their decision not to appoint a Minister of Railways and have to pay another high salary. It has been said long ago that the state of affairs in this country is like to the trappings of an elephant on the back of a mouse, and the country is looking with a good deal of concern on the expenditure of the present Government, and I think that would be the final straw. In some instances commission, although they have a rotten traffic to deal with is a good appointment and they are doing their best. But it is a pity that the Government ever went into the business. Now this highroads commission goes to show that the Government has no confidence in the Board of Works, because after all the Board of Works is the part of the civil service that should look after the highroads commission. The Government appoints a commission with this gentleman in charge, and it is a great pity that the Government will not take the suggestion of Mr. Halfyard and put Mr. Hall back where he originally belonged, because after all the highroads could get along without Mr. Hall. Now we are going to appoint a Railway Commission. I think myself that the country is very grateful to the present commission who has done this work because they must have received some very valuable information and some education along the line that the railway is run. I think that it would be better for the present commission to continue without appointing somebody to the job that would know nothing about the job at all, and this is one of the things that the Government will have to safeguard from now on. It is reported that the Prime Minister thought some years ago that this country should be ruled by a commission as a Crown Colony. I think that it would be well to take the suggestion of Sir William Coaker and appoint a commission to run the Col-

ony. Things have become in a pretty bad state in this land. The conditions of things in the outports and St. Johns" are deplorable, and we want to cut down expense. The Prime Minister tells us to have optimism but it is hard to have optimism. All these frills that the Government is bringing in now is just extra expense, and I ask the Prime Minister to consider this bill and to cut it out, that portion where they are going to pay the commissioners. If there are men who desire to be commissioners and will work without salaries, well let them be commissioners. I suggest this to the Government.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—The Prime Minister told us that he intends to insert in this section three that the salary of the commissioners shall not be more than two thousand dollars. We propose that you include the following: "Commission not to receive more than $500 each." (Reads)

I understand that the commission meets about once a week. Well, if the commission meets once a week and gets ten dollars a meeting, which they will get if the salary is five hundred dollars they are getting as much as they would receive on any directorate of a company no matter how important it might be. And so that this Government or any future Government may not use the positions created to give some dissatisfied member a salary we think that it is advisable that the salaries be limited to five hundred dollars each which seems to me to be good compensation for the work which they expect to do unless a commissioner spends all his time at the railway. The suggestion made by Mr. Halfyard that Mr. Hall be used on the railway I think is a good one. Mr. Hall is a railway man. He was brought here as the railway engineer. His salary is now voted by this legislature. Mr. Hall has nothing whatever to do with the railway. He is now the chief commissioner of the Highway Commission. The Highways Commission must certainly go out of existence after this year. The Government took a vote of two million dollars for the roads, and they have spent over a million dollars already and at the same rate of expenditure this season all of this vote will be exhausted and there will not be sufficient work for Mr. Hall to continue as the Engineer of the Roads Commission. He has a good assistant in Mr. Robinson, and I think that there is no reason why the Government should not utilize Mr. Hall on the Commission. The suggestion that I have made in reference to the payment of the commission is the unanimous suggestion of the Opposition Party.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The only reason for putting in two thousand dollars for the whole commission was that the idea occurred to me that the commission might want to divide the salary in some different way. They might want to divide it into so much a meeting or so much for attendance. Or they might wish to give something extra for some man to act as the secretary or the chairman. And it might be quite possible that somebody might give more attention to the work up there, and they might wish to give him a little more money. There is no point in this proposed arrangement, as a good many members may suppose in connection with the present commission. I think that Mr. Sullivan, as he has not got an executive position and has a little more time than any of the others might do more work and take a larger portion of the money, but Mr. Sullivan objects to being paid any more than anyone else. And that is a point that I want to clear up. There is no object in voting the lump sum of two thousand dollars except with a view of the future when if the commission wants to divide the salary and pay one man four hundred and another six

hundred, they can do it without altering the act, and the total amount will not be more than two thousand dollars.

MR. WARREN—I have heard the amendment for the first time, and I support it because it is exactly in line with what I have said all along. The Prime Minister said the other day that he did not see why members who receive pay under this act should have to go back to their constituencies for re-election, any more than the members of the Board of Works, but I would like to point out to him that when the act passed the members of the Board of Works under chapter four, which applies to this House, received a salary of a hundred and fifty dollars per year. But this is a different matter. Under this act there might be a chief commissioner and he might get fifteen hundred dollars a year and another commissioner five hundred and neither has to go back for re-election, and for this reason I think that it is the proper thing to fix the salaries of the commissioners at five hundred dollars each. The section that we are on now is the section that turns the railway into a department. Subsection five of section three, and I again enter my protest against there being four commissioners, and I again draw the attention of the Prime Minister to the fact that paying this commission five hundred dollars each is a different matter to paying the Board of Works a salary of one hundred and fifty dollars per member.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—There is one point that I want to refer to. Several members have been speaking about that last clause, exempting Commissioners from going back for re-election. I feel very strongly that nobody ought to go back for re-election. I look upon it as a waste of the public money. I was elected as the Prime Minister and I had to go back to the people within a few months and ask them if they still wanted me as Prime Minister. I think it was a waste of my money and of the public money to have to go back for re-election. And with the consent of my party I propose to bring into this House just as we are to go out of office, when the present opposition will think that they are going to be the next Government, and they will not be so concerned, I propose to bring in a proposition to this House to the effect that no Minister who is elected will have to go back to his constituency for re-election. A Minister of Justice or a Minister of Finance or a Minister in any public office has to go back at great expense to himself, and at great expense to the country, and it is all for nothing. The Government is in power and the Government is going to remain in power, and if any man drops out there is another man to take his place, and the position remains the same as far as the country is concerned. When Capt. Winsor goes back to the district for re-election the people do not consider whether he is a good Minister of Marine and Fisheries, but they vote for or against the Government as the case may be. They vote for Monroe or for Coaker or for Winsor or Coaker or Winsor or Monroe, or whoever it may be. I think that it is perfectly absurd to have Ministers going back for re-election to office, and I propose with the consent of the party to bring in a proposition at the last session before the elections to do away with it altogether.

MR. WARREN—I have just looked up Chapter 4 of the Statute, and I find that I was making a mistake about this matter. The last section of the Railway Act that is before the House now does not say that a man when he has held office as a railway commission, does not have to go back for re-election, but under Carter's Purge if a man takes an office of emolument even if he goes back

to his constituents for re-election and comes back to this House, and is again made a railway commissioner his seat would be voided. That is the point under this new act. It is not that he will have to go back for re-election, but under the present act his seat would be vacated and going back for re-election would not give him back his seat, if he again becomes a railway commissioner, after he was elected again. It is not a question of going back for re-election as under the present act he could not be a member of the House and draw pay from the Government. The new law makes it possible to draw pay from the Government and still hold a seat.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —That is perfectly correct. Both sides of the House will agree that we are only making it clear. Every other day we find that in the conducting of public affairs members commit what might strictly be termed infractions of the act. I do not want to go into past history, but I do know that it has frequently happened that members have accepted offices and emoluments. We only put in that clause now so that it will be publicly known. This has been going on ever since the Railway Commission was started, and it is only legalizing what existed before. It is the same as the matter of the Government Director for the Nfld. Power and Paper Company that was cleared up last session.

MR. WARREN—Except that under the previous act the Government was not paying the man. But under this you say let every man take as much as he feels inclined to, and he does not have to vacate his seat. Suppose that my friend, Mr. Sinnott, were to be made a Railway commissioner and draw a salary he would immediately vacate his seat. But under this new provision it is possible for Mr. Sinnott to draw five hundred dollars salary, I hope that he does not mind my using his name, I mean no offence, or he can get more salary, perhaps a thousand dollars or fifteen hundred dollars as the work becomes more onerous, and he can still take it and not have to vacate his seat.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, I beg to move an amendment, along the lines that have been suggested that the salaries be paid according to the meetings or by some other system so that they shall not receive more than five hundred dollars. We must remember that we are putting a law on the statute book for future Governments. Personally I am of the opinion that this five hundred dollars should go on the same principal as the directors' fee.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —I think that the sole object of this section as amended is to ensure that the total cost of the Board to the country shall not be more than a certain amount, that it shall be limited. It is limited to two thousand dollars. I take it that it would be manifestly to the advantage of the good operation of the railway if some man, a member of the commission took a particular interest and was particularly attentive to his duties as a Railway Commissioner, and suppose that two or three of the others were away from the country for any lengthy period he would be deserving of a little remuneration for what he had done. The same thing happens in the case for directors' fees. If one of the directors does not turn up his fee is divided amongst the others, the object being to insure attendance. Take the case of the St. John's Municipal Council, I speak subject to correction, but I think that you will find to-day that if a man misses a certain number of meetings that his fee is divided up amongst the other councillors. Mr. Halfyard discussing the matter of the Railway Commission, looked at it from a point of view as to what

would be the least expensive machinery. He said that the creation of a department was likely to be more expensive than the present system of board management. There is a limit set to the Board. And surely if one man is more attentive to the work in so far as supervision is concerned, and attends the meetings more regularly, it is but good business that he should receive a little remuneration, and I see no reason why one man should not receive six hundred dollars and another four hundred.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — I would like to add a word to what the Minister of Justice has said. I want it clearly understood that there has been no question in the present commission about somebody getting more than somebody else. This is entirely my own suggestion. I cannot take the amendment proposed by the Leader of the Opposition. If we followed out Mr. Halfyard's suggestion or the suggestion of Mr. Duff and put Mr. Hall on the Railway Commission when the highroads have been completed, suppose Mr. Hall was able to give more time to the work of the Railway Commission it might be right that he should get fifteen hundred and the representative of the Executive Government be the five hundred dollar man. It is looking to the future that I do not want to confine the payment of any particular man because the whole constitution of the board may be different from time to time, and the work may not always be equally divided. Mr. Sullivan visits the place possibly more frequently than any one else, nearly every day as a matter of fact.

I hope that there is no insinuation of wrong doing being thrown out because I do not like it. I do not like suggestions that can be taken as insinuations that something that is not proper is going on. If Mr. Sullivan goes up there to see what is going on it is naturally in the interest of the Railway.

MR. WARREN—I think that the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition moved an amendment because I have an amendment which I propose to move to this section. Under this act we give the Governor-in-Council power to run the Railway by means of the Commission. This House practically ceases to have any control over that Department of the Government, which is to-day not only causing the most concern to those in public life, but to private citizens as well. Practically every department of the civil service has to make a report to this House. All the Commissions that have been appointed lately have to make a report to this House, but under this bill the commission goes out to run the railway and they do not bother about the public and those who represent the public, and only in the case of a deficit do they come back to this House for the sum that it is necessary to make it up. The Minister of Finance will take the deficit out of the Consolidated revenue and come in this House for the indemnity, and I move Mr. Chairman that we insert in this section a provision to ensure that this Commission report to this House the same as any other department and as any other commission. I therefore move this addition to the section:

(Reads)

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, although the matter is not very contentious from this side of the House, I rise to support the Amendment of the honourable member for Fortune Bay because I think that we should have all reports from the Commissioners.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I entirely agree with the suggestion of having this clause put in.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, I have also to make a proposition in reference to clauses two and four.

This is an incorporated body, and I do not think that we should give such powers to this Railway Commission in this House, so as they could enter into a contract for the sale or transfer of the Railway. I do not think that any such power should be given to this Government or any other Government by the people's representatives.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, I am of the same opinion as the Leader of the Opposition in this matter. I feel that we have no right to appoint four men to a Railway Commission and let them go out and do what they like with the railway because, according to sections one and two, they have the widest kind of powers, and I do not propose to sanction them. For argument's sake, the Railway Commissioners can go out without any money, and under this Bill, they can decide to spend five hundred thousand dollars on the building of a ship just as they see fit and incur a deficit on the railway at the end of the fiscal year, and the country will have to pay for it.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Chairman, compare the powers under this Bill with that of the Highroads Commission, who can take land and say "Here is so much for it" and if a man does not accept what he is offered he must appoint his own arbitrator at great expense.

This gives the Commission authority to close down every branch road in the country, if they see fit. It was a mistake in the first place to put some of those branches there, but I don't think it is possible to close down some of them. I would like to see some of them closed down. With regard to the Lewisporte branch, that is one, I think the only one, that is paying, and quite a few passengers go over that line. I would like to see some improvements in the cars used on that branch. The cars they use on that line are not fit for the accommodation of passengers and are I think some of the first cars that came into the country with a stove at each end. I took the matter up some time ago with the Manager of the Railway, but the improvements have not been made, and I want to take this opportunity to suggest that these improvements be made on the Lewisporte branch, and some of the other branches that are not paying could be closed down instead.

House then rose until 8 o'clock.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, before we went to supper I was asking under what head the deficit of the Railway for 1924-1925 and 1925-1926 came. And the Minister of Justice said the Minister of Finance would let me know. You admit having a deficit for 1924-1925, and that will come in this year's Budget, I suppose. Will you also have the approximate deficit for the Railway for 1925-1926?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—I expect so.

MR. CASHIN—Why I asked that was because it was not in last year's Budget. I know from last year's Estimates that nothing was put aside, and a deficit has been made on the Railway.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—We had a surplus to fall back on if there was a deficit.

MR. CASHIN—Why I asked the question is this. I understand the railway are right up against it, and can't pay their bills.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—No, it is quite alright. We are not short.

MR. CASHIN—Then it must have been voted by the Government. I am not quite clear on this yet. Do I take it from the Minister of Finance that the surplus from 1923-1924 paid off the deficit on the Railway? Has the Government since given the Railway more money?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Yes.

MR. CASHIN—Can you tell me how much.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—As I remember the surplus was $347,000. We have since been using that to meet the deficit, and if necessary any over-draft has been made through the Bank of Montreal. We haven't overdrawn until a little while ago.

MR. CASHIN—The surplus of the revenue could not possibly pay it off and that means that you are still in debt to the railway. I am just asking for information, I suppose there is no harm in that.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—At the present time what clergymen travel free under the act?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The three superintendents of Education and the heads of the different denominations, but the feeling is that the railway should stand on its own feet and the other departments pay their own travelling expenses. It is just taking it out of one pocket and putting it into the other.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—That leaves a possibility or an opening for passes to be given. I think that there might be a large number of passes issued under that excuse.

MR. HALFYARD—I wonder if it might not be possible to give clergymen passes under that section. It is possible that it might be of a benefit to the railway. There might be a strike and if a clergyman were to travel out there, and his presence might have a soothing effect on the tempers of them, and that might be construed to the benefit of the railway.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The Reid Company has given us the use of their ballast beds along the railway, and in exchange for that we allow certain of their men to pass over our railway. There are cases of that nature which occur. Of course it is possible to pay their passages and charge it up to some account, but it is unnecessary detail. Things of this nature sometimes occur, and that is the reason for it.

MR. CASHIN—The next section deals with gates and one thing and another of that nature. I would like to point out that up at the railway one crossing in front of the dock is very dangerous. There are engines backing down there with a string of cars and motors and horses and pedestrians crossing there, and I think, Mr. Chairman, that there should be some means of protection put there such as an automatic lift gate that could be operated with a lever of some kind so as to protect the people going over there. It is too late to have these things done when someone has been killed. A couple of years ago a fellow was killed because an engine with a string of cars backed down on him. There should also be a man on both ends of the string of cars. I think that there should be something there and it would not cost a lot of money to do it.

Mr. Chairman, before clause thirteen passes I would like to draw the attention of the Prime Minister to the fact that in some villages or settlements the railway station is a couple of miles outside the place, and I would suggest that the words "within one mile of any town, etc.," should be changed to a mile and a half or two miles. I know that the station at Calvert in my district is about a mile and a half from the harbour. One of my constituents had a cow or a horse killed by a train at Calvert some time ago. I know of several other railway stations that are a great deal more than a mile outside the heart of the settlements—Aquaforte for instance. I, therefore, recommend that one mile be altered.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I would like to know if there is any great change in this Bill regarding the

killing of cattle by trains?

HON. MR. CRAMM—Mr. Chairman, I think it is the same provision as is contained in the old Act with respect to the killing of cattle.

MR. HALFYARD—I think it is very difficult—I know it has been in the past—for people who have been unfortunate enough to get their cattle killed to get compensation. Really it is not possible for outport people to keep their cattle fenced in all the time. Evidently, there is no protection in this Bill for cattle owners after their cattle are turned out to graze.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—I agree with the remarks of Mr. Halfyard. Outport people who let their cattle out to graze do not know where they go. This Bill looks to me that outport people have no right to let their cattle out to get over the railroad line, and that if the cattle get killed the owners will not be compensated for them.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Chairman, the Prime Minister made the statement that he knew of cases in which people turned out their cattle to be killed by trains. I quite agree that, if such was the case, they should not be compensated, and I think that the owners of such cattle should be turned out and killed also. I would like to point out, however, that during the past winter lots of cattle had to be turned out to be fed, owing to the shotrage of hay. That applied particularly in several places North in Bonavista Bay. I know of cases where there were ten head of cattle in a barn and not enough hay there to feed one head. But these cattle were not turned out to be killed deliberately; they were turned out owing to scarcity of feed. Personally I think that the Board has too wide a scope under the present Bill.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, there is nothing new about these two clauses, and speaking as one who has some knowledge of the claims department of the railway the killing of animals by trains used be considered a very good method of selling a horse. As a matter of fact it is notorious the extraordinary values that were got for some quadrupeds that happened to fall victims to trains. This Bill is simply a re-enactment of the old Railway Act with improvements from Canadian Acts in some respects. There is no radical change from the already existing provisions; but in this country to-day you got to have some definite enactment fixed which establishes the liability on the railway for cattle killing and whereby the Board may be sued for payment, otherwise people can turn out cattle all over the place.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, I want to draw a comparison of the provisions with regard to the settlement of claims for cattle killed, under this Bill and under the contract with the Reids. Under the old contract with the Reids, the liability for cattle killed on the track, no matter how they got on, provided they were killed within a mile of settlement, was placed on the Company and compensation could be obtained. This Act takes away that general liability, but also makes some other provisions as regards liability of the railway for cattle being killed. Sections 12, 13 and 14, that is, the new Sections 13, 14, and 15 ought to be read together. There is one point that ought not to be lost sight of in this country with regard to the question of fencing to prevent the trespassing of cattle. I do not know what Canadian Act this is modelled on. In dealing with the question of fences, it must be remembered that in England you have got to fence to keep your cattle in, and if your cattle trespass because of your not having fenced sufficiently to keep them in, and they get out and do damage, you are liable. In this country, you

have got to fence to keep cattle out. It is a very old law here with regard to that; in early days when cattle were allowed to roam everywhere, if you did not want cattle to come in and do damage, you had to fence to keep them out because it was quite understood that it was quite proper to let cattle roam and get food and water wherever they could. The country was not settled and had no such large pasture lands as on the other side. That is the point I want to impress; our law is the exact opposite of that on the other side. In England you have got to keep cattle in; here you have got to keep cattle out. Remembering then that it always has been and is the law that you have to fence to keep cattle out, thus admitting the principle of their being allowed to roam, there are some sections of this Bill that seem to contravene that understanding and make rather a difficulty. Take Section 15 and those three sections.

(Reads)

Everywhere around this country, the railroad track runs through improved and unimproved land where cattle are to be found. A man turns his cow out, which is the usual thing; it gets on a public road, where there is a railroad crossing, crosses that road, which is a public utility and gets on the railroad track, another public utility. If that cow is killed by the railroad, I think the railroad ought to be liable unless they have taken sufficient precaution to keep cattle out, but under this Act, if a cow gets on the railroad track, where the railroad ought to put up cattle guards to keep cattle out, according to the natural law of the country, then its owner won't get compensation if it is killed. I agree that if a man leaves his gate open on land adjoining the railroad, neglectfully, and his cow or horse gets on the railroad and is killed, he certainly should not get compensation; but where it is the general custom to let cattle roam in the country, and a cow gets from the road on to the railroad track and gets killed, it does not seem right that there should be no redress, the state of the country being as it is.

(Reads Section 14)

Surely if the railroad is to be operated as a public utility, it ought to be liable for killing cattle that get on the track from the public roads, if it has not provided proper cattle guards. Has the railway got the right to run down cattle as far as it cannot see that it can be considered neglectful to have cattle go abroad, and I think that if cattle get on the road by means of a public crossing, the railway should be liable. I agree with having no liability where a gate is neglectfully left open by the owner on land directly adjoining the railway.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—With regard to what the member for Fortune has been saying as to liability for negligence, the question is somewhat one of contributory negligence and the relief of the liability of the railway for that, this Act protects a man where the servants of the railway are neglectful; to establish any other idea is only going to mean that you have to operate the railway at such a speed as the cows will permit you. You can't accept the principle that the railway conductor has always got to keep his eye out for cows and horses on the track. I think that is too much protection.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—There is one point in connection with the member for Fortune's remarks with regard to fencing to keep cattle out, and that is that the fences, intended to keep cattle out, are often the cause of animals being killed. If a horse or cow manages to get inside the fence and the train comes, he cannot get out by reason of the fence, and runs back across the track and is killed. A little above Leth-

bridge Station some time ago, I made some investigation personally, as to a horse that had been killed there. There had been a good deal of criticism because we paid this claim, although we turned down some others. We thought in the particular case the circumstances warranted it. Along the side of the track there was a river and along the track a fence had been put up and the effect was that if a horse got on the track it would run up against this fence. I maintain that accidents are quite often caused by having fences to keep out horses and cows and I believe nine tenths of the accidents could be avoided by taking down the fences.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, there is a good deal in what the Prime Minister has said in the last part of his speech, that a large proportion of the railway accidents are the result of the cattle on the track being unable to get out, by reason of the fences. I cannot, however, agree with the Minister of Justice, that these cases are to be considered cases of contributory negligence on the part of the owners. I don't see that the plea of contributory negligence holds at all. If I in a motor car run over a horse in the street, I cannot say that it is contributory negligence on the part of the owner to have that horse roaming on the street. In the same way I cannot see that contributory negligence enters into the question with regard to cows getting on the track off the road, as in this country it is the recognised and settled practice to let horses and cows roam to seek pasture.

Especially is it so in this case where it is a settled law of the country, and the practice is to allow the people to put their cattle out to graze and roam around. Horses and cattle are let out in the summer time, and sometimes they don't get back till the fall. The people have nowhere to send them, and they simply roam around at random. Now, if you are drawing up an Act of this kind, we will have to remember that point. Under the old contract, the Reid Newfoundland Company were bound to keep cattle guards, and good ones to keep out the cattle at public crossings, but now it is not so. There is no obligation whatever on the part of the Railway Commission to have proper cattle guards to keep cattle off the railroad. If there was some obligation on their part, it might ease it up a bit. If you are obliged to make cattle guards where the road crosses the railway track, and if a cow or a horse got on it through a public crossing, you won't pay the owner. Now there are lots of places in the country where there are no fencings at all. It is generally where there is no improved land. It is true that quite a bit of the road from here to Clarenville is fenced, but there is a lot that is not fenced. Possibly there are more cattle killed where there is a fencing than where there is no fencing. If cattle get on a railway track over a public crossing, then the owner of the cattle ought to be compensated if the cattle are killed. At all events, safeguards to prevent the cattle getting on the track should be erected by the railway as to effectually keep them out. The difference is now that under the old contract the Reids had to erect cattle guards, but, under this, there is no obligation whatever to do so, and unless that obligation is there, the railway, bearing in mind that in this country most cattle have to roam, should not make that exception. "If they get on the track through a public crossing, they shall not get any compensation if the animal is killed."

Mr. Chairman, I am going to make another appeal to the Government to cut out that last section. Under the old contract you were bound to make cattle guards and keep cattle out, and it is just as much your duty now to

protect the cattle as it was in that time when the old contract was made. If you won't erect cattle guards to keep cattle off the railway, you should pay for the cattle that get in there and are killed. Under the Railway Contract it is provided that the contractor should fence the line and erect cattle guards to keep cattle off the track. Instead of that, you say "We are not going to put cattle guards there, and, if the cattle get on the track through that crossing which the Reids had to put there and keep in repair, and which we let go to rack and ruin, you won't get paid." I appeal to the Government to take that section out.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, I may say that I don't suppose the Government is very much more concerned over this matter than any member of the Opposition side, but, as regards the principle that is laid down one thing must be borne in mind. There is no analogy between the case of the Government operating the railway, and that of the owner of private property. The law requires that I have got to protect my land as an individual against cattle coming in, and I have got to provide a good and sufficient fence. That is to protect my property against any damages done by cattle, and, if the cattle do come in and they do damage my property, in order to recover damages, I have got to show that I have a good and sufficient fence. The honourable member must see that the case of the railway is not the same. This is a case where the railway is being operated by the people, and we have to look at it from the standpoint of the people of Newfoundland, and we say that we are not bothered whether cattle come in on the track; we are not concerned; as we say to the people who own these cattle, if you let cattle come in on the track, you do it at your own peril. Our only liability is when it can be shown that there was carelessness or neglect on the part of the driver of the engine. It surely couldn't be intended that cattle should have the "right of way."

That is quite a different position from that of a private owner. If Jones' horse comes in on his land, he can't recover damages. I have no more feeling than any member of the Opposition about the section being in or out. But I say it is decidedly different from the position the hon. member cites. You might say that we are the same as any other landowner if it was a question of land, but here a man's horse comes on the track, and that is quite different. I am just giving my views. But the position raised is not the same.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, I quite agree that they are not analogous. The only reason I talked about fences was to raise the principle that under our law cattle are allowed to roam. That is all I meant when I drew attention to the Law of England and that of Newfoundland. In this country it is accepted that cattle are all wed to roam.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, in making a contract with a private corporation the Government of that day saw fit to put in a proviso obliging the Railway Company to fence the track. Now we are in the same position as the Reid Nfld. Co., and it seems very unfair to me that clauses that were in the old contract to make it possible to get compensation are now left out. It seems very unfair. What is the good of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines trying to encourage agriculture and raise cattle, when the railway destroys them as fast as the farmers get them. The principle I want to stress is that if it was fair under the Railway Act why is it not now?

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—Mr. Chairman, the subject has been a very vexed one as long as

I can remember. I think when I first went into the Agriculture and Mines Office in 1919, these claims for cattle were handled by the Agriculture and Mines Department. That is not so to-day, nor has it been for some time.

Then there was a lot of discussion among farmers about cattle claims a matter of chance and influence with the powers that be. Some got compensation and others not. When I went in in 1924 I found that the matter of claims had been taken over by the Railway, and of course the Agriculture and Mines Dept. have nothing to do with them. I want to support the stand taken by the members from Fortune and Trinity; I can't see for the life of me why it is necessary to have what was in the contract with the R. N. Co. taken out —it was found necessary then to safeguard property of the public. If we are not going to permanently hold on to the Railway I think we are setting a bad precedent if we do this. If we come in here and make a contract with a private corporation it is reasonable that they ask for the same terms. Now is the proper time. If cattle are killed through no fault of the owners they should be compensated. Only a year ago one of my constituents had an animal killed at Long Harbour.

He applied for compensation, and supported it by an affidavit, but could get no compensation. I remember an animal killed. It got on the trestle, and couldn't get off—the train stopped before it hit it, but when they got to the cow they found it had strangled itself. I think the committee should give this consideration and not depart from the old system.

MR. W. BROWNE—Mr. Chairman, might I point out that Sec. 13 seems very generous, because it says that where cattle are killed the Government are liable. (Reads). Thus a man has a prima facie case for compensation, but further provisions seem to restrict it until there is only one possible way of getting compensation. For example Sec. 15 says:

(Reads)

Well, is there any other way it can get in except by burrowing? That seems to cover any possible case which the Government may have. Sec. 13 is negatived by Sec. 14. I am thinking of the farmers of Kilbride and of the Goulds, who are not the kind of people who are going deliberately to injure themselves and wait months for compensation, and then possibly incur a law-suit. But they let their cattle graze, and it is quite possible that they graze along by the side of the railway. There are no gates, and it might almost be said that the railway are inviting them on, and as the Minister of Agriculture and Mines has pointed out, suppose an animal goes on there, surely there ought to be some protection, as there has been in the past. Under this the only way the Government can become liable is for the cattle to become moles.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, the member for St. John's West has called attention to a section that passed before I came into the House:

(Reads Sec. 13)

Of course that settles the whole thing—didn't notice that. There is no chance at all of compensation. Cattle don't get out surreptitiously, or by accident. I am speaking not because my own district is affected, but because I have lively memories of the time I represented Port-de-Grave, and anyone who has motored over Harbor Grace way will remember having seen herds of ponies grazing. That is so because while they are used in winter to haul wood, their owners cannot afford to keep them in in summer, when they can roam and graze free, so they turn them loose. If they do that they can't obtain compensation, even if killed within a mile of the village.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee rise and report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. Speaker left 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 the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 181 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Harbour Master and Harbour Regulations for the port of St. John's.'"

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 the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 25 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of Light Dues."

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 the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 40 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of the Board of Health, Health Officers and Quarantine."

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 the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to relieve ships from payment of water rates in certain cases."

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 United Church Incorporation Bill.

HON. SIR JOHN CROSBIE—The necessity for this Bill arises out of

the recent fusion in Canada of the Methodist Church with certain sections of the Presbyterian and Congregational Churches. For many years the Methodist Church in Newfoundland has been part and parcel of the Methodist Church in Canada. By an Act of the Federal Legislature of Canada in 1924 the Methodist Church was merged in the United Church of Canada, and as far as matters spiritual are concerned the Methodist Church in Newfoundland is now a part of the United Church of Canada, with the full consent and approbation of the Newfoundland Church authorities and membership. The basis of Union dealing with this side of the subject forms a schedule to this Bill, and is to be ratified by the Act. It is necessary also that the properties now and heretofore held by the Methodist Church should be formally vested in the United Church of Canada, and a large part of the Act provides for this. It is also necessary in connection with our educational system that the United Church be substituted for the Methodist Church and that any grants to which Methodists have been entitled shall now be made to the United Church.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—I have much pleasure in giving my support to this bill. The subject of this bill has been outlined by the Minister of Finance. The Methodist Church of Newfoundland is under the jurisdiction of Canada. In Canada there are so many Methodist, Presbyterians and other Churches throughout the small settlements the United Church was adopted to give better schools and have the cost of Churches reduced in the different towns and settlements. I beg to support this bill now and I will have a little more to say when the bill goes into Committee.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the United Church of Canada" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

With unanimous consent, and 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 Respecting the United Church of Canada."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that as this Bill respecting the United Church of Canada only concerns the Methodist poeple and might not be very interesting to the House, it go through without being read. The Bill contains the Doctrine, Policy and Creed of the Church. The Church needs to be incorporated and they must possess properties and deal in same, also money matters.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Chairman, in giving my support to the Bill I would like to say that so far as some of us are concerned we are glad to find that there are some things on which certain people can unite. I certainly must compliment the Minister in charge of the Bill and those associated with him on the businesslike manner in which they were responsible for putting this Bill through the House to-night. I rest myself content upon one thing to night, and that is upon the judgment of the honourable member for Carbonear. I place more reliance upon the acceptance of this Bill from him than any other member of the 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 without amendment.

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 United Church of Canada" 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 provsiions.

Second Reading of Bill "An Act to confirm an agreement between the Government and the Newfoundland Cold Storage Fresh Fish Corporation."

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this bill I might say that this matter was already thrashed out in the form of Resolutions, and as the people interested are anxious to get the title confirmed as soon as possible I would ask the indulgence of the House for their unanimous consent to put this Bill through all its stages to-night.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the Bill entitled "An Act to Confirm an Agreement between the Government of Newfoundland and the Newfoundland Cold Storage Fresh Fish Corporation, Limited," was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

With unanimous consent, 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 an Agreement between the Government of Newfoundland and the Newfoundland Cold Storage Fresh Fish Corporation, 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. 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 to Confirm an Agreement between the Government of Newfoundland and the Newfoundland Cold Storage Fresh Fish Corporation, 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.

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.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, when the House was last in Committee on Supply I intimated that I had a few observations to make with regard to the Agriculture and Mines Department. What I have to say to-night is not so much for the edification of the Minister, but rather is it meant for the Executive Government. It will be remembered that earlier in the session I presented a petition from every man, with the exception of two, in Bay D'Espoir with regard to the timber industry there, and this petition really followed a letter which I wrote to the Colonial Secretary pointing out the conditions that existed in that locality. The Colonial Secretary referred the matter to the Department of Agriculture and Mines, and the Minister of that Department was good enough to have a talk with me about the affair and later sent Mr. Thistle of that Department to Bay D'Espoir to investigate and make a report on conditions there. Bay D'Espoir supplies pretty well all the wood and all

the timber that is required on the South West Coast to people from Burin to Port aux Basques. That part of the country in Fortune Bay is well wooded and it has been proved that the timber there grows quicker than it does in any other part of the country. But the timber properties in Bay D'Espoir were never developed until Mr. John E. Lake went up there some years ago. Mr. Lake was astute enough to see at the time that a day would come when that sction would be the only spot on the whole South West Coast worth while, and he took over a block of land there in the name of his son, Freeman Lake. By some mistake he was given a portion of the three mile limit in the grant. Under the Crown Lands Act there is a heavy penalty provided for cutting timber upon the three mile limit. When John E. Lake went into insolvency a few years ago the people depending upon him in Bay D'Espoir became destitute, and other mill owners stepped in. Unless something is done by the Government to have those licenses recalled the result is bound to be very serious. Father St. Croix started a parish mill at St. Alban's for his people there, and that mill was doing very well until finally it was burnt. Then two brothers named Roberts started a mill at Head of Bay D'Espoir and two others named Kendall started a mill at Conne River, now called Morrisville. The lumbering industry down there then became a settled one and grew to considerable proportions. When some of the men down there resorted to cutting wood upon the three mile limit portion that had been granted to Freeman Lake I found it impossible to convince them that the Government was within their right in granting that land on the 3-mile limit and that they could not cut from it. Lake became insolvent and had to close down for about two years, and all those people who depended entirely on lumbering for a livelihood were thrown into a state of destitution. When I say that lumbering industry down there had grown to considerable proportions I meant that. They not only saw lumber there, but build big vessels and do other wood work. There is a vessel being constructed down there now for the Prime Minister's firm. I would not like to embarrass him, but I may say that he is hardly aware that the wood going into that vessel, I am very much afraid is not coming from where it ought to come from. I may say too that they build vessels down there that are exceptionally good. Since John E. Lake died the estate of J. E. Lake has been carrying on the mill on the three mile limit, and they handed it over to a limited liability company of which Freeman Lake owned nine-tenths of the shares. He has a legal but not a moral right to the holding of that land. The law is that you cannot cut wood on the three mile limit if you have a grant from the Government to cut elsewhere and he is keeping other limits in reserve. I ask the Government to take steps to get back some of that timber that is there. Mr. Crowe has an option for a lease on those lands, but he is not doing anything with them. I don't want to knock the district, but I don't think there is enough wood up there to warrant the starting of a pulp industry on a large scale, and with the water power up there some other industry would have to be attempted to help out. The Government may perhaps say that it would be an extraordinary or unusual thing for them to take back timber lands they have granted to other people, but I want to point out that while it may appear so on the surface it is not entirely without precedent. If the Highroads Commission requires land for its own use that is for the use of the public it has the power to come in and take the land of a private individual granted by the Government. Similar pow-

ers are given to the Railway Commission. The Government may recall a lease.

I have been corresponding with the Government about this matter and have sent a statement to the Prime Minister and to the Colonial Secretary, by Mr. Kendall, Justice of the Peace down there. Mr. Thistle has reported for the Agriculture and Mines on conditions down there and he agrees with me as to the seriousness of the situation. He is also of my opinion as to what should be done. Lake has not complied with all the conditions that he should comply with according to the lease, and the Government could act on that, or could force him to surrender the lease by reason of the penalties due which make a large amount, possibly too large to pay. It may be asked why did I not take up this matter myself when I was in the Government. When I was Minister of Justice and Lake was about to take action against these people, I told him that if an amicable settlement could not become to, I would take action against him for the cancellation of the lease altogether. But I ceased to be Minister of Justice before I could carry out my threat, and Mr. Lake went on, as I have already told the House, and made those people pay damages. I then wrote the Minister of Agriculture and Mines about a year ago and asked him to give Mr. Kendall permission to use his name and to take action against Lake for the cancelling of the license under the Act. It is only the Minister that can take action against a licensee for not carrying it out. The Minister did not reply to my letter, but I had a talk with him afterwards and there the matter dropped, and I want to impress on the Government that the matter is a serious one. No one who does not live up there can have any idea of what is going to happen to these people if their means of livelihood is taken from them. They are scattered all around Bay D'Espoir, and they depend on the cutting of timber for a livelihood. These men go to Roberts and Kendell and ask for supplies to go in and cut timber, and they also ask him for work in the mill. Now if he is against giving out supplies, they had to stand around and look at the timber that would give them a livelihood and which they are not allowed to cut, because it is held by somebody else for speculative purposes. I would not be a bit surprised if them men who see their children in want and destitution, and that timber there kept by some speculator, I would not be a bit surprised if one day the whole wood went up in smoke. I don't want to delay the House any more. I have no further comment to make on the votes of this department, but I just thought that I would mention this matter now that there were several of the Executive present so that something possibly might be done in th ematter.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—Mr. Chairman, I want to join with the Member for Fortune Bay in expressing my sympathy to the number of his constituents who are affected by the license which was granted Mr. Lake. But it is not today that the damage was done. It was not a year or two years ago. It is unfortunate that the people in the area granted to John E. Lake were not represented by persons who had a knowledge of what was going on, and who were personally interested in the petition that was presented in this House. Now the harm of it all as I see it is that when this petition was presented to the Government of that time, of which there is a record in the Department of Agriculture and Mines shows that that area was granted to John E. Lake by popular request of the people of that district. Unfortunately those two gentlemen who are now most active in trying to have the license cancelled, Mr. Roberts and Mr.

Kendall, their names were amongst the first to appear asking that this area be given to Mr. Lake. I understand that the answer is this that in those days these two men were being employed by Mr. Lake. For that reason they joined in the popular request coming from Bay D'Espoir, to have Mr. Lake be given these areas, because that some one else interested may come in and take these areas, and they would not be operated by those they hoped would operate them. Now as pointed out by the Member for Fortune Bay, morally Mr. Lake has broken the law, but legally he has not. But if you are going to deal with Mr. Lake for breaking his contract in not having erected a mill, there is no reason why you should not cancel 90 p.c. of the contracts all over the island. But this is another heritage that has been handed down from a past Government. I certainly don't think whatever the legal aspect may be, whatever justification there may be for the timber limit there, I don't think we should have the three mile limit there or any part of that, and I am told by my Deputy Minister that a considerable portion of the three mile limit is taken up by Mr. Lake. Whether we should be in a position to carry out the recommendations of Mr. Warren is a matter for the Justice Department. But the hon. member will realise that it was only shortly before the House went into session that we had that report from Mr. Thistle I think that something should be done, even if the Government have to give compensation to a certain extent. There are a large number of people in Bay O'Espoir who depend upon this timber for their existence. They are not able to go out and fish as they live away down in the bottom of the bay. It is a great hardship for those people to see their children hungry around them and the gifts of nature right at their doors. I think that Mr. Lake should be compelled to erect a mill there, or steps should be taken to compensate him.

MR. HALFYARD—Can the Minister inform me if he knows what the Executive Government have done to procure a geologist for this country.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE—I am sorry, I have no direct information. I made a strong recommendation to the Government with a view to getting the services of a geologist, and it is in the hands of the Government. Possibly the Prime Minister could tell you further.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—In this matter, I may say that we were in communication with the High Commissioner about it some time ago, and when the Colonial Secretary was in England last year he again took the matter up, but the Minister of Agriculture telegraphed him that he was considering a man from Canada. That man the High Commissioner recommended went to South Africa, and when we found he was not available we again took the matter up, and were in touch with a man who had been with the expedition to Mount Everest, who made application. He was recommended by the High Commissioner and Mr. Davies, and he asked for £1200. That was more than we could afford to pay, and the Government postponed the question because of the salary. His Excellency got a letter from a gentleman who had made a survey of the Falkland Islands—the Governor was interested in these Islands and this gentleman wrote him. He told the Governor that he had given up his position as geologist in the Falkland Islands, and asked if he knew if there was an opportunity for a geologist in Newfoundland. He has the very high degrees, of Doctor of Science of London University, and is a man of about 40 years of age. From his credentials he seemed to be a very capable man. I asked the Governor to enquire if his man was

prepared to accept £700, and he replied that he would take £700 if we could assure him the same pension conditions as existing in the Falkland Islands. They are very much smaller there than here. I mentioned this matter in connection with the Civil Service Bill. In the meantime the gentleman who had mounted Mount Everest as the geological expert telegraphed that if £1200 was too high he was prepared to take less. We replied that we were in communication with a man for £700, and he came back with the answer that if we didn't get the other man he would come at that figure. I didn't think very much of a man who would come down in that way, and without knowing either, favoured the Falkland Island man. That is as far as it has gone.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—It is absolutely impossible to do anything of that nature with a vote of twenty thousand dollars. I do not want to misinform the House or any member in it, but the truth is that without a very large increase in the present vote you cannot attempt to make any distribution of seed potatoes and unfortunately my experience has been that a very small percentage of the potatoes sent out in this way finds its way into the ground as seed.

MR. BROWN—I believe that there has also been a request from the district of Harbour Main. I am almost sure that the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs will see that some goes out, and that he will see that some goes out to the district of Twillingate. I am sure that the residents of these two loyal old districts will see that the work is done and that the roads in these two districts will be better than ever they were before.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—I have no knowledge whatever of any application received for seed potatoes from the district of Harbour Main. I would not be surprised if some people did try to get some new seed, not that we are short of seed potatoes, but in my opinion it is absolutely necessary to renew the stock. Anybody who knows anything about potatoes and seeds will agree with me that the old seed is all played out, and it is now necessary to improve the quality. I know that this is correct to a certain extent in Harbour Main. I think that there have been some new seeds imported by Knowlings. English seed and Scotch. I do not believe in importing English seed. I think that it is better to go to Prince Edward Island or New Brunswick or some of the provinces up there. You can get the Prince Williams, and the Early Rose, and the Scotch Apples, and they are all very good potatoes. I have seen some good potatoes in Bonavista Bay as good potatoes as anywhere else in the country. Every eight or ten years the seed needs to be renewed, and I hope that the Minister of Agriculture and Mines will take the matter up. I will vote for the money. The best scientific men in the world come from England. I don't know about their geologists, but I know that they have the best theologists, but I do not know about their seed potatoes. However, I hope that the Minister of Agriculture and Mines will be able to import some new seed into the country.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—Whilst we are on this matter I would like for the information of the committee to express my disappointment that there has not been more production so far as local potatoes are concerned. In 1923-24, according to my speech delivered last year there were 141,881 bushels of potatoes imported at a cost of $87,-881.00. In 1925-26 the number has risen to 227,137 bushels imported at a cost of $105,898. That is very disappointing in my opinion. It is time to buck up and look at the facts hon-

estly and sincerely and endeavour to do something to increase production. Now take the case of the South Coast between Port-aux-Basques and Placentia, they imported last year 134,685 bushels costing $57,789.00. I was going to say that the reply that you get from the farmers in the Codroy Valley when you speak to them about this is "What is the use?" "What good is it to get increased production if we cannot get the markets." A little while ago I had Mr. Bayly send out some circular letters to the principal men, clergymen, etc., and the prominent farmers inviting suggestions from them with regard to the matter I have referred to. We got very few replies and it is very discouraging when one is trying to better conditions regarding agriculture.

They may be able to find sufficient money to put the roads in good condition. That would be a matter for Mr. Bailey. But what we have got to do if we want to try and get the local dealers to handle the local article, we have to encourage the farmer to increase production, and to do that we have got to give them a reasonable guarantee so that we won't find the island potato getting into the market that our own farmer was growing his potatoes for, and with the result that he will have his stock left on his hands. Of course that is a matter that will have to be marked out. Then again you will have to see to it that the local farmer is prepared to buy sufficient for local consumption. If necessary you would have to increase the tariff on the imported article. I agree with the suggestion of the Hon. Member for Trinity that the potato should be standardised. I have seen lots of cases where the potato is falling all over the cart, and in the one barrel you find dozens of potatoes the size of your fist, half the size of pebbles and others the size of marbles. We will have to standardise the potato so that only the good article will be allowed to come in. But this takes time and money. The committee must remember that the Department to-day has one third of the vote that it had ten or fifteen years ago, and then it had the services of two or three commissioners. We have no commissioner, and Mr. Bailey is doing all the work of the Department. If we are going to make an honest attempt, I think that it is worth while to consider the situation, that there were 189,000 bushels of potatoes imported from Prince Edward Island last year, when as everyone knows that we should be able to grow sufficient potatoes for our own local consumption.

MR. BROWNE—Mr. Chairman, when I was an undergraduate at the University of Toronto I spent several years in the study of geology. There I met a number of men who were doing the same course, and I know that the Canadian Universities produced many fine men. Now the course of engineering that a man gets in Canada is much more practical than is given in England, because the course of study is about five or six months, and then he spends the balance of the year in the field. So I think that a Canadian would be more suitable for Newfoundland than a man from England. England does not offer the same opportunity for a geologist as Canada does. You can't get a suitable man from England unless you get one who has been abroad and had experience in other countries. On the other hand the Canadian spends most of his time out in the open and has a wide field for research. I feel sure that out of the thousands of men who graduate from the Universities of Canada it would be an easy matter to get a man with good qualifications. Professor Coleman, in charge of the Department of Geology at the University of Toronto, is a man of world wide experience. I feel sure that if

we asked him he could recommend us a suitable man. I know also that the geologists of Canada have recently succeeded in discovering several gold mines in Ontario and Quebec. I don't think that the Government need go any further afield in search of a geologist than our neighbouring dominion.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman, in backing up the remarks of Mr. Browne, the member for St. John's with conditions over here, than possibly the Government might not be amiss in getting in touch with Professor Coleman, whom the hon. member mentioned a few moments ago. He has travelled the Labrador to a considerable extent. I studied geology under him, and I think that he might be able to get a man in Canada that might be more suitable to Newfoundland, and one more conversant with conditions over here, than possibly anyone from the other side. While listening to the remarks of the member for St. John's the thought occurred to me that it might be possible to get a man who has some experience with forestry. Because as we are situated here in Newfoundland we may need our timber in the coming years, and I think that the question of re-afforestation is one which should occupy the attention of the Government, as the matter of the wholesale destruction of our forests should only be contemplated when we are taking ample means and anxious to see that other forests are growing up in their stead. I think that matter should have the attention of the Government. It was very interesting here to-night to listen to the remarks about potatoes and other agricultural products. I believe that Newfoundland should focus some of its attention upon agricultural products. Perhaps we are too dependent upon the fishery today, and if some of the people who prosecute the fishery were to devote some of their attention to agricultural products it might be of great benefit to Newfoundland. I think that here in Newfoundland we should be able to grow sufficient potatoes to satisfy our own local requirements. I hope that the Government will give this matter the consideration that it deserves.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Chairman, it was only a few weeks ago that the estimates were tabled in this House and this is the first opportunity that I have got to ask that a vote be put into these estimates for the protection of the islands in the district of Twillingate. I don't know if this will be done. But this is a question that should be given consideration. This is practically the only place in the district where any timber can be got for building purposes. The islands have been reserved and all kinds of cutting is going on out there. They have little regard for anything. I took the matter up with the Minister of Agriculture and Mines some time ago and I also forwarded him letters that I have received from people residing there asking that the islands be protected. And in order to keep men from slaughtering the timber a man should be appointed to visit these islands at least once or twice a week and see that there is no timber cut except that for building purposes or the fishery purposes. Now I am not sure whether the Minister of Finance is acquainted with all the facts concerning this, but of this I am sure that his late father in law was a man who was advocating the protection of these islands for fishery purposes, and I feel sure that the Hon. Minister of Finance is going to give support to the suggestion that I now make. I ask that a vote of 780 dollars be put in these estimates. This money is to pay the salary of a man who will provide a motor boat and go around these islands and watch them, and to see that there is no cutting of timber only for building purposes. Only a week ago I received a letter from Ex-

ploits in that district asking me to see that these islands will be reserved. I forwarded that letter to the Minister, and Saturday I received two more letters in connection with the reservation of these islands. I ask the Minister of Finance to give me his support to see that that vote is put in the estimates, and a man appointed to do this work.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—With regard to the matter of getting a geologist the Government got in touch with a Mr. Odell, who is a very high class man, but it developed that he could only make his services available for a year, and that would only be time to come down and find the way around. I thought he would not be suitable on that account and that we would want to get a man who would come for a five years term at least. I would certainly strongly recommend resuming negotiations with Mr. Burrows, the Chief of Staff of the Geological Department at Toronto if the other negotiations don't come out alright. He would certainly be a man who would have the confidence of the public and give good service. We will have to get a geologist here if we want to interest any outsiders in coming in and investigating our mining interests. It is the only possible way, as without that, and as it is at present a person can't get the information that he wants. A proper geological survey is certainly required, and until we get such it is futile to expect to do anything with regard to mineral production.

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.

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council requesting that body to correct an error in the Bill sent up entitled "An Act Further to Amend Capt. 35 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Postal and Telegraph Services, and the Amending Act 11, Geo. V. Cap. 37 (1920)," the error being the words Post Master General, instead of Minister of Posts and Telegraphs."

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, May 11, 1926.

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

Mr. Cashin gave notice of question.

Mr. Brown gave notice of question.

Mr. Scammell gave notice of question.

Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 22 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Customs.'"

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—$109,160.66.

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.

(1) MR. CASHIN asked the Minister of Agriculture and Mines to lay on the Table of the House the following information: (1) What quantity

of eel grass was shipped from this Colony last year; (2) From what part of the Colony was it taken; (3) To what part of the world was it exported; (4) What was the gross cost of each shipment; (5) What were the gross returns and the net balance to the Colony; (6) If it is the intention of the Government to develop the industry the coming year; and if so what vote is to be taken in the Estimates for defraying the expenses of the industry.

(2) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister: (1) What is the total amount spent on the Dock to date; (2) What are the reasons for the excess expenditure.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—I beg to table information as required by sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. With regard to section 6, I would like to point out that the investigation of the matter has been purely experimental as far as the Government is concerned. Last year the Government wished to endeavour to find out once and for all, if it was possible to develop an industry regarding eel grass, and secured the services of Mr. Downey who was Head of the Department before I went there. Through his efforts the matter was brought to the attention of manufacturers on the other side and a considerable number of packages of samples were sent over for exhibition.

I have not had the opportunity of consulting with the Prime Minister, but I do not think that it is the desire of the Government to further develop the industry in any way, neither do I think it advisable that the Government should embark on this as a project. We have endeavoured merely to find out if there is a possibility of an industry, and I am glad to say that there are great possibilities. From communication with the Board of Trade on the matter, I understand that it is their intention to form a small local company and I have an idea that Mr. Downey will be engaged by that Company.

No. 2.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — I beg to table the answer.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I beg to table reply to question of April 6, No. 10.

MR. CASHIN—With regard to my question, No. 2 of April 30, I do not seem to have got full information from the Minister of Finance. I want to know whether duty was paid or not.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I will ask for any further information and supply it.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Immigration" 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 to Amend Chapter 181 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Harbor Master and Harbour Regulations for the Port of St. John's'" 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 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 Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 40 of the Consolidated Stateutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Board of Health, Health Officers and Quarantine'" 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 to Amend Chapter 40 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Board of Health, Health Officers and Quarantine'" 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 to Relieve Ships from Payment of Water Rates in Certain Cases" 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 Counvil 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 Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, I understand that the new public building at Corner Brook is finished and in use, and that the Caretaker of it gets $825.50 per year salary. I am also informed that the man appointed for the job by the Government is a Canadian and not a returned soldier either, and that a Newfoundland who is a returned soldier was turned down.

MR. POWER—That man was engaged by the W. I. Bishop Company at construction work, and he is only acting caretaker of that building.

MR. WARREN—Even so, I think there should be a returned Newfoundland soldier put in that job, and I think the sooner the Government appoint one in place of that Canadian the better.

MR. DUFF—Mr. Chairman, I would like to mention that it is down here in the Estimates in black and white that the Keeper of the Carbonear building gets $225; the Keeper of the Bay Roberts building gets $650, and the Keeper at Corner Brook building $825.50. Now on the face of it that seems ridiculous. I think that to pay a keeper of a building $825.50 a year, or about as much as three fishermen earn, and just for sweeping up and looking after the furnace is altogether a waste of money, and I think the Government should cut it out. Then again why should the Keeper at Corner Brook get nearly four times as much as the Keeper at Carbonear? I understood you were going to clean up and keep clean. Instead of that they are allowing people to get money which I consider is pure graft and I object to it.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I quite agree with the remarks of the honourable member for Carbonear to a certain extent. In every case where a new appointment is made it is always an extra emolument whereas the old officials have to submit to the same amount of salaries that they have been getting for years, so that the tendency has been and is, so far

as the present Government is concerned to increase expenditure.

MR. POWER—Mr. Chairman, I think that there is a marked difference between the duties of the Caretaker at Corner Brook and of the Caretaker at Carbonear. The man at Corner Brook is at his post day and night and the amount he receives is anything but too large for him; but the same cannot be said of the man at Carbonear.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, I notice here in the Estimates that the salaries for the Keepers of the buildings at Corner Brook and Grand Falls are alike. As a matter of fact I understand their salaries are under different circumstances, as the man at Grand Falls is provided with a house, whereas the man at Corner Brook is not. There is another inequality.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the remarks of Mr. Duff and Mr. Halfyard the explanation is that the heating apparatus at Grand Falls, Corner Brook and the Normal School require full-fledged engineers, and that is what makes the difference in the salaries and the cost of the upkeep of those buildings. In Carbonear building there is only a small furnace used and the keeper there has not got to assume the same responsibility as the men at the other places.

MR. K. BROWN—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that I do know something about the duties of the Caretaker at Grand Falls, and I will oppose a cut in his wages to the last ditch. The man who is Keeper at the public building at Grand Falls is a man who was in France fighting for you and I, Mr. Chairman, and for the good of this country. He is a wounded man, is not able to do any heavy work now, and he attends to his duties as faithfully as he knows how. He has long hours and very often, it is a disgrace to know, he and his family have to live amongst prisoners and insane people. The prison cells are next to the man's kitchen and I think that the Supreme Court Judges on circuit recommended an improvement in conditions for this Caretaker. Mr. Duff has a perfect right to recommend an increase or a decrease in wages for men in his district, and I have a perfect right to do the same so far as my district is concerned, and I strongly object to a reduction in the salary of the Caretaker at Grand Falls.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that whilst the whole Estimates may not show a great many changes over last year's, still there is a lot of enlightening that could be done in regard to the conduct of affairs of the Public Works Department. When we talk about economy in this House is it for stage effect alone or are we going to get down to business properly? In reply to a question which I tabled some time ago asking for a list of prices that were submitted from practically every grocer and commission merchant in the city I got some interesting information showing how thousands of dollars worth of goods were purchased for the department from people who have not got places of business at all. They do not sell anything, but merely through political pull they order for the department and get liberal commission. Some of these people have been known to prostitute their position on the Board in order to buy for the department and the people of the country have to pay for it. Mr. James Gould was one of these gentlemen and there are others. What is the use of spending money on advertising and asking for tenders when the whole thing is pre-arranged and the tenders are not acted upon. There have been tenders received in the department for several months, and there has not been a meeting of the Board since Jan-

uary last. If that is the case what is the use of calling for tenders and what is the use of having a Board? Why not wipe out the Board and save $1500 in salaries alone? How can the Board function when it does not meet. Now it is just as well for us to understand one another, I claim that the Board of Works threw away $50,000 last year. $10,000 was thrown away on coal contracts and $20,000 on groceries and provisions, and still members are prepared to come in here and talk economy. If we are prepared to talk that way in view of what is going on in that department then we are all hypocrites. Is it politics or is it the business of the country that is being conducted, I ask, Mr. Chairman? Why, there is a man working in that department who is paid for driving a motor car belonging to other people, and who is paid a salary out of the department as well. Take the man who was employed in the public building at Corner Brook. He is not belonging to this country and he was appointed by W. I. Bishop. What right has Bishop to appoint him? I protest against people coming in here and holding up their hands and saying they are economizing. I will go further, Mr. Chairman, and say that the Department of Public Works lost last year $100,000 through gross mismanagement, and through catering to political heelers. This is the second greatest spending department in the public service. The supplying of every public institution comes under its control. We talk about raising salaries. There is an aggregation of people who come under this department, and who are paid nothing in comparison to what they can earn elsewhere. I refer to the Nurses at the General Hospital. Just imagine pianos for the General Hospital, and some of the poor patients there have died owing to the lack of up-to-date equipment. The Minister purchased a piano for the nurses, he says, but I think the nurses would better appreciate an increase to their salaries. The new piano that was put in there cost $1,000 and the chances are it is not as good as the one that was removed. The Prime Minister said in the opening part of the session that the Department of Public Works was run most efficiently and that meetings were held regularly by the Board. Of course his reason for saying that is because he is a member of the Board. To-day he has talked about main line grants. It has been notable in the past, that years ago the main line grants were sent out in May, but this session they have not been voted yet. I understand that they are to be passed in a day or two. The people will be going fishing in a few weeks and the road work will be gone. There is no economy here, and there is no attempt at economy on the part of the Government in any direction, not alone in the Department of Public Works. We have a Railway Board in here now to take it out of the control of the Legislature. I would like for the Minister to tell me why the lowest tenders are not accepted. Is it, sir, because the parties with the lowest tender are politically opposed to the Government that you don't accept their tenders. Now, Sir, I am going to show you where the Government threw away $10,000 deliberately. If I am not right I will take it all back. You advertised for coal of a certain quality. Now did the coal that Besco tendered have that analysis. No it did not. You asked for ash not over six per cent. The coal that Besco tendered contained from 7½ to 8½. You asked for sulphur not over 2 per cent. Besco was from 2½ to 3. It does not come up to specifications. Now Besco's tender was not the lowest. You take the American coal that was tendered at $5.64 and take Besco at $5.65. Then you have to discharge that at the rate

of 700 tons a day. The other discharges at 600 tons a day. There is a difference of five cents a ton. Take a vessel coming in with 3,000 tons of coal, discharging at the rate of 600 tons a day, it would take five days. At 700 tons it would only take four days. Now take the duty and the sales tax which the railway has to pay on that coal. That is five per cent. on the invoice cost. On the American coal that would come to $1.75. You are paying twenty three cents a ton on Besco and ten cents on the American coal. Making it all up it comes to eighteen cents, and that multiplied by 60,000 tons comes to $12,000. Is that economy? Or is it the fact the Government wanted to give Besco something, and that was the first opportunity they had to do it. The same thing applied last year with the institution that is under discussion now. They went down and they gave away ten thousand, and they will do it again this year. They did not do it the year previous when the boot was on the other foot. They then gave it to the lowest tender, and I claim right here now that it is time to cry halt. There is nothing, Mr. Chairman, that the present Government have done properly or right. It makes no matter what side you are on, or whether you are the bitterest opponent of the Government, if you are the lowest tender you should get the business and if not you should not get it. That is the proper method and until we get that we will never hvae economy in the public service. You buy goods from people who have no stores. Now I would like to hear the Minister explain to me why things are not done in a business like manner.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS— Mr. Chairman, I think it is only fair to myself as Head of the Department of Public Works and the Board of Works to refute in a general way some of the statements made by Mr. Cashin. I want to say first that the Department of Public Works is run as economically as any department in the Public Service. I want to go further and say that the Department of Public Works to-day in my opinion is run on lines of economy as much as the Department was ever run under any Government since it became a department. Very often in that Department we have got in wrong with those whom we have purchased goods from, because we refused the goods, or objected to the prices which they wanted for the goods. There is scarcely a week passes but we send back bills to the grocers, dry goods men and others whom we claim were charging too much for the goods they supplied, and we demanded that they reduce these prices down to the proper market rates before we would pay those bills. So far as tenders are concerned, I want to say that when we send out tenders like any other business concern calling for tenders, the lowest or any tender is not necessarily accepted. There is a reason for that, as Mr. Cashin will know. It is not always proper and right to accept the lowest tender. There are other considerations besides the low cost. You must consider the ability of the person to perform the contract into which he was about to enter, and to do the work satisfactorily that he has tendered for. Consequently the lowest tender is not always accepted, but as a matter of fact the Board of Works make it a practice, other things being equal to accept the lowest tender. Sometime in November or December last I decided, wtih the advice of the Board, to call for tenders for groceries and provisions. There were seven or eight tenders sent in, and after making an investigation we discovered that the prices being quoted for the past twelve months or six months in the open market at the lowest market rates, we had been doing just as well, and we had been

cutting our prices just as fine as the quotations on these tenders, and then we decided to continue the present system of buying from man to man in the open market at the lowest market prices. One man's name has been mentioned by Mr. Cashin. I do not know why he did not mention others in other lines. As a matter of fact I may tell the House that last year we saved and had a balance of $35,000, so that of the amount voted during the year we saved about that much. Reference has been made to the matter of payment for nurses. The Department of Public Works has nothing to do with that matter. The Internal Operation of the General Hospital is under the Board of Governors, therefore, they have all to do with the payment of nurses and other internal matters. The Department of Public Works is simply used for the purpose of making these payments. Reference has been made to pianos. I don't think it would be a very popular thing in this House or out of it to deny to that self-sacrificing class of humanity the use of the piano costing $275.00 and not $875.00. As a matter of fact the piano that was there before in place of the one that is there now came from Government House some years ago, and when they put it in it could not be used. It is an old table piano with its back broken. Something better than that should be given the nurses. I don't think Mr. Cashin himself really means what he says, and that we should deny giving to the nurses of the General Hospital the use of a decent piano to amuse themselves when they are off duty. I don't know that I can say any more than I have said. So far as using one of my clerks in connection with my motor car, that is easily explained. I have been using a tin lizzy for about two or three years, and last year I got an up-to-date car. As everyone knows there is a difference in the driving. Now one of the young clerks in the office could drive my car, and for some little while I took him out for a couple of hours a day to teach me to drive. In the meantime his work was not in the least effected. He did everything that he was required to do, and did not get any extra salary for being with me and teaching me to drive. As I said in the beginning, I have no apologies to make for the Department of Board of Works in connection with the consideration of every matter that comes under its notice. We tried to do the best that we could. I know the Board has done it, and I know my Department has done it, and if I produce the deals and the operation of this Board before the House, I think everyone will admit that what I said was correct that the Department of Public Works was never run better.

MR. CASHIN—I appreciate what I heard the Minister say. I appreciate the fact that his Department is run as well as any other department, because I consider that none of the Departments are run properly, but I am glad that he made that remark; because I feel that if the others are not run economically and yours is run just as well, well as ordinary common sense will tell you, we know the result. But it is not what the past Governments have done, it is what the present Government is going to do. Your Government has pledged itself to economy. It is not because past Governments have over-stepped themselves that this Government should come in, and because it is reducing expenditure in one direction or another, think that it is doing its duty. I was not connected with the past Government personally. I criticise all Governments, but I claim that if you make certain promises you should carry them out, and run all the Departments on a sound economical basis. I claim that the Departments are not run on a sound econo-

mical basis. As far as the Board of Works is concerned the criticism of that will be very mild, because they meet so seldom that they are not doing much harm, and very little good. However, you have not explained a way the fact why people are selling goods to the Department, and at the same time they have no shops in their own name. I don't think that is good business. The Minister remarked that last year when the grocery bills came in the prices looked too high, and they cut them down and sent them back. Why did he not ask for tenders? No man in this House can get up and tell me that he can't get goods of any description cheaper by calling for tenders than by buying them in the shop. You can't do it. You have not got a man to go into every shop on Water Street and ask the prices and then decide. When they want a certain amount of goods for the General Hospital they get them as quickly as possible. Now I have been informed on reliable authority that any suggestion or remark that I might make in this House that the Government intend to do quite the opposite. But I am sorry that they are so small. I was told even yesterday because I expressed my views on the St. George's Coal Fields that they were not going to consider it at all. Therefore, my seat in this House is all a joke, and any information I might ask for in this Legislature will only be given after a very difficult task. I am sorry for the Government should be such. Now if the Government are so small that because one politically opposed to them they are not going to accept any of the suggestions, well then they are not fit to occupy the offices they have in the light of what they have done and are doing. No man is able to contradict that statement.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, I have listened very attentively, in following up this debate, to the Minister of Public Works, and I don't think that he has very satisfactorily explained his position. He tells us that he can buy goods cheaper in the market than he can by calling for tenders. That seems unreasonable to me. The point was brought up by the Member for Ferryland, who made reference to the purchasing of goods from a man named Gould. But this man Gould has got to buy the goods from somebody else. And certainly whoever he buys the goods from could sell the goods just as cheaply to the Department as they do to him. He sold goods to your department to the value of $18,781. This I think the Minister should further explain. The Minister claims that the Department is being run economically and it is purchasing goods as cheaply as they can be purchased, and in face of that you are paying $18,000 to a man for goods that he has not got to sell, and which he has to buy from somebody else. That is not an explanation at all, I am surprised to hear the Minister give that explanation. Now the Minister of Public Works is very inconsistent, and in the face of that one transaction his explanation is not satisfactory to me.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman, all these votes are practically the same as went through the House last year. We were then called upon to vote $4,000 for the Government House building which included a new lead roof. As far as I can see practically the whole of the $25,000 that was voted last year was spent on these same buildings. Now the same vote is in here again this year, and I don't think that it has been looked into at all. If the Government considers that it is going to cost $25,000 to keep up the public buildings then the whole vote should go in globo, so that the vote could be expended on the public

buildings that call for attention from time to time.

We find that vote in practically the same terms as last year, and I think it necessitates some explanation.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say in reply to the Hon. Member from Twillingate that these amounts are voted every year. And never since I have been in the Government have I known public buildings to be repaired as they ought—they are all dropping down, and the reason for this vote is to assure that absolutely necessary repairs which may be incurred be provided for. I don't think this vote is enough to attempt to properly repair them, but it has to be voted each year to prevent them from dropping down altogether. That is as I understand it from the Deputy Minister of Public Works. If we were to accept the estimates of repairs needed as furnished by Mr. Churchill I don't know where we would be. This is just to keep them in fairly good repair. As far as the roof of the Oil Shed is concerned, I don't think that has been repaired, but we hope to do so this year, and if it is not used it will go to drop balance.

MR. ASHBOURNE—My point is this. That this is exactly the same vote, and there are many buildings of course, such as in the outports, that this does not touch.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—It has been the custom if it is not used it goes to drop balance.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Can you deviate it from one to another if it is needed?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—I think that has been done in the past.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Chairman, my recollection is that this vote for the Oil Store was not used last year because the Government was considering whether it was necessary to put this roof on or not. The Kerosene Oil Store is used very little now, and I don't know that it is advisable to put this on. Since the Imperial Oil Co. have their tanks here this has been used very little, and my recollection is that it wasn't decided whether this would be repaired. As Sir John Crosbie has said, if it is not used it will go to drop balance.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, while we are on this matter of the Oil Store I want to point out that it is not properly situated. If oil is put there it necessitates hauling to and from the store. At the present time the Imperial Oil people have practically a monopoly for the reason that the City Oil Store is not on the water front, where it should be. The Government would have done well if they had considered using the King's Wharf for the erection of an Oil Store instead of leasing it at $200.00 a year. It would be a great benefit to the importers who handle oil to have had a store there, and if there were an Oil Store elsewhere on the waterfront it would be an advantage.

MR. SCAMMELL — Mr. Chairman, while passing the vote for the repair of buildings that come under the Justice Department, I want to refer to the fact that for three sessions I have been advocating the erection of a Court House at Bonne Bay. I understand the plans have been drawn up, and the figures submitted to the Executive Government for their consideration. I feel that this cannot be deferred much longer. It is not a joke. Bonne Bay is one of the largest settlements on the West Coast, and from which must radiate much of the order and influence of the section. The old building was destroyed by fire in 1922, and since then the people have been doing the best they could under the circumstances. Now I put this up to the Government as reasonable and I think it ought to be one from the standpoint of economy if

nothing else. The Government made something like $2,750.00 from insurance after the fire. I might stand open to correction in that. At present they are renting buildings, and the total rent is over $800.00, and these places are only ramshackle affairs. Now I submit if the Government took the amount which this rental represents, with the amount received for insurance they would be money in. Now I want to know if the Government is going to consider the erection of a Court House at Bonne Bay. It can when erected be used for all public affairs and purposes. Now I have political supporters in Bonne Bay, and some that don't support me or my policies or ideas, but all are one in asking that this building be erected. Put up a Court House, and make provision for a Post Office, and Telegraph Office—put something there that will be an ornament not only to Bonne Bay but to the West Coast. This is about the only thing I have to ask from the Department of Public Works at the present time, and my reason for speaking now is to present the extenuating circumstances, and I hope the Government will have the money voted. That is merely what I rose to say, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to know from the Minister what are the circumstances that make the appointment of an assistant gardener necessary.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—We have quite a little farm there, and not only raise enough for the Asylum, but sometimes sell cabbage and potatoes to other institutions. I don't know how much money they make, but we often buy for other departments from them.

MR. SCAMMELL—I think that it is very interesting to know that there is a farm there that can supply produce to public institutions. I wonder if we can't get a little more information as to what amount is raised, and what is being produced. The public would be interested in knowing this as well, and I would like to know if you have this information.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—I haven't the information now, but I can let you have it later on in the session.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, on this vote for supplies to the Penitentiary, I would like to refer to the rumour that there is considerable venereal diseases prevailing in that institution—I refer to the report that was about some time ago. I don't know if this is getting any degree of attention, but I certainly think that if it is true people ought not to be allowed to spread infection. Are such people being regularly attended? The amount for drugs here is only $120.00, and that is not enough for anything of that sort.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, in reply to that question I would like to say that I quite agree with the remarks of the Hon. Member as to the importance of this matter. There is a physician attending the Penitentiary regularly every week—that is a regular visit, and he reports back to my department. In addition to that he is bound to attend on any case that needs attention. Now as to the matter particularly under discussion. I think I stated to the House before when this matter of veneral diseases was referred to that I had made enquiries. I had the Superintendent to pass the query along to Dr. Keegan, and I can only quote the information given by him, that the report is absolutely without foundation—that is the report I have as to this matter and as to conditions in the Pen. I may say that some time ago the Executive received a petition from a number of ladies on this subject. The Execu-

tive sent it to the Public Health Department for a complete investigation, to find if there was any foundation for the complaint. I can only quote that report from the physician.

MR. CASHIN—I wish to thank the Minister for his information. I was going to make the suggestion that it would be a simple matter for the Board of Health to hold an examination.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I quite agree with that. As a matter of fact only when the point was raised did I realize how severe our Venereal Diseases Act really is. It is very severe and compels the Superintendent of any of these institutions to disclose such a state of things.

MR. CASHIN—The Superintendent may now know. Some people may be afflicted with this and the Superintendnt not know, and they may be getting worse from day to day. I think each one should be examined.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—That is really a matter for the Department of Public Health to which it has been sent for attention.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, while we are on this vote, I think I made a remark a short while ago that nurses in the General Hospital here should be getting more remuneration. I think we will all agree that the work is very arduous—a nurse works for 12 hours a day, or if on night duty, for a 12 hour shift at night. Nurses in Canada and the United States get from $35.00 to $40.00 a week, private nurses here get $25.00 a week. These nurses in the Hospital are getting very small salaries, in comparison with what private nurses and those in Canada and the United States get, and I think both sides of the House will agree that something should be done if it is possible.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE I do not intend to delay the House for very long, but there is a great deal in what Major Cashin says. I had occasion during the last ten days to visit the lunatic asylum, and I must say that it is one institution that is a credit to the Superintendent, Dr. Parsons. I feel safe in saying that at the time of my visit last Sunday there was no place in the institution where I could not sit down on the floor and eat a meal. It was absolutely perfect. And I speak in the highest terms of the work of the nurses and the same can be said of the male department. I found some things in there that possibly the Government may give consideration to in the future and could be changed and make the department much better. I would like every member of this House to pay a visit to the Lunatic Asylum. It would be worth their while, and they owe it to themselves and to the people whom they represent. I agree with what Major Cashin said about the necessity for increase in the nurses' salary. If there is one thing in life that I admire it is the work that the nurses are doing. And possibly the matter of a raise in the nurses' salaries may come before the Government at a later date.

MR. HALFYARD—Referring to the vote for roads and bridges I would like to ask the Government what they propose doing about the vote for Trinity District this year? The Government voted this money last year and it was placed to the credit of the Department of Public Works, and then by the authority of the Governor in Council four thousand dollars of this money was taken and passed over to the Highroads Commission. This happened last year, and you can act just as unjustly and dishonestly again this year. It may be reasonable that you take the main line grants running through sections of Conception Bay districts and give it to the Highroads Commission to do work on the main-

line, but this money was spent on one half mile of road between Shoal Harbour and Clarenville, and the total amount spent was $7,800, and four thousand dollars of this was taken from the vote for Trinity district, their proportional part of the one hundred and fifty thousand dollars. I have received letters from various parts of the districts about bridges that are falling down, and now I am getting a repetition of the same thing, about bridges that are falling into a state of disrepair, and I think that this money that should be used to rebuild the bridges and roads should not be used by the Highroads Commission.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE —I can assure you that the money will not be taken except where the roads go through the south side of Trinity Bay.

MR. HALFYARD—That would be alright if the Highroads Commission goes to work on the roads of the south side of Trinity Bay, but it is not right to place the whole of the main line grant of the district in the hands of the Highroads Commission. It is absolutely necessary that money be spent, and I assure you that money will have to be found to repair the roads and bridges throughout the country. I would like to get an expression of opinion from the Prime Minister as to whether he thinks that that money that was taken from Trinity District last year might not be refunded. The money must be found to repair the bridges and roads.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER— All I can say is that I am at sea with regard to any money being taken, but all I can say is that we will look into the matter and see that the right thing is done.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS— Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to delay the Committee, but while we are on the vote for roads and bridges I would like to make a few remarks. Considerable criticism has been directed against the department all down through the years in connection with the expenditure of money for the repairs of roads and bridges. Whenever you take up a newspaper or any book containing any publication about the repairs to roads or bridges with which the department of Public Works is concerned it is always adverse criticism. The same thing applies to the individual, the man on the street and the member in the House, and now we come to the time of the year when we are passing these votes and when the department of Public Works is accustomed to take the recommendation of the various members, and that they are satisfied to take their share of the responsibility in seeing that this money is properly spent. I suggest also that they should be prepared to take their share of the responsibility as far as the criticism is concerned. I do not believe that all the criticism this department gets is warranted— we are trying to do our best, and I have reason to believe that the money is being fairly well spent, in practically every district throughout the country. We exercise, as far as possible, a sort of supervision, and if, in addition, each member would see that in his district money is properly granted and spent, I believe that a great amount of good would result. But I refuse to accept criticism while members on both sides of the House sit and take it without worrying. The idea some people get from the appointment of road commissions is that practically every cent that goes out of the Public Works Department is thrown away. As a matter of fact we ourselves help that to some extent, because we give the Department of Public Works only $160,000 to spend for every road and bridge throughout the country, and appoint a road commission and give them two millions to dispose of. And there is another

difference in this, that the department of Public Works gets only so much to spend on each portion of the country, in roads and bridges. For example, if we decided to repair a mile of road, we would probably get $100,000 for the whole thing, whether it needed a hundred or a thousand. But the Commission is given two millions, and there is no fixed amount to spend on any place—they can do as they like. But at present where a road should cost $2000.00 we get $200.00, and where it should cost $3000.00 we get $300.00—and what can we expect? Then it is claimed that we are squandering the money! But we cannot blame the public when we are content to belittle ourselves, and to take abuse and say nothing.

I hope Mr. Cashin and Mr. Warren, the leaders of the two Independent parties will not plead "guilty" to any charge of squandering the money for roads in their districts. And I ask the co-operation of the House in seeing that the money is spent to the very best advantage. And when the chance arises to refute the charges made in the Press and elsewhere. And, if you are guilty, to take your medicine and make up your minds to do better!

MR. HALFYARD — Mr. Chairman, on this subject of Ferries, I would like to remind the Minister that I presented a petition some time ago from the people of Britannia, asking that the Ferry service which connects Snook's Hr. and White Rock be extended to Britannia. I presume all the correspondence which passed between the Rev. Mr. Mercer and myself has been forwarded to the Government by the Minister of Public Works, and I would like to know if the Government has come to any decision with regard to granting this petition or not? If the vote has been taken I suppose the amount for this will have to be voted in the additional estimates, and without labouring the matter too much I want to impress on the Government the necessity of having that done—it is time that the people in Trinity District be given some consideration in the matter of transportation. I presume it is not the intention of the Government to give the people of Trinity Bay a steamer this summer, and the least they can do is to spend five or six hundred dollars in giving them a ferry service. But I suppose for the people of Trinity Bay to try to get any satisfaction from the Government, either by writing or speaking in this House, is a waste of time. We are not speaking on the West Indies now, or on China, but about the next door neighbour, to Bonavista District, the district that is getting every attention, while Trinity District is totally neglected.

MR. HIBBS — Mr. Chairman, I should like to refer back to the subject discussed some time ago by the Minister of Public Works. Last year an Act was brought in forming a Highroads Commission, which was modelled after the Canadian Act, with one important exception, that of the Chairmanship. In the Canadian Act the Chairmanship of the Commission was given the Minister of Public Works, and I think he is the proper man. Here it was given a man outside the House, and while I have nothing to say against him, because I think he is a competent man, particularly as regards bridge building, I do say that the Government made a mistake in not making the Minister Chairman of that Commission. In the first place while it is under the Colonial Secretary's Department there is no direct representation in this House, and this commission is spending two millions. The Department of Public Works spends about one million, and you appoint a Commission to spend two millions, and possibly they will be given two more when they spend that. I think the Minister is right when he says we politicians belittle

ourselves. We do it in virtually saying that the Department is not capable of handling this. We have made up a commission of outside men, and who in the House can tell us what the plans for 1926 are. The understanding was first that the Commission would spend a half million and it was stated by the Colonial Secretary, if I mistake not, that they have spent $1,021,000; I understood no roads were to go over a certain amount, and find that twice that was spent. I am speaking in a friendly spirit, and can say that much of the work done is excellent. But I think the Government made a mistake in not bringing out a dozen competent Newfoundlanders, to handle the work. I could find a couple men now who could take the commissioners out for a week or fortnight and teach them something about road-building. It is particularly regrettable that there is no direct representation for that expenditure in this Assembly, and I think the Chairman should be the Minister of Public Works, whoever might be holding that position at the time. If a man goes to the country and is elected as a minister, surely we should have enough confidence in him to place him at the head of the Commission. He would be responsible to this House, and if there is praise or censure he could bear both.

As a matter of fact the Commission spent double what they spent last year. We are aware of the fact that they spent double the amount per mile, than was anticipated. Because they went to work wrong. We have a big road problem in this country, and we will never solve it under the present management unless they shake themselves up. I know that out in Manuels they are building a concrete bridge. Now I would like to see a concrete bridge at Manuels, and I also would like to have a gold watch if I could afford it. I know that in Canada they are building wooden bridges in many of the provinces to-day, not because they are better than concrete bridges, but because the Commission cannot afford the concrete ones for the time being. Now that bridge at Manuels was receiving considerable repair, and it would be able to stand for another ten years. What justification is there for borrowing money to carry out great big propositions, when there is not a quarter enough of money to pay for the high roads or to build bridges. What justification is there to tear down a bridge and build a new one unless you can afford it. Now I do say that before you go ahead with your programme this year you want to put the Minister of Public Works in charge of the roads. I think that the gentlemen on the other side will agree that that is the proper thing to do. Place him in a position to supervise it.

Why, last year the Minister of Public Works himself had to go out and mission himself had to go out and get permission from Mr. Hall to drive over the road. He might be a very good man, but you are giving him too much authority. He knows that he is not responsible to anyone in this House. If he had to give an account of his stewardship on the floor of this House, he might not do what he has done and is doing. Talk about squandering money through the Road Boards, I want to say that the money was never squandered as lavishly as by that Road Commission last year. I admit that the roads were built very well, but when you know what it costs you can't very well praise it. Now I think that the Government made a serious mistake in handling that road.

MR. MOORE—Mr. Chairman, the hon. member seems to have a grouch against Mr. Hall. Now while I am not getting any retainer from Mr. Hall to defend him, yet he must admit that Mr. Hall is the only man in Newfoundland that you can go to to

get advice in regard to bridges and other things in connection with road work. But what I got up to speak about is entirely foreign to what I am talking about. It is in connection with our street lighting in St. John's. I was an eye witness of the case up on Mundy Pond Road, where a horse was electrocuted, and I don't think that it is right for us to allow this Company to go any further without some inspection. That man was paid two hundred dollars afterwards for the loss of his horse. The Company said that 110 volts was not sufficient to kill a man, but it is sufficient to kill a child. And I think that it is my duty to bring this matter up before this House, in order to have inspection and this thing enquired into. If a child had been standing where the horse had been standing the child would have been killed. They don't seem to think anything of it, but they paid the man the money pretty quick to keep hi mfrom talking. I just want to bring this matter to the notice of the Colonial Secretary and the Minister of Justice, to have it attended to. Because it will be too late when there is a child or a man killed, and then it will be a case of locking the stable when the horse is gone.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Chairman, I do not rise now for the purpose of discussing the merits or the demerits of the Road Commission of 1925, but I would like to see the road work discontinued, and the money that is left, $980,000, be distributed among the electoral districts to give employment to-day to the men who are hungry and in despair. Now I am going to ask the Prime Minister, if he is aware of the fact that there are many people to-day looking for employment in this country and they can't get it. I notice in this evening's Telegram where the Colonial Secretary is in receipt of a message from Conception Bay stating that there are 400 men out of employment there. Now what is going to be done about it. This is a very serious problem. We have at least 15,000 people in this country who who don't know where to go to get one hour's work. As far as the Humber is concerned the construction work is practically finished, and they are not going to employ very many more men. Grand Falls is only taking the usual number of men, I don't think that they employ more than fifteen or seventeen hundred a year. Now with the Humber finished and the dock almost finished, and the hotel is just about finished, how are the men going to look for employment. They can't go to the Gander because it is not working, and I would like to be informed what other place can these men go for work? If you spend the money that is left on the roads around Conception Bay what are the men in the north going to do. They also claim a right to the revenue of the country, also to the money that is spent in the country. What are they going to do for employment? Now I want it to be distinctly understood that I don't speak this in the way of criticism. There are fifteen thousand people in this country who don't know where to go to look for employment, and from all you can hear it does not look encouraging for the fishery. I have been told that these men can't get supplies. Then what are they going to do. They might go to Canada or the States, but in many cases they can't get enough money to go there. This is a thing that should concern every member in this House, and I hope to see that some avenue of employment will be given, so that these men can go and earn a livelihood for their wives and families, but at the present time there is absolutely no hope at all for employment.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, I don't think that I should allow the statement of

the hon. member for Fogo to pass without some explanation. He stated in his remarks about the High Roads Commission that it was under the Department of the Colonial Secretary. I want to disabuse the mind of the member on that point. The High Roads Commission is an entirely independent body. The only connection it has with the Colonial Secretary's Department is, as the mouth piece of the Government the Colonial Secretary must occasionally write them expressing the desires and th erulings of the Executive Government. The Act that was passed last year as the hon. member knows, gave the operation of the High Roads into the hands of that Commission, and I don't think that it is fair to the Colonial Secretary that he should be held responsible for the actions of that Commission, over which he has no control. As to the work performed that is a matter of opinion. But I want to make it clear because it may lead to some misunderstanding at some future date, and I think that it is proper that I should let the House know that I am not in control of the High Roads Commission.

MR. HALFYARD—There is a lot of unemployment in this country to-day and the outlook is not so bright as one would desire. The Government of the day is expected to look into the situation and find ways and means to provide employment for the people. Now it has been suggested that the money for the Highroads Commission is going to be spent in the southern districts. I have just heard that. But I think that before all the money has been expended that some of it might be used in the northern districts so as to give the people of these districts an opportunity to earn a livelihood and repair their roads. When criticism was being offered in connection with the spending of the money last year someone offered the suggestion that it savoured of relief, for if the people were not employed on the roads the Government would have to make some provision for them and the same condition of things obtains this year to a greater extent than last year. I know that as far as Trinity district is concerned things are not good and numerous applications have been made to Mr. Cochius for work on the Colinet road. Before the programme is finalized for the spending of money this year, I think that the Government should seriously consider having the Highroads Commission operate with a view to relieving those persons who are most in need. I am informed now that Mr. Grant, who used to go down to Blanc Sablon is not taking down any men at all this year, and thus quite a number of men do not know what to do. I say that the Government will have to give the most serious consideration to the spending of moneys with a view to obtaining the best returns by building roads and also having in mind the relief of the unemployment situation.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—As regards the matter that has been raised this afternoon by Mr. Moore I do not think that the instance should be allowed to pass without some notice being taken of it. The instance I understand is that a horse was near one of the poles on the upper levels and was electrocuted. There was a large transformer on the pole and the horse was struck with the current and killed immediately. That is of course a rather extraordinary instance, and as the hon. member has drawn the matter to the attention of the House and through it to the notice of the Government, I consider that it is a matter more for the Municipal Council than for the Government. I will to-morrow write the Municipal Council and suggest that they institute an enquiry into the incident, because if this is true and there are strong currents going through the streets

there may be loss of human life, and then we will be waking up that there is something seriously wrong, so I will write to the Municipal Council to-morrow and ask them to make an enquiry into the incident.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I would like to know if the Minister can give us the reason why there are three votes for the stores department?

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the honourable member, I may say that last year we found it necessary to appoint a man in charge of that department. There were all kinds of printed matter unloaded upon the department and nobody seemed to be in charge of the department. We transferred Mr. Bambrick from the lower floor of the office to take charge of the stores. There had been a man there previously in charge named Manuel, but Mr. Manuel did not care to take charge, and we left him as assistant to Mr. Bambrick. Then again Mr. Richards, the caretaker, was replaced by a Mr. Froude.

MR. HALFYARD — Regarding the new department made last year, in the appointment of a Postmaster. Can the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs or the Minister in charge of the Estimates justify the creation of that department, or sub-department of the Post Office—that of a Postmaster?

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS—Mr. Chairman, I may say that when Colonel Ross was down here last year he recommended it, and stated that he had never known of a Post Office in any country which had no Postmaster in charge and responsible for all the work being done, and having the staff under his jurisdiction, and responsible to the head of this department and to the government. It was necessary for the efficiency of the department. Everybody seemed to be allowed to do as he pleased, as far as I could tell. That is the explanation, that it was necessary to have one man in charge of the staff, and see that the work is being done and no complaints being made.

MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS — Mr. Chairman, there is one matter I would like to talk about. In several places the offices have been combined, and the salary has been cut out. The responsibility has been placed on the operator or the Postmaster.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, I feel sure that we all appreciate the explanation given by our genial friend, the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, in connection with telephones for which we had applications from various gentlemen representing constituencies on both sides of this House. I think that it was last year or the year before, when this Government first came into power, that I presented a petition from certain sections of my district asking that telephones be installed between Brigus and Cape Broyle. I would like again to point out to the Hon. Minister that that section of my district is practically cut off from any communication with the outside world so to speak, especially during the winter time. And I would like to point out further more that in case of any emergency that may arise, it is very difficult to get in touch with the telegraph office at Cape Broyle, and a telephone would be of great benefit. I notice that the amount that would be rquired would be about $900, and I feel as Mr. Brown, the hon. member for Twillingate feel that no doubt after consultation with my colleague, Mr. Moore, that we may be able to derive a small amount of money out of the road grant for that purpose. The telephone could be installed during the summer time, and when the winter comes they would be in connection with the outside world. I think that the Minister deserves a certain amount of congratulation in view of the fact

that I know that his Department is one of the few in which the expenditure has been decreased during the past twelve months. But I would like to point out to the Minister that I have had complaints from various parts of the district, that the mail has been misplaced. No later than two days ago I received a letter here in St. John's that was addressed to our office in Corner Brook. The letter was sent from St. George's. Now I don't think that that is the kind of service that is expected of your department, and I don't think that you as head of the Department want to give that kind of service to the public. Further I pointed out early in the session that the telegraph system is anything but what it should be. It takes a day to get a message through from any part of the island to the other. That is not good enough. I realise that the Government line is commandeered so to speak by the Commercial Cable Company. Possibly that is not the fault of the present administration. But something should be done. You can cable across to England and have an answer back in the afternoon. But you can't send a message except to a place very close, on the Postal Telegraph lines and get an answer in less than twenty four hours. It happens with me almost every week. Now there is another matter I want to speak about. I think that one day during the absence of the Hon. Minister I made a suggestion to which the Hon. the Colonial Secretary was going to convey to you that the office at Corner Brook should be kept open until nine at night.

MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—I may say that now the office is kept open every night until 10 o'clock.

MR. CASHIN—I appreciate that, because I feel that the service will be better and that business will be helped along considerably provided that you have the proper man in the proper place with an extra operator at both these places. Now I think that myself and Mr. Moore would be agreeable to voting a small amount of the road grant for the erection of that telephone, which is very much needed in that part of the district, and I feel that the Minister will do for Ferryland what he said he would do for Twillingate, and put up the balance of the money.

MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—That is very encouraging. If other gentlemen in the House would do the same thing I would be in a position to-morrow to grant their request, because I know that the Government would be glad to grant the few dollars that they would be asked for. I feel happy to-night. I had no idea that when I came up here this afternoon that I would get so much help from the members. See how happy the Government looks. Oh, that will be a consideration for next year. We will have to trust in Providence and a good season's fishing and good years business to give the Government encouragement, and I know that they will provide the necessary maintainance.

Now with regard to the complaints of the telegraph system and about the mails and the condition of the bags and the material not being up to the standard. We are still using the same material. We get it from some company in Boston and the only company that manufactures that material and some times we have to wait to have our orders filled for months. In reference to the mails being injured, of course we have had a very hard winter and the courier has to go up over that long shore. The mail courier gets blocked from time to time, and I do not know whether the proper covering is used over the mails or not. I was coming down Water Street and I saw a man with a load of mails. He must have somewhere

between twenty-five and forty bags of mails and he had his horse overloaded and there was absolutely no covering over the load. Yes, there might have been a tarpaulin over it and that would have kept it alright. Something impervious. That is a good word. But under these conditions it is hard to expect that when the man gets to Bay Bulls it is hard to expect the mails to be dry. It is a well known fact that troubles arise in the best regulated family, and when I took charge last year I received from somebody a letter complaining that it had taken seven days for a letter to get from Port aux Basques to St. John's and suggested that we get aeroplanes or something to improve the service. But I must say that there are very few complaints coming in from anyone in reference to the delay in mails or any negligence on the part of the staff, and it is as good a staff as we have ever had in the past. And there is one thing that I regret to-night, and that is that I cannot give these men up there a little encouragement, especially those assorters and that part of the staff that is under the control of Mr. Clarke; a man who is thirty five or forty years in the department. I do wish that the Finance Minister with his big heart would enable me to give these men up there an increase. I have to make these statements to-night because these men have asked me for an increase and they make these demands and they expect an increase. There are a half dozen employees up there who get only forty dollars a month. Miss Sparkes, the statistical clerk only gets forty dollars a month, and she is a very fine girl. Of course all the girls and women that we have up there in the department are the very best kind, very clever and very attentive. I contend that we ought to give them a little more salary. And then there is the telephone central. Everyone knows the telephone central only gets a dollar a day, hardly enough to keep boots and stockings on. I don't know how she pays her board out of that. A short time ago I was asked by Mr. Lloyd, the Superintendent of the Money Order Department, if I could give him a little more help, and I had to take a lady from the East End Post Office and put her in his department. There is no provision made for the salary as yet. The salary is voted for the East End Post Office. I give notice now that I am going to ask the Government to transfer the vote for her salary up to the Money Order Department. I don't think that I have anything more to say, sir. I think that the Post Office is being conducted as well to-day as ever it was. The Finance Minister is very severe on me in charge of that Department. He is cutting right and left. He has cut out the overtime for the assorters that have to work overtime because the trains do not arrive regularly; and then these men have to come back and assort the mails, and there is no provision made for them. The same thing applies to the telegraph department, but I have no doubt that the Finance Minister will see his way clear to make provision for the demands for overtime. The Finance Minister is trying to economise. And I give him credit for it, but if they will not give me the money to run the department properly, then they will have to be prepared from time to time to receive requests from me for sums to maintain various branches of the service and keep the work up to the standard.

MR. WARREN—I arrived in the House at a very opportune time. As I came inside I found that some other members had emulated my example and were going to ask the Auditor General for permission to place some of their grants into the tender care

of the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs. I suppose that I have set a bad example in doing what I did, but I will refer to that later on. I have a few remarks to make about the department, and I propose to make them now and be done with it. I want to thank the Minister for a good turn that he has done me for what he did for the returned soldier, John Short, at Hermitage, in giving him an increase in salary, as he was overworked, having to repeat for five stations, and I wish to thank the Minister for it, and John Short also wishes to thank the Minister. Early in the session I presented a petition from some places in my district about mail couriers, and I draw attention to that because I am going up to see the Minister and go into this. There are some places that the Glencoe does not visit, and they do not get any mails at all. I presume that the Post Office is not in for making money out of the sale of three cent stamps for sending a letter to Port aux Basques or any other place, and it is not supposed to pay more than a light house. The loss of opportunity given people of sending and receiving letters must mean a loss in revenue. A little expenditure would provide those people with a mail. I have in my desk some pretty severe complaints from two islands in Fortune Bay, Brunette and Sagona, both of them do a very thriving fishing business. They have no facilities whatever for communication. I wish to suggest to the Minister that the Portia could very easily call at Sagona and Brunette, and do away with the necessity of having a motor boat go from those places in all sorts of weather with women and children on board, and which can't take freight. I know perfectly well the Glencoe can't call at any more but the Portia only calls at the main ports, and this could very well be done in going across from Grand Bank to Belleoram, and land freight for those places. They deal more with Grand Bank than with Fortune Bay, and have to take their chances on getting connection with Grand Bank. If the Portia were to drop over the mails and whatever freight there is, they could cut out this ferry business from Harbour Breton. I take this opportunity of suggesting to the Railway Commission the advisability of doing that. I understood from the manager, Mr. Russell, that it would be done when I asked him some months ago. At Boxey, we have one of the few agricultural settlements in Fortune Bay, and it is necessary for them to go to get hay and sacks of oats and such supplies, and to get those they have to get along in motor boats. Unfortunately we had a very sad accident out there. Mr. H. Petite had to go to English Harbour for some supplies in stormy weather, and took a chance on loading up his boat and was drowned. That sort of thing would be remedied if we had those steam boat connections.

I would like to suggest, with regard to the Glencoe, that that boat could do much better work if it were given a motor boat to take the mails ashore. It is doing very fine work now, and the people are grateful to the Government for the service they get. It certainly will make an improvement in the time of that boat to supply it with a motor boat, because of the number of places where there are no wharves, and the boat has to be rowed sometimes quite a long distance from the steamer to the settlement. It takes up quite a considerable time rowing to shore and back sometimes, a distance of a mile, and, if given a motor boat, the Glencoe would save time every trip.

With regard to overtime, I don't see why overtime should be given in St. John's for working on Sundays. All round the Island the mail clerks work on Sundays, on the Glencoe and on the Portia they have to work on

Sundays; sometimes at five o'clock Sunday morning when it gets in, and they don't get any overtime. I don't see why they should get any more overtime in St. John's than my constituents in Fortune Bay. The steamer clerks up there should get overtime.

With regard to another matter; I am sorry Mr. Lake is not here to-night, because it does not altogether affect me. It affects me only in a small degree. It is the extension of the telegraph lines to make a complete circuit around the boot of Burin Peninsula. Point Rosie is cut off, having no road, as completely almost as if in the middle of Fortune Bay, and that and other places badly need connection. Point Rosie could more cheaply be connected by telephone, and a thousand dollars has been put up to defray part of the expense, and I think that if the Government would put up the rest it would be well worth the expense for the advantage all those places around there would derive.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS — Mr. Chairman, I would like to make an explanation to a statement made by Mr. Warren in relation to telegraph line extension down the boot around Burin and Fortune Bay districts. I may say that Mr. Lake called at my office and pointed out the necessity of having a complete circuit made. I referred the matter to Mr. Veitch, Postal Telegraph Superintendent, and this is a copy of Mr. Veitch's report which I shall read to the House.

(Reads Report)

I also have a copy of a letter here but in any case it does not interest me had no idea that this would cost $8,000, from Mr. Scott, the late Superintendent of Telegraphs, to Mr. Halfyard when he was head of the department. That letter is dated April 1920 and reads as follows:

(Reads Letter)

You will not have satisfaction until that circuit is completed, and I hope that the Government will see its way clear to have it done.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman Grand Bank and Fortune are not in my district, and you have taken Garnish out of it after next election. I was merely making an explanation of the great benefit it would be to the people of the whole of the Burin Peninsula. Last year these offices got $17,000 for their own tolls and about as much more for messages that were paid for and sent to these various places, making $34,000. I was merely complaining on behalf of Burin district, as there is no place in my district effected but Point Rosie, and I have already put one thousand dollars in the Post Office for the telegraph extension, and I am prepared to put another $500 of my special grant this year for Point Rosie telephone, so that Burin District will get the benefit, and the traffic will improve—must improve. It is a matter for Mr. Lake and Mr. Long.

MR. MOORE — Mr. Chairman, I should like to set the House right about the telephone service in Ferryland, and the telephone from Brigus to Cape Broyle. You would think from hearing the Minister and my colleague here to-night that this is the first time this has been mentioned. I have been advcoating that for two years, and had it up with Mr. Veitch, but was told we couldn't get the money, that we would have to get a special grant. I am prepared to meet my colleague and the Minister and put that down to Cape Broyle, and finish it once and for all.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the Minister's attention to certain anomolies in this vote. I refer to salaries paid Postmasters and telegraph operators, and I shall refer to one or two places in my district, and I believe that the Minister will see that something is done, which I suggest should be in the way of in-

crease. I would like to point out to him that in Musgrave Harbor there is a young man acting as postal operator who does the postal work as well and receives $420.00 for both. This young man has been writing me several times, and I want to show you why I think he deserves more. He serves a place with a population of nearly 900. Turn to Lumsden, with a population of about 245, one quarter of that of Musgrave Harbor, and there is a young lady who receives $420.00, and in addition you have a post-office and the Postmaster gets $121.88.

That is so unjust on its face that I feel sure the Minister will give it his consideration, and draw that of the Minister of Finance to it. The Estimates are to some extent signed and sealed, but they shouldn't be regarded as the laws of the Medes and Persians, but as flexible to some extent—I would like the Minister to take a note of that. They are not paid too much at Lumsden, but too little at Musgrave Harbor.

There is another matter I would like to bring to the Minister's attention, although it is not in my district, but in the Minister's own district. But I have knowledge of it through personal contact with the people, and hand it on to him. In the settlement of Seal Cove, in Conception Bay, they have a daily mail; every day the train comes in with the mail, and the Postmaster gets $58.50, the same as when there was a tri-weekly mail. That is insufficient, and I have been asked to draw the Minister's attention to it. The same applies to Upper Gullies, where they get $72.80, and have to travel three quarters of a mile every day for the mail—that shouldn't exist. Take in comparison Seal Cove in Harbour Main and Seal Cove in Fortune Bay—they both get $58.50, and at the first there is a daily mail, and at the latter possibly a weekly mail. That should be rectified.

What I principally rose to speak on was the great need of a telephone service at South End, Change Islands, Fogo. There is a light House there, with nobody living there but the keeper, but the reason that a telephone is needed is because it is a place where ships repair and harbor going to and from the Labrador, and the men come ashore and want to connect with the people, and hope to be able to send a message, but are unable to do so. There used to be a little house there where the people would stay, but that is gone, and now they stay in the lighthouse, sometimes filling it up. I might say tha t there would be no trouble as far as poles are concerned, the telegraph poles could be used, as they are not far away, and this service is needed at South End, Change Islands as much as anywhere.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER— Mr. Chairman, there is just one thing I want to say on the subject of telephones. The expense of instalation has been enormous, and in many places where they have been put in they haven't been paying the Government anything. For that reason I have been thinking that it was not advisable to put in any more. I think, personally, that we should take them out where the people do not pay and put them in where some returns would be made. I would like to see the 10c. toll system, where people have to pay when they us the instrument. But the fact remains that the revenue has been practically nothing. In many cases people use the telephones without paying, and in some cases no returns are given. The whole matter should be carefully enquired into, and I think the phones should be taken out where they are not sufficiently appreciated to be a financial success.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS — Mr. Chairman, I might say that the Prime Minister is correct. We find it necessary to send out circulars to these places, and I

have come to the conclusion that some one is responsible for this—they must have been told by somebody that they would never have to pay anything, and that they got them for nothing. For that reason I made up my mind to send out circulars, advising them that they would have to pay or have the telephone cut out. Pay phones were not put in.

In a great many cases to have the work carried out successfully there should be a Central Station. But we are endeavouring to unravel the whole situation now, and perhaps this time twelve months I will be in a position to tell this House that the telephone system is working admirably and that we are getting a revenue out of it.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Chairman, I do not agree with the Prime Minister and the Minister of Posts in regard to the cutting out of the telephones. The Prime Minister says that several telephones installed in houses are sending in no returns. I would like to inform the Prime Minister that there are a lot of things that don't send in any returns. Take the present tourist road that is being built now. That will never send us any returns to this country.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—That is not a public utility.

MR. BROWN—But it is just as well to cut out the roads here as the telephones down around the North or the South West Coast. That is one of the best things and the most useful things that we have at all. In places where there is no telegraph communication for miles and miles, and somebody gets sick, there is no way to get communication to a doctor. Now that is not the fault of the people but of the Department that allows this thing to exist. If the Postal Dept. put in the pay system and made the people pay it would be alright. As far as the district I represent is concerned, if you want to go into a house and call up a distant place you have got to pay your twenty five cents. I would be long sorry to see any step taken in that direction to cut out the telephones. As a matter of fact I oppose it.

Now the question that I want to speak on to-night is in reference to the mail service between Princetown and King's Cove. The trouble, sir, is between Fleet Cove and King's Cove. They used to get a mail three times a week, then it was cut down to twice a week and sometimes once a week. The courier could not connect. The mail comes up to-morrow and it has to lie at Fleet Cove for four days before it is taken. The courier is ordered to go only twice a week and the mail lies there for two, three or four days at a time. I know that the Minister of Posts is not aware of this fact. I am sure that the Minister will give me every satisfaction, in any matter pertaining to my district or any other district; but these telegrams ordering the mail courier are coming from the Deputy Minister, Mr. Hodder. Now I know that he was pitchforked into the job, he was put in over the heads of Mr. Campbell or others. He is allowed to send out messages to the mail courier at King's Cove to go at a certain time. The Postmaster gets a telegram "Go to-morrow or the next day," and in the meantime the Princetown courier has left a mail there and we get it about 4 o'clock in the afternoon. I ask that the Minister of Posts will see that this thing is taken up and thrashed out, and that the Deputy Minister is to get down to business, and if he wants any points I will be only too glad to go up and give it to him. Now that I have taken the matter up here now I know that Mr. Woodford will be only too glad to see that we get satisfaction.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS — Mr. Chairman, I would like for Mr. Brown to put his

grievance into wrtiing, so that I could endeavour to comply with the demands in reference to Mr. Hodder. Mr. Hodder, I may say, has the best of intentions, but he is new to the position and he makes mistakes from time to time. Besides he is a young man, and when he gets a little more experience he will then be in a better position to run the Department than he is at present. Mr. Hodder is a good man. There is no better man in the service. Mr. Campbell did not feel inclined to take the responsibility, although he could have had it if he wanted it. The Government was looking around for a man to fill Mr. LeMessurier's place. Mr. LeMessurier was there so long that he seemed to own the department. Mr. Hodder thinks that he ought to do certain things right off the bat when I think that he ought to go slowly. When I took charge up there first I thought that I was in the hands of the Philistines, they were all trying to run me. But I just pulled on the bridle a little and brought them to their sense of duty. I gave them to understand that there was only one head and that they had to consult me, and if they did not they were liable to dismissal. And I think that the department is being run well. And there has been nothing but compliments showered on me, and I thank the Opposition especially for it.

But the Minister of Finance has cut the vote for the Department so much that I am astonished. And I want to give notice that I would not be surprised if we had to come in here next year and have to ask for additional supplementary supply because the votes for the department have been cut down. I think that you will agree with me that we should be given in the first place enough to run the department, and if we were extravagant then begin to cut down on it. But I have every confidence in the Finance Minister, but I think that next year you will be asking for more money.

MR. CASHIN—The Hon. Minister has seen fit to crack a joke at my expense. But I think that the whole business is an absolute joke. We were debating the Estimates for the Department of Postal Telegraphs, and the Prime Minister made the statement that he thought that telephones should be cut out altogether. I have been after the telephone that I speak of for some time, and I have suggested that we might take three or four hundred dollars out of the very small vote of two thousand dollars to defray the expense of the telephones. There is another point on which I would like some information. I do not know whether I would get it or not. But some years ago there was a contract entered into with the Avalon Telephone Company, and I think that part of this contract was that they should put telephones through Ferryland district. They have failed and if they had not I would not now be coming in here looking for phones from the Government. There is one phone in Ferryland District that did not cost the Government of Newfoundland one cent. The phone in Fermeuse and Renews was a gift from the Anglo Telegraph Company, and I have been after the Government for the last two years to patch it up and I do not know whether it is done yet or not. That phone in Fermeuse and Renews serves the business people and priests and doctors and everything else, and when I come in here and ask for the small amount of money to join two or three of these settlements up to the main settlement, and I am told that I cannot get it, and if we are willing to give part of the grant it is doubtful whether we will get it or not even then. I suppose that the proper attitude to adopt would be to come in here and knock it, and then perhaps we might get it. As to my knowledge of railroading

I hope that it is as good as the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs about his department. I hope that it is no worse. It is a very poor system in any civil service that one does not encourage promotion, and if that is not done there cannot be any efficiency. But it seems to be the policy of this Government and past Governments to appoint some supporter or defeated candidate to the positions of the deputyships of the departments. I do not know about Mr. LeMessurier, because I was not born when he went to the department, but I do not think that he stood for any district. And it is going to take Mr. Hodder years to gain that experience that Mr. LeMessurier had when he was forced to take his pension. I believe that he asked for it when things were made so hot for him that he had to. Not that I have any brief for Mr. LeMessurier or Mr. Campbell or Mr. Hodder either for that matter, or for anyone else up there in that department. If you want efficiency in a department you must promote those who know the work. You cannot have efficiency if you take a man off the street and put him in there when he does not know his way around the department so to speak; and the man next to him has to do the work and he draws the pay and gets the credit for it. Now your department is associated with the railway in certain respects. You pay huge subsidies to the railway. You paid three or four hundred thousand dollars to the steamers and sixty or seventy thousand dollars to the railway, and without that the railway would not be in the position that it is in to-day. Last year you paid three hundred thousand dollars to the steamers and if you did not do that they would have lost two hundred and ninety thousand dollars, and as it was, they only made forty seven thousand dollars. And you paid sixty or seventy thousand dollars to the railway for carrying the mails across the country and other places, and did not that help materially to put the railway where it is to-day. Not that the railway has earned money although it could if you knew how to manage it properly. Your department is one of the biggest spending departments of the Government to-day, the Public Works and the Railway the largest of them. I want that telephone for Ferryland District which is going to cost this country nine hundred dollars. It is the only telephone that the Government is asked to pay for in that district and I am going to get it. I will get it now or later, and it is going in Ferryland District whether the present Government likes it or not. Last ye r we had a lovely position in Ferryland district. There was no telephone for these people to get the doctor if they were sick, and these people are paying their proportion of the taxation of this country. The only telephone down there was put in by people outside. We come in here and try and do the best we can, and because we ask for a telephone, we are told they are going to be cut out altogether. A telephone is going to be installed down there. I am trying to help, but I want the assistance of the Government. There are telephones all over the country, put in for convenience, that don't bring in any revenue at all. A telephone down in Ferryland would pay. There is going to be a telephone down in Ferryland; you can mark that down. There is going to be one whether the Government likes it or not.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—With regard to the honourable member for Ferryland's remarks about the Avalon Telephone Company contract, I think I explained before that they have merely a right to extend, and they get certain advantages if they extend within a certain time, but they are not obliged to extend. We will be glad to en-

deavour to meet his demands if possible with regard to the installing of a telephone at Ferryland.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—The honourable member for Fogo has made reference to installing a telephone at Change Islands. I feel I would be failing in my duty to the fishermen of this country if I did not support it. The south end of Change Islands is practically equal with Stag Harbour. It is a harbour of refuge for the fishermen passing by there, and quite a number of vessels anchor there. Fifty dollars would put a telephone there because of the telegraph lines already there. I give it my hearty support.

There has been talk about Corner Brook telegraph office not opening until ten o'clock. People have been getting up on the floor of this House of Assembly shouting about that office being open at nine a.m. There is no possible chance of a ship going ashore at Corner Brook at nine a.m but there are a good many chances of fishermen in other parts of the country having this happen between five and nine, and it is found that the telegraph offices don't open to do business before ten in the morning in the outports. They are supposed to open at nine, but they are not putting messages through before ten, and you can't get any business done until then. You might as well keep a message in your pocket as send it after five o'clock; sometimes, after three; so, there are about six hours to communicate in case of accident. I say it is a disgrace. I am told the operators won't work any longer. If the operators in St. John's or the outports won't work longer if necessary and required, why then turn them out. I can fill all their places tomorrow. It is not right that, if a ship goes ashore before ten or after five, you can't get a message through; they stand a chance to be lost. It is not good enough for a fishing country like this. I think the offices should open at least at eight, and not close till eight. I don't think another Government under the sun would tolerate closing the offices at six. I want to say, again, that I support the member for Fogo in his request for a telephone at the southern end of Change Islands. If that is difficult I am willing to help.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few observations on the subject matter of telephones. It appears to me that some change should be made with reference to the allocations of moneys to establish telephones. The Government, to my mind, should re-organise the system and stop the practice of having moneys that are voted to the credit of the Public Works Department for the maintenance of roads and bridges from being diverted to the use of telephones. God knows, according to some people, there have been leakages enough in regard to roads and bridges. If money is going to be continued from my grant for telephone extensions I want in future to be called Minister of Posts and Telegraphs as well as Minister of Public Works. Therefore, I would suggest to the Government that a new system be inaugurated so that the department that I represent will not be saddled with the expenditure of the moneys for roads and bridges and that are really spent on the installation of telephones.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Mr. Chairman, I merely rise for the purpose of stating that the $150,000.00 voted for public works is not meant for roads and bridges alone. That money is voted for all public utilities, and in a great many cases has been found to be of great public benefit. Take the case which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries mentions in connection with the linking up of that lighthouse on Change Islands, would not that be a public benefit to the peo-

ple of this country generally. If fog alarms and lighthouses had telephones connecting with other offices immense assistance to mariners could be given, particularly when they are in imminent danger of their lives. Consequently, I disagree with the utterances of the Minister of Public Works.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—Mr. Chairman, if the speeches made by the honourable members of the different districts here to-night are sincere, I certainly think that they should receive serious consideration. I was going to say a few words in reply to the remarks of the Minister of Public Works, but I think that the Hon. Mr. Sullivan gave Mr. Russell an effective answer. With regard to the opening and closing of telegraph offices and the remarks of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I might say that it is the first time that it has been brought to my notice that an outport telegraph office is not opened for business in the morning before ten o'clock and closed in the evening practically at six o'clock when it should be kept open until eight o'clock, and I promise that I shall take immediate steps to remedy the matter.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Chairman, the explanations given by the Minister has been very satisfactory. With regard to the statement made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, my experience has been that all outport offices have been open for business, at least, at nine o'clock in the morning, although there may be instances where offices have not and do not open before ten o'clock. Now I would like to ask the Prime Minister if any request has been made by the people between King's Cove and Summerville for the extension of the telephone line. At present there is no connection with the main places in that section to get any information about the movements of trains. This is a very important matter to the people of that locality and I would strongly recommend that this matter be given the serious consideration of the Government.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I may say that we have a number of similar applications for telephones in our own district; but we are not treating the requests from our own district any different from any other district.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Chairman, in reference to the remark of Mr. Sullivan, I am well aware of the fact that the money could be used for any public works. But my point is that there is not a member here but knows that the vote for roads and bridges is not nearly sufficient. My point is that no portion of the vote of the Board for the repair of roads and bridges when the vote for them is not nearly sufficient.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to hear from the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs that the department is being run in such a way, and that there are no complaints from the general public in any particular. Now I don't suppose, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister wishes to make us think that the Department is being run perfectly, because that would be impossible. It would be impossible to have a perfect department. But there was one thing about the post office with which I would agree with the Minister, and that is as regards the Public Press. There are very few complaints in the Press to-day about the Post Office neglecting to perform its duties. When I was Minister of Posts and Telegraphs that didn't apply. There was a section of the Press of that day that had someone to report if there was anything they thought irregular, or if they thought any mistakes were being made of which the public was not informed. Now mistakes seem to go unnoticed; in connection with firms that have an outport agency you often

find letters properly addressed to the outport in the box here in St. John's —they have been properly addressed, but simply wrongly assorted. And there wouldn't be much fuss—you would simply ring up the Post Office and tell them, and the young lady would try to remedy it. I know another case of a city residence named "Winterton," mail matter addressed to this residence often went to Winterton, Trinity Bay, so you can see that the service is not perfect. It is hard to run a department where the mails come in irregularly, and the public clamor for their mail within half an hour of its arrival. But I have known on the mails coming in from Bonavista Bay branch to connect with the express, and sometimes they have been brought in on a freight when no connection was made with the express, and they have, with all due respect to the efficiency of the post-office, been lying at the station for 24 hours. The best official I know to handle that sort of thing is Mr. Bradbury. He knows the service and the men, and grew up with the service. He was there looking after the mail clerks, and I think it was a mistake to move him and take it out of his hands. Many changes were made for political reasons, and the service suffers as a consequence.

In the matter of a telephone service throughout the country. Now a telephone service is a great blessing, the greatest blessing that has been given to isolated sections of the country, but although tolls may not be collected between the different communities, the telephone has fed the telegraph offices and thus created revenue. Suppose you have a telephone service at Whitbourne and the outlying settlements, no doubt there are hundreds of telegrams sent through Whitbourne that would not have been sent. I would support the tolls system in the communities, for connection between places, but even then it may be very expensive, for you would need an exchange system. There is a telephone official up there now and he should be able to work out a scheme to determine the revenue that is derived from that source. I feel that very few messages have gone over the telephone lines without parties paying the five cents. However, I do not think that the suggestion of the Prime Minister of considering the matter of cutting out telephones for purposes of economy can be put into effect. Telephone connection as well as telegraph connection no doubt has very often been the means of saving life. Furthermore, it is a public utility of such importance throughout the Island that it is indispensable. I might say that the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs has been amusing, entertaining and instructive to-night to a certain extent. I notice that the telegraph office at Hodge's Cove has been cut out and that the Operator's salary at Port Rexton, one of the most important sections of Trinity district, gets $420 a year as compared with the salary of $840 of other operators in other parts of the Island for doing practically the same amount of work. I think that is very unfair. I am not going to advocate now the increase of salaries. If you are going to put the salaries of lady telegraphers on a $420 a year basis alright, but when we see the votes for other outports double that amount for doing the same amount of work we must draw attention to such anomalies. Now I think that the Minister should take a note of this with a view to having matters remedied. If, as I have already stated, it was general that the salary was fixed at a certain figure, well and good; but on reading through the Estimates I can go on quoting a score of other places where the operators have been favored through political pull. I notice here there is a new vote for Hillview, Trinity Bay. I may

say that the official there has work to do in connection with the telegraph business for sixteen offices, and he performs faithful service. There is a vote on page 118 with regard to an overseer at the General Post Office. Now I would like to have an explanation of this vote and also as to who that gentleman is? I observe also on page 142 there is a vote for two mail clerks on the one Labrador steamer and connection with the Northern Labrador service a vote for three mail clerks. I would like to have an explanation of these matters, and I am sorry that the Minister is not in the House at the present time. However, I presume they can be held over until he returns. I notice that there is a vote here for Bonavista Bay for twenty eight thousand, but there is nothing for Trinity Bay. I do not know whether the Prime Minister can tell us about the Trinity Bay service yet or not. Evidently the Government has not yet come to a decision. If Bonavista Bay and Trinity were treated alike I would be inclined to vote for this. The Malakof should serve the two bays. Under the present conditions I cannot vote for this, because I think that a good service could be given in keeping with the country and that the people of Bonavista Bay would be willing to divide the service of the Malakoff with Trinity Bay. If you were treating two adjacent districts in some other part of the island like you are treating these two you would certainly have the matter brought most forcibly to your attention more forcibly than it is in my power to do. I would like for some member of the Government, if the Prime Minister is not inclined to talk, then the Minister of Finance might give me some explanation to justify to some extent the treatment that has been meted out to Trinity Bay. I would certainly not be worthy to represent the constituency if I did not do my best to bring this matter forcibly to the attention of the Government. The Prime Minister thought that when the boat was taken off Trinity Bay that a certain section of the district would be served by a road from Lead Cove to Heart's Content. The road was started and some money spent near Lead Cove.

I think that the Prime Minister tried to do something in that respect. Three or four miles were built and then the work was discontinued. The people in that section of the district are not very well off and they thought that possibly the highroads commission might operate in that section of the country and continue the road from Lead Cove to Heart's Content and to Whitbourne, and it would be as good an attraction for tourists as any that could be found.

Fortune Bay has not got a vote here for five thousand dollars. I presume that the district is being served in some other respect. If I could represent my case to the Prime Minister as well as Mr. Warren, possibly something might be done for Trinity District. I would like the Prime Minister or some Minister to make some pronouncement on this matter. I asked a question last year what the operation of the Malakoff cost in 1924 and I found that it was greater than the year before. I presume that the same will obtain this year. The Government is responsible for the Estimates and all I can do as a representative of the District of Trinity is to draw the attention of the Government as forcibly as I can to the treatment of that district by the Government. I propose to continue talking until I get an explanation from the Prime Minister.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—All that I have to say about Trinity Distrcit is that it is served on both sides of the bay by the railway, and while it is the policy of the Government to build roads, we can't build roads

without the money to do it. We have been endeavouring to give the people good roads to connect with the railway, but we have not been able to do it, and while it is costing as much as it is to carry on a public service we cannot do more than we are doing. Trinity District is not worse off in that respect than a great many other districts, It has railway connections and is much better off than some others. We want to give the people roads and we will do it when we can.

MR. HALFYARD—What the Prime Minister has said is no explanation to me with regard to steam transportation in Trinity Bay. Trinity District adjoins Bonavista and that is served better than any other section of the country. We have herring inspectors appointed to go around Trinity District and have no means of shipping the herring after they are caught. That applies particularly to the South West Arm. Something ought to be done. The people would be satisfied if you would give them a fortnightly service in the spring and the fall if you could not do any better instead of having them shipping their herring by motor boat to Northern Bight and Clarenville to connect with the train. The Prime Minister has said that Trinity is not so badly off as a great many other districts. Let him compare it with Bonavista District which is contiguous to it. They talk about reducing expenditure. Let them treat Bonavista the same as Trinity and they would save twenty eight thousand dollars. The treatment of Trinity District I say is absolutely contrary to any degree of justice in dealing with the people of the country. The Prime Minister has spoken about roads in Trinity District. I say that the roads the Prime Minister intended to build have been prevented by His Executive Government. Trinity District is being discriminated against. A member of the Government would not stand for having his district treated as Trinity is treated. That is not giving us a square deal. As far as the Government is concerned the people of Trinity District have to be penalised and discriminated against just as much as if they were at the North Pole. I appeal to the Government, and I appeal to the Prime Minister though of course he can't do everything unless he is supported by his executive, to see justice meted out to Trinity District with regard to steam transportation. You are discriminating against one of the oldest and most important districts of the country. Let the Malakoff serve both districts. Make Clarenville a terminus if you don't want a terminus north of Trinity and Port Blandford if you like. Let us have some service weekly or fortnightly. Do the best you can.

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.

Mr. Brown gave notice of question.

Mr. Randell gave notice of question.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

And it being after Midnight,

Wednesday, May 12th, 1926.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, May 12, 1926.

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

Petitions were presented by:

Minister of Marine and Fisheries

from Gambo re road.

Mr. Cahill from Colliers re road.

Mr. Scammell gave notice of question.

Mr. Cashin 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:

Dept. of Public Works .. $1,095,039.95

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.

Answers to the following questions were tabled with exceptions to Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9.

(1) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay upon the Table of this House statements furnished by W. I. Bishop, his Company, or his Engineers, in respect to Dock costs and similar reports furnished by the Government Engineer or his representative on Dock construction.

(2) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay upon the Table of this House the following information in relation to the Dry Dock: What was (a) The original estimate of the William I. Bishop Co. as to the cost of the St. John's Dry Dock complete; (b) The actual cost to date, giving also comparisons of original estimates and actual costs in respect to (1) Removal of old deck timbers and other material and equipment; (2) Excavation for concrete work for new dry dock; (3) Total amount of concrete poured, estimated total cost and actual cost; (4) Estimated cost of concrete per cubic yard and actual cost; (5) Estimate as to cost of cofferdam, its construction and removal and actual cost; (6) Estimate as to dock gateway and its actual cost; (7) Estimates as to freight sheds, proportion completed to date and cost thereof; (8) Estimate as to pumping, equipment of new dock and actual cost; (9) Estimate as to cost of dismantling steamer Desola and building new wharf, what was to be material employed in construction of said wharf; (10) Who supplied timber used in construction of cofferdam and at what price, and were alternative tenders for supply called for; was any timber or lumber supplied by local firms; if so by whom and what were prices paid; (11) Who supplied the travelling crane and through what agent; how does the capacity of the crane compare with that provided for in the original plans and how does the actual cost of this machinery compare with the original estimate; were tenders for the supply of this machinery sought for in the various markets; (12) What was the amount of the retaining fee for which W. I. Bishop was engaged on Dry Dock construction; does this cover supervision of the entire operations at the Dock; if not what additional amounts or percentages is W. I. Bishop or his Company to receive in respect to undertakings additional to the original Dock plans and in respect to what additional undertakings are such amounts or percentages to be paid.

(3) MR. BROWN asked Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines how many Bulls under control of his department are at present distributed throughout the country, also to Table a statement showing where these Bulls are located and to name the persons responsible to the department for the care of such Bulls in each case, and what such persons are being paid in each case for looking after those Bulls; also to show what cash returns have been received from the keepers of those Bulls for services rendered by the said Bulls, and to show the names of the keepers and the amount received from each in every case.

(4) MR. BROWN asked Hon. the Colonial Secretary to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing what amounts were paid the Trinity

Enterprise for printing the synopsis of the debates of the House of Assembly for the sessions of 1924-1925 respectively; and also to show what will be paid them for printing the same synopsis this session.

(5) MR. SCAMMELL asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries what price perton was paid E. W. Sainsbury of Wesleyville for coal supplied the Dredge during the season of 1924 and 1925 respectively.

(6) MR. SCAMMELL asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the Table of the House a copy, or copies of the original bills of E. and S. Barbour of Newtown for supplies delivered to the Dredge, to the amount of $775.21, as per answer to question No. 5, Order Paper April 16th, 1926.

(7) MR. W. J. BROWNE asked Hon. the Prime Minister, as Chairman of the Railway Commission, the total amount to date collected from the workmen engaged in the construction the keepers of those Bulls for services to whom was this paid and what was the nature of the contract with the doctor furnishing the services.

(8) MR. W. J. BROWNE asked Hon. the Prime Minister, as Chairman of the Railway Commission, particulars of the Accident Insurance carried on workmen engaged on the construction of the St. John's Dry Dock and in other auxiliary work, the amounts paid in premiums, the name of the Company or Companies with whom the workmen were insured, the number of accidents reported since work commenced to date, name of workmen, nature of disability, number of dependents and amount of compensation awarded in each case.

(9) MR. W. J. BROWNE asked Hon. the Minister of Justice the number of actions instituted in the Supreme Court under the Workmen's Compensation Act during the years 1923, 1924, 1925, 1926 respectively, together with the names of workmen and employers, number of dependents, nature of claim, and amount of judgment or settlement in each case; if any agreements were registered where no action was taken give the particulars as above.

(10) MR. RANDELL asked Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs to name the Postmasters at the following places on the Labrador: George's Island, Independant, Punch Bowl, and to whom the salaries voted were paid last year.

In reference to No. 1:

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I may say that we have no official statement from the W. I. Bishop Company in connection with the Dock, but we have been in communication with Mr. Bishop personally and through his subordinates and find that it is going to cost more than at first anticipated, but we have nothing of an official report in connection with it. I think we will be able to furnish a satisfactory statement to show why the Dock has cost more than anticipated.

MR. CASHIN—With regard to the reply I received from the Minister of Finance and Customs connected with the $20,000 collected from Sir Edgar Bowring, I would like to ask some further explanations. The money, I understand, was given to Mr. Cramm. Was the amount of the cheque handed to the Treasury $16,500, and is $2,000 all he gets for the whole thing?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—That is correct, and an amount was held by him to adjust with Burns and Burridge.

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.

MR. CASHIN—With regard to this vote for Sydney, I would like to make some reference to Mr. Shano, who is the clerk in charge there. I know from personal acquaintance and reports that I have heard, that he is a

most energetic official. I don't want to advocate any huge increases, but I think that, possibly, at some future date ,the Government might see their way clear to give this gentleman a little increase, and it would not be misplaced.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, we just passed the St. Anthony vote, and this is a $50.00 vote for the person who looks after the mail there. I think the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs has had some considerable correspondence with the operator at St. Anthony in which he has been asking for an increase in wages. The office at St. Anthony is a combined one, and is a telegraph office and Post Office as well. The Operator, Mr. Milley, has written the Department on various occasions seeking an increase in his wages—his salary in the Estimates is $600.00, which would be $50.00 per month. Taking the matter into consideration it will be found he has very good ground for asking for this. The office is, perhaps with the exception of Hampden, the largest on the coast, and although there is a small amount paid the Mission, for the mail which people leave at the office of the Grenfell Association, and which they take care of, and for which the young man gets $50.00 a year, this office does the main work of the community, which is very large. And all the mail from the Grenfell Association goes through there of course—they use the main office for the mails and telegraphs and things of that sort. I think St. Anthony can be classed at a higher amount than is here. I notice for instance if you will turn to Pilley's Island on page 158 you will find the salary is $720.00. I think that is something to go on, and suggest that there is a great deal more business done at St. Anthony than Pilley's Island. There is something manifestly unfair in that and I am going to suggest to the Minister that Mr. Milley's salary should be brought up to that of Pilley's Island. I gave Mr. Milley to understand that I would bring this to the attention of the Minister, and have done so by letter and I rise to draw his attention to the matter again. If the Minister will take a note of this matter he will find a considerable number of letters, in which the whole thing is set forth. I suggest that the salary be increased to $720.00.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman, some years ago Notre Dame Bay had two boats serving it, one on the North Side and one on the South. Since then this has been discontinued until the Autumn, when the "Home," after finishing the service in the Straits, to relieve the congestion of traffic has been sent down to help the "Clyde." My purpose in speaking is to draw this to the attention of the Prime Minister, for the consideration of the Railway Commission, with a view to having the terminus of the "Home" placed at Twillingate instead of Change Islands. Change Islands is about 15 miles from Twillingate, and as I understand the "Home" has been equipped with a new propellor, which gives her an increased speed, I think it might be possible to have her call at Herring Neck and Twillingate each week. If the "Home" calls at Twillingate it would give us a weekly mail service, and I would like the Prime Minister to bring this before the Railway to see if it is possible to have the S.S. Home call at Herring Neck and also Twillingate each trip.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, now that we are on the Steam Subsidies, I wish to draw attention to the high amount of money that we have to pay for steam subsidies, and I contend that this should not be charged to the Department of Posts and Telegraphs at all. Every year this Department has to report a deficit, and this expenditure is not contracted by them at all. It should be under the

Railway Commission. The system is altogether wrong. Of course the Minister of Finance and Customs knows that as well as anyone else. It is just taking it out of one pocket and putting it into another. With regard to Trinity Bay I presume that the Government has given the matter some consideration and I would like to hear from the Minister of Finance if there will be any vote for service on Trinity Bay this year.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—In reply to the hon. member for Trinity I do not think that it is possible, in fact I am sure that it is not from experience to operate a boat in this country in the public service without a subsidy. I have no doubt in my own mind that the boats might be operated somewhat cheaper than by the railway, but that is a very difficult thing to say. It requires some consideration before you can make such a statement. With regards to the steamship subsidies these boats get subsidies for carrying the mail and of course they get a certain amount for the carrying of the cargoes. It is a matter of book-keeping whether it is charged to the railway and is shown in the deficit or whether it is charged to the Post Office. With regard to the boat for Trinity I had a discussion with the Prime Minister and he feels and possibly the hon. member himself feels that after all a great deal of service is given to Trinity Bay by the Railway. I met a good many Trinity people and they seemed to be all fairly well satisfied if they could get the road from Lead Cove to Hearts Content, and it would help the situation out a great deal. If they get that piece of road that now come under the Highroads Commission it will help the whole thing out and possibly this summer some arrangements may be made to start it. I must admit that some people came over here asking for a boat for a service but it seemed that they wanted to provide the boat and captain and everything else themselves. But generally the people that I meet do not seem to be very keen about it. Trinity, Catalina and Port Union are all connected up around Trinity Bay and I think that if they get that piece of road everything will be alright.

MR. HALFYARD—I am glad to hear the Government considers spending some money in that section of Trinity District under the Highroads Commission. I understand from the Minister that certain men came in here last year in connection with a motor ferry service. I think that they came in here on invitation, that is, certain men in the district were communicated with and asked what their opinions were with regard to operating a motor service on Smith Sound. I was told this indirectly that the Executive Government had made these advances in trying to formulate a scheme for the operation of a service. I presume that the Government gave this matter some consideration but nothing came of it. It seems now that the Government has abandoned the idea of giving Trinity District any kind of service at all. As I have brought the point repeatedly before the Government that the service could be given to Trinity Bay without costing the Government one cent more, whereby the Malakoff could do the service for both the bays. Whether you give the past administration credit for attempting any economy, that was their idea of having one boat for both bays and they saved thirty thousand dollars. Some service is better than none at all. It is all that we can afford to have—one boat for the two bays, but I think that it is necessary to have some service whereby the people can get their freight to the trains and to St. John's. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to agi-

tate myself further over this matter. The Government certainly knows the situation, and if they are determined not to do anything it is no good labouring the question further. I leave the matter in the Government's hands and I know that it is deserving of the most serious consideration.

MR. CASHIN—I am of the opinion of Mr. Halfyard in connection with the taking of money for these subsidies out of one pocket and putting them into another. I have just totalled this vote up and I find that the total subsidies paid his year to the railway is in the vicinity of four hundred and thirty thousand dollars. It is a huge amount when one comes to look at it, especially when one considers the fact that the railway probably loses another six or seven hundred thousand dollars. I think that the Minister of Finance will agree that a system somewhat along these lines should be attempted and run these boats as economically as they can be. I would almost put the boats separately under a different head, because I feel that those in charge of the railway do not know a lot about the handling of ships, a lot of them. Run them separately on their own bottom and then at the end of the year, and when the amount of the deficit is known when they have been wound up, you can tell the Post Office to hand over such and such an amount of money and square the accounts. Last year the coastal boats only paid around fifty thousand dollars on their total operations, and that in my opinion is a very small amount. On top of that you paid sixty-two thousand dollars to the railway, and that leaves a balance of three hundred and sixty-two thousand dollars to the steamships. I think that there should be some system inaugurated whereby these boats would be able to balance their own accounts. Boats like the Glencoe that are filled up with passengers and freight nearly all the time can pay their own accounts. They may not make any money but they should be able to pay their accounts if they are run economically.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—I think that I explained the matter of the Marconi arrangements to the House before. The contract with the Marconi Company cost the Government ten thousand dollars last year and it will cost about eighteen thousand dollars this year. The Marconi Company was operating at a considerable loss, and their contract expired last year and they declined to carry on and they wanted to make a new contract but the Government had not sufficient data at hand to enter into a new contract, so they made arrangements for this service to continue for another year, when we will make full enquiries and find out what is the best that can be done.

In connection with the public despatches, I have prepared a memorandum, and if the committee will not mind I will read it and it will probably be of interest to the House as there has been considerable criticism about the despatches that we have been receiving.

(Reads.)

These are the facts, Mr. Chairman. This matter has been given considerable attention by my department and everything possible has been done to give the news despatch satisfactorily to the public. The agent at Halifax, Mr. Merkel, who compiles the Newfoundland despatch, was down here last year and had an opoprtunity of discussing this matter fully with the newspaper people here, and Mr. Merkel expressed his willingness to do the best he could to improve things; and I think he has done his best. It is very difficult to get, perhaps, a highly satis-

factory message when the limitation is so low and expenses have to be cut down. The Canadian Press message, although not the best message, is the most economical.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—I would like to know what the object is of getting these messages if they are not for the use of the Government.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—They are for the use of the public. There is a digest taken from the general news every day and sent to the outports.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few observations in relation to the matter of the public despatches and the memorandum just tabled by the Colonial Secretary. In that memorandum prepared for the Hon. Colonial Secretary I hold that the main point in connection with the matter has not been touched at all. It is not a matter of paying for the despatch nor is it a matter of the quantity of news contained therein, but the quality that we get generally is not what we want in Newfoundland. On several occasions the daily newspaper editors have taken the matter up with the Deputy Colonial Secretary complaining about the slush messages that we have been receiving of no interest to the Newfoundland public to a large extent and upon which the Commercial Cable Company have been reaping a large amount of money as tolls. It was understood from time to time that a remedy would be effected and it was so but it was not lasting. For a couple of weeks after the several complaints were made Mr. Merkel sent the news satisfactorily but after that period everything would go back to the same old rut that the compiler of the despatch at Halifax has not, apparently, been able to get out of. For instance, there was a General Election in Canada last Fall and on polling day we waited upon the Deputy Colonial Secretary here and asked him to arrange to get a service for us that would be satisfactory to the Newfoundland public. The matter was of much interest to this country, as a great number of our people were interest in the result of the election. The service was arranged and it proved very satisfactory; but after a week the service went back to the old rut again and news of an absolutely worthless character was sent here, as before, containing items of murders, cases of moral turpitude, etc., but nothing about the Budget Speech that was delivered in the Canadian House of Commons quite recently. When the strike was called in England a week ago the Editor of our paper went to the Deputy Colonial Secretary from whom we have received every courtesy and who has done his best; and asked him to get something in connection with the strike because for three or four weeks while negotiations were going on preceding the strike there were very few words received here although the "Montreal Daily Star" was filled up with "matter" leading up to the strike. All we got was a few messages that were uninteresting to our people. However, after the Deputy Colonial Secretary telegraphed the Canadian Press correspondent things became satisfactory and have been satisfactory ever since. Our point is that we want the news to be satisfactory at all times and not to give us what the Canadian public are not interested in and I am sure that we are not. If Mr. Merkel for the Canadian Press is paid $2300 for compiling the despatch he should do the work himself and not have his office boy do it. This is a public utility for the people of Newfoundland and I do not think that we can do without it. During the years 1921-22-23, as a matter of fact, we were not asked to pay for this service and we were never billed to pay

for it. The papers here supporting the Government of that day had refused to pay for it and we took the stand that we would not pay for it either unless they would. A conference then took place in the Colonial Secretary's office and an arrangement was entered into but we were never asked for the money. As soon as we were billed to pay for the service and found that other newspapers were billed and were prepared to pay for the service, we paid our amount. But we are prepared to pay more for the service, as I think it is a small amount per year for any newspaper established on a commercial basis, but when we pay for it we want to get something for what we are paying. I say, without fear of contradiction, that the Canadian Press of Halifax, when there was not much news going have been sending Newfoundland worthless stuff. We are satisfied to pay $300 and I think the other newspaper is too, but even that amount is too much to pay for nothing. If the Colony is called upon to pay $4,000.00 toward this service I think we should demand better treatment than we have been getting. The Associated Press may be very expensive and may not give us the kind of news in Newfoundland that we want because it is essentially an American Syndicate; but I think it would be better for us to put a man in Halifax, as used to be done before, and let him compile the messages suitable for Newfoundland from the Halifax papers. I remember we used to have Mr. Weir some years ago domiciled in Halifax to compile messages. He was employed by the Newfoundland papers and took his material from the Halifax papers. I think it would be better to go back to that again than to have the people of Newfoundland getting messages that are of no interest to them and for which they have to pay $2300 a year to the syndicate who sends them. Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is fair to throw the blame over on the newspapers because of this unsatisfactory service, because, as I have already mentioned, so far as our paper is concerned, we are prepared to pay for what we get but we are not prepared to pay for what we do not get.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, Mr. Mews, the Deputy Colonial Secretary, is not in the House to explain this thing for himself and I am only dependent on what I get from him. But I know that Mr. Mews has done his best to get this matter straightened out and I doubt if it is part of his duty to do his work. The Canadian Government used to give a subsidy of $50,000.00 a year to the Canadian newspapers, but lats year they cut it out entirely.

MR. PUDDESTER—They only cut it out for one year; it is being paid again this year.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—The Canadian News Press is not anything like the Associated Press. The Canadian Press is merely local whilst the Associated Press is an international concern. The newspapers in Canada subscribe to the Associated Press and therefore get more comprehensive news because it costs a large amount of money. Anyway it is a magnanimous act on the part of the Newfoundland Government to pay a man to compile the public despatch. I think it is up to this House to say whether or not the newspapers here should pay entirely for the compilation of the Canadian despatch; if so many slush messages are sent here I think it is time that the whole thing was cut out.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPUOSITION—Mr. Chairman, I understand from the remarks of the member for Bay de Verde that a great many of the messages received here

have got to be left out of our press sometimes because they are unfit for publication. I also understand that the man who compiles those messages gets $2,300 a year.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—He gets about one-quarter of it, because that amount also includes a subscription to the Canadian Press News.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—I am not a newspaper man and therefore am not very competent to talk on this matter, but it seems to me that we could do better by cutting out this service altogether and have the newspapers here, through their own enterprise, get their own news, as in that way the paper that puts out the best news would get the biggest circulation. I think, however, that this discussion this afternoon has been a good thing.

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 Colonial Secretary, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the "Discussion of Nfld. Power and Paper Co. Bonds."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman, with regard to the matter before the House, the first thing that appears to my mind is: Why did the Executive Government depreciate by $10,000,000 the security held by our Government against a guarantee of principal and interest without getting the consent of the Legislature in that regard. Enquiries were made as to this matter, and we were told that there was nothing for the House to consider. Matters unimportant have taken up a considerable amount of our time during this session, but a matter like this, involving the Humber project and matters of such great importance to the country at large, are not brought before the House. I would like to know whether or not the Executive Government, when they decided upon this course of action, had power, by reason of the Power and Paper Company Act, to act of themselves. It appears to me that the matter of the Executive Government having this unprecedented power to depreciate a security which is held by this country is very questionable, and I would like to hear from the Attorney General in connection with the powers of the Executive Government in this respect, and as to why the consent of this House was not asked for. To my mind, at any rate, before this should pass through the House, if the interpretation should be that they have those powers, the Act should be amended forthwith to prevent any Executive Government, either this or any subsequent one, from being able to alter in any way the security held by the Newfoundland people.

Coming to the consideration of what has influenced the Executive Government in coming to this conclusion, I feel that the House has not been informed to such an extent as it should have been in this matter, and I can come but to two conclusions: one is, that the Government must have further information, or else they are acting unthinkingly. In the first case, if they have further information and have kept it from the House, I think that they are treating us with a certain amount of contempt. I know that in the beginning those letters which were eventually published in the press were handed

to us and asked to be treated as confidential. I don't think that the Government should have looked upon those letters as confidential. I think it was a good point that those letters were printed, because then the public at large would then be in a position to understand and interpret for themselves why the Executive Government came to this conclusion. On the other hand, maybe, they have accepted without sufficient data and with unbusinesslike trust the assurance of other parties whose interests are not similar to the interests of our Colony in this matter. I think that that is what the Executive Government has done and that is an action contrary to what a man would do in his own business. For example, suppose I were mortgagee of a house, I would not dream of having a man spend money upon that house mortgaged by me and then giving him a prior mortgage on it without asking certain statements. My first question to that man would be to give me a statement of the amount of money spent. As far as I can see and gather from the point of view of a layman, that statement was not handed to the Executive Government, and as far as I can see they have not made any enquiry into why this Humber project which was supposed to cost about twenty millions has eaten up such a large amount of money as it has. We are told by the Colonial Secretary that there are certain general assets and general liabilities here, and in this regard it would be interesting to know who are the sundry creditors mentioned. I doubt very much whether the Colonial Secretary could tell us who these creditors are.

(Reads from Howard's report to Lake.) (Auditors have not finalised.)

I have searched the records of the Supreme Court in order to find out something about this matter. I found out down there that a ten million dollar debenture bond with interest at six per cent. was given by the Utilities Corporation to the Bank of England. That debenture bond is a first and fixed specific charge upon the Utilities assets which means that before anything else is paid that has to be and interest at the rate of six per cent.

(Reads from Report of Mr. Howard to Mr. Lake).

There is eight million left there. How do we know but that the whole thing might not be worth any more than the ten million that the Bank of England has first charge upon.

We are told that Mr. Carter came out here but he was the representative of the British Treasury and how can it be argued that he would look after our interests as he was looking after the interests of the British Treasury whose interests conflict with ours.

The Executive Government should have made a contract differing somewhat in this respect. They could have seen at least that the A and B debentures might have been pooled. The amount raised when the A and B debentures were guaranteed was thought would cover the whole thing and now certain other monies have to be provided and they want to get the consent of the Executive Government to allow them to give a priority of security to those. The Government are allowing this and they should tell who were their financial advisors in this matter and what advice was given that would enable them to come to this conclusion. What is goon enough for the British Treasury is not necessarily good enough for us. Interest for them is 4½ per cent. Interest on our bond is 5½ per cent. The first and fixed specific charge is the other ten million carrying interest at six per

cent. and that is the first thing that has to be paid.

I would not doubt but clever financiers have put it over the Executive Government in this regard.

Now as regards the legal aspect of the situation, we are confronted with a series of agreements and cross agreements and I think that before this House, should give its consent or acquiesce in the stand taken by the Executive Government, that there should be a statement from the legal advisors of the Crown. I understand that Mr. Higgins was in London and he probably interviewed these financial people on the other side. The impression that I got from the perusal of Burns and Burridge's letter was that there was no advice given in that matter. I have taken the trouble to keep that letter and I find here that he says.

(Reads)

Now I can't find anything in that letter of advice as to what this Colony or the Executive Government should do regards the assets of this Utilities Company, it seems to me from what I can gather from the persual of these documents that certain assets of the Company such as ships, town site and timber has been made part of mortgage under A and B and covered only by a floating clause. The chances are that if that company is ever wound up there will be very little afloat. I contend Mr. Chairman that before Newfoundland to-day can put its finger on any security out there, as regards the Company, that we may have to assume a $20,000.000 liability. As a practical man I think that this House should seriously consider this matter. It is a big matter. This is one which I feel that I am unable to give adequate expression to. I am not a lawyer although I have delved into these debenture bonds, in order to find out something in regard to them. I find out with regard to the Debenture Bonds of this Utilities Company, that it is questionable whether we may not have to assume half of the liability, and this would be another five million perhaps before we could utilise the Humber project as we might want to. At any rate it seems that the interest of 6 per cent. must be paid first of all, or the chances are that it might throttle the whole project. I do not understand why this matter was not brought before this House, in order that this Legislature might confirm or reject if it thought wise, the action of the Executive Government. As I said before if they consider that they are allowed to do this , under the Clause in the Newfoundland Power & Paper Act which interprets the Newfoundland Government as the Executive Government of the time , it is doubtful if that is the correct interpretation that should be applied to this case. At any rate if the Executive Government decide to guarantee and allow this issue to take precedent over A and B Debentures, why not bring in a bill to authorise it and place the mater beyond doubt. It is not out of the question that some future administration may feel differently about this matter from what the present administration does. They may not look at the matter eye to eye with the Executive Government of the present time. Therefore in view of this, I think that it would only be fair to explain that if these bond holders are satisfied, that the matter could be done by the Executive Government without referring it to this House, then if any other subsequent administration thought differently, it could not hold them up for breach of faith, in case any subsequent Government failed to ratify the agreement as passed by this Executive Government. This matter is a great one because it involves a great project, and I think myself that the Government before accepting the alternative pointed out to them by Mr. Carter should have gone into

the matter more thoroughly. They should have investigated the matter to a greater extent, and if they could not do anything else, they should have in my opinion, tried to get our bonds or the interest pooled with the British Treasury. As I said before we have very little information to go on. Those remarks that I have made have been made so to speak, by a layman. But I think that the Executive Government should have driven a better bargain, in this regard, and if they could not have done anything else, they could have had our interests pooled with the British Treasury.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, this matter has been brought before this House not for the benefit of this House or the members of this House but simply because some of the citizens of St. John's were to call a public meeting here in reference to this matter, and to satisfy the citizens the Government thought it just as well to bring the matter before this House for discussion. As far as I am concerned I don't see how any discussion can affect the matter. The Government have made the arrangement, they have given the security, and this has gone through. The Minister of Justice tells us that the Government have done something which they should not have done. I agree with the emmber for Twillingate that a matter of such importance should have been brought up before this Legislature for its ratification. The corerspondence between the Government, the Prime Minister and those on the other side shows us that those interested in the project told the Government what they had to do. They told the Government that they decided to accept the second one, which has been done in this agreement. As far as we are concerned I cannot see any sense at all for delaying the House on a discussion of this subject because we cannot help the country anyway. We have lost the security which we had and probably because of that we will be called upon to pay our guaranteee, which we would not have to do if our security had not been given away. Because in the event of the Newfoundland Power and Paper Co. going into the hands of a receiver, there is no doubt but that $20,000,000 could be secured for the outfit.

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 (Thursday) afternoon at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, May 13th, 1926.

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

Petitions were presented by:

Hon. the Minister of Posts from Conception Harbor.

Hon. the Minister of Justice gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Amend 15 Geo. V., Cap. 8, entitled 'Of the House of Assembly.'"

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 51 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Nuisances and Municipal Regulations.'"

Pursuant to order and on motion of

Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 22, Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series) entitled 'Of the Customs'" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time 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 Posts and Telegraphs $1,213,571.35

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.

(1) MR. SCAMMELL asked Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs to lay on the Table of the House a statement in answer to each of the following questions: (a) How many telephones under the control of the Department are in operation in the District of St. Barbe; (b) Where are these telephones situated (i.e. what localities); (c) Who are the keepers in each case and what salaries are paid them in each case; (d) What income was received by the Department from each of these telephone offices for the fiscal years ending June 30th, 1924 and 1925 respectively.

(2) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the Table of the House the following information: (1) Has the Government taken any steps to ascertain the number of people now unemployed around the country; (2) Has the Government considered any programme for the relief of these people; (3) Is it the intention of the Government to take any steps to assist the fishermen in getting supplies for the coming fishery.

No. 1 deferred.

No. 2:

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—In response to this question asked by Mr. Cashin, I am pleased to be able to say that so far, there has not been any particular pressure brought to bear upon the Government for the finding of labor for the unemployed or supplies for the fishermen, and I hope that the people of the country generally are beginning to realise that the issues very grave in this country if people are to be imbued with the idea that whenever they are out of employment they are to look to the Government for the necessary assistance. Since we have been in office we have been trying to spread propaganda against that idea. Most of the Members on the other side of the House, I believe, are willing to help us to that end, but questions of this kind put, across the House, while they may possibly have some political effect to embarrass the administration in power, in my opinion cannot possibly do any good and will in most cases do a great deal of harm.

MR. CASHIN—Arising out of the answer of the Prime Minister to my question, I might say that I did not ask that question for any political information good or bad. I might say that question has not been handed to the press as far as I am concerned and therefore can't do any political harm, or otherwise. I asked that question realising the seriousnss of the situation, and I would be only too pleased to help out the country in that respect. I did not have that question published in any of the papers. I did not ask any Government paper to publish it and as regards the one that is supposed to be supporting this side of the House, as far as I am concerned they did not get that question from me.

HON. THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—I beg to table reply to question asked by Mr. Scammell on the Order Paper of May 12, No. 5.

In reference to the other question as to amount of goods supplied by E. and S. Barbour, I may say for his information that when the dredge went

down to Newtown we saw it would be there quite a time, and the question of supplies came up, and I wrote and asked different merchants down there including E. and S. Barbour to supply me with prices of different articles likely to be required for the dredge, and after a few days I got a list of dry goods, and after going through it we found that it was cheaper to buy down there than to buy at St. John's and send by steamer to Wesleyville and have it transferred to Newtown to the dredge.

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.

MR. WARREN — Mr. Chairman, I have a few words to say respecting this particular vote for Mr. J. H. Dee, Inspector of Preventive Service, in connection with the Customs Department. I might preface my remarks by saying that what I am going to say is not directed to the Minister but to the way a certain portion of that department has been conducted. From time to time I have had occasion to appeal to the Minister to temper mercy with justice, and as far, as he is concerned I want to say that he has not failed to do so. He will remember some trivial cases in which some of my constituents and constituents of some members on the other side of the House were held up for technical breaches of the Customs Act, and the Minister saw fit to withdraw the prosecutions. But I want to draw the attention of the House and the Government to the way Mr. Dee has been acting as Inspector of Preventive Service, and I propose to state the actual facts of what has happened, and I do so not because I have any animosity against the gentleman whom I am going to criticise, but I have been asked by a number of my constituents to point out to the House what Mr. Dee has done up in Fortune Bay and to say that Mr. Dee has lost his usefulness as Inspector of Preventive Service around the South Coast of this Island. I have in mind three cases in which the Inspector of Preventive Service went out of his way to invoke the law upon people in Fortune Bay, and when I state the facts I am quite sure that members of this Committee will agree with me that something ought to be done to protect people to some extent at all events from the predatory ravages of whoever is Inspector of Preventive Service. Now Mr. Dee paid a visit to Belleoram last Fall and awaiting him there were three cases, and in each one action is supposed to have been taken by the local Collector of Customs at that place. The first one was against the Captain of a vessel called the "Florence." In the meantime the vessel had been held up and prevented from sailing for the Banks. Her owners already had been sufficiently punished for the time they lost by being held up because anybody who knows anything about the Bank fishery knows that a couple of days might mean the loss of a tremendous amount to the owners and crew of a banker. In this case the vessel was allowed to proceed to sea, after being held up several days, through the good offices of the Minister and on condition that after finishing the banking voyage the Captain and crew would give themselves up. The "Florence" arrived from the Banks on a Sunday morning in August last year. She was not a smuggler or a bootlegger. She did not come from St. Pierre or any other port; she came direct from the Banks. One of the crew went on board Sunday night accompanied by some inhabitant of Belleoram to get a part bottle of liquor that he had on board for his own use. There are very few bank fishermen

who do not take a bottle of liquor to sea with them for their own use. On Monday morning the Captain of the "Florence" made his report to Collector Curnew who afterwards sealed up what liquor was on board. The liquor that was on board for all the crew amounted to eleven and half bottles of port wine and a few broken bottles of brandy. After that every time the vessel came to land for a baiting she was held up by the Customs on account of the crew having had these broken bottles of liquor on board. About a half dozen times I saw Mr. LeMessurier, Assistant Collector of Customs here, about the vessel being held up and assuring him that these men would give themselves up at the end of the banking voyage. I also asked him not to prosecute the Captain or seize the vessel because of what the crew did. Mr. LeMessurier gave me some satisfaction. Inspector Dee arrived in Belleoram sometime in October or November last, and, although Mr. LeMessurier knew that I was interested and knew the facts of what was going on, the Captain of the "Florence" was hauled up, the vessel seized and the Captain was find $100.

The next case concerned Capt. Elms of one of Harvey & Company's bankers. He went to St. Pierre to go on the slip and while there a merchant told him he had a parcel for Mr. J. R. Bond and asked him if he would take it to him. Elms consented to do so. As a matter of fact the parcel contained a lady's coat and was destined for the school mistress, at Stone's Cove—a lady whose salary amounts to about $200.00 a year. Elms left St. Pierre and his port of entry was Pushthrough as he was on his way to the Straits to go fishing. He could not make Pushthrough owing to stress of weather, and he put into Richard's Harbour. There he openly posted the parcel addressed to J. R. Bond, got his baiting and left for the Straits and fished. Upon his return to the home port with a load of fish the vessel was seized by Inspector Dee, and Capt. Elms, instead of being summoned for smuggling under a section of the Customs Act which provides a maxium penalty of $200, he was summoned by Mr. Dee under another section of the Act for not reporting at the port of entry and under which the Magistrate had no alternative whatever and Capt. Elms was fined $800, and which fine the Customs authorities have since reduced to $200. J. R. Bond did not know anything about this matter. He wired me the facts and asked me what to do. I wired him back and I told him to plead "not guilty," as the parcel was really intended for the school teacher. The magistrate knew that they could not prove anything against Bond when he pleaded "not guilty" in Court, and the next thing happened was that Capt. Elms was threatened with another action by Inspector Dee and a fine of $200. Then Mr. Bond went to the Magistrate and pleaded "guilty" and an arrangement was made by which he was fined $100.

The third case that I have to refer to is that of a rum-runner, and when I talk of a rum-runner or a bootlegger I have not got that contempt for him that some people seem to have. I do not think he is outside the pale altogether because he takes his chances, not to sell the stuff, but to deliver the stuff made by wealthy distillers on the other side of the Atlantic who are making fortunes out of the traffic. And this is not the only place that I have talked in this fashion—I have done it in London. Some people seem to be obsessed with the idea that a rum-runner is the lowest creature born. In my mind and conscience the rum-runner who delivers the stuff is no worse than some of the Lords in England and Scotland who make the stuff, knowing that they have got to deliver it to the rum-

runner before they get their money out of it. There are wealthy titled gentlemen on the other side of the water who distill whiskey, and they distill it knowing that it is going to the United States. They get piles of money for the stuff and get away with it, but for the unfortunate poor devil who takes chances of losing his vessel and probably his life to deliver the stuff there seems to be nothing but scorn and contempt. I say again deliberately that there is not the slightest difference morally between the rum-runner and the lords whom they act for. However, Captain Ed. O. Fudge, in the schooner "J. D. Hazen," which is one of four rum-runners, left St. Pierre last Fall and ran before the wind after losing her anchors and rudder and brought up at Belleoram Reach. The people got out their motor boats and pulled the vessel off the shore and into Belleoram. Inspector Dee immediately put his "can-hooks" on her on the ground that the Captain's manifest was not right and because he did not report exactly the number of gallons of rum he had on board. Dee seized vessel, rum and everything in sight, and Capt. Fudge was fined besides. Fudge appealed to the Supreme Court, but the appeal was not gone on with, and I understand the whole thing was handed back to him by the Customs.

Now the three cases that I have cited are outstanding instances of what the Inspector of Preventive Service has done in Fortune Bay. In the first case of the "Florence" I admit that the crew had no business to have that liquor in their possession. Still the fine of $100 on the Captain, although technically right, could easily have been lessened. The case of Captain Elms was a deliberate attempt on the part of Inspector Dee to get something out of the Customs himself. He knew perfectly well the facts of the three cases. He also knew that the schooner "J. D. Hazen" went into Belleoram through stress of weather and the best proof is that when Fudge appealed to the Supreme Court the whole thing was settled in his favour. Sometimes I agree with the principle that a man who informs or takes prosecution against a person should get a portion of the fine, but when a fine under the Customs Act was made $800 for a minimum, instead of $200, it makes a man a persecutor and not a prosecutor. Early this session I asked whether Inspector Dee got any proportion of the fines that he was concerned in collecting, and I was told that he did. I was told, however, that he got nothing for 1924 and 1925. I do not know whether he did or not, but I intend to pursue the subject and find out what his share of the blood money collected up to last year was. The Minister says that the fines for 1924 and 1925 were not divided, but it would be rather interesting to know why Mr. Dee goes out of his way so much and inflicts heavy penalties for minor technical breaches of the Customs Act. In 1921 a man named Linehan of Placentia district was fined $100; general revenue got $25, Information, which is an official at the Customs Department, got $10, Detective Tobin got $25, and Inspector Dee got $40. The same year P. J. O'Reilly was fined $200; general revenue got $50 of it, and Inspector got $90. That is the same proportion all down through the figures that were given me by the Customs. The total amount of fines for that year was $2,056.00, out of which Inspector Dee got $834.00. In 1922 the schr. "Lettis B." got into trouble and the total amount of fines (Bonds to be given upon Enntry of Goods) paid by the "Lettis B." was $4,434.00, out of which general revenue got $1,108.00, Inspector Dee $1,985.00, Detective Tobin $625.00 and Information $325.00. The total fines collected for 1922 was $8,525.00 out of which In-

spector Dee hauled down $3,144.00, and all this money besides his salary and keep on the S.S. Daisy. In 1923 the total fines collected was $2,000.00, out of which Inspector Dee got $614.-75. I have not been able to get the figures for 1924 and 1925; but for 1921-22-23 Inspector Dee got over $5000.00 in addition to his salary and his keep on the S.S. Daisy. Surely it is not meant that when Dee goes to the South Coast that he is to pick out, in conjunction with a decrepit Magistrate, sections of the Act providing the biggest maximum fines, that prosecutions are to be taken under, as was done in the case of Capt. Elms and when the Magistrate had no alternative, because under that section, if the vessel is under 100 tons the minimum fine is $400, and over 100 tons $800; but Dee knew the case was a matter of smuggling, but he did not take action for smuggling, rather did he summons Capt. Elms for not going to Pushthrough to report, knowing that the vessel could not get in there owing to stress of weather and knowing also that the fine, as I have already stated, under this section, was heavy. Therefore, Inspector Dee's usefulness is seriously discounted for this reason on the South Coast of this Island. He went up in Fortune Bay and he summoned the Captain of the "Florence" before the Magistrate at Belleoram and had him fined $100 because amongst the crew were eleven bottles of broken port wine and some brandy. Yet, despite all this, Inspector Dee, on his return to St. John's, is found taking thirty or thirty-five bottles of liquor to his own house.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I don't think that is correct. If you can prove it to me I will be very glad. I had an enquiry into this, and I thought it was so much piffle and I dismissed it entirely. There was nothing in it that could be taken hold of. I say this is not worth while to bother about.

MR. WARREN—But the Captain of the "Florence" was fined $100.00 and the people on the West Coast know that Mr. Dee was taking liquor away from the "Daisy," and he was stopped, an enquiry was held, and he was let off. I want to say this, that Mr. Dee's usefulness as an Inspector of Customs is gone, unless the people on that Coast are informed as to just exactly what happened, and why Mr. Dee was let off, and why these men who go out on the Banks, three hundred miles from the Coast, because they had broken bottles of wine and brandy on board, were held up and fined $100.00. Two Custom House Officers reported that Mr. Dee had in his house, or in his possession six bottles of benedictine. What was done with him? I want to say that unless you explain that to the people on the South West Coast, Mr. Dee's usefulness there is absolutely gone, and also his usefulness to the Customs Department. Now I don't know the facts, I don't know the number of bottles that were taken away from the "Daisy," but I do know that he did take some liquor ashore. I know the names of the men that reported it, and the story was told to me by Captain Fudge when he came here about his case. But all I ask of the Minister is to get up and tell us exactly what happened, how many bottles were taken away from the "Daisy," by what authority, why they were not put in the Bond Store, and why Mr. Dee was not prosecuted and fined the same as the crew of the "Florence" were fined.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—To hear the honourable member for Fortune talk you would think that all the people in Fortune Bay were Angel Gabriels. Mr. Warren was told the story of the man Elms who was fined $100.00. Has Mr. Warren explained that there was

a man sent over to Sydney to post parcels to Newfoundland. I was in the Post Office in Sydney on the 23rd of January, I saw parcels there addressed to Newfoundland to be sent down in schooners. They are posted and there was never a cent of duty paid on them. Are you aware of that?

MR. WARREN—Yes.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—A man in St. John's can't get a parcel in free, but give it to a captain of a schooner on the West Coast and he will bring it in. Now I don't say Mr. Dee is perfect. No man is going to be popular whose job is to seize stuff for the Custom House, but he is only doing his duty, and if the West Coast is allowed to run loose, I think we can say good bye to the revenue. I don't mean to say for one minute that all the people on the West Coast are alike, but there are a tremendous lot of parcels coming in from Sydney to the West Coast that this country does not see a cent of duty from.Those who are saying that Mr. Dee was severe, but the fines are laid down and the law is laid down, and if it was cut out entirely they would get nothing. Again Mr. Warren has spoken about rum-runners. He says that the man who undertakes to rum-run is no worse than a manufacturer who sells him the rum. Well I have nothing to say about that. If a man takes a chance and runs rum into a country what happens when he is caught. Now by your own confession in connection with Captain Fudge, the reason why Mr. Dee prosecuted was because as you say the manifest put in at the Custom House is not correct.

MR. WARREN—I say that is what he was charged with.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Well if he was charged on that and the liquor was more than was reported on the manifest then he was liable to be brought up under that charge. Now I am not here to protect Mr. Dee, but I have found him to do his duty fairly well, but you can put one hundred men in Dee's position, and perhaps he will do just as well as any one of the hundred. I would like to call the Member's attention to the fact that he gave me a kind of a shock this evening when he said that there were four rum-runners up in Fortune Bay.

MR. WARREN—I said there were four vessels out of Fortune Bay that were rum running somewhere else. I did not say that they were running into Newfoundland.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Now turn to and take the case of those parcels coming across from Sydney. There is a regular system of Jews who are absolutely beating the Customs to a standstill. There was one case where I had to send up to Channel to prosecute. There were twelve tins with one gallon of liquor in each covered with fruit cake. Now I am just trying to tell you what the difficulties are. He also found liquor up in Corner Brook in pork barrels, addressed to people who do not live in Corner Brook at all. Somebody goes down and gets delivery of them. There are all kinds of stories which cannot possibly be explained. Regarding Mr. Dee and the case of wine, I was absent when this happened, I was in England. When I came back I was informed by the Collector there was some trouble about Mr. Dee and some stuff that was supposed to have been taken from the "Daisy.' I said what is it all about? Has there been an enquiry into it? He said "yes," but as far as he could see there was nothing in it at all. Mr. Dee was taking some stuff ashore and he took a box with half a dozen bottles of Benedictine in it also. When he found the box he immediately returned it. That is all I could get out of it. I don't think we should chastise Mr. Dee for that. I think the

honourable member will admit that it would be unfair to accuse him of smuggling under such circumstances as that. I think myself that the case of that banker was a bit harsh. I agree with the honourable member for Fortune Bay there. I sent my sanction for the release of the vessel, and I told him to go on. In the meantime Mr. Warren will understand that there is only one way to stop smuggling, and that is to carry out the Act. Now as far as the distribution of fines and forfeitures is concerned, that has been going on I don't know how long. We are still up against the trouble of having these men almost every day going down there. I am trying to bring a change about and see if there is no other system under which this could work. Possibly a man should not be harsh as you claim Mr. Dee is, but if you allow anything, whether it be the rich or the poor, the trouble will get to such a pass that we will have difficulty in handling it. Surely the honourable member does not think that I am any more desirous or that I take any more pleasure in bringing a man to justic than any onee else. Does he think that it is any pleasure to me to dismiss a man? As a matter of fact I may tell you that I suffer a great deal more than any other man in the Government. I have dismissed men and I have taken them back, and I have dismissed them again and taken them back again. I have done everything possible to bring some of them around and I failed afterwards. All that I can say to the House is that I have tried to the best that I knew how, and in doing that I have sometimes hurt some people and then they have hurt me. Now the difficulty is to get a man qualified to put in his services all over the country, and carry out the law and collect the Customs duty properly. And I may say that that is the one man that this country gets the revenue from and the main revenue today. Mr. Warren referred to a Mr. Information down there, and the fact of his getting a proportion of the fines. I am a great deal like Mr. Warren. I dont know how he is entitled to any of it. But he got certain monies apparently because he was Mr. Information.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Information gets this money under the regulations that were put into effect three years ago. These decided how the fines were to be divided.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I have an idea that it goes back further than that, although the Minister of Justice is probably right. But I may tell you that this will be changed now. And as far as Jerry Dee is concerned, I understand that he is doing the best that he knows how, and until the evidence is stronger than it is at present it is impossible for me to take action against him.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, of course in the ordinary way the Minister responsible for the Department has to reply. But I will deal with the latter part of his speech before coming to the earliest portion. He has said that it is no pleasure to him to have to prosecute people, and that if he does those same people try to hurt him afterwards. Well I want to tell the Minister right away that it is no pleasure to me to prosecute people either, but I have done it and been hurt afterwards; nor is it my intention to hurt the Minister, but I want to point out to the Government and the Department, that in spite of what the Minister has said, you will never convince me or the people of the West Coast from Ferryland to Port aux Basques that Mr. Dee did not try to smuggle liquor and was let off. Now the Minister started off by saying that I wanted to give the House the impression that the people of Fortune Bay were angels. Well I may

say that I try to think that they are, but I don't believe they all are. But on the other hand they are not the smugglers that the people think that they are. You go up to Fortune Bay, go up to Belleoram, where all this happened, and even the Minister could not buy a bottle of whiskey there. Somebody might lend him one if he promised to pay it back. But there is no smuggling there for traffic purposes. Now my friend, the hon. member for Carbonear, early in the session had something to say about the people of the West Coast, getting goods in duty free or something like that. He did not know what he was talking about either.

MR. DUFF—The cap does not fit.

MR. WARREN—No, the cap does not fit. Now in connection with the Daisy. On the whole of that coast for at least nine months of the year look at the amount of the fines; $2,000; and believe me I am paying a compliment to Mr. Dee; nothing escapes him that can possibly escape. The Minister told us that Mr. Iolquet is the head agent for smuggling from Eaton's.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I said that this man takes the parcels from people coming from Sidney and gives them to the bankers going to Newfoundland.

MR. WARREN—It would be interesting to know how many bankers entered from St. Pierre into Fortune Bay during 1925. You would be surprised to find how few there are. Fortune Bay is not the headquarters for smuggling. Some parcels may come there, but I am not talking of this. But what I complain of is this, that the Inspector knew the facts before he took the action, and he deliberately took action against the Captain for going into a port that was not a port of entry, because he was going to get $800 fine. And then when the Magistrate wanted to fine the man another two hundred dollars, they made an arrangement between them. And Bond said "I plead guilty. Fine me $100 and don't fine that man $200." If that is the way that the service is going to be carried on, then it is about time that you got a new inspector. Now then with regard to what Mr. Dee took ashore. I want to say that my information is that he took more than six bottles. According to that information, he took six bottles of Benedictine and thirty odd bottles of liquor.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I must say that I don't know that.

MR. WARREN—That is what has been reported to me.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—If you wish to make that charge I am quite satisfied to have an investigation to see just what did come in.

MR. WARREN — The information that I got was that the enquiry was held before the Minister got back; and it was merely reported to him, when he got back as a matter of news. I didn't know that he had anything to do with it at all. Mr. Chairman, in ventilating these facts about the Florence the Minister said "What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander." My information was that Mr. Dee had taken six bottles of Benedictine and thirty bottles of liquor besides, and if that is so, he should have been fined just the same as the crew of the Florence were fined for having broken bottles of liquor aboard the ship, although they did not come from St. Pierre, but from the Banks.

MR. CASHIN—While on this vote I want to say that while I agree with the Government having detectives for this sort of thing, I don't agree with a man going and tempting a person to break the law, so that he may inform on him—he is only an informer, and I think he is the lowest creature God ever made. There was a time in Ireland when they cut the ears off a

man for that sort of thing, but this is not Ireland. I don't think it is a great advertisement to the Government to have that kind of a servant. I agree with a detective doing his duty, but I can't agree with a man who goes and deliberately tempts people to steal or smuggle, and then report them. I know of one of these, and would like to serve notice that the next time he comes on my wharf he goes overboard. His name is Kendrick and he wanted one of my Captains to smuggle a half-gallon of rum last summer.

Mr. Chairman, we are now drawing to the close of the Estimates, and I propose to have a few remarks in connection with the Department to which we are now coming. I have been a strong advocate for the past two years for the re-imposition of the Income Tax and the Business Profits Tax. We are now going to vote a sum of money for the Assessor's Department—a very small amount, $14,-120.00. Would I at this juncture be asking too much in asking the Minister when we may expect the Budget?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I expect on Tuesday.

MR. CASHIN—Thank you. Now Mr. Chairman, personally, as an Independent member on this side of the House I may say that I expect when the Budget comes down, in view of the fact that we are going to vote $15,000 this afternoon, for the maintenance of the Assessor's Department, that no doubt when the Finance Minister brings in the Budget, we will have a re-imposition of the Income Tax and the Business Profits Tax. I take it that if there were not going to be a re-imposition of these taxes, and in view of the fact that they have not been operating during the past twelve months, that the Department would no longer be necessary, and would be abolished, perhaps with the exception of one or two clerks that would be held there to collect back income taxes, which no doubt are very few.

I would like to make a few remarks this afternoon, possibly one or two in reply to what the Prime Minister said this afternoon. He said in the course of his remarks that he would like to have all the members of the Opposition help out the Government in the grave issues that now confront us, or words to that effect. Evidently the Prime Minister thought I was asking that question for political reasons, even though I have since assured him that the answer would not be published, unless it was through his newspapers. I do not think that the Prime Minister should have insinuated, as he has done, that I do not desire to help out as much as any other member in this House. As a matter of fact I regard the Prime Ministers words as too trivial to answer. I do not need to go into details to prove that I have had the interest of the country at heart as anyone here, either in the past or in the future. We all realize that the situation is a grave one, and I anticipate that after we have voted these monies, and when the Minister of Finance comes in here on Tuesday, if this Government has the interests of the people at heart, in which the Prime Minister said we should have the cooperation of every member on this side, that there will be a considerable reduction in taxation. I may be asked how that can be accomplished, and in reply to that question, which may be directed to me, I would say that it can be partly carried out by the re-imposition of the Income Tax and the Business Profits Tax. Now Sir, the point has been raised that the incomes of $2000.00 which have been taxed in the past only brought in a revenue of $45,-000.00, and if I had the doing of the thing, which fortunately or unfortunately I have not, I would do it on this line. I would place the tax on

incomes running from $4000.00 upwards—the details could be figured out, and incomes of less than that amount would be free from the tax. I say that because the people who have incomes of $4000.00 and upwards can well afford to pay something to the country; no doubt they have made it out of the country. Now regarding the unemployment in this country, and the prospects for the fishery. We are until now without the budget, and that is not our fault—we have never held up this Chamber or Assembly deliberately at any time, and I can say that I feel business people are wondering what is going to happen; what is going on or what is coming off. The people carrying on the fisheries are wondering what the Budget is going to develop, when the Minister reads it to this House on Tuesday, and they are holding back. Because he is largely interested in supplying for the fisheries of this country and he knows that the merchants to-day are holding back because the demands for our fish are falling off, and because of the high rates charged for goods which they have to sell to the fishermen, it is practically impossible for the fishermen to make the two ends meet under the existing circumstances. I make the statement in this House this afternoon that putting the Labrador catch and the shore catch at a million and a quarter quintals for the year the average price accordingly, which I made up to-day in conversation with a fisherman, that the cost of the quintal of fish under the present rates that are charged for supplies is six dollars and ten cents per quintal. Now sir, is not that situation one which should call for serious consideration. Now the people are looking for a reduction in taxation and the Government will say to me how can you reduce taxation and pay your bills. In reply I say reimpose the income tax and the business profits tax and you will collect three or four hundred thousand dollars. Cut down the expenditure on the railway a quarter of a million dollars and that will make six hundred and fifty thousand dollars in two clinks, and then you would be able to take off the duty on butter one or two cents a pound, and take the duty off clothing, which went up twenty two per cent., and lines and twines ten per cent., and tobacco and the other necessities of life for the fishermen. I have been criticised by the members of the Government because I speak for the fishermen, not being being a fisherman myself, but I represent a fishing constituency in this House, and these people sent me here to carry out their instructions, and it is my duty even if I do not gain my livelihood as they do to see that their interests are protected and to outline as far as my abilities will allow a scheme for the reduction of taxation. But I make the statement that if this administration or any other administration does not intend to reimpose the income tax and the business profits tax, then they will be short in their accounts; and it will be necessary to arrange for another five million dollar loan and put an extra ten or fifteen per cent taxation on the people of this country. I have figured it out from the figures that have been given me by the Minister of Finance and the Prime Minister as the Chairman of the Railway Commission. Now, sir, we have voted these expenditures, or in a short time we will have voted them. I have listened here this afternoon to my friend on my right, Mr. Warren, in connection with the smuggling, and these people have been fined a large amount of money which possibly they could not afford to pay for smuggling a bottle of rum or a bottle of whiskey as the case may be. Well, sir, is it fair to fine these people for the smuggling of a bottle of rum or a bottle of whiskey when you allow whiskey, etc.,

to come into this country duty free to be used by Government officials and secretaries at the Government House. It is only a temptation to the poor fishermen on the South West Coast, and the Southern Shore and Placentia, to smuggle it in in order to live as cheaply as those who live in the laps of luxury. Is that right? If I am wrong, which I doubt, I am perfectly satisfied to retract that statement, but I do not think that it is fair that favour should be shown to anyone from the richest to the poorest. We have six or seven millions coming into this country annually duty free, but Sir, I claim that the practice of allowing goods to come into this country duty free has been prostituted, although I do not blame the present Government for it. I feel that we should place a duty of five per cent. or some per cent. on everything with the possible exception of machinery that might come in here some time in the future for the development of some big industry. I agree with you that people would be down on you. They would criticise you and be coming to you to-morrow to take it off again. But sometime we will have to pay through the nose. What I mean by that is that I would tax everything that comes in for the churches and everything else. I was not afraid to get up and make that statement and why should not they have to pay as well as we have to pay. The Public pays for the upkeep and the public has to pay the bills. Of course I have no doubt that wonderful good has been done by allowing goods into the country in some cases, but does it counteract the excessive taxation that is placed on the shoulders of the poor. It is the poor people of the country that have to pay the greatest share of the taxation. I have had representation from my own district, fifteen or twenty men called on me, looking for supplies they were at the time, handline fishermen, and they told me that it was impossible for them to fit out for the fishery this spring and go fishing and make the two ends meet. I claim that the handline fisherman who is catching fifty quintals of fish is doing fairly good, and to catch that fish costs them three hundred dollars. They would want twelve dollars per quintal for it to pay their bills, and to enable them to fit out for the winter. The Government should reimpose the income tax and the business profits tax. And I hope that when the Budget Speech comes down there, and whether it is in the Budget or is going to be put in there that there should be five per cent. put on the six million dollars worth of goods that comes into this country duty free. And I say to you, Sir, as chairman of this committee, that you have my permission to publish that in the Daily News tomorrow morning, but be sure to put it in right. If the Government will do that they can make their accounts come square and reduce taxation ten per cent. I agree with the Government that they may be playing politics with their exposition to-day, but I want to tell them, although I have not any great political experience that by putting the people on Water Street against them, as they say to one another in their Executive Meetings if they did this or if they did that, they would get the mass of the people with them. And the masses made this Government and they will make or break them. Last year on April 28th I left the Government, when the Budget that was brought in here put an extra twelve or fifteen per cent. on the taxpayers of the country, and this year when the Budget Speech comes down here, and if the Minister of Finance is in a position that he should be in and be prepared to take off twelve or fifteen per cent. I will be the first man on this side of the House to compliment him. I propose now sir as I have some

figures here, I am rather strong on figures at time, and I wish to point out to the House the financial position of the Government at the pre sent time with regard to their last two years in office. I have not got them here. But I have them from memory. We come to the dock, and I was one of those that advocated the expenditure of the money. The estimate for the dock was one million and eighty six thousand dollars, and I prophesy right here that it will cost two million. I make that statement without fear of contradicton from any member in this House. Up to two days ago the dock had cost one million four hundred and fifty thousand dollars and the estimated amount necessary to finish is about five hundred thousand dollars, and Mr. Chairman, it is a simple sum in proportion, if the W. I. Bishop Company stated that it would cost one million and eighty six thousand dollars, and it is going to cost fifty per cent. more from their statement, that a half million dollars more will be necessary to finish, then the final cost will be near two and a half million dollars. Put it at two. You voted two million dollars for roads and you spent one million and six hundred thousand to pay the deficit, and a million on rerailing the Clarenville Division, and another half a million for the Caribou, and you are going to bring legislation for the rerailing of the Clarenville-Bishops Falls section, and that will be another million and a half, together with the equipment that is necessary, and you are going to have a deficit on the Budget up to the thirtieth of June of a half a million dollars; and you lost seven hundred and seventy-four thousand dollars on the railway during the past twelve months. Add that up. That is nine million eight hundred and seventy-four thousand dollars. Take off six million and you have three million eight hundred and seventy-four thousand dollars, and you have to come in to-morrow with a loan bill and ask this House to vote for it, and at five per cent. that means an extra two hundred and fifty thousand dollars taxation on the people of this country. Now, Sir, these things must happen provided you do not reimpose the income tax and the business profits tax and cut down the railway expenditure a quarter of a million dollars, which can be done. And I feel that you can, if you want to, come in here, or the Finance Minister can come in here, and take off ten per cent. if he wants to. But if you do not make that cut in the expenditure of the railway and reimpose that income tax and the business profits tax, and do not put five per cent. or some per cent. on all the six million dollars worth of goods that is coming into this country, you are going to have to come in here and put on another fifteen per cent. taxation. An extra million dollars taxation on what, and on whom and for whom? It will not hurt me directly or indirectly, but it is going to hurt someone. I wish that the Budget were in now that the estimates are finished and we would know of the competence or the incompetence of the present administration. And the Prime Minister gets up this afternoon and says in effect that I am the man on this side of the House who does not want Newfoundland to go forward, and that I am the one that asks questions in this House for the sake of political expediency. The Prime Minister and the Government themselves are advertisement enough, because they went to the country, and I went with them, and then made certain promises to the people and then came back and acted quite on the contrary. I find, Mr. Chairman, that the Prime Minister does not like one of my class. I regret that I am not in his class or position in the community and that I have gone so far as to be impertinent to him in his high position as the

Prime Minister of Newfoundland. I want to tell him that the people of this country made him the Prime Minister and he is their servant and not their master, and the people of the country made his Government, and I make this prediction now that he will not have the pluck to go back to his constituents and ask them for a repetition of the confidence that they imposed in him in 1924.

But I am going back, please goodness, if I live. It is regrettable that some people in this world are brought into this world under different circumstances than others, but I assure the Prime Minister that I do not give one fillip of my finger for him or any one like him, and I presume that he retorts in the same way to me. But he will probably want me before I want him. I never made a promise to the people of this country and went back on them. I think at least that I have the courage to say yes or no and he has not. Deliberate deceit from start to finish. I said one time before in this House that his manifesto started in sin. It will die in sin. It will not hurt me but it will hurt himself, for two years ago there was not a more popular man in the country than the present Prime Minister. But what is the position to-day? The position we are up against is that he has, instead of carrying out the policy of the manifesto, put further taxation on the people of the country. He puts it on the people of every mans district and we have to stand for it. I heard Mr. Duff make a reference to the Coxeys army marching on Washington. It is a pity that we have not a man of that nature in Newfoundland to-day, and I believe that the time has come when we need a leader of that calibre. I am not a Bolshevik or a Communist, and I am not in communication with the Communist elements in Russia, but I want British fair play, and that has not been handed out by the present administration or the Prime Minister. Lots of people are getting favours. Mr. Warren's poor fishermen are fined a hundred dollars for smuggling a bottle of rum or a bottle of whiskey, but the classes can get it in duty free. The trouble is that they are paying for the stuff that these aristocrats get for nothing. I trust that it is a little better than the stuff that was on exhibition here a little while ago. Again, Sir, I take it that the Government will now reimpose the income tax and the business profits tax. I take that from the fact that we are going to vote fifteen thousand dollars for the Assessor's Department, and if you do that I will congratulate the Government even if they did defeat the motion made by the Opposition two months ago. I will leave any further remarks that I may have to make until the Budget has appeared, and I will again ask the Prime Minister and the Finance Minister to give some consideration to the matter of the reimposition of the business profits and the income taxes and take a hold of the railway outfit and cut it a half a million dollars, and put a percentage on the six million dollars worth of goods that is at present coming into the country duty free; and if they do that they will be able to lighten the burden of taxation by ten per cent.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Before the Committee rises I should like to say a few words. I don't intend to reply to Mr. Cashin's speech this afternoon as what he has spoken about is more or less a matter connected with the Budget, but I shall take the opportunity to say a few words when the Budget comes in, and I think I shall be able to defend myself, as per usual, in connection with the financial affairs of the country. I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his courtesy in putting through the Estimates and I will endeavour to have the Budget along on Tuesday.

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 notice and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions relating to the Railway and Shipping.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—It will be remembered that when we were discussing this Bill before we left clause 4 over for consideration, as suggested by the honourable member for Fortune, who proposed that section 2 of clause 4 should be amended. We propose to insert the words "provided, however, that the Board shall not have power to sell, transfer, or lease the railway or any portion thereof without the consent of the Legislature" after the words "such contract shall be in the name of the Board." That was the only point raised, I think, in connection with that particular clause. It appeared we would, according to the clause, have power to dispose of the railway over night and get away with the proceeds, and while I still contend that as the clause reads that authority could not be taken to sell the railway, for safer purposes, and at the suggestion of the honourable member for Fortune, we decided to put in these words.

In considering the new clauses 13, 14 and 15, the contentious clause seems to have been section 13, and it is proposed to amend it in this way: Reads "occupied and improved land" instead of occupied or improved land, and at the third last line "at large" is dropped and "upon the railway track" is substituted.

MR. ASHBOURNE—While we are on these resolutions I would like to call the attention of the Prime Minister, as Chairman of the Railway Commission, to the advisability or the consideration of, when they are rerailing the Clarenville section this summer, whether or not it might be well to have the main line come through Lewisporte and cut out the branch line of nine miles from the Notre Dame Junction. Lewisporte is the chief railway port of the North and in view of the fact that the Commission is considering the rerailing of the track and that sometime in the future they might consider building a railway down to the Gander, I thought that probably this matter might not be amiss and it might be taken into consideration by the Railway Commission. I just mention this fact to the Prime Minister because if it would not do anything else it would save the salaries of the men at Notre Dame Junction Station. It might be found that the thing was not possible, but I know that there is a great deal of inconvenience caused to passengers in getting off the express at Notre Dame Junction and waiting for the transfer of the mails and baggage and express and then get the luggage, etc., on board and then get back on the Lewisporte track again before they can start for Lewisporte. I am not advocating any large expenditure of money but perhaps it might save the people of Notre Dame Bay and of the whole North a great deal of inconvenience, because Lewisporte is the terminal and practically everybody in the North travels, those who do travel, to Lewisporte at some time of the year or other. I just bring this to the attention of the Prime Minister, because perhaps sometime there may be consideration given to the matter of building a railway down to the Gander and then the possibilities of what

I suggest might be looked into.

MR. BROWN—I think that the big part of the grievance with the Notre Dame Junction is that it takes so long after the express has gone for the branch train to come up from the Y and get on the main line and get the mail and baggage and freight transferred to it and then get back on the Lewisporte line again. It was suggested to me last fall that a siding might be put alongside the Notre Dame Junction and then the express and mails and baggage might be transferred from the expresses to the branch train direct and save an hour or more. There would be no need of the train coming up and getting on the main track and then backing up and getting back on the Lewisporte line again. If there were two good cars, passenger cars, first and second class, put on the branch I think that it would do away with a lot of grievance. It must be remembered that this is one of the most important branches in the country, and about two or three hundred people from Notre Dame Bay travel over the line every week, and they want to get into Lewisporte with the least possible delay. If this siding could be put in, and it is quite feasbile, I think that there would be better satisfaction all around.

MR. SCAMMELL—My own experience with the Lewisporte shore line is one that goes back for a number of years, from the time I first came here to St. John's as a student, and then during the years that I came here to teach and in the years that I have been living here, and I have often had occasion to go home, and in most cases I went over the railway, and I think that Mr. Brown's statement is a very reasonable one. You have, as the express schedule stands at the present time, to arrive at Lewisporte at a rotten hour, at two or three o'clock in the morning if the express is on time. Then your luggage is chucked off and you wait until the express has pulled out and the shore train has come up and taken that freight and luggage on board. I think that his suggestion that there ought to be a siding so that the transfer could be made immediately is worth consideration. With regard to the accommodation on the branch line, it is only nine miles long but these nine miles can be made very uncomfortable travelling with the car full of smoke after waiting first of all for two or three hours at the junction for the train. To my mind the putting of a siding there would to a great extent offset the criticism that has been forthcoming in this connection. And for that reason I support Mr. Brown in that suggestion, that was principally why I rose to my feet. I would like to ask the Prime Minister what section of the road they are going to rerail this present summer.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, in response to Mr. Scammell's question as to rerailing, I may say that the railroad management advises that the section where it is most needed—that is where there are most broken rails—is between Clarenville and Bishop's Falls. There is also a little bit of the road on the Topsails that needs attention. Outside of that the whole section between Clarenville and Bishop's Falls requires rerailing, and it is about the same amount of mileage as from here to Clarenville.

Regarding the suggestion of Mr. Ashbourne, this would mean a cost of at least half a million dollars, and couldn't be undertaken. It seems to me that the suggestion of Mr. Brown's is a very reasonable one, and I will see that it is taken up at the next meeting. I travelled only once in my life over that line, to make the round trip of the Clyde, and I was very much struck with the magnificent scenery round Green Bay—in my opinion the most magnificent in the country, and I think it is something

that would attract the tourists, if we could give them ordinary comforts in getting there and provide hotel accommodation. I remember when I went there with my wife, the cars were so dirty that we had to put newspapers down to sit on. As Mr. Brown has said, there was a stove in each end of the car, and the ashes were flying everywhere—it was most uncomfortable for a gentlman, not to speak of a lady. And the accommodations at Lewisporte were not very good; I don't know if they are better now. It would be most delightful to take that trip around Green Bay, and if the accommodations were proper, I am sure tourists would be delighted with it. We propose, if our plans are approved of, to buy four new steam coaches of the type which proved so effective last year, and on which we made money. If we put coaches on the South Shore Branch, on Bay de Verde and Bonavista Bay Branches they will not only be effective and useful but will save money. One freight train per week would be enough for these branches, and we could accommodate passengers and mails daily by the coaches. If we do this we will have more free cars, and no doubt could arrange for better accommodations on the Notre Dame Junction Branch.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, with the amendments that have been made since these resolutions were brought in it is really more acceptable. But I think that section 16 bars any good that may come from the other parts of the resolutions. Why is there any necessity of having that there at all? The commission for the last year or two has acted without pay, and possibly the same commission could be employed. I am opposing this on principle. We are trying to keep the Legislature free from impurities and not make a commercial business out of it, and that is the only reason why I suggest having this cut out.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, I have to confess to a certain amount of doubt in this respect. I don't know if it has been accepted that the Commission are to be paid or not. I agree with Mr. Halfyard that this section could be very well ruled out. After all, if we accept the principle outlined here we are doing away with a very important part of our constitutional heritage, the independence of members, and the principle that members of the House shall not be affected by other influences. And if the present commissioners have been willing to accept the position without pay, they have set a good example for others to follow. If we can find three or four men to do this now without pay, no doubt we shall be able to do so at any time. It seems to me that section 16 lays the provisions of this Bill open to the point that we could come in here and vote fancy salaries to members of the Railway Commission.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—It is restricted to $2,000 for all members.

MR. SCAMMELL—Even then you will be authorized to appoint a commission of members under pay. I think it would be better if section 16 were abolished. Your various members would really be Ministers of the Crown.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Chairman, I take the liberty of saying a few words. My point is simply this, that the principle is admitted in section 2, but it doesn't set out how much a member gets. Now if a member of the House accepts a position of emolument he vacates his seat. This provision is exactly the same as the Board of Works, and exempts the members from that penalty. Now no one seriously contemplates that the class of man who comes into this House is the class who looks for a $500.00 job. I do not think there are

any here now, and hope there will never be.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, regarding the question raised by the member for St. John's West, Mr. Browne, and answered by Mr. Monroe. Under this Act you could appoint a commission of three men, who would have a majority vote, and with the general manager could manage the department. You could pay them $1,000.00, and that would be an amount of money which could cause a debate. I am not saying this because I am a member on this side of the House, but we have heard from the Minister of Justice, who sits there as a practical politician. I give him credit that he does give consideration to matters affecting the country, but in this matter he has given us what he thinks to-day, from a standpoint of political expediency, and as a practical politician, but that may not be his view in ten years' time, and I would like to hear from him from that standpoint, not from that of the political situation of the present time. This provision is hitting at the dignity and purity of this House. The fact that a member can go on this commission at a salary without going to the country is apt to destroy the safeguards of this Assembly and the independence of its members, which should be preserved intact.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Chairman, the honourable member for St. Barbe himself will appreciate the fact that the test always is what happens with regard to the individual himself when his case is put before the people. So far as the position to-day is concerned, surely it is exactly what a democratic people are entitled to have, namely, that members come in here and amongst them may be found some men who are supposed to be of advantage to put on the Railway Commission. It is not an utter absurdity to have a member of the House of Assembly go back for re-election because he is made an adviser to the management of the railway. The Board is only a nominal one and a member of it cannot be classed like the head of a ministerial department because he does not get a ministerial salary. I hope we are not getting down to the stage when it is thought that a man can be purchased for a $500 job. Personally, I do not want to be here when that day arrives. I do not think that a man can be regarded as sacrificing his independence because of the small salary he gets on the Railway Commission. I think it would be very much better to dispense with the idea of getting a free man or a cheap man, and I think that a member of the Board should be compensated for his loss of time just as a director does; and I will go further and say that any member who acts on that Board is worth more than $10 a session to this country or to anything else.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I think the salary of $500 spoken of is only imaginary, because under this clause one man is likely to get $1500 and another man $500. In connection with the members of the Board of Works there is a definite sum fixed and no man can get more than $250. It is the principle of the thing I am objecting to, and I think that the present Commission can legally take a part of this money, and why should we want to further indemnify members of this House against the disabilities Act by their accepting offices of emolument from the Colony. The thin end of the wedge is in and an attempt is being made to drive the wedge in further and to make it impossible in future for some members to voice their sentiments on any question of policy. Mr. Chairman, I cannot see the necessity of this clause in the Resolutions, and it would be very much better to have it eliminated.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, I

would like to ask what pressing reason is there for having this section here at all?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, as far as the present Commission is concerned neither the Finance Minister, the Colonial Secretary or myself would be affected in any way; but Hon. Mr. Sullivan would, and in six months' time would have to vacate his seat and go back to his district for re-election, because he accepts $500.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed the said Resolution 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 on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill "An Act Respecting Railway and Shipping" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Hon. the Minister of Justice gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill "An Act to Amend an Act Amending Cap. 3, 14, Geo. V. entitled 'An Act for the Confirmation of an Agreement between the Government and Harry J. Crowe, Timber Merchant, and for other purposes."

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

Mr. Ashbourne gave notice of question.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, May 14th, 1926.

The House met at three 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 Bill, sent up by the House of Assembly, entitled "An Act to Further Amend Cap. 35 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Postal and Telegraph Services, and the Amending Act George V. Cap. 37 (1920)" without amendment.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had recieved a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they have passed the Bill, sent up by the House of Assembly, entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 15, George V. Cap. XIV., entitled 'An Act for the Confirmation of an Agreement between the Government and the Newfoundland Hotel Facilities, Ltd." 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 Amendments made by the House of Assembly in and upon the Amendments made by the Legislative Council in and upon the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to Amend the Seal Fishery Act, and other Acts relating to the Seal Fishery," without Amendment.

Petitions were presented by:

Hon. the Colonial Secretary from New Harbour re Road.

Mr. Cashin gave notice of question.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 15, Geo. V. Cap. 8, enittled '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 Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 51 of the Con-

solidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Nuisances and Municipal Regulation'" 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, the Bill entitled 'An Act to Amend an Act amending Cap. 3, 14 Geo. V. entitled 'An Act for the Confirmation of an Agreement between the Government and Harry J. Crowe, Timber Merchant, and for other purposes,'" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time presently.

Whereupon, with unanimous consent, the Bill entitled 'An Act to amend an Act amending Cap. 3, 14 Geo. V., entitled 'An Act for the Confirmation of an Agreement between the Government and Harry J. Crowe, Timber Merchant, and for other 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,, with unanimous consent, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled 'An Act to amend an Act amending Cap. 3, 14 Geo. V. entitled 'An Act for the Confirmation of an Agreement between the Government and Harry J. Crowe, Timber Merchant, 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 presently.

Whereupon, the Bill entitled "An Act to amend an Act amending Cap. 14, Geo. V., entitled 'An Act for the Confirmation of an Agreement between the Government and Harry J. Crowe, Timber Merchant, 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.

The Chairman from the Committee of the Whole on Supply reported certain Resolutions, which were read a first time as follows:

Dept. of Customs	$452,788.00
Dept. of Assessor	15,120.00
Dept. of Contingencies..	216,992.00
Dept. of Pension Commissioners	618,550.00
Dept. of Liquor Control Bd.	13,000.00

The said Resolutions being read a second time it was moved and seconded that the House concur with the Committee therein, and the said Resolutions were agreed to.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Colonial Secretary, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the "Discussion of Power and Paper Co. Bonds."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MR. SCAMMELL—I have asked the Colonial Secretary to have this motion deferred, but I have very little more to add to the debate than what has been already said. Apparently in connection with the Humber industry a situation has arisen that has brought about very great changes, particularly as regards the management up there. The Government apparently has given its sanction to a ten million guarantee, and we can do nothing now. They have agreed that our position be relegated to third place. We have been told that it was not necessary in any case that the House should be consulted in connection with this, and all that is left for

us to do outside of uttering a protest is to bow to the Government's decision and let this go on. As regards the matters at Corner Brook, I think it will forever remain a mystery, though I submit it ought not, how all the money gone through up there was spent. I am of the opinion that if the Government were doing their duty sincerely in connection with this that they would long ago have caused to be held an audit or commission of enquiry into the whole circumstances underlying the tremendous expenditure up there. Circumstances that have brought about the position that rendered it necessary for the Government to have to submit to this being relegated to the inferior position held to-day. It might not even now be too late to do something along these lines, and to cause to be made an audit or examination or commission to inquire into the circumstances that brought about this terrible expenditure. I don't think that anyone who supported the original proposition doubted that the original capital was going in itself to be sufficient to do the construction work at least, and by no means expected that the cost of construction would so far exceed the original estimate. I very much fear that the experience gained through at the Humber is going to some extent give a black eye to the matter of the coming here of other projects of a like nature, or to those that we may seek to encourage to come here, or that may wish to come here. The faith we had in some of those men behind the Humber project and the experience we have gone through has left us in a position of doubt and suspicion. We shall more than ever in in the future seek to discover the bona fides of people with whom we are dealing in connection with enterprises of this sort. The suggestion that to-day is not too late to institute a commission or audit to account for the expenditure may not perhaps have a very salutary effect on the future of such projects, but on the other hand it may amount to this, that the people of the country will take it as an indication that the Government and the House have given consideration to what has transpired and are anxious to discover the underlying causes of these things, so that such mistakes and errors shall not again occur in connection with propositions of this nature. I am of the opinion that this audit should be made, that it is not yet too late to make that enquiry or audit, and that it would have a very salutary effect and would be in the interests of the country. Nothing has been shown us that you have taken the trouble to investigate the causes that brought about the state of affairs that rendered necessary the depreciation of our security and the undue haste of the Government in acting without that information, I consider the greatest argument against their conduct in connection with this matter. Out of evil sometimes comes good, and in connection with this matter public concern was aroused and public interest awakened and a band of public spirited men got together for the serious consideration of this transaction and for an explanation from the powers that be. That action I have no doubt was instrumental in forcing the Government to come to the decision of placing this motion on the Order Paper and having the whole matter discussed. At any rate the axe is fallen and we have got a change of management and officials all round, at Corner Brook. Let us hope that change is going to be for the good and many of the old causes of dispute in connection with the operations up there will disappear. I very much fear that even now despite the facts and figures given by Mr. Lake in his report, that in certain sections of that enterprise discrimination is being flagrantly practised again Newfoundlanders. I charge that Newfound-

land contractors in connection with contracts for the cutting of timber and driving are not getting a square deal. I have in my possession today a letter from a friend of mine at Deer Lake, in whose word I have absolute faith and who would have no reason to mistate the case, and he has showed me in it conclusively that Newfoundlanders who wanted contracts to cut timber and who were able to do it just as well as French Canadians, who were experienced men, and experienced men who wanted the contract for log driving could not get a look in. Simultaneously with my getting this letter, and learning those things referred to I see by the "News" that sixty seven French Canadian log drivers were leaving Three Rivers, Quebec, to go to the West Coast. Let us trust that with the new management higher efficiency will result, renewing the faith in the financial stability of the proposition, and that this evil will be remedied also and that Newfoundlanders be assured a square deal, for despite the figures of Mr. Lake I am still of the opinion that there is discrimination going on against Newfoundlanders. If you have reason to send a commission of enquiry to enquire into matters at the Humber make that a part of their terms of reference that they ought to discover if there are sufficient grounds for the complaint that Newfoundlanders are being discriminated against. I have had information from two or three men, that well qualified men have in cases been discriminated against and turned down in favor of foreign contractors. I hope that the Colonial Secretary will take cognisance of this and investigate for the improvement of affairs or disproval if such can be of the information that I have had in this respect. Let us hope that the new management will be such that discrimination will no longer be tolerated, and if complaints come in let us see if the grounds for complaint are good and act accordingly.

I merely wanted to make this expression of opinion and of my views in connection with the affairs at the Humber, and I do not wish to detain the House longer.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—In reply to the honourable member who has just spoken, I would like to make a few remarks on the point he has mentioned. I had a letter only this morning from Mr. Smith, the new manager at Corner Brook, in response to a letter I had written in connection with this matter, when I heard that a number of French Canadians were coming in as river drivers. I could not at all conceive that it was not possible to get Newfoundlanders. Mr. Smith, pointed out that he was only just beginning to get the hang of things, but that he was going to make it his business to see that Newfoundlanders were employed wherever possible. I think that Mr. Scammell rather unfairly blames the new manager Mr. Smith in connection with that. Mr. Smith has only arrived very recently in the country. He is here about a fortnight and came to St. John's first without even stopping at Corner Brook on the way. He is on the job actually only about a week, and could not possibly be very much in the know of things, and could not be responsible for the importation of those French Canadians. I think now that we can look for better things in respect of that.

As regards the "undue haste" of our action, that has been referred to, I don't see how blame can rest on the Government in that respect, under the circumstances that existed. Mr. Carter found that something had to be done immediately. The British Government and the Trade Facilities recognised that action had to be taken immediately or the Company had to go into the hands of a receiver, and it was because we recognised that im-

mediate action had to be taken, that it was taken.

As regards holding an enquiry into the expenditure at Corner Brook, I can't see that the Government could do it any better than it is being done on behalf of Baring Bros. and the Trade Facilities who have been investigating through their accountants out there, into every detail, and attempting to see in what respects expenditure can be cut down. As the Colonial Secretary has particularly emphasised, I don't think that the Government could have done anything else but what they have done, for the only alternative possible was accepted. I really think that the two new men, Mr. Smith, the President, and Mr. White, the Vice-president, are starting in with the intention of watching every particular detail of the work with a view to cutting down expenditure, and Mr. Smith and Mr. White both gave me an assurance that not a single dollar more of the million pounds would be spent than is absolutely necessary and that they do not expect to have to call for any more than has been called for.

MR. SCAMMELL—I did not exactly charge that the new manager at Corner Brook was responsible for the importation of French Canadians. I merely said that the people responsible up there should see that the engaging of foreigners for jobs that can be filled by Newfoundlanders should no longer be allowed to continue. I am glad that the Prime Minister has now given a tentative assurance that Mr. White and Mr. Smith will see to it that this evil is remedied to every possible extent. I understood the Prime Minister to say that an investigation was going on at Corner Brook on behalf of the Trade Facilities. Has there been any report made of that investigation so far? I presume that the Newfoundland Government will have a copy of a report when it is made?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—We will table it, of course, if we do.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—I want to thank the honourable member for St. Barbe who has just spoken, for his fair and constructive criticism. I think that it is only right that matters of this sort should be ventilated to the greatest extent. With regard to having some tab on the expenditure out at the Humber, I might say that I think that was a very serious omission made when the contract was entered into, which was not of course, under the present administration. I think that in cases of projects where large guarantees are involved that the Government should have some person on the job to watch and see how the money is expended. Under the original contract the mill was to be at Deer Lake and it was to cost twenty millions for the construction work. The site of operations was decided to be changed to Corner Brook and the expense of transmission lines has materially increased the expenditure and accounts to a large extent for the exceeding of the original estimates.

I am glad that the Prime Minister has made an explanation with regard to these French Canadians that Mr. Scammell referred to. As he has told the House, as soon as the matter came to our attention a message was sent to the man protesting against the action of bringing in Canadian loggers. I want to assure the honourable member and the House that the Government is just as much concerned as the Members of the Opposition are with regard to the protection of our own men. We intend to protect them at all costs, and there is not a man coming in, but will be kept out when our own men can do the work. I think that we can look forward to a better condition of things in that respect than has existed.

The present matter has been brought before the House arising out of a

question put on the Order Paper by Mr. Godden. It was thought that a question of such importance should receive the utmost ventilation and that the fullest opportunity should be given to see exactly how things stood.

MR. RANDELL—I have been listening with considerable interest to what has been said in connection with this subject, and I have been very much interested in some of the statements that have been made with regard to our position in connection with the industry at Corner Brook, as compared to what it was before. There is no doubt that this matter is one of great concern to every single man in the country. We have gone ahead and guaranteed another ten million dollars without perhaps understanding the whole position out there.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—We have not guaranteed another ten million dollars. They have not even raised another ten million dollars. The position is this that they have raised another five million, and have power to raise another five million again, and they have asked to have that stand ahead of our mortgage bond as regards priority of claims for payment. That is, that will be the first claim on the property, then comes the British Government's claim and then our claim.

CAPT. RANDELL—Do I understand from the hon. gentleman that the only agreement that the Government has come to in connection with this matter is to allow that first guarantee of $10,000,000 to take a third place. Then there is no guarantee in connection with a further ten million. Well then sir, I still maintain that we should have had a proper audit of the accounts up there. The Government should have found out where all the money was gone. We don't know as members of the House of Assembly how that money has been expended. It might have been thrown to the four winds of heaven as far as we know. Does anybody, I mean anybody on the Government side, know what the contracts were made with the Fraser Brace and the W. I. Bishop Co.? What they estimated that their cost would be in the beginning, and what it cost the Newfoundland Power and Paper Co. more than their first estimate. Now there are a great many people in this country who are afraid that this company will go into the hands of the receivers eventually. I am not here to knock this thing at all. We have listened to members on the other side of the House and they have deprecated anybody getting up here to say anything likely to hurt this industry. I am not trying to do that. But I would like to know where we stand before we commit ourselves to something whereby this country is going to suffer to the extent of ten or fifteen millions of dollars. The question arises in the mind of a great many thinking people as to whether this is going to pay or not. They are afraid that it is not going to be a paying proposition. Now if this Company has got to go into the hands of the receivers, it is better that it went there now. Because notwithstanding anything that has been said by the hon. gentlemen on that side of the House with regard to the position being improved by this deal? I believe that that is a statement that is very doubtful. I am not a financier, but I cannot for the life of me see how the position is improved materially. There is not the least doubt that the construction work out there cost considerably over 100 p.c. more than was originally intended. And I listened with attention to the Colonial Secretary when he made the statement that when the Bill went through this House it was intended that a mill be erected at Deer Lake.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—I corrected that statement. I understood from Mr. Warren that the

foot steps of the British Trade Facilities, when it comes to guaranteeing the principle to the extent of millions of dollars. I think we should dive into the thing and see just where we out to the House, and trying to figure out how these people are going to make any money. Besides that in three years they will have to provide a sinking fund, which amounts to $401,600 per year. That is one item that has to be provided for in three years from now. Then there is the royalty that they have to pay on horse power. This is no small item. And except they can get more for the paper or manufacture it a lot cheaper, then I can't see where the income is coming from. I may be wrong. But I don't agree with following in the know, that company has to pay about five per cent. on all that. We were told when this contract was put through this House that they were going to make 400 tons of paper per day, and that they were going to get $60 per ton. Now it costs about forty dollars per ton to make paper. I am not quite clear as to whether that forty dollars included the shipping from Corner Brook to where the sale would be made or not, that is whether they are going to get $20 per ton at Corner Brook or at the point of delivery. But supposing that they do make $20 per ton and that they manufacture 400 tons per day. That would be 120,000 tons per year. That can't turn into that company any more than $2,400,000, and out of that they have to pay interest at five per cent. on $48,000,000. I am trying to point change was made when the Bill went through this House.

CAPT. RANDELL—I think that was what was originally intended, but not when the contract went through this House. One is beginning to wonder sir, how this thing is going to be a paying proposition. We have been told that the cost is going into the $48,000,000. Well now as far as I stand before following anybody's lead. They say that they cannot borrow any more money. I quite appreciate the putting up money to finish the thing because it was supposed to be finished last August. But how anyone could think that we are in a better position in connection with that industry, sir, is somewhat of a puzzle. If the thing was going ahead right and it was a paying proposition why did the management resign there, and why have the people been getting out. If it was going to be a paying proposition why did they want any help? The same applies to the hotel down here. If that is going to be a paying proposition, if it was a good speculative venture, nobody would be coming into this House asking for help. When you see an industry in this country getting in bad as the saying is, things are getting a bit tight with them. Then they look to the Government for help. Now that applies to this Newfoundland Power and Paper Co., in my opinion. I don't want to say anything against the Company. I don't want to knock it in any way. But I feel that I would not be doing justice to the people; who I represent here, the people who did me the honour to elect me to this House, if I did not have something to say in this matter. And I suggest that the Government should thrash things out more before letting themselves in for any further liability. I don't say sir, that the country is to be congratulated on the outcome of this industry. I think it is deplorable. To say that we were given to understand that the industry would be run on $20,000,000, or about $18,000,000, and they would have $2,000,000 for working capital. And then to come in here two years afterwards and tell us that the deal cost $48,000,000. The people are beginning to wonder sir, if it would not be better for the whole thing to go into the hands of the receivers right now. Certainly it would be better than to keep on for

a year and then to get into difficult waters, and then to go into the hands of the receivers. We might realise the $20,000,000 now. As to how the thing is being conducted out there in connection with employment, I have listened with a great deal of attention to what has been said here, and I have given quite a lot of thought to the statement that Newfoundland is being discriminated against, in many incidents out there. But that is generally what happens when new people come from the outside into a new country. Their methods of doing business are the best and they quite freely criticise the methods of the people in the country of their adoption. I have seen it in different parts all the world over. But the fact remains that our Newfoundlanders have been discriminated against there. Although that industry was principally meant to help out the labour situation, and to provide labour for our people, they have been provided with labour, but it has been the lowest class of labour. And even then they brought men from the outside to take it away from them. I trust sir, that this new management will have better luck than the previous management. And try to see that there is not waste out there, because the fact remains that there was waste. That I know. And I know very little about construction. They made contracts with outside people that Newfoundlanders were looking for—good contracts; and it was a case of "No Newfoundlander need apply." There is no getting away from that fact. I know that was done in several incidents. Now I don't propose to keep the House any longer over this matter. I was labouring under a wrong impression when I got up to speak, because I certainly thought that the Government had guaranteed another $10,000,000. But when the Government considers sir, what the Government has already done and that there is not any way of retraction, I don't think that there is much use of having this thing discussed in this House. I trust sir, however that when that Company gets going under a new management, that there will be no further loss, and that it will be of great value to the country.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words on this matter. I certainly agree with the hon. member for Trinity that it would be very poor policy for any member of this House to knock a corporation of this magnitude or any industry in this country and more particularly at the present time, when we are up against such a demand for labour. It is impossible to get labour for all the people that are applying for it at the present time. Now there is a great deal of misunderstanding about this proposition. I am glad to hear the hon. member say that when he got up he was under a mis-apprehension, and that he thought that the Government had guaranteed a further ten million dollars. And then he stated that the new agreement had not strengthened the position of the country in anyway. Now I beg to differ with him. I agree with his statement about importing labour, and I am opposed to it just as he is; our people should get the preference every time, and anything we can do in this connection we should lose no time in doing. Now what are the facts in connection with this proposition? Newfoundland had guaranteed the interest and the sinking fund on $10,000,000, and the British Trade Facilities have guaranteed the interest and the sinking fund on a further amount. As the Prime Minister told you Mr. Carter was sent out by the Trade Facilities Company, to consult with the Government of Newfoundland, to see what could be done in the best interests of Newfoundland, and of course of the Trade Facilities. The sending out of Mr. Carter by the Treasury Board was brought about by the fact, that the

Bank of England and Baring Brothers had advanced Armstrong Whitworth over and above the amounts guaranteed by the A. & B. debentures $20,000,000. They had spend the amount raised under the A and B debentures. The result was that the Bank of England sent out Mr. Frater Taylor to inquire into the state of things. On his return he reported to the Bank and Trade Facilities the condition of affairs, and hence the sending out of Mr. Carter here. Would Newfoundland be justified in refusing what the Trade Facilities were prepared to do, because we after all had received considerable benfit out of the tremendous sum spent. I think the country directly or indirectly, through the amounts paid to the people for labour and the duty collected received pretty nearly the amount of the guarantee.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY —You said that the Bank of England advanced $20,000,000. I don't think that is correct. They advanced $10,000,000.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—The Armstrong Whitworth spent $20,000,000 in addition to the A and B debentures. Now as we have received practically what we guaranteed, we are not in a bad position at all. I do not think that this country is going to be called upon to pay the interest on the B debentures, or that we will have to pay the interest and the sinking fund on those prior lien bonds.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—How much profit do they make on a ton of paper.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—I will take the Member for Trinity's figures. That is forty dollars a ton to make. And they sell it for $65 a ton. There is twenty five dollars a ton profit. They are now manufacturing 300 tons a day, and soon they will be able to manufacture 400 tons a day. I understand they will turn out 400 tons per day. Assuming they will develop to capacity and turn out the 400 tons that will mean 120,000 tons per year, and if they make a profit of $25.00 a ton, that is a profit of $3,000,000 which is enough to pay the interest on 50 millions. But I am not so much interested on whether they will pay the interest on the fifty million; what this House and the country is interested in is whether they will pay the interest and the sinking fund on 25 millions. Taking the figures of Captain Randell, suppose the paper cost $40.00 a ton to make, and is sold at $65.00, that will give a profit of three millions, and in that cost the royalty is included, the depreciation, and all other taxes, such as export taxes of $1.00 per ton—that is taking the price as low as it will possibly be—I think they will get $70.00 and $75.00 for it. Captain Randell said he didn't see how the position of the country had been bettered in this transaction. This country did not have as security the transmission line, which is worth a million pounds. The Mill was no good without the transmission line. As a quid pro quo for allowing the issue of one million pounds to rank ahead of the A. and B. debentures we have as extra security the transmission line. We have the water power, a wrapping machine and a paper storage building.

CAPTAIN RANDELL—Will the hon. gentleman tell me how the Armstrong people got control of the transmission line.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—The Armstrong people found the money to build it. Personally I took the stand that they had no right to segregate the transmission line, because they took a contract to build and equip a mill capable of turning out 400 tons of paper a day, the mill couldn't turn out one ton unless it had the transmission line. This Government fell in line with the late Government who refused to allow the transmsision line to be segregated.

Now, sir, as to the supervision of

expenditure there. I visited Corner Brook on several occasions, and I know of one gentleman, although I did not meet him, who is perhaps more unpopular than any other, and his name is Major MacLennan. He seems to have been sent out by the Trade Facilities, and he had to give a certificate for all work performed before payments were made. He was continually going over the jobs, and personally I believe he was representing the Treasury—he certainly was not acting for the Armstrong people, and that he was there to see that no ducks and drakes were played with the expenditure.

Do you think the Government would be justified in withholding their consent to this issue of one million pounds? Would you be prepared to close down the plant at this juncture which might ruin the credit of the Company and cause such an amount of unemployment in addition to what we already have? Would we be prepared to accept the responsibility for all this as we would have to if we had forced the Company into the hands of a receiver. I assure you that the Government has acted only in the best interests of the labourers of the country. The hon. gentleman states that this will have the effect of debarring foreign capital from coming in here. Capital only comes in after a thorough investigation, and that will be the test. The management at Grand Falls still have confidence in this country and faith in the people, which they are showing in further developments at Grand Falls and Red Indian Lake. I know that it is not going to be helpful in getting capital to come in to this country to find that construction cost more than was anticipated, and more than it would in Canada. I understand much of that cost was caused by the fact that the contract called for the completion within two years. If it had gone over a period of three years or four years it would have been much better for the contractors. It is true that we would not have had the same amount of employment at first, but I have no hesitation in saying that the work would have been more economically performed. Still, as I said before, I have no thought in my mind that, except by gross mismanagement, the Company will be able to pay the interest and sinking fund on the A. and B. Debentures due on the Prior Lien Bonds, and I hope on the whole capital as well. Paper is bound to go up. In the United States to-day many of the smallest paper mills are closing up because they cannot get the raw material—the demand for paper is not going down, if anything the supply is. The cost of raw material in Canada is getting dearer and dearer each year—in some parts of Canada it is taking two years to get it to the mills, and if they have to labor under these conditions the cost is bound to go up. Here in Newfoundland we can cut and manufacture right at the sea-board.

Let us look at the rosy side of things—if we must criticize let it be helpful and not destructive criticism. Goodness knows it is hard enough to get on anyway. Let us be optimistic and not pessimistic!

CAPTAIN RANDELL—Mr. Chairman, I want to say just one word in connection with what the hon. member has just said. I did not advance any destructive criticism. I just wanted information, and I wanted to know just where we stand. And I would like sir, this country, and House to understand that I am not here to knock, or as a knocker. I just wanted to find out what we were doing, and where we stood—whether we were going to gain or lose.

MR. CASHIN — Mr. Chairman, I would like to add a word or two to the debate, and preface it by the remark that I also am not a knocker. I think the whole argument is caused

by the fact that the Government ought, when they opened the House, in my opinion, told the House just what they had done, and I feel that members on both sides would have backed them up if they had been told what the Government had done, and that they had the power to do it. That is the part that I don't like about it. Why, this is a matter of national importance as far as Newfoundland is concerned. I believe that even the capital in this thing is safe, and that if the price of paper is going to be $70.00 a ton, Newfoundland won't get stuck—I don't believe that if it was wound up to-day we would get stuck! The Company has spent about forty millions, and about twenty or twenty-five of that for labour in Newfoundland. Fifty per cent. of that is going in the Treasury, and there is our $10,000,000. I do resent the attitude that the Government presumably took, in reckoning that "We have done this, and we were empowered to do so." I contend that even if the law is as it is, they should have come in here and told us. That it should have been brought here by the Government, not be forced out by people outside this House.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE— Mr. Chairman, I am glad the hon. member has given me an opportunity to say a few words before the Committee rises. I think the hon. gentleman who frankly said that he was under a misapprehension reflects the attitude of most people. The gentleman who has just sat down has left the impression that we were forced to move this into committee to avoid discussion in the country. And the suggestion has been as to the cause of the misunderstanding — the cause has not been in this House. There has been no difficulty in the House. The hon. gentleman will remember that early in the session the hon. member for St. Barbe made some remarks on this, which had already been stated in the Press. He made a remark to the effect that there was no reference to this in the Speech from the Throne, to which I interjected the answer that there was no occasion or necessity for it, as there was nothing for the Legislature to do. Out of that remark some people outside this House, for reasons best known to themselves, aired themselves in the newspapers, simply because they did not know what it was all about, just as was said here to-day.

One would have imagined that there was some extraordinary reason why the Government had brought in no legislation. When the Prime Minister obtained permission to publish the correspondence and supplied all the information, he showed that all this was so delicately important that it had to be done, not on the hustings, but quietly. There was to have been a meeting in the city which was then called off, and some of these people have not finished apologising yet, for their misconception of the facts as later stated. The debate this evening is important insofar that it shows the conduct of the Government to have been perfectly proper. There was no duty on the Government to bring this before the Legislature—they have done it merely for the information of the members.

If the people interested were satisfied without legislation, it was none of our business to go hunting after it. And I want to say right now that it is not always good that matters in which the country is interested should be exploited by people outside the House, and that is borne out by the actions of those people in this case. We were not concealing anything, because there was nothing to hide—there was nothing more than any Executive would have done under the circumstances. And when the information was asked for it was given this House. It was not mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, because we

felt it would not be wise to broad cast the condition of the Company, and I take the view that it would be a great pity to have financial conditions exploited in this way. It is not always advantageous to do so. I do not pretend to have any business knowledge of paper manufacture, but I do know that as I respect the advice of a man whom I ask for legal advice, so do I value the opinion of a man like Mr. Frater Taylor, and I consider it of importance, and I say here, and make it as a public statement that Mr. Frater Taylor is my authority for the statement that even with extraordinary depression, Newfoundland would never be called upon to pay a cent. The statement of a man like that is worth respecting. He doesn't say anything as far as the ordinary stockholders of the Company are concerned, but as far as we are concerned, I think that that answers the comment of the last three speakers. There is no sense in worrying in advance, and I go further and say that Newfoundland has already actually received the amount we might be called upon to pay. We must not forget the amount of labour that this has given; I hazard the opinion that the amount we have actually received is more than we would have to pay. It has been of the greatest importance, and that importance is shown, and the value in employment it has been, in the fact that even to-day men are seeking employment there. So far as I am concerned I want to register my appreciation of the thought of the Colonial Secretary in giving us the opportunity to really see this, and to see that the adverse comment is based and grounded in misapprehension, and that we haven't contracted any new liability. We have seen something perhaps that we did not know before, and can see that there is not the slightest thing to be alarmed about. I only want to repeat, Mr. Chairman, that as far as the attitude of the Government is concerned, there was nothing to warrant putting it in the Speech from the Throne. What was done was all that was required, or we should have come in here and asked for legislation.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, just a word following upon the Attorney-General's remarks. No doubt the past Government, and those in Opposition at the time were responsible for this action, because in my opinion, it is giving the Executive power to deal with ten million dollars. I don't think if you were in Opposition and the Government were bringing in such a measure that you would support it—I don't think it is good business. I said before and say again that all the discussion arose from the fact that this was not understood, even by the people who voted for it in 1923—they didn't understand it. It goes to show how careful we should be in those things.

I will go further than I did before and say that if the Company broke up to-morrow Newfoundland is the only one that can't lose, because they have such an amount spent that they have to operate the plant. The British Government may get stuck, and the second people may get stuck, but we have the labour and the revenue arising from the labour. I think we are the only ones who are really secure. These are my sentiments, and I add again that I don't think the Executive Government should have power to enter into a contract for ten millions, or for five millions or even for five dollars! It is a hard thing to say, but some of them are at times not to be trusted.

CAPTAIN RANDELL—Mr. Chairman, I am afraid I didn't make myself clear. I know that if the Company were wound up to-morrow Newfoundland would not get stuck; everyone knows that. The reason I made the enquiries I did was that I want-

ed to know what is in the future for us. We know that if they went to the wall to-morrow we wouldn't lose, that Newfoundland has the benefit of the labour. But the figures which have been given don't show that that will run into $10,000,000 for the past two years. There is no fear of Newfoundland getting stuck now—I was looking into the future.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, before I ask the Committee to rise I should like to say a few words regarding the financial condition of this Company and how it affects Newfoundland. The situation is this: There is a five million dollar prior lien loan, which is a first claim; ten millions in "A" debentures, which are the property of the Treasury, and ten millions in "B" debentures, which belong to Newfoundland. The prior lien loan bears interest at 5 p.c., which toals $250,000 a year; the British Treasury "A" debentures bear interest at 4½ p.c., totalling $450,000 per year, which makes $700,000, which comes prior to our interest. We get interest at 5 p.c. on ten millions, or $500,000 a year, making the full total $1,200,000.

Now the price of paper has been spoken of here. The price of paper to-day in the United States is seventy dollars per ton, and the paper can be manufactured for forty dollars. But suppose that only ten dollars per ton is made on four hundred tons per day that will provide for every cent of the interest, that is required to be paid on the prior lean bonds and the "A" and "B" mortgage debentures, and therefore I submit that there is no occasion to worry, and the country is a long way from being required to make up any loss. Therefore I move that the committee rise.

MR. GRIMES—I do not intend to delay the House, but for a moment in reference to the question that we have now before us for consideration. I am glad to know that such a rosy view of the situation with regard to the future of the Newfoundland Power and Paper Co. because certainly we want all the industries in this country to succeed particularly under the conditions that exist to-day, but there are reasons why we should have this discussion in order to get the information that has been lacking for the members of the House, and because we have been responsible for committing the country to the extent of ten million dollars. The Attorney General admitted with the rest of us that it is very large powers to give the Executive Council to allow them the right to enter into an agreement or modify an agreement which involves this amount of five million dollars or more, and because of that I think that the Legislature should have been consulted in the matter and their approval had because this contract was finalized. We have not got all the information that we are entitled to under this agreement despite the report that was tabled by Mr. Lake at this session. There was nothing in the report but a statement of the number of employees in the mill and the amount of money that has been expended there. Now according to the contract:

(Reads)

Now the Government has not been given the information that one naturally expects would come from an audit so that we would be justified in approving the action of the Executive Government, which we have had brought to our attention during the last few days. No person has any desire to stab any company that is trying to carry on any enterprize in this country, but they certainly have the right to get all the information as to how that company is progressing and what successes have been attending its efforts, in building up the enterprize. Members of the Government as well as the members on this side of the House are aware that there has been extravagant expenditure go-

ing on in connection with the construction at Corner Brook.

The country has to suffer in some extent in connection with that extravagance, and when the Government is in a position to carefully scrutinize what a company of this kind the legislature should be able to place some check on the way in which the company is being managed. That is the position that I take this afternoon that the Government should have asked the legislature to ratify the agreement. I admit with the Attorney General that the country has not entered into any agreement, but in view of what he himself has said it is all the more necessary that future Governments should be given due notice by this legislature that they will not be party to any contracts of this nature made in the future. If we took that position here we certainly would be serving notice on them that any government attempting to do that would meet with defeat when it came before the House of Assembly for ratification of the Agreement. Therefore I wish to enter my protest against the Government's having entered into this contract without consulting the legislature.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say first of all that I would like to correct an impression that perhaps may have gone abroad as regards the report made on some remarks which I made here a couple of days ago, reported in the Daily News. They say that I said that the sum that we were liable for was twenty million dollars. Our liability so far as regards the guarantee is ten million dollars, and I did not say in this House that we would be liable for twenty million dollars. The statement that I made was that there would be twenty million dollars ahead of us, which we may have to assume the liability of before we would be able to lay a finger on our own security. It is fifteen millions so far, but you have taken the authority to raise it to twenty. Mr. Chairman, I want to get the facts out of the case because I want to know what I am talking about as well as any other hon. member, and that is the reason that I am taking this stand to-day because I know that it is a big thing and it is a technical matter. As far as I understand it, the Government has given permission to the issue of two million pounds prior bonds. Well yes, Mr. Chairman, I am glad to get that out of the Government this afternoon. I would like to draw the attention of the Hon. the Colonial Secretary to a report of the House of Assembly as published in the Evening Telegram on April 7th, 1926.

(Reads)

Now that is the only day in the session that I was not in the House and I think that the Prime Minister will admit that he made that statement. I would like to ask the Prime Minister if he is going to introduce that legislation. No.

(Reads)

Well why not bring it in as a bill and place it beyond shadow of doubt. That may be alright, Mr. Minister of Justice, but are you satisfied that the thing is legal, because we have not been asked for legislation. It is the disposal of the security that is held by the people of Newfoundland without their consent or the consent of the legislature. And the view of it that I take is that the security that is held by the Government of Newfoundland for the people of Newfoundland in trust should not be altered or impaired except by consent of the legislature. Why did not the Government get to work and bring in resolutions to have the necessary approval of their actions. Why should it be in the power of the Executive Government to alter our security by allowing even five million dollars to go ahead of us. It may be that the Executive Government will come in

and make another alteration, and I claim as a member of this House that if that can be done under this act, then the act should be amended so that this House alone and not the Executive Government should have that power.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Just one word out of respect for the hon. member, so that he will understand that there is no idea at all of not appreciating the earnestness of his position. He has just made a most delightful statement of constitutional law that I would not offhand contradiet or correct. I would not pretend to be the authority on constitutional law that some people who have been airing their views in the press apparently are. But I have respect for persons who are paid to do certain work and are employed to do this work and are competent to do it, and I merely say that no act of the Executive Government overshadows the British Constitution, and what the Executive Government may have done in this case does not in any way establish a precedent in the constitution of Newfoundland. We simply did this under a special act. Now the first question of the hon. member is whether the Executive Government is clothed with the authority that it can dissipate, if one may use the word, the assets of the people. I want to point out that that is one question but the question in this case is that there is a specific agreement between the British Treasury and the Newfoundland Government and the Armstrong Whitworth Company, and the expression that is used in that agreement is "That priority shall not be granted without the consent in writing of the Newfoundland Government." I expected myself that the Government of Newfoundland would have been asked to obtain the consent of the legislature. But the point that I wish to make is that the representative of the British Treasury came out, and their legal representative came out and they asked the Executive Government to give their consent to this thing. There was no occasion to call the House. Of course if the House had been in session there is no doubt that the House would be informed. This was early in October. The House was not in session and the matter was urgent, and it was requested that it be treated confidentaially, and there is no reason to think that the action of the Government was unconstitutional or unreasonable. The Executive Government accepted the advice of its solicitors, and those concerned in the future of the place and the officials of the British Treasury, and they consented to it. I make these few remarks, Mr. Chairman, as a compliment to the hon. member who is so earnestly interested in the matter and is so earnestly desirous of knowing the facts. The action of the Government in this respect does not form any precedent, and the consent of the Government in writing was considered as quite sufficient.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER— There is just one point that the Minister of Justice did not make and I would like to point it out, and it is this: It was within the rights of the British Treasury and the Trades Facilities to say that "we are the holders of the A bonds and we have ample security, and why should we worry." But they did not say that and that is what appealed to me and to the Executive Government when we were asked to do this thing in a hurry.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and on motion the Chairman left the Chair.

At quarter past 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 Administrator 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 Respecting the Operation of Wireless Telegraphs in Newfoundland."

"An Act Respecting the Civil Service."

"An Act to Amend the Seal Fishery Act, and other Acts Relating to the Seal Fishery."

"An Act to Amend the Act 15, Geo. V. Cap. XIV., entitled "An Act for the Confirmation of an Agreement between the Government and the Newfoundland Hotel Facilities, Ltd."

"An Act to Further Amend Chapter 35 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Postal and Telegraph Services.'"

"An Act to Amend an Act Amending Cap. 3.14 Geo. V., entitled 'An Act for the Confirmation of an Agreement between the Government and Harry J. Crowe, Timber Merchant, and for other purposes."

The House then resumed.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 15 and 16 Geo. V. Cap. 23 (1925) entitled 'An Act Respecting the Encouragement of Shipbuilding and Rebuilding.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, you will remember that the other day when this bill was before the chair there was quite a lot of discussion on Section four. Since then the Select Committee met and discussed the matter and they have brought in the following amendment. Section four would now read as follows:

(Reads)

That is section four.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I do not think that there is much change in it, but if the hon. members think that it is a lot to remember I agree with them.

MR. SCAMMELL — Mr. Chairman, this bill that we have here now has gone through a good many stages since we first had it up here, and we hardly know where we are. I understand that one, two and three stand. It is this section four that is amended, but you have a section five added there.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, before the Committee rises, I would like to get some information from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, about the position of the pilots in St. John's, how they work, how they are paid, and what they earned last year.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the Leader of the Opposition, I may say that the money that is collected is turned into the Harbour Master, and after the expense of the boats is taken out, what is left is divided among the eleven or twelve pilots. There is not any revenue coming into the Government in any shape or form. I will get the information as to what they earned last year, tomorrow. The pilots are under the control of the Department, but of course Capt. English has all to do with them. There is a board consisting of Mr. Job, Mr. Shea and Capt. English himself.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, I may say that the pilot system in Halifax and other ports is different. They are

paid a salary by the Government. I think that some consideration should be given to that here. After all they are more or less Government officials in a sense. A man who has spent all his life as a pilot, and when he gets too old to work he is thrown on his own resources. He does not even come in for a pension, like a Government official does. Look at the hardship that he has to go through. I think that some consideration should be given here to the system that obtains in other parts.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the Leader of the Opposition, I want to say that I entirely agree with him as regards the pilot system here. Because we have a very hard case before us at the present time. A pilot has just died and he has left seven children. They have no help whatever. And it was only a few days ago that the pilots petitioned me, and asked me if I would allow them to take on the youngest boy to run the motor boat.

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 Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Railway and Shipping" 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 have passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 15 and 16, Geo. V. Cap. 23 (1925) entitled "An Act respecting the Encouragement of Shipbuilding and Re-building" without amendment.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until Monday afternoon next, 17th inst., at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, May 17th.

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

HON. MR. BRADLEY—I beg leave to present a petition from over three hundred fishermen of the District of Port de Grave, with reference to the export of codfish from the Labrador by steam. In days gone by the fish was exported from the coast in sailing vessels but in recent years various firms have been sending steamers to take that fish from the coast. One of the evils resulting from this is that, whereas these fishing vessels formerly brought down salt, as that was the usual ballast, to-day that salt does not go down, and is particularly hard to get at the beginning of the season. The steamers do not arrive until sometime in September, and do not even then bring salt. It is a fact that the Labrador fishery is on the decline and the advent of steamers, the petitioners believe, has greatly accelerated this decline. It has brought about a resulting shortage of salt and during the earlier days of the season, the fish being short salted is of an inferior quality, and that of course has an evil effect upon the marketing of fish. Not being a fisherman and having no acquaintance with the Labrador fishery, I do not speak ex cathedra, but I do speak from information received from practical men who have spent a lifetime on the Labrador. Another evil attendant upon this method of export-

ation, is that the exporter being anxious to send the fish off the coast into the markets as soon as possible, the fishermen have to begin making the fish too early in the season, and as a result fifteen to twenty days of the prime fishing season is lost. In the rush so to make the fish it cannot possibly be properly cured, and does not get the proper sun, but is rushed away in a condition that is unfit for the markets. The quality of the fish thus suffering, necessarily reduces its value, causing loss in the markets and loss to the fishermen. The steamers, in this rush to get fish on board to reach market as early as possible, are surrounded by numerous small boats anxious to get their fish on board, and the decks of the steamer are strewn with coal where the sailors have been passing it, and as many as a hundred men will jump down into the hold of the steamer at a time. The coal dust gets ground into the fish which is trodden on, and its quality is again impaired. When the steamers have left the coast, a good portion of the fishing season is still left, but the fishermen have no means of getting their late fish off the coast and the catch is therefore short. The fishermen of my district and of other districts likewise, have realised that these conditions tend to shorten the catch and depreciate the quality of the product, which results in our acquiring a bad reputation for our product, and they ask that they be remedied.

I am heartily in accord with this petition, and I want to give it my unqualified support and ask that it be referred to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who I am sure will give it the serious consideration it unquestionably merits.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Arising in support of the petition just presented by the honourable member for Port de Grave, I ask leave to present a similar petition from Coley's Point, Harbor Grace. It is exactly the same as that which has been just read, and is very largely signed by the fishermen in that part of Harbor Grace District. The substance of it has been very eloquently and clearly set forth by the honourable member for Port de Grave. It is, I consider, one of the most important petitions ever presented to the House. Possibly these electors have put their finger on the vital spot with regard to the marketing of the catch. I hope and trust that the Min. of Marine & Fisheries will get in touch with the Board of Trade and ascertain their views, and I am sure that the Government will bring about any legislation that will conserve the interests of the fishermen and the country in respect of this very important matter.

HON. THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Rising in support of the prayer of the petitions that have just been presented to the House by the Honourable Colonial Secretary on behalf of the fishermen of Coley's Point and of Port de Grave by Mr. Bradley, I might say that I have just returned from a visit to the District of Harbor Grace, and while I support the petition I regret that if conditions do not change over there very little fish will be caught on the Labrador during the coming season to export by steamer or sailing vessel or anything else. Things are all hung up over there expecting one thing and another to happen. I give the petition my support, and I hope that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will find it possible to act so that conditions with regard to the exportation of fish from the Labrador will be improved.

MR. SCAMMELL—Consistently with the stand I have taken since this session has opened, there is no other action for me but to rise to register support of the petitions that have just been presented. The petition is such, in the main, but it also sets forth

certain grievances obtaining to-day with regard to the fish exportation from the Labrador which have resulted in bringing home to these fishermen that these conditions are responsible for great detriment to the industry they are interested in. I am glad that those petitions with regard to the Labrador have been presented by Members on the opposite side of the House. I know of no better way in which the consciousness of the Government of the need of doing something for the fishery, may be roused than by having it brought to their attention by Members on their own side of the House. A considerable amount of talk is given the subject to rouse them by members on this side of the House, but they will say that we are but talking politics. I am glad to hear for this reason expressions of hope from the Government ranks, that radical changes be brought about for improvement in this connection. I am very well cognisant that the things laid down in that petition are correct. The present method of exportation from the Labrador has brought about every one of the evils that the petition has set forth. The greatest evil is that referring to the question of salt. At the F. P. U. Convention last year the matter of the salt supply for the Labrador was discussed. The conditions in connection with the salt supply there at present ought not to be in existence and the fishermen are being fleeced with regard to prices, and have often to use inferior salt. At that convention it was resolved that if we ever could influence a Government in power that we would press for the establishment of salt depots on the Labrador so that the question of securing a proper supply of salt would be settled, and a reasonable price assured. On the question of the damage done to the fish in exporting in the rush to secure the early market prices much might be said. Suffice it to say that everything laid down in that petition is absolutely correct in substance and in fact. My honorable friend, Mr. Brown, can vouch for the details, as only last year on behalf of the F. P. U. he went down on the the Senef to investigate conditions obtaining down there with regard to the fishery. He found that inferior fish was being sold which must necessarily have a very ill effect on our reputation in the markets and on our markets directly. The matter contained in this petition is worthy of more than a few minutes in passing, and I trust that since the first move in presenting these petitions has come from the Government ranks that very serious consideration will be given the prayer of the petition to see if we can't wipe out the exportation of fish from the Labrador by steamer, or at least in some retion to see if we can't wipe out the evils to which attention has been drawn.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker, with your permission I want to make it clear, as I do not want to be misrepresented. I agree with what is contained in that petition. If it were possible to prevent the export of fish from the Labrador by steamer I would support that, but I do not think it is possible. You cannot find vessels available to-day to take the catch to market, and furthermore exporters of fish cannot afford to ship owing to the high rates of insurance. The Insurance rate on codfish shipped in vessels from the Labrador to Europe is from six to eight per cent.; whereas the Insurance on fish shipped by steamer is one-half of one per cent. This works out at a difference of about forty-five cents on a quintal for Insurance alone. Then the rate of freight by sailing vessel to Europe figures out about $1.75 per qtl., whereas the rate by steamer on time charter will figure out about 75c. per qtl. unless steamer is unneces-

sarily delayed. That makes a difference of $1.45 per qtl. in favour of steamers. These increases would have to come off the purchase price on fish on the Labrador. Under these circumstances, I do not thnik it feasible or workable to have the catch taken from the Labrador to market in sailing vessels; but I would like to see all the Labrador fish brought to St. John's, and put through an inspection here and packed in casks.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the prayer of the petition presented by the honorable members for Port de Grave and Hr. Grace, and I think it is a move in the right direction. Last season, as has been stated by the honourable member for St. Barbe, I was sent to the Labrador to buy a cargo of fish for the Union Trading Company, and I had an excellent opportunity to size up the situation. We went to Salmon Bight where there was a steamer for the Monroe Export Company waiting for a cargo of fish. At the time there was no fish ready to be shipped because it was not made. Still fish that we refused to take and fish that did not see a day's sun was put on board that steamer. We then went to the Sand Banks and other places and most of the fish that we saw we refused to buy because it was unfit for market, although it was put on board other steamers. We called at Black Islands and Cape North, but the fish there was not half cured, and we refused to take it. We then came south with between three and four thousand qtls. on board. When we returned to Port Union a great part of that fish, despite the care we had taken in purchasing it, had to be taken and made again before it could be shipped by steamer to market. These conditions have existed on the Labrador coast for the past few years, and it is small wonder that Iceland and Norway have been capturing our markets. Something has to be done to remedy this state of affairs, and I hope that the Government, particularly the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, will give this petition earnest consideration with a view to helping out our Labrador fishermen and the country as a whole.

MR. WARREN — Mr. Speaker, it must be obvious to all who heard the petition read that it is one that cannot be put in the pidgeon-hole. This is a petition that will have to engage the serious attention of the Government pretty soon, and whether the prayer of the petition is acceded to or not it will have to be very carefully considered. It is pleasing to find that outside of this House there are some people engaged in the fishery who think that the Government and this House has something to do, after all, with the fishery, and while the matter of regulating exportation may be one for the Board of Trade and those interested, at all events these people are sufficiently interested to come to this House and take some action with regard to this industry. I do not know much of the details in connection with the exportation of fish from the Labrador, nor have I got any details such as has been given to the House by the honourable member for St. Barbe and the honourable member for Twillingate, but I do know that these people have awakened to the fact that that industry is on the wane and it is obvious that something will have to be done very soon, and this petition is a clear intimation to the Government that something must be done. The Leader of the Opposition, who knows more about the handling of fish than ever I could pretend to know, stated that he does not see how it's possible to stop the exportation of fish by steamer, but whether it is stopped or not it is evident that the dumping of fish in large quantities into the foreign markets plays havoc with the prices locally, and we can see the result of it around us to

day. I am reminded of an incident that took place 115 years ago. Our great-grandfathers had more sense than we have and in the time when England was at war with France, prior to the battle of Waterloo in 1815, were sending fish across in sailing vessels, and those vessels were liable to capture at any time by French Privateers off this coast. The British Government offered to provide warships for the Newfoundland fishing fleet to convoy the cargoes of fish across to Spain and Portugal; but our great-grandfathers, realising that the sending of a large quantity of fish across at one time would lessen the prices, refused to accept convoys and were prepared to take their chances of losing their vessels and their cargoes, and ran the risk of being captured themselves and being brought to French prisons. Well if that was true with regard to the dumping of heavy cargoes of fish in the foreign markets then, surely we ought to do something to try and mitigate this thing. If no solution can be found to this question, at least some consideration can be given to it by those vitally and financially interested.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my support to the prayer of the petition. On two or three occasions during this session before I expressed my views on this subject pointing out to the House the fact, that large cargoes of fish were shipped from the Labrador and St. John's, and the foreign markets became flooded, with the result that a reduction in price took place. Two weeks ago I stated here that fish had been shipped from the Labrador in bad condition. The fish was not cured because twenty days after it came out of the water it was landed in a Mediterranean market. As the fishing season is now approaching, I think the Government should take immediate action and try and remedy the matters complained off in the petition.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Speaker, I would also like to give my support to the petition presented this afternoon by the honourable members for Port de Grave and Hr. Grace. This is a subject that has concerned Labrador fishermen, particularly the people of Conception Bay, for a number of years. During the short period that I was Minister of Marine and Fisheries I had Mr. Abbott go to the Labrador coast to make a report in connection with the fishing industry. He spent five or six weeks there, collecting data and most of it upon information such as we have been treated with this afternoon. The matter of steamers having to do with the poor quality of fish, the way fish was collected by those in charge and the question of sale figured largely in that report. The prices charged for salt figured largely in that report. The prices charged for salt were above what ought to have been charged, so that fishermen realised very little for his catch of fish. The necessity for the establishment of bait depots in several places along the coast was also mentioned in that report. That report was laid before the Warren Government, but that administration did not have an opportunity to deal with the situation. The Prime Minister stated a few days ago that he was trying to find a solution himself in connection with the pooling of fish and to regulate shipments and to standardize fish. If that could be done for the Labrador coast, it would greatly improve conditions there and it would be a step in the proper direction.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker, it is not only this past year that I have seen such conditions on the Labrador coast, and it is not only to-day that the trade of this country have heard of the matter. No doubt, there are some peo-

ple who think that the Department of Marine and Fisheries never considered this matter before this, but I can assure this country that the complaints made in this petition were taken up by myself one month after I assumed office. Last year it was dealt with by the Fishery Board. It was suggested here this afternoon that I take the matter up with the Board of Trade. It would be far better to take it up with the Esquimaux on the Labrador. Last year the Fishery Board asked the Board of Trade to meet them to talk over fishery matters in connection with our fish going to market, and on other matters that would be beneficial to this Colony. A meeting was called to take place in the Marine and Fisheries office and about forty exporters, including outport and city, were invited. Four men turned up and Mr. Hepburn, who is a member of the Fishery Board, suggested that a meeting be held in an outside hall. We hired the Seamen's Institute for a meeting and only the same four men turned up. I stated at the time that as far as I was personally concerned I would refuse in future to have anything to say with the Board of Trade on fishery matters. Now I blame the St. John's merchants, who are fish buyers themselves, for ninety-five per cent. of the bad fish that was shipped out of this country, because they paid as much for badly cured fish as they did for good. Two schooners arrived in St. John's last Fall, one with a cargo of No. 1 fish, and the other with cargo of inferior fish. The merchant who bought all that fish paid as much for the bad as he did for the good. Now what encouragement is that for the man who takes care to properly cure his fish from the time it comes out of the water until it is shipped. This sort of thing has been going on for years; and I must admit also that some of our fishermen are very careless in the handling of their fish. In my opinion, however, if fish was bought according to quality there would be an improvement in the cure. I do not agree with the Leader of the Opposition that it is impossible to ship fish from the Labrador other than by steamer. I do agree that quite a number of sailing vessels have gone out, but I believe that a sufficient number of vessels can be got to take the catch to market yet. The Minister of Public Works said that things did not look favorable for the fishermen in his district. I was speaking to a number of these men at my office the past few weeks with reference to the damage done by storms on the Labrador last year; I found out from these men that quite a number of Conception Bay men are not going to the Labrador this season, and if that is the case the total catch is going to be smaller, and it will be quite possible to get enough sailing vessels to carry the fish to market. As far as fish being dirty when put on board steamers is concerned, I might say that I have been on board steamers which were taking fish on board when the deck was covered with coal. I hear of supercargoes refusing to buy fish because it was not fit to market. But the great trouble as to poorly cured fish is that if one person refuses to buy, some other person will. The fishermen are not to blame for this thing; I blame the people who buy the bad fish. I agree with the petition that it is about time that something was done to try and improve the cure and bring about better conditions for the fishery in Newfoundland. In Nova Scotia I notice the fish buyers, who were up against the same problem as we are now, have drawn up rules and regulations as to the curing of fish and they pay now fifty cents a qtl. extra for well made fish. If the merchants in this town did the same as was done in Nova Scotia there would soon be a solution to our fish problem

that faces us to-day, and if the merchants won't do it let us do it ourselves. I think, however, that indications at present are somewhat bright that something will be done to help those who want to continue fishing in this country, and if something is done it will help to keep our young men from going abroad to earn their livelihood. I heartily support the prayer of the petition and I promise to do all in my power—and the Fishery Board is also prepared to do the same—to see that the prayer of the petitioners is acceded to.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—The honourable member for Fortune, this afternoon, has said that some Government must take up the matter of fish inspection. I agree with him that the matter of fish inspection has to be taken up through the House of Assembly, and that, when a proper system is outlined, a system that will improve and benefit the cure, then this House must bring in legislation to make that a law. I am glad to see that some interest is now being taken by the people who are not in this House, and who are interested in the Labrador Fishery. I hope that something will be done in this matter to benefit the whole fishery of Newfoundland.

MR. ASHBOURNE — Mr. Speaker, with regard to the petition presented, I want to associate myself with its contents. It is, however, questionable whether or not the export of fish from the Labrador can be carried on by sailing vessels alone. At any rate, the fishermen and the merchants can do something if they insist upon the proper cure of fish before it goes out. As I understand it, the curing of fish by salt is really, so to speak, a chemical action, whereby the salt cures it by extracting the water. This chemical process is known as osmosis. It stands to reason, therefore, that if the salt preserves the fish by the extraction of water, the Labrador fish shipped out as "Slop Labrador" will not keep up in the markets. Therefore, to my mind, the chief thing is to insist upon absolutely number one quality, and then to regulate the shipments.

Mr. Cashin gave notice of question.

Mr. Hickman gave notice of question.

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Local Affairs."

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Public Roads."

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 Justice presented a petition from the Commercial Cable Co. of New York praying for Confirmation of an agreement entered into with the Government.

Said petition was, on motion, referred to a Select Committee for enquiry and report thereon. The Committee to consist of Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, Hon. the Minister of Justice, Hon. the Colonial Secretary, Mr. Warren, Mr. Halfyard.

The answer to the following question was tabled.

(1) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister: (1) If the S. S. Watchful has been sold; (2) To whom, and what was the price obtained.

In reference to question No. 1:

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I may say that there was a sale practically made of the S. S. Watchful to net the Government $12,000. A gentleman by the name of Captain Butt paid $700 as against that purchase, and then some of the principals came down and looked over the ship. They went away again and we heard no more from them. I don't know whether they are buying it or not.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Speaker, arising out of the discussion in connection with the Estimates of the Department of Public Works last week, Mr. Scammell asked a question in reference to the conduct of the farm run in connection with the Lunatic Asylum. I promised to get some information, and, for his information and for the information of the House, I beg to submit this.

(Reads)

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 15 and 16 George V. Cap. 23 (1925) entitled 'An Act respecting the Encouragement of Shipbuilding and Rebuilding.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister if it would be too late to remedy it under the provisions of this Act.

(Reads)

Have you in mind now the paying of a bounty on some vessels that have had no survey whatever. Do you know of any ship to-day not twelve or fifteen tons, which does not qualify under the Act for the original bounty? Do you know of any such vessel that was not surveyed according to the provisions of the original Act?

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I don't know one.

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 notice 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 Railway and Shipping."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, since we were in Committee on this Bill in its Resolution form, and passed the bill with various amendments, a slight error has been pointed out in Section 4 of the Bill. As it originally read, you will remember that, in Clause 20, Section 4, some of the gentlemen on the opposite side pointed out that, according to the provisions of this Act, there was nothing to prevent us from disposing of the railway over night, and getting away with the proceeds, and so we amended it as follows:

(Reads)

Now, it has been pointed out to me that, under that wording we would not have the power of selling any of the old rails that might come off the line, so I propose now to alter the wording to read "Or any branch thereof," instead of "Or any portion thereof." That is all the explanation I have to give now, and, as the Bill has been pretty well thrashed out, if the honourable members have no other suggestions to make, I propose that the Committee rise.

HON. THE LEADE ROF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, I may say that I was not in the House when these Resolutions went through and these alterations were made. I was going to bring up that very section that the Prime Minister has referred to, and I was going to suggest the very thing that the Prime Minister has suggested. I think that suggestion will improve the Bill very much and make it clearer than it stands at present.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, 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 on to-morrow.

Second Reading of Newspaper and Books Bill.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Speaker: I understand that the Motion before the Chair is that this Bill be read a second time, and it is to that Motion that I propose to address myself for a few minutes. On the day that the Prime Minister introduced the Bill here, I stated that, in my opinion, it was nothing more or less than an attemp to muzzle the press, and, if I remember aright, the Prime Minister, in introducing it, argued that the chief reason why he introduced the Bill here and the sole reason was that the Government was anxious to codify or consolidate or improve or revise, whichever way you like to put it, the present existing law relative to the publication of newspapers and books in this Colony. If there was not added to this Bill something considerably more than was needed to give effect to the explanation which the Prime Minister gave, I would not say that there would be any object in opposing the second reading, but there is a great deal more added to this Bill than the Prime Minister took the trouble to explain on the day he introduced the Bill here, and it is because of that great deal more, which was added that I, for one, do not intend to support the second reading of this Bill this afternoon. I have gone over, Sir, the original Bill which this Act seeks to repeal, namely, Chapter 69 of the Consolidated Statutes, and, while I say that, even in this Bill, there are some minor additions, minor improvements, perhaps, to the original Bill, still, at the same time, in my humble opinion, for all practical purposes, Chapter 69 of the Consolidated Statutes, as it stands, is, in itself, absolutely sufficient to embody the main desire of the Bill before us at the present time. You say that the idea of this Bill is to make it easy to discover for yourselves who the publishers of newspapers and pamphlets may be. I submit, Sir, that you have absolutely all the power and machinery that you needed for this purpose in Chapter 69 of the Consolidated Statutes as it stands at the present time. Now, Sir, I am going to make a charge here that the whole Bill, now before us, is only a disguise on the part of the Government to seek to bring into effect the obnoxious clause 13 of the present Bill.

Now we have travelled a long way since the fight was waged under the British constitution for the liberty of the Press, and I never thought that in this year of Grace 1926 the Legislature of a British Dominion would so seek to curtail the Liberty of the Press to the extent the Government does in seeking to introduce this legislature. I would have much preferred that the Prime Minister had, when moving the second reading of this Bill, declared that he wished to muzzle the mouth of the Press, because that is what it amounts to. But I want to discuss it from a larger standpoint than that of political opposition. I am going to try to take the House back over the little period of British History, and refer to the incidents where attempts were made to curtail the freedom of the Press, this will sufficiently show that an attempt is here being made to do something that is subversive of one of the greatest institutions in the British Constitution. The very piece I am going to quote shows that 200 years ago the minds of British peope were more liberal and advanced than the minds of some people in the Government ranks in this country to-day. Those of you who have made even a cursory study of literature will remember the letters of

Junius, and will remember that they are a contradiction of the principle of this Bill which is before us to-day. And I suppose that there have been no anonymous writings in modern times through the British Press which so stirred the public and so brought about reform as these letters to which I refer. They created a furore! They extended over a period of years from 1767 to 1772, and finally, after all the controversy had passed away, after all efforts to discover the editor had failed, he dedicated them to the English Nation, and by "English" he meant "British." And I submitted they have contributed as much to our constitution as Magna Carta itself, because they drew attention to the danger England was in of losing some of her fundamental rights, and in his dedication to the English Nation (and it is quite apparent that these letters were not written by any ordinary man) the author said (Reads)

"The freedom of the press has ever been regarded as the palladium of English liberty" etc. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that we as a Legislature have gone a long way back in attempting to do away with something that was regarded as a sacred privilege as long as 200 years ago. You have incorporated into this Bill in Clause 13 measures which may be said to make for the purity of politics; some men will argue that under this it will be easier to bring in a man who would otherwise stay out, because he does not care for the scurrility or defamatory reference of a political press. The framers of that Clause knew as well as I know, that there is no argument to be set up in support of such a pretext. If a newspaper publishes such a scurrilous or defamatory remark about a man, whether he be a Minister of the Crown or a political Candidate, then that man has recourse to the Courts; he has two means of redress, action and indictment. I will again quote Junius (Reads).

Now I say therefore, Mr. Speaker, that to-day, as was the case in the days when these words were said, that the same law is there; that the same recourse to action and the same means of defence are there, and if any newspaper in this Country publishes a scurrilous, defamatory or abusive letter about any man, whether he be a Minister of the Crown, a Political Candidate or a private citizen, that man has the same measures at his disposal as when these words were written, and probably his remedy is a great deal easier than then, because the Libel Laws have made it easy to defend ones character. I submit therefore, that History shows that no reason can be advanced for legislation such as we have in Section 13 of this Bill. And as I argue that you are down here to-day attempting to muzzle the Press, and I submit you are tampering with the liberties of the people—and that you have no right or reason to do so. The newspapers you may say do no good in trying to show up a man trying to get in political life. Under this a man may be trying for political honors, and be the most scurrilous rogue in the country, and if you push this far enough, no recourse can be had against him, and no criticism levelled against him. I submit that to-day the Press of the Country is the most effective and the greatest lever left in the country for the challenging of the conduct of public men. Not so many months ago this country rang with a famous case known as the "Cigarette case." I think, Mr. Speaker, without saying anything that will bring me under the censure of the Chair, I can say that in that case a Minister of the Crown was suing a newspaper for libel, and that newspaper was fined. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the fine was well worth it, because even though the newspaper was

not absolutely correct, the situation developed that the Minister of the Crown admitted under oath that he had broken the law. It was well worth the defeat, to lay bare that a Minister admitted that he had broken the law, and I say now that that newspaper rendered a public service. And if you pass this measure you are going to check off all such discussion, and debar the searchlight of public opinion from a man who breaks the law. A Minister may break the law but he is not above the law. It may be argued that newspapers do nothing to elevate the tone of public life. I can do no better again than to quote the man I have been quoting. (Reads).

And I submit that in 1926 as then a Minister of the Crown has few difficulties to contend with except the censure of the Press, and if that is removed you break down the last barrier against irregularities.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Hear, Hear!

MR. SCAMMELL—The Prime Minister says "Hear, Hear," and he says it in a way that leads me to think that he says so insincerely. If he is sincere I still don't think he has the right focus. Now Sir, if I may be permitted to continue, I would say that the Government is not only going to extremes, but to extremes which will render it impossible for a man to contribute an article to the Press. Laying down that no article can be printed except the authorship is known! You can't take up a newspaper to-day without finding articles and letters contributed by men whose names are never given; you can take up the latest English and American Journals and see their best articles submitted over a nom-de-plume. And why come down and say that there is to be nothing of that kind here? The greatest philanthropist in the country, the greatest leader of public thought may seek to give expression to his views on some question of public importance, on some subject or other. He may not wish to give his name to the public, but you make it imperative that he do so. You say that no reference shall be made to His Excellency the Governor. Now I do not wish to refer to that in any way which will cause the Speaker to rule me out of order, but you can imagine a position that may very well arise, where the Governor may have acted in such a way that it is absolutely right and proper that some reference to his conduct may be made in the Press, but under this Bill such is out of the question.

Mr. Speaker, I reiterate what I have already said, that this is nothing more nor less than an attempt to shut off criticism from public men, that you are seeking to debar the searchlight of public opinion from these men. And you are bringing this in because you must have seen the handwriting on the wall, and so that there will be no proper and adverse criticism of your party and your policies when you go to the country. That is the sum total of the whole thing, and that is the aspect in which it will appear to the country. I submit that it is unnesessary. I say again, as I have already said, that the present Act, with one at a very high price, and nobody or two minor alterations is sufficient for the purpose for which it was intended. But you want to go further and get in the thin edge of the wedge, hampering the very expression of public opinion, and I have no hesitation in saying that not in recent years has such a piece of legislation been brought in. It would not be tolerated in any other corner of the British Dominions, and I cannot and will not support it. On the motion that it be read a second time I consequently move in amendment that the Bill be read six months hence.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Speaker, as one of the members in this House directly concerned and interested in

newspapers, I want to say a word or two in connection with this Bill before the Chair. In most commercial enterprises, and most comemrcial businesses, a man who embarks on that business wants to have as much freedom as possible and as few restrictions as possible to conduct his business. So it is with the newspaper business. Mr. Scammell has just gone into the history of the freedom of the Press—a liberty bought at a very high pricee, and nobody wants to see the liberty of the Press curtailed to any large extent. But the liberty of the Press is one thing, and a thing that was bought very dear, but the license of the Press is another thing, and in the case of the Bill, liberty has been mixed with license.

Now when Mr. Scammell was speaking I couldn't help but think that he had read Sections (a) and (b) of Clause 13 very inaccurately. If you will study it again you will find that it has a very different meaning from that which Mr. Scammell wants to put on it. He refers to Junius, and his writings of two or three centuries ago. I have to say that Newfoundland would welcome a Junius to-day, and that he would have great latitude now, and also after this Bill becomes law. Junius did not descend to personalities—Junius did not attack the characters of public men. He attacked the great evils of England at the time—the policies of that time; he did not descend to degrading the characters of Ministers of the Crown, and if Junius came to Newfoundland to-morrow he would be welcomed and have the greatest latitude in the newspapers of Newfoundland. May I, Sir, quote Sections (a) and (b) of Clause 13 of this Bill.

(Reads.)

Now, during an election campaign in this country and in Canada there are certain circulars of a political nature go out from headquarters of both political parties. In Newfoundland these go out to the public containing matter written about the character of the men who are coming before the country, and no man can find out who wrote them. Sometimes it is very hard to find out the publishing office where they are printed. I have three such circulars in my hand, two of which were used in 1919, and contains various comments on men who were candidates at that time; they go back some time before 1919, and holding them in my hand I can't find out who wrote them, what office printed them, or anything else concerning them. They are very scurrilous and defamatory, and should not have seen the light in Newfoundland, but you can't find out who printed them. Now I have a circular used by a political party in Canada containing an account of certain doings of a Minister of the Crown, but on this one the address of the publishers is printed. And I feel, Sir, that this Bill, asking writers and publishers to put their names and addresses on such things is as necessary here as in Canada. That is all is asked for.

Other than that I may say that a writer should append his name at the bottom of his article. I claim that a man who writes articles should sign his name at the end, and also that the name of the publishing house should be printed, so that a man who is attacked can take action. I don't think, as a newspaper man, that there is anything wrong in that—why should there be? If a man writes a circular of a defamatory nature why shouldn't he be man enough to sign his name, and not hide behind a publishing house. Now, Sir, I have this also to say:

(Reads section.)

Now, Sir, I have my own opinion

of a man who attacks the representative of His Majesty in this country hiding behind an editor. There is nothing to prevent an editor saying anything he wishes to say, but there ought to be a law to prevent a man who is too cowardly to come out in the open when he attacks the representative of His Majesty—he should be man enough to attack him over his own name, and not leave a newspaper editor to take the blame. We have men in this country to whom it would be the worse thing that could happen to have to write over their own names—their very writings would be discredited if they wrote over their own names.

(Reads.)

That sections means that practically two months preceding an election, or six weeks preceding an election, an editor of a newspaper, a reporter of a newspaper or any one employed on the staff of a newspaper can say what they like about a candidate, or about a Government, or about the policy of the Government. They can say almost anything within the four corners of the libel act, but it prevents a man, as I instanced just now, from coming out under a nom de plume with personal attacks on a candidate and hiding behind the back of an editor of a newspaper. I have had some experience of a man coming out under a nom de plume and attacking this one and that one. In two instances which I have in mind we were haled to court in a libel action for a letter written by a certain gentleman in this country who is not by any means of the lower five. He assured us that the statement that he was making was correct and that if we had to go to court he would back us up. We were fined and he was not man enough to come forward and tell his story in the court. He hid behind the back of the editor and we had to bear the brunt of the whole thing. I do not think that it is fair. As far as this measure is concerned there is nothing that an editor can have any objection to, because if he wants to publish any article that is written under a nom de plume he can publish it if he sees fit to do so. There is nothing to stop him from doing so. If he wishes to publish the letter he can put a heading to it and publish it as an editorial and take his responsibility like a man. If the editor thinks that it is in the best interest of the country to publish a letter, he can do so and take the responsibility himself.

Now, Mr. Scammell says that a scalawag can come out for election and nothing can be said about him and he cannot be attacked within six weeks before the election. If a nawspaper editor or any member of the staff of a newspaper knows that a scalawag has come forward for election, he can be attacked by these persons, and if some man comes forward with a letter to attack that man, I say that he should be man enough to attack over his own name. No man should be given a license to make any charge unless he is prepared to attack openly and say "I am prepared to back up my charge." The editor of a paper should distrust any man that is too cowardly to put his own name under his letter.

One or two have been speaking to me about the registration of the companies in connection with newspapers. Well, if any man starts a company as a commercial venture and he is elected the president or the vice-president or the secretary, as the case may be, he counts the cost before he is elected to that office and he is prepared to take the responsibility of the deeds and the misdeeds of the corporation. I claim that the same should be the position with newspapers. A newspaper should be

established, I hold, as a commercial venture. If it is established as a commercial venture and a gentleman takes office in it, I claim that he should be prepared to take the responsibility, and when an action for libel or anything of that nature is taken against the company, the president should be man enough to go down to the court and assume his responsibility just the same as the president of any other company. A company could heretofore be formed to publish a newspaper and a man could be elected to the position of president of that company and hide behind the back of the editor, who has nothing and is not responsible and can say what he likes, and when a man aggrieved comes to claim his rights before the court of justice he has very little redress, and I think that the whole company should take the responsibility for the conduct of that newspaper as well as the editor. For these two or three reasons, Mr. Speaker, I say that I do not think that there is anything in this Bill to in any way jeopardize the liberty of the Press. In connection with the clause that prevents a man from writing lettters about the Governor, the King's representative in Newfoundland, unless he signs his name, I may say that I have my own opinion about the man who writes letters about the Governor. The Bill now before the House is, I think, a step in the right direction. I do not wish to have any curtailment of the liberty of the Press but I think that the license of the Press is a different thing and I think that it should be somewhat curtailed.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Speaker, I intimated to the hon. member for St. Barbe that I would say a word. I was much impressed with his earnestness and that he seems to have completely mistaken the whole point of the Bill. I do not wish to repeat what has been said by the speaker who immediately preceded me, but I do say that it only requires a litttle reflection on the part of the hon. member who has intimated that he will move an amendment, or who rather has formally moved an amendment, that in this particular case his natural enthusiasm on behalf of what might be termed the cause of democracy has caused him not to appreciate the point of the Bill. He suggested that the Prime Minister in introducing the Bill deliberately refrained from referring to this particular section at all, and the hon. member endeavours to inferentially indicate that the whole thing in this Bill was this terrible section thirteeen. I respect his views but I say that he has unconsciously done the Prime Minister a great wrong. There is no mistake at all about the first part of this Bill. It is repealing Chap. 69 of the Consolidated Chapters and repealing it for very sufficient reasons, as I am sure as the hon. members will appreciate when they have read Chap. 69. On the first point, that is the principle of the second reading, I do not think there can be any difference of opinion when it is considered that the Bill is only a consolidation of a grading up of the provisions of Chap. 69 brought about by the changes of conditions during the years. Chap. 69, the old act that we have on the Statute Books now, was formed long before the incorporated company came into existence. I am reminded of an instance by the hon. member himself. He quoted a cigarette case in which a fine of five hundred dollars was paid. The difference in modern legislation is that in any country in the Empire except Newfoundland, if a man were convicted by a jury in that manner he would be sent to jail. The reason that no more can be done today is that companies cannot be

imprisoned, and the hon. member must appreciate that if he to-morrow were libelel by some thug who had not the courage to sign his own name to his own letters and allows the newspaper to take the responsibility, it is time to put the law in the position so that that class of man can be got. This is dealing with the reconstruction of the act apart altogether from politics. The difficulty in the past has been that taking libel actions was valueless because companies of no substance could not be got at. What is wanted to-day is absolute freedom, as has been said by both the hon. members. This Bill does not impair the freedom of any one who is prepared to say what he likes and is also prepared to take his own chances and write over his own name. The hon. member has referred to this particular clause, this new clause, and he says that there is nothing like it in any other part of the British Empire. I may tell the hon. member that the clause that we are instituting here has been introduced in what I think we may call the most advanced type of democratic assembly in the world, in Australia. It says:

(Reads.)

Now I submit that there is a vast difference in that and what we are doing here. Here we merely state that any article that pertains during election time to any candidate of Government or Opposition must be signed. One does not want to suggest that one section of the Press is more guilty than another. It would be an unfair way to have this Bill dealt with, but I do know of a circular that was written in this town that if the name of the writer of the circular had been signed to it that something might have happened that would not have been to the credit of this country. The newspapers properly always disclaim any responsibility for the opinions of its correspondents, and what is the daily request of the newspapers about their anonymous correspondeents? It is that they be sure to give their names to the paper. If a man wants to make any comment on any matter of public importance he ought to do it decently, but if he wishes to be abusive or scurrilous he should not be ashamed to sign his name.

In supporting the second reading of this Bill I do not see anything in it that suppresses the liberty of the Press. I hope the hon. member will pardon me when I say that Junius stood for clean criticism. I think it is time that the scurrility and abusiveness that sometimes marks elections conducted in this country should be controlled somewhat. It is not a sectional bill at all. It treats Opposition and Government alike. And in an election if a candidate is being criticised let him know who his man is and give him a chance to take civil or criminal proceedings if he wants to, and we know in the past the value of criminal proceeedings.

I may say to the Prime Minister that in looking over this Bill I notice that there are two or three minor alterations that may be made. And, Mr. Speaker, I say that I do look forward to both sides of the House agreeing on reflection that the measures that are taken in this Bill are beneficial to all concerned and are a step in the right direction.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Speaker, I propose to vote for the amendment and I may as well say why I am going to do it. First of all I admit that the first portion of the Bill is absolutely necessary for the protection of anybody in the country. Owing to the manner in which newspapers operate I appreciate what the Minister of Justice says with regard to making somebody liable for what is published in the paper.

But I regard section thirteen as legislation that is absolutely opposed to the English law of libel and slander. I refer more particularly to the criminal side of it, and I say, if necessary, that it cannot be carried out. We have lately been getting our legislation from Canada. Here we are taking a jump from Canada across the world to Australia. My opinion is that we should have not gotten it all. With the first part of the section I agree, because I think that the Governor in his position ought to be immune from anything of that sore, for the reason that he has no chance to reply and we cannot expect the Governor to take action in one of the courts. It is true that some years ago His Majesty did take action by availing of the English law against some paper and some person in England because of something defamatory that was published about him, but that will show at all events there is provision enough in the English law if it is carried out. But in a case of this sort, and in a small community like this, that section cannot be left out. But the next one:

(Reads.)

Supposing that a man did write something that to him was not defamatory and which he did write under a nom de plume and it is then left to some magistrate in St. John's, or perhaps in the outports, to say whether the article is defamatory or not and the man has no regrets and the magistrate can fine him up to two thousand dollars. I think that is going too far altogether. I think from what the Attorney General read out the maximum fine in Australia is fifty pounds. I would like to know why in this case the fine in Newfoundland is put up to two thousand dollars. It is putting too large a jurisdiction in the hands of a magistrate to decide in the heat of an election what is defamatory and what is not. I think that the case would be provided for if you make the printer responsible and leave it to him to decide whether the matter is defamatory or not and whether he is liable to action by publishing an article over a nom de plume. The member for Bay de Verde stated that people did this and hid behind the back of the editor. Surely it is a mattter for the editor to prevent people from hiding behind him if he does not want to be guilty of libel.

I would like to ask the Attorney General what they are going to do in connection with anything that is defamatory and is published outside of this Colony. Supposing that a man goes to Sydney and gets his election material, or these pamphlets, although I have not seen them myself, printed there and then brought into this country. It does not matter whether the newspaper says that they do not take the responsibility. That is another reason why I say that you will have to make the printer responsible for the whole thing.

The English law of slander and libel is sufficient but this gives a magistrate the right to fine a man up to two thousand dollars for something which in his opinion is not defamatory but in the opinion of the magistrate is defamatory. I say that there is no necessity so long as you have the limited liability company and so long as the printer of the pamphlet or whatever it is has to have his name written on it. I think that the English law which they have in Canada and everywhere else except perhaps in Australia will cover the case and there is no necessity of taking away from a man the right to be tried by a jury in a case of this nature.

MR. BROWNE—I think that on an important question of this kind raising a point of a constitutional nature

I should not allow the occasion to pass without making a few remarks. With the general principle dealt with in this act I feel sure that every one is in accord. We have seen in the past how candidates have been calumniated for no other reason except that they are opposed politically to certain people on the other side. I think that is what is driving men, good men, out of the political arena and robbing this country of men of great ability. Many a man of sensitive nature has been deterred from entering public life because of his fears that not only his own actions but the actions of his father and possibly his grandfather will be dragged into the limelight again and scandal circulated concerning the members of his family. The hon. member who moved the amendment while I was not in the House knows that his own leader suffered as much in that respect as any other man in this country. Therefore I think that the principal that we are discussing is of the fullest significance to the whole country and not to be dismissed by the amendment that has been introduced. In a country of enlightened opinion, where the majority of the people possess a good deal of refinement, having many opportunities for an advanced education, we do not find the press being used to exploit or coerce or cajole or mislead the public on political questions. But in this country where we have a number of illiterate people dependent almost solely on what they hear, and where we have a large number of people who believe almost everything that they read in the newspapers I feel that the time has come when there must be some restriction placed on the press which is such a means of propaganda and of influencing public opinion. I have in my own mind a man who has been the victim of propaganda of this sort. In the two political campaigns in which I accepted nomination I was able to see how this weapon works.

I have always made it a principle that I would never say anything that I would think was a slander and that I would not be prepared to back up. I have always taken that attitude in this House. But those who were opposing me did not refuse to resort to underhanded methods to do me harm. I think that I express the opinion of every hon. member on both sides of the House when I say that these underhanded methods,—I refer to the treachery of correspondents writing these letters to the newspapers,—are endeavours to belittle political opponents. And a man is attacked by insinuations and innuendoes that do more harm than libel itself. Therefore, while I agree with the hon. member for Fortune in some of his remarks that he has made on some matters in this bill I argue that we must put some restriction on contemptible tactics of this sort. Is that going to be done by this bill? I feel sure that in a very large measure it will be. But I would not only require the name of the manager of the journal to print in it but the name of the editor as well. A man under the English law is not considered guilty until he has been proven guilty by a jury but a man in Newfoundland under the present law is guilty as soon as a letter of this kind appears in the newspapers. A man has no chance against libel. It was once said by a learned English Judge in an English case that the libel always has the head start and you can never overtake it. If it is printed in the paper—say the "Morning Murcury," will not the paper be circulated all over the country and what it contains pass from mouth to mouth; and if the paper comes back the next day and says that the information that they had was absolutely untrue, and it retracts every word, will that retraction clean the matter up. You can never

follow up the libel and negative it. It will always do harm. It is one of the peculiarities of human nature that we are always ready to give ear to something that we do not know is true or is damaging to our neighbour, but not so eager to listen to or repeat something which may do him good. The English law is a law that has been developed over hundreds of years. The law of libel in England and the freedom that is given to the press is a very important part of the constitution of that country. There was a time in England,—I do not think there was ever a time in Newfoundland—when the press was in the control of the Government, and when a political opponent had no opportunity whatever to defend himself. Even freedom of speech was denied. The press was subject to very strong censorship under a tyrannical Government. The Government owned the press; or they supervised everything that was published so that they might remain in power. It was for freedom to speak the truth that men fought and were imprisoned and died but it was not to be permitted to scandalize or libel an opponent that Junius or anyone else made such a contribution to the fine literature of their time.

The law of libel was established on the basis of a man being tried by his peers and I have already expressed my opinion to members on this side of the House with regard to that. I do not think that the capacity of our Magistrates all over the Island is equal to the subject of libel. Further, I do not think that a Magistrate at present has power to try a libel case at all. He can try a slander case and then only when the slander imputes unchastity to a female. I feel that it is quite a jump to give power to a Magistrate, who is not equipped with legal lore and legal knowledge, to impose a fine of two thousand dollars and part of which fine is to go to the person laying the information. I feel that all will agree that no one should publish what they do not believe to be true without the one effected having redress. Perhaps we cannot appreciate now the length to which the unlicensed press of this country has gone to in political campaigns. Events that occurred a century ago were resurrected and put in print again for a younger generation to read and who would have never heard of them if this Act was in force. We want to try and uplift this country and keep political issues clear and clean cut. I think it will be a blessing to us all to know that when going on a political campaign there is a law to protect us from being personally attacked by scurrilously articles. I support the Bill and I have great faith in the effect it is going to have. I feel sure that anyone who has the interest of his country at heart will welcome the Bill because of its absolute fairness and because it carries out the principle for which this Party went to the country, namely, a "square deal to all," and, no doubt, all will now get a square deal that they did not get before.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker: I am not in a position now to discuss the merits or demerits of the Bill, but, as there is a difference of opinion on both sides of the House over the Bill between the legal lights and those connected with newspapers, I think the Bill should have been given more consideration. As there is no election pending, I shall second the Amendment proposed by the hon. member for St. Barbe. I agree with a great deal that that has been said by members on both sides, but I doubt very much whether this Bill will overcome the circulation of circulars in a political campagn. During my last campaign I came across circulars that were bad in character and that were circulated by motor car and done me

a great deal of harm. Nobody knew who distributed the circulars or who printed them. Although I had no knowledge of some of them, I took the responsibility and made every effort to destroy them. If this Bill would cover a menace of that sort, I think it would be a good thing for all. At this juncture, however, I do not want to discuss the matter any further. When the Bill, if it does, goes into Committee stage I shall have something to say on the salient points of it.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER— Mr. Speaker, I do not quite understand the attitude of the Leader of the Opposition because he says he does not want to discuss the merits or demerits of the Bill, yet he admits its fine principle, but does not point out to us any objectionable features in the Bill. Objections have been raised by the honourable member for Fortune Bay. I cannot agree with him and I am glad to say that we can differ with him in that respect. The honourable member for St. Barbe gave us to understand that he did not understand the Bill at all because he distinctly stated in connection with the cigarette case that the insinuations mentioned in the press would not have been made if this Bill had been in force. Consequently, that member must not have given any consideration to the Bill at all. There has been no real criticism given to the Bill or any reason given for rejecting it, yet the proposition is put forward to give the measure the six months' hoist. From my viewpoint it is an extraordinary attitude.

MR. HICKMAN — Mr. Speaker, I think I stated clearly to the House that there was a difference of opinion on both sides of the House between the legal lights and the newspapermen, and that I thought the matter should be fairly considered and discussed.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker, I suppose that the people connected with me and my family have been more severely criticized in the press than any others in this country. Personally, I do not care whether this much discussed clause now is allowed to continue or not; but I object to a Magistrate in any district having the power to fine a man two thousand dollars for a breach of the Act. Unless that clause is stricken out I shall not support it. Furthermore, what about people going to the country with Manifestoes and signing them. If that clause empowering Magistrates to such an extent is allowed to remain, this is a Government measure pure and simple.

Pursuant to order, Hon. the Prime Minister moved that the Bill entitled "An Act relating to Newspapers and Books," be now read a second time.

Whereupon Mr. Scammell moved and Mr. Hickman seconded, in amendment that the word "on" be left out, and that there be added at the end of the motion the words "Six months hence."

Whereupon the House divided and there appeared in favour of the amendment:

Mr. Hickman
Mr. Halfyard
Mr. Hibbs
Mr. Grimes
Mr. Scammell
Mr. Brown
Mr. Godden
Mr. Ashbourne
Mr. Cashin
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. the Minister of Posts
Hon. Mr. Long
Hon. Mr. Cramm
The Minister of Agriculture
The Minister Marine and Fisheries.
The Minister Public Works
Mr. Moore
Mr. Sinnott
Mr. Chambers

Mr. Puddester
Mr. Cahill
Mr. Linegar
Mr. Browne (17)

so it passed in the negative.

Whereupon the original motion that the Bill be read a second time was 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. the Minister of Posts
Hon. Mr. Long
Hon. Mr. Cramm
The Minister of Agriculture
The Minister Marine and Fisheries.
The Minister Public Works
Mr. Moore
Mr. Sinnott
Mr. Chambers
Mr. Puddester
Mr. Cahill
Mr. Linegar
Mr. Browne (17)

and against it:

Mr. Hickman
Mr. Halfyard
Mr. Hibbs
Mr. Grimes
Mr. Scammell
Mr. Brown
Mr. Godden
Mr. Ashbourne
Mr. Cashin
Mr. Warren (10)

so it passed in the affirmative and was ordered accordingly.

Whereupon the Bill entitled "An Act relating to Newspapers and Books" 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 MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I beg to move the second reading of Bill to amend "An Act to amend 15 Geo. 5, Cap. 8 'Of the House of Assembly'" and would like to explain that it is merely to correct an error whereby "Grand Falls" was printed in place of "Exploits."

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend 15, Geo. V., Cap. 8, entitled '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 Whole House on to-morrow.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —I beg to move the second reading of "An Act to amend Chapter 51 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Nuisances and Municipal Regulations.'" I may explain that the necessity for this amendment arose out of a decision the other day in the Magistrate's Court. The old act in the Consolidated Statutes was passed before the innovation of the modern motor trucks and such vehicles, and these could not be considered obstructions to maintain an action as it was held by Judge Morris that a motor car was not a vehicle within the meaning of that act. The deficiency is being remedied by inserting the words: ("or any truck, motor vehicle.....")

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 51 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Nuisances and Municipal Regulations" 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 have passed the Bills sent up entitled respectively "An Act Respecting the United Church of Canada," and "An Act to Confirm an Agreement between the Government of Newfoundland and the Newfoundland Cold Storage Fresh Fish Corporation, Ltd." without amendment.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, May 18th 1926.

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 appointed to consider the petition of the Commercial Cable Company of New York, as follows;

> The Select Committee appointed to consider the petition of the Commercial Cable Company of New York, beg to report that the Committee have considered the matter to them referred; that they find the rules of the House respecting notice have been duly complied with, and they recommend that leave be granted for the introduction of the annexed Bill.
>
> (Sgd.) J. R. BENNETT,
> W. W. HALFYARD,
> W. R. WARREN,
> WM. WOODFORD,
> W. J. HIGGINS.
>
> May 18th, 1926.

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice this Report was received and adopted. Whereupon the Bill entitled "An Act to Confirm an Agreement between the Commercial Cable Co. and the Government" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Mr. Warren gave notice of question.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Local Affairs," 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 Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Public Roads," 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 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. Chairman,—This is the third occasion on which I have had the honor of addressing the Committee of the House on Ways and Means. Honourable members will remember that in 1924, when the present administration came into office, we had the unpleasant duty of finalizing the accounts of the previous Government. We found that that Government went out of office leaving a deficit of $1,620,468.36, not including an expenditure of upwards of $100,000.00 which came into the operation of our first year in office. This deficit has been met by the appropriation of $1,600,000.00 in the 1924 Loan, the balance having been paid from Surplus Trust Funds.

Our assumption of office in June 1924 enabled us to start the fiscal year at its beginning. Most Governments are elected in November and take office when the fiscal year is half over.

My second Budget Speech on April 8th, 1925, showed that the Monroe Administration was in earnest in its efforts to bring back this country of ours to a state in which we could once more see her paying her way on current account. Personally, I was determined to work night and day if by any means I could make our expenditure and revenue balance. And now, with the Accounts for 1924-25, the first year of the Monroe Government, closed, I have the

honour and gratification of announcing to this House that our Revenue exceeded our Expenditure on current account by $347,003.23, or $71,506.23 more than the Estimate in my Budget Speech last April. That means we made a better showing on current account as compared with the previous year by nearly two million dollars. I want to congratulate the country and the people upon this result, and also thank my colleagues for their co-operation in making it possible. I am proud of the country which can show such a surplus after the devastating effect of former years. It once more shows an ability to "come back" which gives us renewed confidence and hope.

My honorable friends opposite have already been trying to criticise this result. They tell us that it has been wrung from the people in taxes and so forth, but it is well known that the new Tariff (their own Tariff by the way) was only in operation a few months before the end of the fiscal year 1924-25. And I will say also that if Newfoundlanders have the spirit I think they have, they will always be willing to pay their share if by so doing they will keep the old ship on an even keel and able to weather the financial storms when they arise.

I would also refer my critics to my Budget Speech of last year, page 7, where they will find an itemized account showing that more than $200,000 was raised from those who were evading the payment of their just dues to the Colony. To no small extent I obtained my surplus by the collection of arrears that should have been paid long ago if previous Governments had done as they should, and from the collection of duties which had been collected before only in a haphazard manner.

I said last year that I was reasonably certain that millions must have been lost to the Revenue of the Colony during the past twenty years through the presentation of false invoices and the undervaluing of goods generally, and while I do not wish to strike a personal note, I have done my utmost to stop these depredations from the public monies and show those who think too loosely of the Revenue Act that there is such a law and that it must be obeyed. This has resulted in bringing in increased Revenue and will continue so to do. In the matter of Bonded Warehouses, I have had a general clean-up, and the Auditor General has installed a new Ledger which is working splendidly and shows at a glance the amount of goods in Bond by any shipment and the amount of duty due.

The total Revenue for the fiscal year 1924-25 amounted to $9,783,188.46, made up as follows:

REVENUE 1924-25.

Customs	$ 7,996,972.55
Posts	316,265.69
Telegraphs	207,177.28
Crown Lands	159,015.21
Inland Revenue Stamps	42,496.80
Fines and Forfeitures	5,952.26
Interest on Guaranteed Loans	86,849.51
Broom Department, Penitentiary	6,658.46
Fees Public Institutions	55,421.25
Taxes and Assessments	223,857.37
Estate Duties	47,332.38
Liquor Sales	176,662.56

Business Profits' Tax (arrears)	16,548.09
Income Tax	351,080.73
Manufacturers' Sales Tax	11,094.42
Miscellaneous—General	79,803.90
	$ 9,783,188.46

The total Expenditure for the fiscal year 1924-25 was $9,436,185.23, as follows:

EXPENDITURE 1924-25.

Interest on Public Debt	$ 3,128,224.96
Civil Government	457,163.58
Civil Pensions	75,717.77
Military Pensions	594,499.27
Old Age Pensions	97,787.50
Administration of Justice	457,767.64
Legislation	98,042.97
Education	835,842.77
Public Charities	1,059,755.91
Agriculture and Mines	51,898.16
Marine and Fisheries	316,966.18
Roads and Bridges	224,563.70
Posts and Telegraphs	1,249,949.46
Customs	509,552.25
Contingencies—General	89,940.70
Elections	7,284.35
Audit Act, Section 33 (b)	181,228.06
	$ 9,436,185.23

The Revenue marks an increase over the previous year of $1,381,519. 37, and the Expenditure a decrease of $585,952.22, or a better showing as I have said than the previous year by $1,967,471.59.

The increase under the regular heads of Revenue are general, but principally under the head of Customs.

The increase in Customs' Revenue took place right through the year, and not only when the new Tariff came into operation. My last Budget Speech showed an increase up to the end of February, 1925, nearly two months before the New Tariff came into effect, of $681,384.75. The four months of the Spring always show the heaviest importations, and maintained very little more than the same rate of increase, thus proving that our splendid showing last year did not depend upon the much discussed New Tariff.

We have been accused in all sorts of ways of spending lavishly, and my answer is to point to the decreased Expenditure on current account of nearly $600,000.00 for 1924-25. The total Expenditure is the lowest, with the exception of 1921-22, since 1919-20. The much talked of increase to the civil service, which was really only restoring their salaries to the amount voted in the Estimates, has meant increased efficiency, and, in spite of it, I am able to show this substantial decrease, largely brought about by savings on Able-Bodied Poor

Relief, under which system some of our people had been induced to let the country feed them instead of continuing to exhibit that independent spirit upon which the true prosperity of any country can alone be built up. Able-Bodied Poor Relief has not by any means ceased as it seems impossible to cut it off completely at one operation, but we are using every effort to reduce such expenditure.

We effected a saving of nearly $700,000 if we exclude an increase of $112,000.00 in Interest on Public Debt. Of this saving $237,000.00 was saved on expenditure under the Audit Act, mainly Able-Bodied Poor Relief, and $113,000.00 in the Charities' Department, $121,000.00 in the Posts and Telegraphs' Department, $79,000.00 in the Justice Department and so on.

The only increases were those which could not be avoided, such as Military and Civil Pensions.

LOANS

On Loan Account we spent $2,875,-176.36 during 1924-25. That may seem a large amount, but we can point to the fact that our expenditure was practically all on Capital Account, such as for the new Steamer for the Gulf and other works of permanent nature and for which the country has valuable assets. This is proven by the following statement:

LOAN EXPENDITURE FOR FISCAL YEAR 1924-1925.

Expenditure for which we have Assets of permanent value		$ 2,165,523.52
Purchase Quidi Vidi Park	$ 11,129.00	
Purchase of Building at Ferryland	3,000.00	
New Post Office, Brooklyn, B.B.	400.00	
Rolling Stock for Railway	200,923.23	
New Steamer for Gulf	470,289.56	
New Steamer fittings, equipment, etc.,	24,820.00	
Steam Coaches	37,204.32	
New Rails	721,937.17	
Buildings on Railway	3,910.57	
Bridges and Trestles	8,480.43	
New Dock	683,429.24	
	$2,165,523.52	
Roads, Bridges, Marine Works, etc.		227,544.35
Roads and Bridges under Public Works	$ 94,255.61	
Roads and Bridges under Govt. Engineer	34,805.08	
Roads, etc. under Highroads' Commission	23,000.00	
Marine Works	75,483.66	
	$ 227,544.35	
Necessary Maintenance Work on Railway		128,964.73
Other Railway Purposes		245,120.02
General Purposes		108,023.74
Alterations Post Office	$ 11,500.00	
Unemployment Bureau	6,499.33	
Game and Inland Board	8,000.00	
Aid to Patriotic Association	2,500.00	

War Graves	16,641.53	
Advertising and Cables	1,498.78	
Royal Bank to repay advance and Interest a/c Dominion Co-operative Company	61,384.10	
	$ 108,023.74	
Total Expenditure		$ 2,875,176.36

It is quite in order for my honorable friends opposite to criticize the expenditures which we are making on Loan account; but they, fortunately or unfortunately, are not faced with the responsibility of decisions as we are. The Government are not spending moneys for the mere pleasure of the thing, nor even to benefit political followers, but their bounden duty as a Government, responsible for the conduct of the whole country, is to maintain that country at the highest state of efficiency consistent with a reasonable expenditure. We do not want to tinker with essential work and throw good money away on work of uncertain value. That is why we undertook to make a good job in rebuilding the Dock, in putting an asset there that will last long after we, in this House, will have passed away. That is why we have undertaken the re-railing of the line to Clarenville, and more re-railing will have to be done when further funds are available. It is not our policy to let the Railway run down as has been the policy in the past, and while it is a going concern we shall maintain it as efficiently as we can afford and keep it safe for the travelling public.

In like manner we have embarked on a Highroads-building policy. I confess that I did not anticipate that we should have had such a large expenditure as the Highroads' Commission incurred last season, but before we judged them it would have been only just if we had waited a few months in order to examine their work after a Winter and Spring. In other words, we wanted road work that will withstand the assaults of our weather, and from all indications of the conditions of the Roads at the present time, the Highroads' Commission have done good work, and their roads are in splendid order after the winter. It is our aim to put Newfoundland in such a position that she will be ready to grasp the opportunity to advance when it comes knocking at her doors. We want our country not to be the sport of historic misfortune nor even the place of fog and frost, but a country which will become known for its strong and independent people and its health-giving and pleasant climate.

In this connection I trust that the erection of the new Hotel and the efforts of the Tourist Publicity Bureau will have the result hoped for in a great influx of visitors during the summer months. The Government are giving such assistance as they deem necessary in connection with the new Hotel, which will be ready, I understand, for the official opening in June. From what I can learn of its appointments, it should, under capable management, satisfy the most fastidious traveller

The gross Public Debt at the close of the fiscal year 1924-25 was $64,517,998.93 to which has been added since the balance of the 1924 Loan

not raised $2,000,000.00, and $500,000.00 raised under the Dock Act of last year, making a total of $67,017,998.93. This two and a half million loan was raised in England, on what I consider very favourable terms, 97.49 being obtained net at St. John's.

The allowance by the Trade Facilities' Board in England of 3¾ per cent. on all purchases made in that country by us has not at the present moment been computed but will be adjusted in the near future.

Before I pass to the current year it may be of interest to note the following in reference to the trade figures for 1924-25 which are given as an Appendix to this report, and their comparison with the previous year.

There was an increase in Imports of	$ 8,727,492.00
There was an increase in Exports of	2,518,615.00
Making an increase in total Trade of	$ 11,246,107.00

The figures are as follows:—

	1923–24	1924–25
Imports	$ 27,677,182.00	$ 36,404,674.00
Exports	21,071,571.00	23,590,186.00
	$ 48,748,753.00	$ 59,994,860.00

The total Trade figures are the highest in the history of the Colony with the exception of those abnormal years from 1918 to 1920. The Imports showed $12,814,468 in excess of Exports, due to the large importations for construction work at Corner Brook, Grand Falls and St. John's. Of the Imports, amounting to $36,404,674, goods to the value of $20,554,502.00 were dutiable, and goods to the value of $15,850,172.00 were free of duty. The quantity of Fish exported was 99,577 quintals less than the Export of the previous year, but was greater in export value by $1,961,882 than in 1923-24. The export of Cod Oil increased in quantity 2,932 gallons and $396,153 in value. The export of Cod Liver Oil showed an increase of 36,095 gallons and in value $45,071.00. The export of Seal Oil increased 1,215 gallons and in value $121,333. The export of Seal Skins increased 6,912 skins and in value $60,748. Lobsters showed a decrease in export of 3,107 Cases and in value $71,373, due to the close season imposed on catching. The export of Pickled Salmon showed a decrease of 96 Tierces in quantity and an increase in value of $14,710. The export of Fresh Salmon fell below the average of the previous three years, being 975,830 pounds and in value $156,366 less than the previous year's export. The export of Frozen and Bulk Herring shows an increase in quantity of 3,208 barrels but a decrease in value of $3,229. Pickled Herring shows the lowest export in the last six years, being 12,396 barrels less than the previous year and $183,300 less in value. The export of Whale Oil increased by 390 tuns and in value $50,853. The export of Lumber was 193,305 feet less than the previous year and was $6,976 less in value, due, no doubt, to the quantity required for home consumption. The export of Paper shows an increase of 9,813 tons and of value $848,994. The export of Pulp decreased by 18,963 tons and in value $315,937. The export of Iron Ore shows an increase of 373,354 tons valued at $617,701.

This leads me to make a few passing remarks about our Fishery industries. In connection with Canned Salmon we had a visit last year from Mr. Robert Chambers who has had many years' experience in salmon hatcheries in British Columbia and who, while here, visited several of our factories. He left Newfoundland with the conviction that the possibilities for the canning of Salmon on modern lines are such as to promise excellent returns if a system of centralization was adopted. He found our Salmon to be well flavoured and of excellent quality in every way. In this connection I understand that the Hudson Bay Company intend to operate the large cold storage plant in the West End and engage in the Fresh Salmon and Fresh Fish industry generally this season. This is a matter of great hopefulness and I trust the venture will prove of profit to our people. With regard to the export of Salted Turbot, satisfactory progress is noted. One dealer shipped eleven hundred barrels and suffered only One Hundred dollars in reclamations, due to better handling and the inspection of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. There is very little doing in Halibut but there should be vast possibilities in this industry as, with the depletion of this fishery in the North Sea, there ought to be a great demand from Great Britain and U. S. A. The Herring Fishery seems to be decreasing, and yet the demand from Northern Europe is exceeding the supply. We seem content to cater to inferior markets only, and I look for greater interest in this industry. I notice from a report of the Marine and Fisheries that the quantity of medicinal Cod Liver Oil exported last year was three times as much as the year previous. The quality was good and steady and further advances are anticipated with confidence.

As I have already stated, the Cod Fishery, our main industry, turned out favourably last year (1925), as the shortage in catch was offset by a greater value of nearly two million dollars than the previous season. The prices ranged at about $10.00 per quintal for Shore Fish and from $5.00 to $5.50 per quintal for Labrador. The Bank Fishery showed a catch of 101,384 quintals for 1925, or a fifty per cent. increase over catch for 1924. The export of Codfish from Labrador was 90,392 quintals as compared with 57,840 quintals for 1924.

RAILWAY

I have already referred to certain capital expenditure made in connection with the Railway. The re-railing with seventy pound English rail commenced at St. John's in June 1925, and was completed to two miles west of Clarenville, or one hundred and thirty-three miles, in September. The results have shown the great necessity of, and the great advantage in having this heavier rail, as derailments have been avoided and all trains can move over this division in less time, thereby reducing cost of operation. In order to further reduce derailments and make the Railway safe for travel it was found necessary to carry on an enlarged programme of ballasting, tie renewals, and repairs to equipment which increased the expenditure for these purposes by $310,000.00 over the previous year. This ballasting will also have to continue for at least two years more. Approximately 500,000 ties were removed, as compared with the ten year previous average of about 300,000 ties. As a result the Railway Operating Account of this year had to bear nearly twice the ordinary expenditure for ballasting. In addition to this considerable improvements have had to be made to

station buildings, yards, sidings, bridges and culverts. A lot of this work was never finished and too big a risk was being taken in operating over wooden trestles. Extensive repairs were also found necessary to Main Gut Bridge, Stephenville. More freight was handled during the past year than in any year in the history of the Railway, due mostly to traffic in the Humber area. The prospects for increased freight appear to be improving year by year and considerable extra pulpwood traffic is in prospect for next season. Rolling stock has been added during the past year as follows:

50 Box Cars
50 Flat Cars
12 Ballast Dump Cars
1 Dining Car and
3 Snow Ploughs all built at the Railway Car Shop. Two new Sleepers were imported and one Steam Shovel was purchased.

The new Steamer S.S. "Caribou," operating between N. Sydney and Port aux Basques, commenced the service on November 3rd., 1925. This ship is far superior to any other steamer previously in this particular service and will be able to take care of increased passenger travel. It can also effect a considerable saving in being able to handle cargo for railway service and bring freight at the same time, thereby saving demurrage on cars and giving quicker despatch to freight.

For the current year I estimate a Revenue of $10,069,000.00 made up as follows:

REVENUE 1925-1926.

Customs	$ 8,250,000.00
Postal	317,000.00
Telegraph	250,000.00
Crown Lands	120,000.00
Inland Revenue Stamps	45,000.00
Fines and Forfeitures	26,000.00
Liquor Profits and repayment for Stocks	320,000.00
Fees Public Institutions	55,000.00
Broom Department, Penitentiary	8,000.00
Interest Guaranteed Loans	87,000.00
Estate Duties	150,000.00
Bank Taxes, Assessments and Cable Taxes	141,000.00
Income Tax Arrears	165,000.00
Miscellaneous	135,000.00
	$ 10,069,000.00

Against this our Expenditure will reach $10,007,447.61, leaving a surplus of $61,522.39.

With regard to the coming year of 1926-1927, I want to be quite frank with the House and say that I am hopeful that our expenditure will not reach the figures set in the Estimates which have been placed before the House. We have to face the fact that expenditure must be reduced. We cannot expect such large Revenues as we have had to continue. During the past two years construction work in private industries has been heavy and remunerative to our people and thus helped the Revenue considerably.

The reduction of Taxation is something to which we all look forward, but only by the reduction of expenditure can it be accomplished.

My Estimates for 1926-27 provide for an Expenditure of $9,764,394.84. I estimate a Revenue of $10,065,000.00 and a Surplus of $300,605.16. My figures are based upon certain favourable factors which encourage a hopeful outlook. I may instance one very important fact, that on December 31st, 1925, there was on deposit in the Savings' Account of the various Banks throughout the Colony the sum of $23,179,123.56. This is not only the largest amount of savings put away by the people for a rainy day in the history of the Colony, but the figures show that during the twelve months previous they added the substantial sum of $1,043,894.54 to their savings. I consider this a splendid showing, and I desire to pay due tribute to those who exhibit such thrifty habits. Judging from the number of depositors in our own Government Savings' Bank I should say that these deposits represent about forty-five thousand accounts. This means that practically one person in six in the whole Colony puts aside for future use such sums, be they large or small, as he can afford. And in considering these savings of the people we must also add the sum of $965,000 which was paid in Life Insurance premiums during the year 1924. During that year seventeen hundred and eighty-five new policies were issued, totalling nearly four million dollars, making the total Life Insurance in force December 31st, 1924 over $28,000,000.00. These are facts which show that our people are alive to the advantage of putting aside for a rainy day.

Another encouraging feature is the result this year of the Sealfishery. It is now closed and the total catch will be over two hundred thousand seals, not including seals killed by our landsmen. This is the largest catch since 1916, when it was two hundred and forty-one thousand. The average catch per year from 1916 to 1925 works out at one hundred and twenty-eight thousand seals, so that we may consider that we have opened the year under very favourable conditions. It has well been said that the Sealfishery sets the pace for the whole year. The money which is set in circulation thereby provides the wherewithal in hundreds of cases to purchase sufficient fishery supplies to at least begin fishing operations in the summer. This in turn has its effect upon the Codfishery, in that it is prosecuted with more vim and the fishermen have a greater sense of independence.

Another factor that we must remember is the rapid growth of the pulp and paper industry. The House will remember that paper making operations at Corner Brook began in July 1925. When a maximum daily production of four hundred tons is achieved the total production will mean rather more than twice that of other years, and in value will probably rather mean more than equal the export value of our fisheries.

We already realize what this means in labour to our men and in Customs' returns, and we can only hope that these great labour giving industries will flourish and continue to expand in our country. In this connection I might mention the expectation and hope we all have that the Gander proposition will be successfully started, as well as development of the large Aluminum project in Bay D'Espoir. It is also of some interest to note that the A.N.D. Company expect to expend about two million dollars in improvements and additions at Grand Falls in the next two years.

In view of the publication of the Customs' and other reports, and the natural question which might arise as to conditions in the Public Service at the present time, I might say as I said last year that the Departments of the Government are functioning better and more efficiently than formerly. The division of responsibility laid

down in the Audit Act as between the Auditor General and the Deputy Heads and other officials charged with the expenditure of public moneys, in which the latter are responsible for audit in the first instance, has not always worked out satisfactorily, and, in consultation with the Auditor General, the audit of his Department has been expanded and made more effective. As far as my own Department is concerned, safeguards were instituted more than a year ago, and I am evolving a system of check that will cover all the operations of this principal source of revenue.

I now beg to propose the following

RESOLUTIONS.

RESOLVED:—That the Act passed in the fifteenth year of the Reign of His Majesty King George V., Chapter 34, entitled "The Revenue Act 1925" be amended in the manner following:

SCHEDULE A.

Item 29.—Add after the letters "N.E.S." the words "Including those known as Black Puddings."

Item 42.—After the word "Biscuits" in the second last line of the item, add a comma and the words "and Dog Biscuits."

Item 72.—Strike out from after the words "All other kinds of Sugar," the words "Granulated or otherwise, "White, Brown or Yellow" and add the letters "N.E.S."

In the next line strike out the words "unrefined per lb. ¾ cts." and add the words "Brown or Yellow when imported direct or in bond from the British West Indies—per lb. one cent."

Item 85.—After word "Alcohol" add "Tin Foil, Tin Tags."

Item 93.—Strike out "M. Feet" and subsitute "Ton."

Item 94.—After "Lignum Vitae" strike out "Ad Val. 10 p.c." and substitute the word "Free."

Item 101.—Strike out the words "Including wooden package in which imported, N.E.S." and the words following Gasoline, viz: "including package." Add as sub-section to this item "Casks of wood in which Kerosene or Refined Oil is imported, each—50 cents."

Item 106.—Substitute "5 p.c." for "15 p.c."

Item 149.—Add "and Shackles for same."

Item 165.—Strike out the word "Iron" which precedes "Wire."

Item 168.—Add after the word "Wire" the words "Rods of Bronze, Steel or other metal when imported for welding purposes and Tin Pieces known as Tin Chaplins when imported by Manufacturers for use in their manufactures."

Item 177.—(a) After "Ploughs" add "and Emery."

Item 181.—After "Agricultural Implements" add "and parts for same," and after "Binders" add "Raffia when imported by Florists."

Item 188.—After the words "Telephone and Telegraph Instruments" add "Radio Machines and apparatus."

Item 195.—After the figures "$100.00" add "Welding Outfits."

Item 197.—After the word "purposes" add "Furnaces" and after the word "Derricks" add "and Grips and Buckets for digging or Dredging Machines."

Item 202.—After the words "Printing Presses" add "and parts for the same."

Item 204.—Strike out "14 p.c." and substitute the word "Free."

Item 205.—Strike out "15 p.c." and substitute the word "Free."

Item 206.—After "Machines" add "Weaving Looms."

Item 216.—After "Straps" add "Shackles, Thimbles, Match Hooks and Becket Links for the same."

Item 218.—After the word "Brushes" add "and Sawdust of Hardwoods."

Item 222.—After "Garments" add "Aprons."

Item 229.—Strike out the words "Crochet Cotton, Knitting Cotton."

Item 230.—After the word "Threads" add "Crochet and Knitting Threads of Cotton, Silk, Linen or mixture thereof."

Item 234.—Strike out the words "Rubber or Caoutchouc" and add the words "any process other than oiling."

Item 256.—After the word "Containers" add "and covers for the same," and after the words "their manufactures" add the words "and Ribbed Glass when imported by manufacturers of Washboards."

Item 257.—After the word "Cloth" add the word "Leather."

Item 270.—After the letters "N.E.S." add the words "Not to include Wire Brushes imported by manufacturers."

Item 280.—After the word "Apparatus" add "Life Buoys."

Item 295.—Add "Chromos, Chromotypes, Artotypes or Oleographs when imported by Printers to be included in the manufacture of Local Calendars—ad val. 10 p.c."

Item 306.—(e) Strike out "5 cts." and substitute therefor "15 cts."

Item 315.—After the words "Imported by Manufacturers" add "and Fish Packers;" Insert between the word "Colony" and the word "and" "Shooks for the use of Cold Storage Companies," and strike out words "Cold Storage Companies" following the word "by" and substitute the word "them." Strike out the words "Lead Sheets, Boxes of Steel, Wood or of Paper and Tin in combination, and Labels when imported by Tea Dealers to be used by them in packing tea in small packages" and add the same as a sub-section of the item adding thereto "ad val. 5 p.c."

Item 321.—Strike out the words "or any of the Departments thereof."

SCHEDULE B.

Goods Subject to Drawback for Home Consumption.

Item 343.—Strike out the word "paper" in the second column, the words "when printed upon by any regular printer in this Colony" in the third column, and "100 per cent." in the fourth column.

Item 356.—After the word "all" add "bottles and essences and"

Item 359.—Strike out the figure "10" in the fourth column and substitute therefor "25."

Item 359.—(a) Strike out "359a" and renumber this section "360."

Add to Schedule B., under the heading of "Goods" the following, viz:—

Item 361.—"All material imported and used in the manufacture of Boots and Shoes, with the exception of Leathers of the kind or nature of those manufactured in Newfoundland." Under the heading "When subject to Drawback" add "When imported by Wholesales Manufacturers of Boots and Shoes," and under the heading "Portion of Duty, etc." add "33-1|3 p.c. of the duty paid."

RESOLVED. These Resolutions shall be held to have come into operation on the 19th day of May, One Thousand Nine Hundred and Twenty-Six, at the hour of 9 a.m.

REPORT OF RAILWAY OPERATIONS YEAR ENDING JUNE 30TH, 1925.

EARNINGS.

	Year 1923-1924	Year 1924-1925
Passenger	$ 803,649.60	$ 834,067.94
Freight	888,929.14	888,342.03
Mail	58,723.56	60,408.92
Dining and Sleeping Cars	70,135.38	74,295.65
Miscellaneous	101,569.97	92,573.43
Express	134,126.80	157,916.00
Steamers	779,946.16	882,893.88
Dockyards	394,771.97	380,702.53
	$3,231,852.58	$3,371,200.38

EXPENSES.

Conducting Transportation	$1,128,488.42	$1,189,508.36
Maintenance of Way and Structures	555,057.40	708,679.86
Maintenance of Equipment	347,354.11	480,953.16
General	160,522.29	169,256.97
Dining and Sleeping Cars	51,552.84	55,193.73
Express	31,551.70	32,062.29
Steamer	610,178.39	738,344.85
Dockyards	353,566.77	355,711.00
Total Expenses	$3,238,371.92	$3,729,710.22
Total Earnings	3,231,852.58	3,371,200.38
Net Loss	$ 6,519.34	$ 358,509.84

The Profit or Loss on each branch of the System shows thus:

Loss on Operation of Railway	$ 217,492.31	$ 528,050.40
Profit on Operation of Steamers	169,767.77	144,549.03
Profit on Operation of Dockyards	$ 41,205.20	24,991.53
Net Loss	$ 6,519.34	$ 358,509.84

There was $310,000.00 more spent on Maintenace of Way and Equipment than previous year.

$17,000.00 less net earnings, Dock Shops.

Total Locomotive Mileage	1,123,612	
Passenger Mileage	240,607	
Freight	438.462	
Mixed Train Mileage	184,519	
Cost per mile run	$3.05	
Revenue per mile run	$2.44	
Expenses per mile of line	$2,922.01	
Revenue per miles of line run	$2,336.59	
Passengres carried	268,187	
Average revenue per mile of passengers	3.42	cents
Tons freight hauled	424,253	tons
Average revenue per ton per mile	3.07	cents
Number tons coal discharged	65,216	tons
Cost per ton discharging	73	cents
Total amount coal consumed	73,606	tons
Average amount coal consumed per 100 loco. miles	4.21	tons

IMPROVEMENTS CARRIED OUT DURING 1925. BRIDGES AND CULVERTS.

Masonry and 53' 6" Span Cape Ray Barachoic (additional.)

1 53' 6" Span Cape Ray Barachoic (Renewal.)

2 50ft. clear spans Terra Nova River (Masonry 2 piers 1 abutment.)

Span only 53' 6" South Branch River (Pier and abutment to be built.)

1 25' clear span and 2 abutments ½ Mile, Placentia Branch.

1 25' clear span and 2 abutments 5½ Miles, Placentia Branch.

2 15' clear span and 4 abutments Brigus Jct. (Branch and siding.)

Masonry for 1 25' span 7½ Miles, Placentia Branch.

1 12' clear span and 2 abutments 11th Mile, Placentia Branch.

2 Abutments and 3 Piers North Brook Bridge.

Concrete Abutments North Branch Bridge.

Masonry for 1.25' clear span 6½ Mile, Placentia Branch.

Repairs Steelwork 200' clear span Main Gut Bridge.

Concrete Culvert 4' x 4' 10th Mile, Placentia Branch.

Concrete Culvert 4' x 4' 56th Mile.

BUILDINGS.

Section Foreman's House, Arnold's Cove.

Agent's Dwelling, Humbermouth.

Freight Shed, Humbermouth.

Section Foreman's House, Come by Chance.

Station and Freight Shed, Gambo.

2 Section Foremen's Houses, 2 Sectionmen's camps, Howley.

Combined station and Freight Shed, Howley.

Section Foreman's House, Alexander Bay.

Freight Shed and Shelter, Upshall.

Section Foreman's House, Bishop's Falls.

Station and Freight Shed, Grand Falls.

Ice-House, Port aux Basques.

Put door in rear of Clarenville Round House and connected track with West leg of "Y."

NEW TRACK.

"Y" at Badger.

Spur Siding Eel Brook, Norris Arm.

Spur Siding at Islington ½ Mile east of Station to hold 3 cars.

Spur and Siding for sand pit at Trepassey about 1900 feet long (not including Siding.)

Spur Siding east of Cold Storage.

Spur Siding from Long Bridge down South Side of Dock.

3 Sidings west of Gas Works for yard room during Dock Construction.

Track relaid St. John's to 2 miles West Shoal Hr.—70 lb. rail.

MISCELLANEOUS.

New Water Service, Clarenville.

Track Scales, Whitbourne.

Pile and crib Breastwork South Side of Freight Shed, St. John's.

New Water Service, Gaff Topsail.

Concrete Pit Round House, Port aux Basques.

Wharf Block at Port aux Basques as an aid in turning S.S. "Caribou."

BALLASTING, 1925.

SHOVELS.

Division.	No. 1	No. 2	No. 3	Cars	Cu. Yards
1	....	2319	....	2319	18,552
2	....	2129	....	2129	17,032
3	....	....	....	....	....
4	....	....	....	....	....
5	....	....	6861	....	54,888
Bonavista Branch	1076	....	....	1076	8,608
Trepassey Branch	2412	....	....	2412	19,296
Placentia Branch	....	558	....	558	4,464
Heart's Content Branch	....	....	....	....	....
Brigus and Bay de Verde	....	....	....	....	....
					122,840

TOTALS MISCELLANEOUS WORK.

Shovel No. 2 at 10th Mile Placentia Branch	89	712
Ditcher Filling Gambo Platform	81	648
Grand Total		124,200 Cu. Yds.

SUMMARY BALLASTING.

	Cars	Cu. Yds.
Main Line	11309	90472
Branches	4046	32368
	15255	122840

COMPARISON BALLASTING DONE FOR 4 YEAR PERIOD.

1922	37,208 Cubic Yards
1923	59,096 " "
1924	43,004 " "
1925	122,840 " "

REVENUE FOR FIVE YEARS—COMPARATIVE STATEMENT.

	1920-21	1921-22	1922-23	1923-24	1924-25
Customs	$6,026,599.70	$6,343,196.79	$6,481,068.40	$6,602,957.31	$7,996,972.55
Postal & Telegraphs	393,159.10	368,303.71	404,692.07	468,208.05	523,442.97
Crown Lands	79,347.58	73,933.89	80,067.35	97,931.78	159,015.21
Fines & Forfeitures.	6,806.21	6,312.66	5,785.56	5,649.66	5,952.26
Inland Rev. Stamps	53,228.94	39,273.58	38,484.52	42,850.00	42,496.80
Int. Guarant'd Loans	56,485.24	81,479.82	88,043.00	86,543.46	86,849.51
Brooms, Penitentiary	5,758.36	6,512.42	7,779.82	8,411.67	6,658.46
Fees, Institutions	5,759.77	26,961.17	42,755.96	51,932.08	55,421.25
Profit on Coin	3,396.26	.....	.....	.....	.....
Taxes & Assessments	251,056.71	70,117.60	70,145.45	68,119.83	96,088.16
Estate Duties	45,252.46	68,054.10	150,000.00	22,708.02	47,332.38
Liquor Sales	346,208.15	467,583.37	540,297.28	219,243.20	176,662.56
Excess Profits Tax.	766,716.64	111,838.28	24,247.04	14,439.13	16,548.09
Income Tax	87,672.38	187,761.75	303,832.19	366,414.69	351,080.73
Mfctrs' Sales Tax	.....	61,699.31	55,014.66	66,758.21	11,094.42
Miscellaneous, Gen'l	310,592.35	237,290.04	460,657.86	167,490.15	79,803.90
Bank Tax	.....	119,362.43	123,905.58	112,011.85	127,769.21
	$8,438,039.85	$8,269,680.92	$8,876,772.74	$8,401,669.09	$9,783,188.46

TRADE STATISTICS OF NEWFOUNDLAND FROM 1920 TO 1921 TO 1924 TO 1925.

Year	Imports	Exports	Total
1920-21	$28,909,727	$22,441,267	$51,350,994
1921-22	18,209,853	19,478,417	37,688,270
1922-23	19,321,824	20,956,863	40,278,687
1923-24	27,677,182	21,071,571	48,748,753
1924-25	36,404,674	23,590,186	59,994,860

CODFISH EXPORTS.

Year	Qtls.	Value
1920-21	1,363,792	$13,334,954
1921-22	1,592,046	11,695,668
1922-23	1,483,087	10,135,318
1923-24	1,264,674	8,483,735
1924-25	1,165,097	10,445,617

LOBSTER FISHERY.

Year	Cases	Value
1920-21	12,450	$304,954
1921-22	12,006	229,947
1922-23	9,401	289,337
1923-24	6,922	170,618
1924-25	3,815	99,345

EXPORTS OF COD OIL.

Year	Tuns	Value
1920-21	2,936	$474,364
1921-22	5,837	594,096
1922-23	5,159	656,989
1923-24	3,239	493,873
1924-25	6,171	890,026

EXPORTS OF COD LIVER OIL.

Year	Gals.	Value
1920-21	45,956	$79,982
1921-22	48,559	28,265
1922-23	50,962	36,967
1923-24	41,389	31,462
1924-25	77,484	76,533

EXPORTS OF THE SEALFISHERY.

Year	No. of Skins	Value
1920-21	100,118	$147,935
1921-22	130,241	205,652
1922-23	100,574	163,116
1923-24	142,310	212,450
1924-25	149,222	273,198

EXPORTS OF SEAL OIL.

Year	Tuns	Value
1920-21	1,487	$248,422
1921-22	1,730	176,008
1922-23	1,501	170,997
1923-24	1,993	275,278
1924-25	3,208	396,611

WHALE OIL.

Year	Tuns	Value
1920-21	34	$ 5,852
1921-22	5	303
1922-23	27	4,206
1923-24	284	36,471
1924-25	682	87,324

LUMBER.

Year	Feet	Value
1920-21	1,680,808	$70,835
1921-22	1,824,709	63,599
1922-23	2,026,938	76,100
1923-24	265,605	9,035
1924-25	72,300	2,059

SALMON FISHERY (Pickled)

Year	Tcs.	Value
1920-21	3,113	$ 85,503
1921-22	5,659	125,060
1922-23	4,185	82,948
1923-24	3,731	58,918
1924-25	3,635	73,628

SALMON EXPORTED (Fresh)

Year	Lbs.	Value
1920-21	596,520	$ 91,564
1921-22	810,340	116,662
1922-23	1,304,125	202,571
1923-24	1,589,278	238,370
1924-25	613,448	82,004

HERRING (Frozen and Bulk.)

Year	Brls.	Value
1920-21	21,856	$78,712
1921-22	21,739	62,586
1922-23	19,430	61,141
1923-24	18,387	70,079
1924-25	21,595	66,850

HERRING PICKLED.

Year	Brls.	Value
1920-21	78,232	$645,398
1921-22	93,753	769,921
1922-23	73,197	370,024
1923-24	52,833	460,700
1924-25	40,437	272,400

PULP.

Year	Tons	Value
1920-21	26,838	$246,000
1921-22	19,932	364,514
1922-23	21,680	364,289
1923-24	31,674	531,833
1924-25	12,711	215,896

IRON.

Year	Tons	Value
1920-21	514,203	$ 621,576
1921-22	484,322	643,687
1922-23	1,004,138	1,706,017
1923-24	744,075	1,281,929
1924-25	1,117,429	1,899,630

PAPER.			COPPER.		
Year	Tons	Value	Year	Tons	Value
1920-21	62,311	$4,646,583	1920-21	3	$ 392
1921-22	34,512	3,088,260	1921-22	—	—
1922-23	56,386	5,052,141	1922-23	300	30,000
1923-24	60,537	5,423,892	1923-24	9	450
1924-25	70,350	6,272,886	1924-25	—	—

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF SAVINGS' DEPOSITS IN NEWFOUNDLAND, SHOWING AMOUNT OF DEPOSITS AS AT 31st OF DECEMBER FOR EACH OF THE PAST FIVE YEARS.

	1921	1922	1923	1924	1925
Bank of Montreal	$5,822,052.42	$6,034,863.96	$6,447,801.70	$7,461,911.99	$7,682,316.05
Canadian Bank of Commerce	750,067.45	701,760.71	616,105.69	752,523.23	971,194.00
Royal Bank of Canada	3,631,738.82	3,766,033.03	3,697,549.08	3,750,604.07	3,940,325.94
Bank of Nova Scotia	7,760,405.04	7,676,776.00	7,651,810.39	8,254,494.28	8,571,132.02
Government Savings' Bank	2,172,695.14	1,984,542.81	1,927,456.35	1,915,695.45	2,014,155.55
	20,136,958.87	20,163,975.51	20,340,223.21	22,135,229.02	23,179,123.56

THE FOLLOWING FIGURES WILL SHOW THE SAVINGS BY THE PEOPLE FROM LIFE INSURANCE:

	1922	1923	1924
Premiums paid by Policy Holders	$ 891,449.32	$ 984,861.14	$ 964,954.36
New Policies Issued	2,695,339.96 (1197 Policies)	4,564,213.62 (2570 Policies)	3,983,748.32 (1785 Policies)
Total Insurance in force 31st Dec., 1924	26,081,079.85	27,022,905.19	28,070,129.08
Value of Securities Deposited in Bank of Montreal to meet Adjusted Reserve	3,411,650.00	3,677,210.31	4,469,566.21

N.B.—The Insurance Returns are always a year in arrears.

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.

Answers to Questions

The answers to the following questions were tabled, with the exception of No. 2, which was deferred; also the answer to question No. 9 on the Order Paper of May 12th, asked by Mr. Browne, was tabled.

Notice of Question

(1) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing the following information: Total Revenue of the Railway for the months of January, February and March, 1926, as well as the Total Expenditure for the same period.

(2) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the Table of the House statement giving the following information: Total Revenue from all sources for January, February and March, 1926, together with the total Expenditure for the same periods, this in-

formation not to include the Railway.

(3) MR. HICKMAN asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs if the Newfoundland Knitting Mills, Ltd., now being paid 2 p.c. on their capital; if so, how much was paid during 1922, 1923, 1924, 1925, 1926.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 15 and 16 George V. Cap. 23 (1925) 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 Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act respecting Railway and Shipping," 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.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, May 19th, 1926.

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

Mr. Scammell gave notice of question.

Mr. Brown gave notice of question.

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 15 Geo. V., Cap. 8, entitled 'Of the House of Assembly.'"

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 with unanimous consent, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend 15 Geo. V., Cap. 8, entitled '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 Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 51 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Nuisances and Municipal Regulations.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—As I have already explained on the Second Reading of this Bill, it is the result of a request arising out of a decision recently handed down in the Magistrate's Court wherein it was held that under the Act, obstruction of the street by motor car was not an offence, as a motor vehicle was not comprised therein. The Act was passed before motors came into the country, and it is necessary now that they also be included.

MR. WARREN—I want to draw the Minister of Justice's attention to this Bill amending the Act "Of Nuisances

and Municipal Regulations." I think that the drafting is wrong. It is a form of drafting that I always set my face against when I was Minister of Justice.

(Reads)

"By inserting in the tenth line thereof," is that to mean the tenth line of the Bill as it is engrossed, or as it is in the Royal Gazette or as it is printed in the Statutes for the benefit of the Magistrates and the legal profession. That is bad drafting and later on is going to lead to trouble. I would suggest repealing Section 22 and passing a new section with those new words in.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—"The tenth line" apparently refers to the Act, as printed in the Consolidated Statutes. For the information of the Honourable Members I will read the whole section:

(Reads)

I move that the said section of the Chapter be hereby repealed and the following substituted therefor:

(Reads)

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 to Amend Chapter 51 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Nuisances and Municipal Regulations'" 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 to Amend Chapter 22 Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Customs.'"

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the House in moving the second reading of this Bill that it has a great deal to do with the Dumping Act. There has been a considerable amount of discussion about it, as is already known, and we are changing certain sections of it to make it as near perfect as possible by the appointment of a Board comprised of present officials, but I do not think that we need any new officials. The concensus of opinion is that under a Board more fair treatment and satisfaction will be meted out than under one man as valuator. Section 56 of the Customs Act is repealed and the domestic value of such goods is stated as the current domestic value in the usual and ordinary commercial acceptation of the term, etc., and in order to determine what is the current domestic value, section 2 points out how it may be determined; this will apply particularly to the importation of goods which may be produced in this Colony. The latter part of section 56 which is repealed was in conflict with section 4 and was therefore a hindrance to carrying out the law. The appointment of a Board of Customs necessitates the amending sections 66 and 70. Section 203 was not clear enough for a Magistrate to carry out fines under this section and therefore has been amended. Section 171 is amended so that those seeking authority for the passing of goods for other people may be specially controlled by the department. At present much confusion exists and evil may be done by the loose system of giving power of attorney to anybody to transact Customs business. Any further information that is desired I shall be only too glad to furnish it in Committee stage of the Bill.

MR. HICKMAN—Do I understand the honourable Minister to say that

he has a sufficient staff in the Customs to take care of the parcels coming by post and a great number of which has to be examined?

HON. MINISTER OF CUSTOMS—Yes, the Bill will cover examination by post and the only new official to be appointed will be one to replace Mr. Skirving who retired some time ago. I do not think, in view of the number of parcels that went there, that we got anything like the returns that we should have got.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Speaker, no doubt if an appointment is made in place of Mr. Skirving that the man will be advised largely by what the Deputy Minister of Customs has to say. There has been a great deal of question over the way goods have been valued during the past year or so at the Customs Warerooms, and the confidence of the trade cannot be had unless a man who is experienced with the market prices abroad is appointed, furthermore, an experienced man can save money for the country in that department. Considerable trouble has arisen through the valuation of goods from price lists that were old, particularly in connection with ready made clothing, and I hope that the Minister of Finance will see that the right man is appointed.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Speaker, as the honourable member who has just sat down knows, it is a difficult matter to get a man to please everybody, but every effort will be made to find the best man possible for the job, whether he is a Liberal or a Tory. No matter what a man's politics is it is immaterial, because it will relieve me of a whole lot of responsibility that I now have. I also contend that if a man is worth while having he should be paid a decent salary. If a good man is only half paid we all know what usually happens. But as soon as this Bill goes through, I think that the trade generally will be satisfied in this country with the way things will be conducted. Personally, I think the Bill will cure a lot of the disease that has happened in the past. Formerly the appraiser of goods was paid $1600.00 per year. This I consider a joke because a thoroughly competent man cannot be found for less than three thousand dollars a year, that is, if he is any good.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Speaker, with the Bill itself I have no objection whatever to offer, and I think it will commend itself to the House; but I notice that the Deputy Minister of Customs is going to be made Chairman of this Board of Customs, and I hope that is so because he has had great experience in that department. As provided in the Audit Act, the Deputy Minister of Finance should be the ex officio Secretary of the Treasury Board. But we have found recently that he does not act as such. Now I hope the Government will not break the Act by appointing anybody else to act in place of the Deputy Minister of Customs in this instance as happened in the enquiry of the Treasury Board not long since. Since the Government are amending the Customs Act I would suggest that they go further and take this opportunity of either doing away with payments of the proportion of fines under the Act or apportion them out in a different way in which they are doing. I recently had occasion to draw attention to the manner in which fines were divided up under the Customs Act. Now I am not trying to criticise any particular individual, but having had experience of how the whole thing works out I purpose to lay it before the House to see what we are going to do about it. In 1921 two thousand dollars was collected and out of that amount the general revenue got five hundred dollars. Various amounts were paid out to members of the Customs staff. I contend that when the Act was passed that it

was not intended that the fine should go to the one who conducted the case, but rather to the one who laid the information. In certain cases within the past year or so the money has gone to higher up Customs officials and not to the ones who laid the information. I know that the Governor-in-Council has power to apportion those fines, and I know that in ninety per cent. of the cases where fines were inflicted that the money went to the wrong man. The Preventive Officer is paid a good salary to go around looking for evidence, and while he has to have evidence it is the person who gives the information that should get part of the fine and not him. I know there are lots of cases where people give information and do not want their identity known, and I know that in a great many cases that it is tidewaiters who give the information and get nothing for it. I hope that the Government will see that in future that fines will be so apportioned that lower officials of the Customs will receive as much recognition with regard to the distribution of fines as those higher up.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Speaker, I quite agree with the remarks of the honourable member for Fortune Bay. There has ben a great deal of difficulties in connection with fines that have been paid in the past; but I do believe that there are lots of people who did not get paid and who should get paid for laying information that brings revenue to this Colony from the lowest official up. This particular matter has taken a great deal of my time; but I can assure the honourable member that it will be only a matter of time when this thing will be straightened out and will work satisfactorily to all concerned.

MR. DUFF—What I was going to say was that to-day there are a great number of travellers leaving this country, for a short time and then coming back with full trunks. And they don't pay any duty. Now I think that it is unfair that one portion of the country would be paying duties for another. The wealthy people of this country can travel and then come back with all they desire, and pay no duty, while the underdog has to pay the full duty.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Mr. Speaker, I might tell the hon. member for Carbonear that we are making every attempt to collect all the duties and to examine all the trunks coming into this country. Of course now and then we have a member coming up to us and saying that he has a daughter coming in and would we let her pass. And you can't be too exact. But I may say that there is very little coming that way. I may also say that there is not as much coming in now as did come in, and I can assure you that there will be very much less after this Bill goes through.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 22, Consolidated Statutes (Third Series), entitled 'Of the Customs,'" 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 to-morrow, Thursday, afternoon at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, May 20th, 1926.

The House met at three 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 Bills sent up entitled respectively, "An Act to Amend Chapter 25 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Light Dues,'" "An Act to Relieve Ships from payment of Water Rates in Certain Cases,'" and "An Act to Amend Chapter 40 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Board of Health, Health Officers, and Quarantine,'" 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 Respecting Immigration," with some amendments in which they request the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the said Amendments were read a first time.

With unanimous consent and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, 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 concurred in without amendment.

At half past three of the clock of the clock the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod appeared at the Bar of the House with a message from His Excellency the Administrator 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 Respecting the United Church of Canada."

"An Act to Confirm an Agreement between the Government of Newfoundland Cold Storage Fresh , Fish Corporation, Ltd."

"An Act to Relieve Ships from Payment of Water Rates in Certain Cases."

"An Act to Amend Chapter 40 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Board of Health, Health Officers, and uarantine."

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

The House then resumed.

Petitions were presented by:

Mr. Duff from Carbonear re Fish Export.

Mr. Lake from Grand Bank re road.

Mr. Cashin gave notice of question.

Mr. Grimes gave notice of question.

Mr. Scammell gave notice of question.

MR. CASHIN gave notice of question.

(1) MR. BROWN asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs what are the names of the various brands of rum that are being imported and sold by the Controller's Department to-day; also to ask if it is correct that the Controller's Department is at prseent mixing the various kinds of rum (known as red rum) whether it be good, bad or indifferent, and selling it to the public under the same label at three prices, viz.: $1.50, $2.00 and $2.50 per bottle respectively.

(2) MR. SCAMMELL asked Hon. the Colonial Secretary to lay on the Table of the House a statement in answer to each of the following questions: (a) How much Poor Relief was given out by the Relieving Officer at Wesleyville for the period of July 1st, 1924, to December 31st, 1924; (b) How much was given out by the same Officer for the period January 1st, 1925,

to December 31st, 1925; (c) Name the parties who supplied goods filling the orders given in each case, showing the total amount received by each of these parties in each case.

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 22, Consolidated Statutes, (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Customs.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MR. SCAMMELL—One or two remarks have been made here during the session with regard to a dumping act that was to be introduced. Is this the legislation that has been referred to?

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Yes.

MR. SCAMMELL—I have not a great deal to say on the subject. It seems to me that the Government is probably well advised in constituting a Board of appraisors as the people will have more faith naturally in a board, than one man, for setting a value. Take the case of a man who strikes a bargain and gets goods cheap up in the United States, and makes out entries and so on quite honestly, how does it work out?

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—That is exactly what the bill is wanted for. A man goes up and buys boots at the ridiculous price of ten or fifteen cents, he has to pay duty on their fair value.

MR. SCAMMELL—As the Minister of Finance remarks it is not fair and reasonable from the standpoint of the importer and of the Customs to pay duty on the ridiculously low valuation of ten or fifteen cents, but it ought to be contemplated that for example you have in this country various firms manufacturing boots, as that is the example we have taken. Suppose we compare the prices of three of the biggest firms we may find when we want to set a value on an imported boot, that there are three entirely different prices for a similar article at a bargain, say not at a ridiculous price of ten cents, but at a dollar and fifty and the cost of the local manufactured article may be two fifty. Where is the basis then of the decision of the Board?

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—The valuation is to be made on the cost of the article in the United States, not here. That is covered in the Bill.

MR. GODDEN — That might be made clear by inserting value at point of origin in section 56.

MR. MOORE—Mr. Chairman, in connection with the valuation of goods at the Customs House, some friends of mine have been making complaints to me about the system. I think the Customs House is alright, as these people have given trouble there before, but I contend that the ordinary men for valuation down there are not capable of valuation. There should be a man who has gone across the water and bought goods. Men of that kind would save a great deal of the trouble in connection with such matters down there. We should have such men and pay them, if necessary. A man like Sandy Robertson would be suitable; better satisfaction would be got in connection with the valuing of goods.

MR. WARREN — Section 56 says "such domestic value," that would infer that there had been a previous reference to "domestic value." The word "domestic", however, does not appear in the original act. That would appear to be an error in the drafting of this Bill.

MON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, Mr. LeMessurier says that that means "Ac-

cording to the Domestic Value at the place of manufacture."

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, the expression all through the Old Act is "The Fair Market Value." I can't see why that should not still be used. Of course, it is really a matter for a Customs expert to decide as to the difference between these two words.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, I expect this is a rescript of the Canadian Act. It seems to me that it would be better to stick to the word "Domestic," and alter the word "Market" in the previous section for the word "Domestic." That means that Domestic value has been used before in the Act, but it has not. They refer to Market Value.

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 Relating to Newspapers and Books."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MR. BROWNE—Mr. Chairman, perhaps it would be advisable to put in the word "Editor," because, frequently newspapers are sent to various printing establishments to be printed and published, and the printers may not have a real knowledge of the contents except as it goes through the press. The same thing applies to the publishers, whereas the Editor is the person who reads and writes all that is published in the newspaper, and he is the person really responsible. I think it would be more ffeective if his name was added.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, in reply to Mr. Browne, I may say that, in the original draft of the Act, we had the Editor's name included, and there was exception taken to it by one or two of the newspapers for having to publish his name. They considered it quite sufficient without his name being mentioned.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, following out the Prime Minister's remarks, I would like to say that there may be cases where there would be a number of editors on a paper. In the case, for instance, of an incorporated company with three or four editors; in this case, the publisher becomes liable in the first instance for anything that appears in the paper, and, then if anyone else wants to take proceedings he has recourse to the Colonial Secretary's Office, and he can get all the particulars there.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, I want to be correctly informed by the Minister of Justice on this point. Does this specifically mean, or is it the intention of the section actually to do away entirely or absolutely with anonymity; or does it only mean that where a letter refers to the Government or to an Officer of the Crown, that that letter should be signed?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Yes.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, in connection with clause 14, the fine of $2000 was criticised by some of the members of the opposite side, and it has been suggested to make that $1000, and also to add subsection C to that clause.

(Reads Subsection C)

The intention of that section is to give the party that might be fined the right of appeal.

MR. BROWNE—Mr. Chairman, may I point out an evident injustice in this section.

(Reads the section)

In other words if an offence is committed, the man that makes the complaint is entitled to half the penalty. Supposing, using the name of the man in the street, John Jones, liabled and John Smith makes the complaint. John Smith gets half the amount, and John Jones does not get anything, although his character has been taken away.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, that brings up a rather remarkable point. It does not matter whether the statement that is published is necessarily true or not. It may be abusive, but it is true just the same, and the man is liable to be brought up before a magistrate and fined a thousand dollars. Then the agrieved person issues a libel action against the publishers of the newspaper. The case is tried by a jury, and the jury may decide differently. When he has been fined, he can't plead justification under this Act.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Wouldn't that be met by the provision for appeal.

MR. WARREN—Take the case where John Jones publishes a thing that is neither abusive or defamatory, and the newspaper publishes it without his signature. It may be perfectly true, yet because a magistrate says it is abusive he is fined $500.00. The aggrieved person can then go to the Supreme Court to obtain redress, but under this Act a man can be haled before a Magistrate and fined $500.00, and I think the amount is out of proportion as it now reads. He can go to the Supreme Court, and they will say, "It is no use your pleading that this is true—it is abusive," and let the fine stand.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—All it provides is that if a thing is abusive or scurrilous without a name being signed, there is a fine. The ordinary remedy of libel is still there. Suppose for instance the Morning Star comes out with a scurrilous article signed by John Jones—that is no offence under the Act. But if the Morning Star comes out with the same article under the name of "Democrat," it is open to fine under this Act. A man has the same liberty as ever for writing anything at all, but if he writes anything scurrilous or abusive he must sign his name.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—It must be borne in mind that this Act refers only to the period of elections. At any other time a man can write anything as scurrilous as he likes.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and had passed the said Bill with some amendments.

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

Second Reading of Commercial Cable Co. Bill.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, in moving the Second Reading of this Bill, which I think was distributed yesterday, I wish to say that there is nothing in this Act except the granting of permission to land cables; the Commercial Cable Co. intend to bring in a couple of additional cables at Cuckhold's Cove. There is also a provision to grant them land up to 50 acres. I may say further that there are no concessions given; they asked for certain exemptions of duty, but the Government didn't grant it.

MR. WARREN—50 acres seems to be a lot of land to me.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—It may not be necessary to grant that amount it says "up to" 50 acres. They may need additional land for houses, trenching, and such things.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act for the Con-

firmation of an Agreement with the Commercial Cable Co." 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 Local Affairs Act.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the Second Reading of this Bill. I might say that this Act and the Public Roads' Act are more or less bound up in one another and have to be considered together. The Public Roads' Act is a consolidation and amendment of Cap. 33 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series). It is amended simply in order to be in conformity with the Local Affairs Act. Now the Local Affairs Act which we have first on the order paper to-day is the one of greater importance. Under this Act the Road Boards, first constituted and appointed by the Local Affairs Act, Chap. 50 of the Consolidated Statutes, are provided for to some extent. Sec. 3 says (reads). Sec. 16 provides (reads). Then, taking this main Act, which is one I have referred to, the Act Regarding Local Affairs, this Act provides for municipalities of Towns, Villages and Divisions. A town is an area with a population of one thousand; a village has a population of five hundred, and a Division is an area of contiguous places, having altogether a population of not less than five hundred. The corporation will be not less than six in the case of a town, four for a village, and as many as appointed in the case of a division. Councils will be appointed by the Governor in Council in the first place, and they will be continued by appointment until a majority of the adult population in an incorporated area require the privilege of election.

MR. SCAMMELL—It is Mussolini rule that's all.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—There is great diversity of opinion as to whether elected or appointed Road Boards are best in the outports, and I am decidedly of the opinion that the appointed Board is best. A member can get the opinion of the people as to the persons best fitted for service, and make the appointments. In Bonavista District we decided to get the names of people who really represented the place, irrespective of their political leanings, to form the Board—people who were really interested in the affairs of the place. We have formed the Boards into Advisory Committees, and I don't think there could be a better arrangement. The Hon. Member for St. Barbe refers to "Mussolini Rule"—I know districts in Bonavista Bay where nobody but Union men have anything to say regarding the election of Road Boards, and I am perfectly satisfied that in my district the people of the small settlements have very little to say. Under the old Act, passed by a former government a Board was to hold office for two years only and no longer; notice was to be given in the Gazette for re-elction, but as far as I know that notice has not been given for any district—there are no Road Boards properly existing at the present time. Under this Act when elections are held the expenses are to be borne by the incorporate area itself.

The general hope and desire of the Government is to have the first appointed councils followed by elected councils—by starting with appointed councils the Government wants to avoid the expense of a preliminary election—elections cost money, and we feel that this expense can be obviated. Regarding the question of organization, you will find a section in the latter part of the Act whereby a Board composed of members of the Council will take charge of that; this provides that the Board can take action. The Board will appoint a Superintendent of Local Affairs to see that efficient organization is carried on. There will necessarily be con-

siderable organization work. Boundaries will have to be worked out by someone in authority, and the advice of Members of the Assembly taken.

Generally speaking the Government take this Act as being one which will enable places to become self-supporting, and to establish municipalities of their own—I think it will be of a benefit to the community. Our outport people are well able to develop their civic affairs as have other places, and this will, we hope form a nucleus for that development. One thing that suggested the bill to me was that we have places that are lighted at the expense of the Government, such as Carbonear, Harbour Grace, Bonavista and Port Union; I agree with the modern lighting, but I think that these places ought to pay for it, just as the people of the town of St. John's pay for their conveniences. If the people want some convenience, they should be prepared to pay for it. I have never considered it right that these things should be paid for out of the funds of the Colony while othplaces were going in darkness. Take Bonavista for instance; it is lit at the expense of the Government, while Gambo and Glovertown are in darkness, and if the people want to get around in the night they have to take a lamp in their hands. Now if Bonavista wants light, it should pay for it—and I say the same for Harbor Grace and Carbonear.

There may be some things in this that will have to be discussed in Committee, but practically speaking the Bill is only to provide for the building up of municipalities, and it should commend itself to the people of the House and country in general.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Speaker, in reference to this bill there is one section that does not seem to be in keeping with the democratic ideas of the day, and the right of the people to decide for themselves as to whether they shall decide for themselves to ask for the local board before the appointment is made by the Governor in Council. The section says:—

(Reads)

I cannot see why this section should be here. Why not leave it as it was formerly and leave it to the people themselves. I do not know about the bulk of the districts because I do not know. That will have to be found out from the Department of Public Works. I was the representative of the district of Port-de-Grave for six years, and during that time there was an election held and nearly every settlement had a local road board and on the day appointed for the election, with the exception of one or two places, the people turned up in good numbers for the election. I speak for that section that I know about because I had something to do with the sending out of the money, in so far as the special grants were concerned and I went around myself through the district and saw that the people availed of the act so as to decide for themselves concerning the expenditure of the moneys in these settlements. That applies to the district of Port de Grave and it also applies to a certain extent to the district of Trinity. Take the case of Point Leamington. I have had two or three communications from this settlement saying that they have not had an opportunity to elect their local road board since the present Government came into power. There was a meeting called about three years ago, but it was at a time when a large portion of the men of the district were away and it was impossible for that reason that it should be well attended. I think that if an election is to take place it should be at a time when the people of the district are usually home. Furthermore you cannot set the same date for every locality. You will have to set the date according to the occupation of the people. I think that in the elction of the road boards

that they should be held as heretofore.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—In reply to the hon. member, that in view of the fact that the Act allowed the election to take place at the naturally suitable date, that the people showed absolute indifference to carrying out the election in the outports, and I made enquiries in various places, not only in my own district, as to the most advisable method of choosing the road boards, whether they should be elected or be chosen by the Governor in Council, and almost nine out of ten told me that they thought that if the roadboard were appointed it would suit the case alright. It rests entirely with the members for the various districts to see that the appointments are the right appointments. In most of these small places only half a dozen men are at all interested in matters of a public nature, and if these people were to have a little election on their own account, and then ask for this roadboard to be appointed without going through the expense of having all the papers issued for the election from the Board of Works, and perhaps this method might have the best result.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the longer we are here the more important and more contentious legislation the Government sees fit to bring before the House. I suppose that with the exception of the newspaper bill no legislation has been brought in here so far, so far reaching in its effect and of such contentious nature. I listened to the Prime Minister while he made the explanation on the second reading. We have an act here respecting Local Affairs. This act occupies thirty one pages and contains ninety three sections. It is an act that seeks to interrupt and upset the whole of the present system of the administration as regards expenditure on the public roads. Notice was given of the introduction of this bill in the Speech from the Throne and then it is left to the very last days of the session of the House before it is brought in. I submit Mr. Speaker, that the Prime Minister has come to a pass where he does not give the members respect for any intelligence whatever and any respect for a desire to concern themselves with matters that are of import to the country. We are here now for three months, and when the time has come to close up, when we want to get back to our different avocations in life, whatever they may be, this bill is brought in. I do not say, Mr. Speaker, that there is not a necessity for this bill at all. I do think that possibly the matter of the administration of public affairs might be well taken up and legislation introduced to make improvements. Now I am in a position to refute some of the remarks made by the Prime Minister, but I do not propose to do so now. I know that the manner of the expenditure of the public monies could be improved upon, but I do not think that there is any rush or necessity that we should be called upon at this juncture of the legislature to deal with this matter. The first notice that we got of this matter was yesterday, and I submit that it is almost too much. Here, you are going to upset the existing state of affairs in the outports, and in connection with this matter you are going to give yourself more power than has been exercisd by the Governor in Council for many years gone. This is a state of affairs that has been opposed by a large and intelligent section of the people of this country. It seems to me that your business should be to get the Budget finished and close the House of Assembly and leave such legislation as this until another session. Take the road grants to-day. The greater proportion of these have been sent out and your extra expenditure will be looked after by the High Road

Commission, and because of that there will not be any material effect by deferring this legislation. I listened with some interest to the explanations given by the Prime Minister, and as he went along there were some points raised to which I will reply later, but I merely rise to say that under the circumstances that we should not proceed with this legislation at this late juncture of the session. If however, it is the intention of the Government to force it through, at least they might give us the courtesy of a little time to consider it.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the House will probably adjourn now until Tuesday, and one of the reasons that we have the bill distributed here today is to give the hon. members time to duly consider it. It is a long bill I admit but there is nothing of a very contentious nature in it. It is largely rules and qualifications, and I do not think that it is necessary that any one need give up their holiday on Monday to study it. It is a most important piece of legislation, but I want to see some of the districts given an opportunity to manage their own affairs.

MR. DUFF—I think that it would be a good thing if there were a little more interest in local affairs, and I am inclined to favour this bill. The Prime Minister said just now that some towns around Conception Bay were lighted at the expense of the Colony, and I do not think that it is fair, I speak of my district, that things of that nature should be done at the expense of the country, and that matters should be put on a more equitable basis. As regards the elections in the outports for the road boards I know that there are some good men on them, speaking now of Carbonear, but I know also that some men that are no good are placed there for sympathy and they have never taken an active part in the public affairs of the town. I notice that the Governor in Council is going to appoint the first Municipal Council. Ordinarily I have no objections to that, but there was a man over there in Carbonear taking the names of the people who wanted to work for the Highroads Commission on the Hodgewater line. Now if the Highroads Commission is going into politics I would like to hear it here in this House, because it appears to me that they are. I would not in the least have any objection to passing over the control of affairs to the man who opposed me in the last General Election, because he is a gentleman. I know that the Prime Minister has nothing to do with this, but I know that certain members of the Government have all to do with it, and I say that it is not right.

MR. ASHBOURNE—This year when we were called together for the dispatch of business it was intimated to the members in the Speech from the Throne that a measure for the incorporation of Municipalities would be introduced this session. In the Speech from the Throne last session it was stated that legislation of this nature would be introduced, but it was deferred, and I think that it is natural for us to wonder how it is that it has not been brought before the House until yesterday. The Speech from the Throne says:—

(Reads)

We find nothing in this bill presented here, of that nature. Now, Mr. Speaker, some of the remarks passed by the Prime Minister this afternoon may be correct, but, Mr. Speaker, I contend that if the people in the various outports do not interest themselves very much in public affairs at present how are they to expect they are going to have the election of the members under the act now under contemplation if they do not have the election under the old system. I have gone through the bill and notice that it gives a lot of power to the Muni-

cipalities, and I am doubtful whether or not it will be advisable at this juncture of the session to go into the matter at all. As regards the appointments by the Executive Government of the members of the Municipality, I do not agree with that at all. You introduce politics immediately. There is another thing that I would like to remind the Prime Minister as regards the elections in the outports. Under this bill instead of a roadboard it is hoped to elect a Municipal Council. What is the difference? As I said before, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this bill was mentioned in the Speech from the Throne in 1925, and also in the Speech from the Throne this year we should have had the matter up before.

Further discussion was deferred.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until Tuesday afternoon next, 25th inst., at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, May 25th, 1926.

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

Replies to the following questions were tabled with exception to Nos. 1, 2, 5.

(1) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the Table of the House statement giving the following information: (1) How many motor cycles have been landed in this Colony since July the 1st, 1924; (2) By whom were they imported; (3) Did any arrive as personal effects, and if so to whom did they belong; (4) What amount of Duty was paid on each; (5) If any were landed as personal effects why were they not appraised and Duty collected on the value; (6) Give the names of owners in each instance.

(2) MR. CASHIN asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the Table of the House statement giving the following information: (1) What machinery was imported into the Colony for the Newfoundland Butter Company, Limitd; (2) What Duty was paid on same; (3) If no Duty has been paid why not; (4) Have Entries been passed for the machinery; (5) Give a statement of same certified by the Auditor-General showing dates this machinery was imported; dates Entries were passed for same; date Duties were paid, and amount entered in the Books of the Customs, and deposited to the credit of the Exchequer.

(3) MR. SCAMMELL asked Hon. the Colonial Secretary to lay on the Table of the House copies of all Proclamations issued by the Department, under the provisions of Chapter 50 of the Consolidated Statutes, respecting the election of Road Boards.

(4) MR. SCAMMELL asked Hon. the Minister of Justice if the Bills relating respectively to Local Affairs and Public Roads (now before the House) were drafted by the Justice Department; if they were not drafted there, by whom were they drafted and what fee, if any, has so far been paid for the work of drafting them.

(5) MR. GRIMES asked Hon. the Prime Minister to answer the following questions: (1) What extra fittings and equipment were supplied to S.S. "Caribou" that cost $24,820.00; (2) Give names of firms or suppliers of these furnishings or equipment; (3) Were any tenders called or asked for same, if not why not; (4) Specify the furnishings and equipment referred to, giving separate cost of extra linen, tableware, crockeryware, mattress and other equipment; (5) What amount of paints as stores were brought out on S.S. "Caribou" and what amount of paints were brought as freight, giving names of shippers and consignees.

In reference to No. 4.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—The Bill respecting Local Affairs is the joint work of the Solicitor of the House and the Department of Justice. The Public Roads Bill is the work of the Department of Justice. No fee has been paid on them.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY —I beg to table reply to question No. 2 on the Order Paper of May 20th.

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 Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, I regret, from a personal point of view as well as from the view of my position as an Independent Member of this House, that the Budget Speech presented by the Honourable Minister of Finance and Customs on the 19th inst. is not up to my expectations in any way, shape, or form.

To begin with, I propose to prove to this Committee that it is camouflage of the worst quality from beginning to end. A Budget Speech should show the financial standings of the country to the exact cent. It should show the country's earnings in the way of Revenue, etc., for the year which ended on June the 30th, 1925; and, as we are now approaching the end of the fiscal year of 1925-26, which will end on June the 30th, practically another month from now, the Finance Minister should be in a position to give a most accurate statement as to how his accounts will stand at the end of that period.

I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that I will be out of order if I make the statement that the Budget Speech presented by Sir John Crosbie a couple of days ago surpasses everything from a deceptive point of view which has ever been presented to the public of Newfoundland, possibly with the exception of the Prime Minister's Manifesto of 1924.

I wish to point out to the Chamber, as well as to the people of Newfoundland, that the present Administration came into power under the cover of deception, and to-day we are debating a Budget which the Finance Minister would have the country believe is accurate.

I make the statement now sir, that the Finance Minister knows himself that his Budget Speech is inaccurate and that every member of the present Administration knows the same thing. However, it is my duty to prove that this Budget Speech is inaccurate and to show that the Surplus shown for the Fiscal Year ending June the 30th, 1925, amounting according to the Finance Minister's figures to $347,003.23 should show a deficit of $181,047.13.

No doubt members on both sides of this House will ask the question how these figures are ascertained, and I would draw attention to the fact that the Finance Minister has overlooked the undoubted fact that the Newfoundland Government Railway as it is now termed, is part and parcel of Newfoundland's business organization, and the following list which I will read to the House, will give the expenditure and earnings of the Railway Department each month beginning July the 1st, 1924, and ending June the 30th, 1925.

Railway Statement from July 1, 1924, to June 30, 1925

1924—	Expenditure	Earnings
July	$222,027.99	$216,156.38
August	211,931.01	219,612.99
September .	215,708.82	227,267.32
October	223,936.73	234,786.52
November . .	211,468.92	212,946.05
December . .	222,788.18	197,157.36

1925—		
January ...	196,167.09	120,014.53
February ..	179,976.09	92,808.61
March	202,420.20	119,596.86
April	205,419.79	135,062.42
May	233,400.14	160,210.56
June	310,409.41	171,984.37
	$2,635,654.37	2,107,603.97

DEFICIT: $528,050.40.

You will therefore see that for the Fiscal Year ending the 30th of June, 1925, the Railway Deficit amounted to $528,050.40, whereas the Surplus shown by the Finance Minister only amounted to $347,003.23.

Now, it is a simple sum in subtraction that if one deducts the Surplus of $347,003.23 from the Deficit on the Railway of $528,050.40, there is left a debt of $181,047.17. I would put the question to the Finance Minister, the Prime Minister, and his Executive Government, why it is their idea to deceive the public in such a manner.

One only had to listen to the Finance Minister read his Budget Speech on Tuesday last, and any man of ordinary intelligence could readily perceive from the manner which it was delivered that the Finance Minister was laboring very hard, that the Finance Minister knew in his own heart and soul that he was attempting to deceive the public.

It did not show the usual vim and vigor with which the Finance Minister was imbued at various periods of his political career; but, on the contrary, it showed that he and his Administration have written themselves down, so to speak, in the political arena of Newfoundland, as an aggregation of deliberate deceivers whose only ambition it is to hold on to the reins of office at any cost; to increase taxation no matter at whose expense and to further the cause of the classes of this country in preference to the masses, which fact needs no further comment from me to prove that that has been their actual policy from the time they took up the reins of office in June, 1924.

I have shown that there is an actual deficit of $181,047.17 on the statement for 1924-25 which period ended on the 30th of June last, instead of a Surplus shown by the Finance Minister of $347,000.

I now propose to prove that instead of a Surplus for the fiscal year ending the 30th of June, 1926, we shall have a deficit of approximately $1,000,000, instead of the Surplus of $61,552.39.

Again the Finance Minister will ask me how did I arrive at these figures, to which I reply by stating, to begin with that the total Revenue collected from all sources, exclusive of the Railway, from July the 1st, 1925, to March the 31st, 1926, was $6,504,927.43, and our total Expenditure for the same period amounted to $6,871,549.08.

These figures, which have been supplied me by the Finance and Customs Department, show a deficit for that time amounting to $366,621.65. Now, for the same period, namely, July the 1st, 1924, to March the 31st, 1925, there was collected $6,645,259.17, or, in other words, an amount totalling $140,331.74 more than that portion of the fiscal year 1925-26, whilst the Expenditure for the same period 1924-25 amounted to $6,631,330.04 or $240,219.04 less than the nine months of the fiscal year 1925-26.

Therefore, we are short in Revenue up to March the 31st, 1926, of an amount totalling $380,550.78.

These figures can be arrived at by adding the excessive expenditure for the 1925-26 period of $240,219.04 to the shortage in Revenue for the same period, which amounted to $140,331.74.

I would also like to draw the attention of this committee to the fact that this shortage of Revenue for the nine months of 1925-26 has been incurred after an excessive Tariff of about twelve or fifteen per cent. had been imposed on April 1925, which goes to

prove that people will always purchase more when goods are low; and merely purchase the absolute necessities when prices rise.

Now, sir, as our total Revenue to March the 31st, 1926, aggregates $6,504,927.43, and, for the sake of argument, let us suppose that the remaining three months of the fiscal year will bring us in the same amount of Revenue as during the same period of the fiscal year 1924-25, and that our Expenditure, which no doubt will increase accordingly, but let it remain the same as for the period 1924-25, and we find that this will total a Revenue of $10,382,486.63.

These figures being arrived at from the fact that our total Revenue to March the 31st be added to the sum of $3,877,559.20 which amount was collected for the months of April, May and June for the fiscal year 1924-25, now our Expenditure for the three months of the fiscal year 1924-25, April, May and June, amounted to $3,544,485.10.

Add this amount to our total Expenditure up to March the 31st, 1926, which amounted to $6,871,549.08 and you will find that our total Expenditure for the fiscal year 1925-26 will amount to approximately $10,416,034.18 or, in other words, a deficit of $33,547.55, instead of a Surplus of $61,552.39, as outlined in the Finance Ministers' Budget. These figures do not include any of the operations of the Railway, but I will let the House have them in a few minutes.

Now, sir, during the fiscal year 1924-25, the amount collected on account of Estate Duties was $47,332.38, whilst Sir John Crosbie estimates that for the Fiscal Year ending the 30th of June next, Estate Duties will be collected amounting to $150,000.

This seems out of all proportion, and, to my mind, has been merely put in on guess work, as surely the Finance Minister does not hope that numbers of our wealthy citizens will pass away, and is basing his calculations on the proposed deaths which might occur.

In my opinion the amount collected from that source will not exceed at the most $100,000, or approximately $50,000 less than estimated by the Finance Minister.

Then again we find that during the fiscal year 1924-25 there was a profit from the Liquor Department of $176,662.56, whilst for the fiscal year 1925-26 the Finance Minister estimates a profit of $320,000, approximately $150,000 more than the fiscal year 1924-25 which is ridiculously out of line, and at its best, will not go over a profit of a million.

These two amounts will total $120,000 excessive estimate on two items alone; consequently there would be a deficit on Current Revenue and Expenditure for the fiscal year 1925-26 of between one hundred and fifty to two hundred and fifty thousand dollars; and, as I said before, these amounts do not include the operations of the Railway. But now, let us see what we can appproximate our loss on the Railway as being on June the 30th, 1926.

For this purpose I herewith have a statement showing the expenditure and earnings of the Railway for the nine months beginning July the 1st, 1925, and ending March the 31st, 1926, and for purposes of accuracy shall read the monthly amounts.

Railway Statement from July 1st, 1925, to March 31st, 1926.

1925—		
July	$234,085.52	$199,894.74
August	244,236.36	195,349.22
September	241,130.77	177,403.27
October	239,363.14	197,144.81
November	212,300.17	182,181.35
December	211,804.72	184,656.88
1926—		
January, February & March	574,133.19	284,169.80
	$1,957,053.87	$1,420,800.07

Deficit for 9 months, $536,553.80.

You will therefore see that for the nine months ending March the 31st, 1926, that the Railway Department lost $536,253.80, with three more months to go, and it will be interesting to note that the day the Finance Minister presented the Budget, the Hon. the Prime Minister in answer to a question asked by me, tabled a reply in this House showing that for the three months of January, February and March, 1926, the Railway Department sunk $289,-963.39.

Now for the six months of operations, January the 1st, 1925, to June the 30th, 1925, according to figures tabled in this House in answer to questions put by me to the Prime Minister, the total deficit on the Railway amounted to $528,115.37, and it is only reasonable to suppose that for the same six months of 1926, the deficit would increase rather than decrease, as Expenditure has not been curtailed and the weather conditions during the past winter have been much more strenuous than for the same period in 1925.

Therefore I estimate that for the period of January the 1st, 1926, to June the 30th, 1926, our total loss on operations of the Railway will be at least $750,000. To this we must add a deficit of $246,290.41, which occurred from the period of July the 1st, 1925, to December the 31st, 1925; consequently for the fiscal year 1925-26 our Railway deficit will be approximately $1,000,000.

Now, sir, haven't I proven most satisfactorily to this House that the Finance Minister's Budget is nothing more or less than a padded fabrication, a deliberate attempt on the part of the Finance Minister and the Executive Government to deceive the people.

I have proven beyond the shadow of a doubt that instead of a surplus of $347,000 for the fiscal year 1924-25, that we have had a deficit of $181,000. I have proven and estimated that for the fiscal year 1925-26 you will have a deficit on Current Revenue alone of approximately a quarter of a million dollars.

Add to this quarter of a million dollars one million dollars loss on the Railway, will make your total deficit for the fiscal year 1925-26 one and a quarter millions, and I defy the Finance Minister or the Prime Minister to stand up in this House and deny my assertions. I tell them both now, without fear of being called to order, that the great Italian Machiavelli was a Mission Father in comparison to them. It has been their sole ambition since taking office to deceive in every way, shape and form.

I want to say now, sir, that the Budget Speech, no matter what Finance Minister may present it, is similar in form to an annual meeting of shareholders of an Incorporated Company, in which every little detail is explained ,accounts audited and found correct. Loans and their distribution should be explained to date, and, in this instance, I would like to point out the fact that this Government, since their ascension to power in 1925, have spent approximately thirty million dollars in twenty-three months, or approximately one million and a half dollars per month.

Now, I shall have to prove that statement, and I tell them that for the two years in office they collected approximately $20,000,000 in Revenues; they borrowed six million dollars and are overdrawn on that amount at the present time. Now, let us see where the six million dollars has gone, and here are the facts:

The Dock will cost at least	$2,000,000.00
Re-railing Clarenvi lle division, cost	1,000,000.00
A Deficit you had to pay on the 1923-24 account	1,600,000.00
Highways Commission ..	2,000,000.00

Deficits on the Railway for two years	1,500,000.00
Deficits on your Current Revenue as proven today	500,000.00
Caribou purchase price..	500,000.00
Making a total of	$9,150,000.00

Approximately $3,150,000.00 overdrawn on your moneys which you borrowed during the past eighteen months. Consequently, within a few days you will be coming into this House with a Loan Bill for at least $5,000,000.00, which means further taxation and further deficits, as the interest will have to be paid out of Current Revenue.

To the total amount of over nine million dollars must be added two years Revenue of approximately ten million dollars each year, making a total of twenty million dollars. Therefore, the present Government has spent thirty million dollars in twenty-three months.

I listened with interest a few days ago to the Finance Minister when he delivered his Budget, wherein he pointed out to the Legislature that the average price for fish during the current year 1925 was ten dollars per quintal. This statement is untrue and the following is a comparative statement of the catch of fish for 1924 and the catch of fish for 1925:

1925.

Labrador:			
411,222	qtls.	@ $5.25 ..	$2,158,915.00
Shore:			
801,164	qtls.	@ $8.50 ..	6,809,894.00
			$8,968,809.50

1924.

Labrador:			
325,000	qtls.	@ $7.00 ..	$2,275,000.00
Shore:			
750,000	qtls.	@ $9.25 ..	6,937,500.00
			$9,212,500.00

Difference favour 1924 ..	243,690.50
Less 14 on 8,968,809.50 (Increase Tariff)	1,155,633.33
Total	$1,399,323.83
Less in 1925 than 1924..	

We must not forget the fact that the fishery season which closed around the end of 1925 was proseuted under a Tariff which had been increased approximately fourteen per cent.

Therefore the total difference of value between the two catches in favour of 1924 would be $1,399,323.83.

The Finance Minister may have been "critically correct" in his statement when he valued the fish at ten dollars per quintal as when merchants export fish they have to pass the necessary Export Entries through the Custom House, and generally put that value on the article, but it does not necessarily mean that that value is received, as considerable of the fish which went into the foreign markets last year is yet unsold, and some of it will not fetch $2.00 per quintal. This fact the Hon. the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance will bear me out in.

Now, I would also like to make a statement of the Current Revenue for the calendar year 1925, and we can see that for that period the total Revenue collected through the Customs was $10,453,403.80, whilst our Expenditure for the same twelve months, that is January the 1st, 1925, to December the 31st, 1925, amounted to $10,433,299.24, which left a current surplus to the Treasury of $20,104.56. These figures are exclusive of any operations on the Railway, and for the information of the House I would like to point out that the Railway for that period lost approximately $775,000.

Therefore, the business of Newfoundland for that period was out the amount of three quarters of a million dollars.

Now, sir, I think I have proven most conclusively to every member in this

House that my charges that the Finance Minister's Budget Speech has been deliberately padded, have been borne out, and I feel that it is up to the Finance Minister and the Prime Minister to rise in their seats and tell the country why they attempted to deceive them as to the financial condition of the Colony. As I pointed out before, this is our annual meeting, which is practically the same as an annual meeting of any incorporated company, at which meetings every detail of business is discussed, all cards are laid on the table, profits or losses are shown.

In the case of profits, dividends are paid on the capital stock, and in case of losses, in various instances, shareholders are called upon to pay their proportional part of the loss.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that it is the duty of this Government, and I also feel that they would have the cooperation of each and every individual member on both sides of this House, if they had brought in a true statement instead of attempting to deceive the members of the House and throw dust in the eyes of the people.

With regard to the gentlemen who have taken their seats on this side of the House since last we met, I have very little to say at present, but, afeter hearing their explanations, shall take whatever course I may consider appropriate.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister of Finance and Customs if the Committee will now rise. Certain statements have been made to the effect that this Budget is incorrect, and since the Budget was brought into this House several members of the Government have taken their seats on this side of the House. I think we ought to have some time to take these things into consideration, and I think the House would like to have personal explanations from the Prime Minister and these members.

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 Prime Minister moved that the House do now adjourn until Thursday afternoon, the 27th inst., at 3 o'clock.

MR. BRADLEY—Mr. Speaker, in rising to second this motion, I desire to make to the House, and through the House to the country at large, an explanation of the difference in my position since I last sat on the floors of this House, and in order that this House and the people of this Colony understand that position, it will be necessary for me to take them back to the year 1924, when I first became a member of the Monroe party. A Manifesto was submitted to me which promised to do away with all the evils to which this Colony was subjected by the alleged mal-administration of the past, I, Sir, have, so to speak, a stake in this Colony, and an interest in it, and I believed that the party led by the Prime Minister had all the ideals which I felt should be put in effect, and which I felt would bring about conditions such as we had not had for years past. We had passed through a period of depression; we had heard of extravagance, boodle, waste of money and other things, and I felt the Monroe party would put a stop to these things. And that Manifesto preached retrenchment in expenditure, decrease of taxation. I went to the polls and was fortunate enough to be elected; the Prime Minister honoured me with a seat in the Executive, and I honestly expected the reforms which the

Prime Minister had promised when he in his Manifesto had promised conservation. Now, Sir, I do not wish to make personal references to anyone, but I found to my surprise that the Executive included a gentleman who had not, as we, gone to the polls in 1924. I have nothing personally against that gentleman, but have sufficient knowledge of the electorate of this country to know that he was not acceptable to them, and I have sufficient knowledge of the members of this House to know that he was not acceptable to them, nor is he to-day. I was put in an awkward position—I had to take an attitude which would probably tend to disruption or "grin and bear it," and in the interests of the country I decided to take the latter course, and up to the present time I have had to "grin and bear it."

The House met in July of 1924, and naturally we had no Estimates of our own—we had no time to become familiar with the affairs of the country, and were forced to take the figures of the past administration. We took these and put them through and closed without further business. But when the House met in 1925 I had visions of some of the things that we were in a position to do—we could do something in the way of reducing taxation and expenditure. Remember that we had gone to the country with a policy of retrenchment—we were going to reduce improper expenditure and lessen taxation; in a word we had promised to "Clean up, keep clean, and a square deal to all." I ask this House if the people of this country have received that square deal? Look at the Estimates of 1925, is there the retrenchment that we were promised? And look at the tariff of 1925. In spite of my protest the necessities of the working man were put up to 75 per cent. in some cases, and a duty was put on lines and twines which had been free for 25 years. What could I do? I should have left the party then, but I realized it was very difficult to make the decision. I did not want to do anything to cause an upheavel, because I realized that the people of the country did not want it, so I sat still and did nothing. Now it has been alleged that I became dissatisfied. I did so from the day when the personnel of the Government was made public.

Now I would like to add a few words about an industry which is fast taking second place—the fishery. I suppose in a couple of months the main industry of this country will be paper making, but up to the present it has been the fishery, and I want to ask this House to consider the attitude of the present administration towards the fishery—what have they done?

They can spend millions on highroads and tourists but not a nickel on the fishery. It was difficult for a son of a fisherman to stand that. When the policy was introduced, I admit quite frankly that I did not oppose it—it was receiving the support of many members, and I had but little knowledge, and am prepared to admit that I thought it might do something for Newfoundland. That policy has come into effect, and two millions have been allocated for the purpose of building highroads, and I think this House is in possession of the report of that Commission. Half of it was spent in repairing 140 miles of highroad, while the roads in parts of my district are not fit to travel over—it is impossible to go from Clarke's Beach to Hibbs' Cove in Port de Grave. That is a fishing district, and they haven't even got roads to walk over, but there is any amount where it is not needed, and where the roads would be fairly passable without it.

Now, Sir, my complaint is that taxes have been piled on the fishermen. They have allowed them to go down as far as the wealthy classes are concerned, while 15 per cent. with the Sales Tax have been placed on lines

and twines and 70 per cent. on clothing—where does the rich man get off? Where is the income tax to-day? Where is the profits tax? What about the concessions given capital? It is a harrowing tale.

I have been accused of treachery. I have been guilty of no treachery, and I want this country and House to understand it. Mr. Monroe must have known my attitude at that Council meeting, and prior to that I had no conference with anyone. I had no collusion with the Opposition—and the Leader of the Opposition is here to prove it. I do admit that I had conversations with members of my own party, but that was as far as I got. I have never broken any confidence of the Prime Minister—never! But I know a story I could tell about the Budget which would enlighten the House. And I throw the challenge to the Prime Minister to release me from my trust and I will tell it. And I challenge the Minister of Finance and Customs to get up here and show that the Budget shows the true state of affairs in this country. I had no idea that Major Cashin was going to speak as he did—he evidently has figured out a good many things. And I could say a great deal more which, if I get permission, I shall say.

Now, Sir, I have only one word more to say. As far as the charge of treachery is concerned, I am quite prepared to look to my constituents and the people of this country at large in the face, and while I am not the son of a prophet, I am going to make the statement that I shall be here in this House when the Monroe administration has passed into oblivion.

MR. LAKE—Mr. Speaker, in rising to this motion I wish to explain my position here to-day.

I have been called a "traitor" and, like Mr. Bradley, I will go back to 1924 when I was asked to become a member of the Monroe party.

Mr. Monroe asked me if I wished to run for Burin District, and I told him I would under one consideration, that it would be made an Executive seat. That was the only demand I made. I went to Burin and came back with Mr. Long.

I of course took with me the Manifesto of Mr. Monroe, and explained it as our policy to the people of that district. And I came back successful. I did not come to St. John's when I was returned, as I had my business to attend to. It was only a few days when Mr. Monroe wired me (I hope I am not committing any breach of confidence; I am not a politician, and if I commit a breach, someone can object). He telegraphed me and asked if I would take an Executive seat in Burin. Then before I replied to this he wired asking if I would re-consider as he couldn't give me the Executive seat and the department too, but he could give me the Humber job.

I wired back to say that the people expected the member who lived in the district, and was thus really the senior member would have the Executive seat. After some discussion I submitted to the Prime Minister and took my seat as an ordinary member of the House. As time went on I expected that Mr. Monroe would keep some of the promises he made in his Manifesto.

I might also say that before I came to St. John's the Government had been formed, and when I read the public news I was astounded and ashamed to meet the people of my district when I learned that it contained a gentleman whom I thought was in the Hickman Cabinet.

I was more than astounded—I was ashamed. If I had known that that gentleman, whose name is forbidden within this House—if I had known that A. B. Morine was a member of that Government, I would not have been a member of that Government, or of any other Government of which

he was a member, because this country does not want him, and because he can't go to a single district in this country and be elected. So much for that.

When I came back here, after some time, I told the Prime Minister in the Board of Trade rooms that I was surprised, but I was only one of the little fellows, but the little fellows grow, and I have grown in political experience.

We were asked to do many things—I was one of the little fellows, and was supposed to raise my hand when I was asked.

Now I want to tell this House what caused this trouble.

A few weeks ago the Crowe Bill was brought in this Chamber, and Mr. A. B. Morine sat in that corner, with his hand before his eyes; Mr. Crowe sat over there. We were asked to put this through and without delay. I know some influential people on Water Street, whose names I will not mention, who asked me if we could defer it because they did not think it was in the best interests of the country.

By some means the Bill was deferred and a party meeting was called. This was called for on Monday, and I left on Saturday for Marystown to meet my wife. I came to the meeting at 4 o'clock. Previous to that I had made the statement to a couple of members that I was dissatisfied—that I did not want to be a voting machine for men who had no interests in the country.

I said so so plainly and the Prime Minister took me to task, for which I was glad. At that meeting the Prime Minister accused some members of disloyalty—he may not have put it in these words, but he appealed to me as not being absolutely in harmony with the rest of the party.

I rose in my place and said I felt the cap fitted and I would wear it with dignity, and I told him many things.

I went back and reviewed the tariff situation, with which I was dissatisfied, seeing that we had gone out with a policy of retrenchment, and all we had had was a squandermania policy of highroads, and that I was disgusted. Speaking of the tariff I objected to it, much as Major Cashin has done, and I was very much tempted to walk across the floors of the House.

I kept my seat while the duty was put on lines and twines against the best interests of my district. It was a very hard pill. The highroads policy was brought in here and I understand two million dollars were voted for it, and I would not like to take any member or any man from my district out to Holyrood and let him see what they are going to spend ten or fifteen thousand dollars on—a small piece of road—while the people of Burin and Grand Bank cannot get a bridge over which to haul eighty thousand quintals of fish; and I want to tell this House that the district of Burin is the biggest producing district in this country.

They produced one hundred and forty-one thousand nine hundred and thirty-five quintals of fish and they cannot get a bridge to haul it across. I am ashamed to go back to my district. I could not get a dollar. I objected along these lines at a party meeting and because of that I am a traitor.

I am an independent citizen of this country, who owes no man anything, and I will not stand in this House if I cannot speak my mind if I wish.

I want to tell you something about the highroads. Last year I asked the Government to give me some money. In the district of Burin there is only one bridge over which it is safe to drive a horse and carriage in a distance of one hundred and twenty-five miles of main road, and that in a district that has produced one hundred and forty thousand quintals of codfish. The people immediately got after

me for some money. There are three bridges down, and the Government or the Road Commission, in fact I don't know who is running things, decided after a lot of effort to rebuild the three bridges in the district of Burin.

Our men are fishermen and they have been fishing since the last day of February—what few of them that are left and have not been laid up with the "flu." They sent men up to build these bridges and they built two and a half bridges and the half cost eleven thousand dollars, which was absolutely thrown away, and the Chairman of the Roads Commission would not take any advice from me or from anyone else.

And then you want to tell me that an independent member should stand for such treatment as that. Last year I asked the Government if they would give me a special grant of twenty-five hundred dollars to repair a particular bit of road between Garnish and Lamaline, a distance of forty-five miles. Through the urging of my friend Sir John Crosbie, coupled with the efforts of my friend and colleague Mr. Long, I was given the money and I sent men to work on the job. Then, in the meantime, Mr. Long spent one thousand dollars of the money for some other purpose, and when I came to pay the bills the amount was one thousand dollars short. I admit that perhaps I should have consulted Mr. Long at the time. The men were without their money. They were without their money for a month until at last the Orange Society of Grand Bank rightly demanded of me that the men be paid for their labor, and I telegraphed the Government and I got no response, and I had to go on a note in the Bank of Nova Scotia in Grand Bank with two other men for the sum of one thousand dollars, and that in a district that produced a hundred and forty thousand quintals of fish. Fishermen of Burin, rise up. And if they do rise I cannot see how I can do anything for them. I am disgusted with the whole situation.

I asked the Government to give the thousand dollars to me because I could not afford to pay a thousand dollars out of my pocket. I am a fisherman, and all I can do is to make two ends meet. My business is fish and the fisheries of Burin District have not been very remunerative during the last three or four years. I begged this House to give a bait depot to the District of Burin. I have no assurance of the bait depot and I did not get the thousand dollars to pay off the note until about three weeks ago.

Do you think that is fair treatment to bring to the men of Burin District when the Government is spending millions of dollars on highroads, and I want to tell the men from Burin district in this House that I could not stand for it.

It was said that I was bought with the Humber job. I want to tell this House that you cannot buy Clyde Lake with a Humber job. I have an independent spirit, and that spirit I intend to maintain as long as life will last. I would like to have an opportunity to read to this House a letter that I sent to the Executive Council the other day.

(Reads letter)

That is the famous thousand dollars that I had to get from the Bank of Nova Scotia.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that I became dissatisfied when I saw that there was nothing being done for my district and everything being done with highroads. I could not face the people of my district when they had not a bridge or a road or anything, while down here there are thousands and millions of dollars being spent on a highroads policy in which I have not very much faith. I was told by some of my staunchest supporters that if I did not do something about the roads that I might as well not come back.

I thought that the Government would carry out some of the items of the manifesto as laid down when I went through the district of Burin.

Now, I reiterated that in Burin district to the best of my ability, and I promised the fisheries of this country would be given some consideration, and among the few things I did promise was that I would try to get a bait depot in the town of Burin because I felt that if there were a bait depot there, there would be a very much larger catch of fish there.

It is a matter of opinion whether it is a good thing to catch more fish now or no. But I want to tell this House that our people are fishermen and nothing else, and over three hundred and fifty men went across on the Kyle to go fishing in Lunenburg. To my knowledge there was no man last year on the highroads. I never had a man on the dock and I never had a man on the new hotel. Possibly there are exceptions. I was not allowed to get a man there.

But that district produces a hundred and forty thousand quintals and helps to pay the national debt or the interest on the national debt and provide money for the highroads, and I do not think that it is good enough that we do not get some consideration.

Another matter which I brought before the people of Burin district was the matter of Prohibition. The matter was brought up on the floors of the Halls in Burin district. I read them this:

(Reads Manifesto)

We have a prohibition law and as Major Cashin said we are going to get three hundred thousand dollars from the liquor bill. Now, Mr. Speaker, I said just now that I was disgusted. I could not help being anything else coming from a fishing district and a fishing town in which everything is fish and I saw nothing done about the fisheries.

Last year twenty thousand dollars was granted to promote the fisheries of this country and over a million dollars were spent on the highroads. Is that consistent, Mr. Speaker? Then they took off the income tax and the bank tax. I objected to the income tax being taken off. I still object. I think that both these taxes should be brought back and let them help to defray the expenses of the country.

We are going to spend two million dollars on a dock that was going to cost a million, but we could only get two and a half bridges in Burin district, the half which cost eleven thousand dollars out of twenty-seven or twentyeight thousand, and that wasted because the work was being done by incompetent men.

I was through the district of Harbor Main Sunday. It was the first time I was through the district, and the expenditure took my breath away, but I cannot see where there is a million dollars spent. I noticed that they were building a bridge that was going to cost ten or fifteen thousand dollars and were taking up the old bridge which on good authority would last another fifteen or twenty years. But Burin District cannot have a bridge. We were promised last year a public building in Lamaline. The one there is a hundred and twenty years old now, and people working in there want oil clothes on when they are taking the messages. I became disgusted and I think rightly so. And if I cannot get up in this House and express my views and go out and meet a few of my friends I think that things have come to a serious pass. I do not want a general election. The last thing that I would like to see is a general election, but I would like to see the members of the Government get a square deal. Let us begin to

clean up and keep clean and give a square deal to all. But I do not think that it is a square deal to all if you give a million dollars to spend on highroads and give Burin district nothing. I said that the district of Burin produced a hundred and forty-one thousand quintals of fish last year. Fortune Bay eighty-six thousand. The district of Burgeo and LaPoile twenty-seven thousand, a grand total of two hundred and fifty-five thousand quintals of fish, almost one-third of the total shore catch of this country.

I would like to ask Mr. Chambers how much money he got last year for the district of Burgeo and LaPoile? He knows that he was hard hit by the Tariff and he was fed up when the duty was put on lines and twines. My friend, Mr. Warren, can speak for himself. I would like to ask him how much he got last year. We were trying to get a telegraph line this year from Grand Bank to Bay L'Argent, one of the most important lines in the country, and the matter got no consideration. Mr. Warren offered the Postal Telegraphs a thousand dollars of his road grant to build the line. But this year Grand Bank was out of direct communication with St. John's from April 9th until the seventh of May. Nearly a month and still we cannot get communication lines on that side of the Bay. I told Mr. Warren that he was too easy. I would fight to the last ditch and I would not use the road grant in this way when they were spending millions on roads while Fortune Bay got nothing. I tell you, sir, that the conditions in Fortune Bay District and Burin District, and Burgeo and LaPoile district, are disgraceful, and why are men given Executive seats unless they can get some of the demands granted. The only Executive seat from St. John's around to Bonne Bay is Mr. Long, I do not think that is enough. Pardon, Mr. Sullivan. Mr. Sullivan gets his share of the road work, and my district has not fit bridges to drive a horse and carriage over, and I am expected to be one of the little fellows to come into this House and put up my hand when I am told, and I want to tell this House that I will not put up my hand unless I want to.

I say that we want Government for the people, by the people and of the people. I represent the district of Burin, and I want to do something for the District. I have failed to do anything worth while for the district of Burin.

I promised the people a Bait Depot. I did not get the bait depot. I promised them roads and bridges. Not one mile of road in Burin is fit to travel on. I say that without fear of contradiction. The two towns of Fortune and Grand Bank are four miles apart, one of them is a town of two thousand people, and the other one thousand, and to-day you cannot drive a horse and carriage between those two places. I ask you sir, if that is fair treatment for the people of Burin District and the representative of the people of Burin.

I think that those who are within sound of my voice must appreciate that fact. I am a traitor for asking for money for the District of Burin! It will be said within a few days, perhaps to-morrow, that I got thirty-five thousand dollars for the dock. That dock cost about a hundred thousand dollars and through financial stress the people who built that dock could not carry on. About the time the discussion about the dock in the West End began I asked the Government through my colleague, Mr. Long, to advance thirty-five thousand dollars, and the money was placed to their credit in the Bank of Nova Scotia in Burin, to relieve the notes against the dock. The Government has the dock as security. I do not consider that they have given anything. Bonds were issued and I un-

derstand that last year the dock paid off the yearly bond of one thousand dollars and interest, and they will continue to pay it off in the one thousand dollar yearly installments. And that is not giving money, or if it is I do not know what to say about it. Two millions of dollars are being spent in the West End and that must be paid particularly by the district of Burin, because the district of Burin is the biggest producing fish district in this country.

I do not wish to delay this House this afternoon, but I felt that I had to rise and make certain statements. This move has been considered by me since last year when the tariff was brought in and increased the duties and I could not stand for it any longer. I have considered the final move for the last three or four days. I considered that matter, Mr. Speaker, but I delayed, as I could not bring myself to the point of releasing myself from the Government in which I went to the country, until this afternoon, at two o'clock, because I felt that I should be a part of it. But I could not live there under the existing conditions. And finally I sat down and I wrote this letter, which I will read to the House now. This was written to the Prime Minister this afternoon only after grave consideration, because I have no personal enmity against any man on that side of the House. I have many friends over there. But I thought that I could do nothing over there. However, I would not have left them only that the ultimatum was sent to two of my friends, Mr. Bradley and Mr. Russell. This is the letter:

(Reads the letter)

Now, I say sir, in all sincerity that the main industry of this country is absolutely neglected. I am a fisherman. My father was a fisherman. All my business is wrapped up in fish. The district that I represent is composed entirely of fishermen. Now I would like to know what this country would do if there were not a few districts to produce fish and produce a revenue to pay the interest on the Newfoundland debt.

And now the fishery is to be given second place, and the first place is to be given to high roads. I went to the country on the policy of cleaning up, keeping clean and a square deal to all. And I don't consider that my constituents have got a square deal. I say that the district of Burin has not got a square deal. And I am going to stay here and talk for the District of Burin until I get hoarse. And when I go back to the district of Burin if the people there do not want to elect me I shall be satisfied. But I certainly hope, Mr. Speaker, in all sincerity, that we will have no general election at this time, although many people think that we want a general election. But I do want to see the country cleaned up and the high roads policy changed. Because it nearly broke my heart to see the way, the extravagant way, in which money is about to be spent on the high roads and my own district absolutely neglected. Fishermen coming home after returning from the Banks, they have to wade in mud up to their knees. I came in over the road Saturday night, and I met twenty-five or thirty wagons going to work on the highroads, and they were given to understand that the high roads would not begin for a month or two yet.

And the people in Conception Bay, many of them are stopping home from the fisheries, to go to work on the highroads. The complaint is being heard everywhere now that the men do not want to go to the fishery, they want to go to work on the highroads. Where are we, and whither tending? Now I have got sick and tired of this party because the rank and file of this party are not considered. And the rank and file over there, know that is true. They have been fighting

for their rights day after day. And I don't doubt now but that some of them would like to be over here with us.

Anyway, I merely rose in my seat here to explain to this House why I left the Monroe Party, because I could get no satisfaction from them.

MR. RUSSELL—Mr. Speaker, in rising to support the motion to adjourn I wish to say that I do not intend to take up as much of the time of this House, as did my friend, Mr. Lake. I have no desire to tire anybody, and as he and Mr. Bradley have covered all the points, practically, that they could possibly cover, I thought that I would content myself with just a few remarks regarding my own position. As a matter of fact, I suppose that it is not necessary to even rise in my place to explain my position, because the letter in reply to the Prime Minister, demanding my resignation, has already been published in the Public Press. I stated fairly fully in that letter what my position was. From small beginnings big things sometimes come, or troublesome things at least. And little did I think when I was asked to attend a meeting of four members of the Monroe Party Tuesday night last that the present condition of affairs would result. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I am like the four other members that have crossed the floors of this House, and are now occupying independent seats. I am not a wealthy man. I am not a rich man. Neither am I a merchant. I am just a common citizen. In private life I am the publisher of a small weekly newspaper in the town of Bay Roberts. But that does not detract in any way from my independence of spirit and action. I represent the people of Harbour Grace with my colleague Hon. John R. Bennett, and Mr. Hickman, the leader of the Opposition. I have faithfully striven, sir, to serve the people of that district in every way possible. Mr. Monroe was good enough to place me in charge of the Department of Public Works, when I was first returned, and I have honestly striven under a great many handicaps to do my duty to the Government and to the people of this country, in managing the affairs of that department in the best way I know how. I practised economy, and I only wish Mr. Speaker, that the Executive Government itself had been, during the past two years, doing their bit, the same as the various departments did their bit. I will give the heads of the other departments this credit when I say that I believe that every department of the Monroe Government, and every head of every department has been honestly striving to do their best to make a success of the work of their Departments. I have not always agreed with the things that the Executive Government did, and from time to time I have in a conservative manner, voiced an objection. But unfortunately some of my objections and complaints have fallen on deaf ears. Every man sitting in the Government to-day I consider a friend of mine. I have nothing against any man. I am not hot headed. Some years ago perhaps when I was younger, I might have had a little more fire or spirit about me. But as years have gone by my judgment has been somewhat tempered. And when I joined up with the Monroe Party I made up my mind that I would stand by the party through thick and thin as long as things were fairly done. And Tuesday night when I attended that meeting I had no idea of breaking with the party. I had no idea of moving a vote of want of confidence or anything else. Neither were votes of confidence discussed. We were there as five men to discuss little grievances in one way or another. Now I don't say this in any disrespectful way, but I claim that two, three or five members of a party have a perfect right to

meet in an office or home or anywhere else, to discuss any grievances that they may have. That was the extent of the meeting. But certain leaks occurred and certain rumours were spread, and certain statements were made, which to my mind were largely false, and perhaps without any due consideration, without any effort being made to find out the truth of the matter, because as far as I know I was not askedby the Prime Minister for any explanation, and I don't think that any of the other gentlemen were was not asked by the Prime Minister saw fit to write that letter to Mr. Bradley and myself asking us for our resignations. There was scarcely anything to do but resign. Now my position is a little different from the other gentlemen who have crossed the floors of this House. I was in charge of the Department of Public Works, and drawing a salary of $4,000 a year. I have responsibilities in connection with my home, as every family man has, and any step I have taken has not been taken without due consideration. I have the interests of this country at heart as much as any man in the government, in the Opposition or in the Independent ranks. I am not a wealthy man, but a wealthy man can only eat three meals a day, and can only wear one suit of clothes at a time as any other man; my interests are wrapped up in my home and my business, but I am also interested in the welfare of this country, and of the district of Harbour Grace that I have the honour to represent here, and of which I am a native. Unfortunately I am not a fisherman, but I am the son of a fisherman—I never had the chance to become one, but I know something about the fishery, and I know that it is decreasing. The men in Harbour Grace are just marking time, making no effort whatever to go to the fishery, and if they make the effort they can get no supplies; they are just marking time and expecting the Highroads policy to start up again where a man with a horse and cart can get five dollars a day. I was one of the men who voted for the Highroads policy, but I think I voted for an expenditure of one million, but I had no idea that when the Commissioners were appointed money would be spent in the way it was. I speak with a perfect knowledge of what I say; I went over the road from St. John's to Bay Roberts once or twice a week, and there was an awful lot of unnecessary extravagance, and I referred before to the caravan that I met Monday morning going towards Holyrood, I met as many as forty carts, and I asked them where they were going and they said they were going working. I asked another and another, but I could get no satisfaction until I came up with one who was separate from the others and asked him "what's on this morning?" and he said "we're going to Colinet to work on the road." I am in favour of good roads, but I am not in favour of spending money in this way when roads in other districts are neither fit nor safe to walk over. I wish to repeat what Mr. Lake has said. I do not stand for turmoil or trouble in this country, nor do I favour a general election, and personally I wish to say that I will do everything possible to avoid any turmoil that would bring about a general election in this country. I am sufficiently interested, and I am patriotic and sane enough to take that stand—I believe it is the wish of the people of my district, and that is my position to-day. I have simply, Mr. Speaker, asserted a little bit of independence; I have often said that I refused to become a rubber stamp or a figure head in connection not only with the Public Works Department but with any part of the Government. I am as big as the biggest when it comes to the affairs of the country—I may not be as wealthy as some; I may not have as much

social influence, but I consider that I am politically the equal of any, and I have this to say that I am willing to concede the ability of some men opposite; of the Minister of Justice, of the Colonial Secretary, even of the Prime Minister, of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, but while I concede the ability of these men I feel that others outside this House should not be considered—our recommendations should be considered and if possible granted. I could go on enumerating things that have been considerd by the members of the party, and I regret to say that a great many things that they asked for were regarded as childish. A man has a great many things from his district to deal with, and there must be of necessity at times some requests that are not as necessary as others. And there are not many complaints from my district.

Speaking in a general way, I think the Prime Minister was ill advised to cause this breach when it looked as if the trouble could have been patched up, but that was a matter for the Prime Minister. I have little more to say—I do not wish to trespass on the ground of the other speakers. The letter which I sent explained my position; my resignation was demanded without a hearing. According to British law no person is declared guilty until he is heard, and I was declared guilty without a hearing of any sort, and my resignation demanded by the Prime Minister. That is all I have to say at the present time; possibly some other day I will have something more to say on this matter.

MR. MOORE—Mr. Chairman, rising to support the motion, and in accordance with the preceding speakers, I wish to make an explanation why I am found here in no man's land to-day. I want to congratulate the gentlemen who are here with me this afternoon because I feel they are going to make a fine party. They were going dumb on the government benches—Mr. Lake was talking to himself over there, and this afternoon he has made a fine speech. Mr. Bradley was, I think, never heard from on the other side, and he has given us a splendid speech. We have still to hear from Mr. Little, a man who had the courage of his convictions, and who acted on the principle that his district was being neglected and the town of Bonavista was being neglected.

Now let us go back to the famous meeting of Tuesday night last, that will go down in history; my attitude was that I had no intention of disruption of the government, I went in after the Budget was delivered, and I didn't believe the things I heard, and if those others have to suffer I want to suffer with them. I went to Ferryland District with the Manifesto of Walter S. Monroe; I preached the Manifesto around the district; we promised the people reduction of taxation, but, my God, what did we get, they are out there now without bridges or roads, and with nothing going on. I want to tell the Prime Minister that when I attended that meeting I had no intention of causing disruption in the government, but when I came in here this afternoon and saw the long faces on the government side I felt there was "something rotten in Denmark." I have been called a traitor, but I am not a traitor to my constituents or to the people of Newfoundland—I am a traitor to any party that is directed and run by A. B. Morine.

MR. LITTLE—Mr. Speaker, I have come before the tribunal, and I suppose I have to give an account. Now Sir, like the previous speakers I have to go back to 1923 and 1924. In 1923 a message came from St. John's, "Bring Little up"—well, he wasn't very little then. But I came up, and didn't know why I was coming—I thought it was about a shortage of bait that I was being brought up. When I came in here I was asked to

stand for Bonavista Bay as a candidate—the idea of a man like me getting out of a skiff and running against a man like Sir William Coaker. I was here three weeks and decided nothing, and I went home without making a decision—that is the truth, and I defy denial. Finally, after I was home about a week, I was persuaded, and wired back "If you can't get a better man, I accept." You all know what happened—we came back defeated, but I considered it a victory for me, to gain such a vote as I did. And you know what happened in 1924—I was again asked and I declined. And I hadn't made up my mind when my colleagues came into Bonavista Arm, and I couldn't very well get out of it then. I went on and was elected. Now does any member think that I was any asset to this House? I think that I was, if nobody else does. As a practical fisherman, I know that Bonavista harbour is the roughest harbour that there is to approach in boats. Very often men get in, driving before wind and sea, on the beach even before their boats do and that has happened pretty often. To-day we have not got a foot of public wharf in Bonavista Harbour that we can haul a boat up on. Last Spring after the House closed people of my district got after me and they thought that my doom was sealed, but when they have found that I have asserted my independence and have refused to take dictation from any man, I could not go back this year and say I could not get the necessary money for the completion of Bonavista Harbour. The Government had promised to send Mr. Hall there. Mr. Hall had promised to go there, but neither Mr. Hall or his money has arrived there since. I think I have cleared myself now and have good reason to take my seat. I was never asked what stand, independent or otherwise I would take, but I know that I said that when you fool a man once that you cannot fool a man twice. I have done my best and I can't do more. I do not want to be personal, but I think I want to stand by them, and what I told them was that I was going to stand by the people who elected me, and the promises I made.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, whilst I do not desire to delay the time of the House this evening, I would like to say a few words in connection with the depletion of our ranks and the establishment of another party in the middle of the House as the gentlemen who comprise that party have told me in their letters they would do. I do not know now whether we have got four parties or three parties, or two parties, or how many parties we have here; but I do know that five gentlemen have moved their seats from this side of the House, two of them, of course, having done so, because I had to tell them to do so, and I want to tell the House that it was not on account of any one meeting on Tuesday or Wednesday nights that these gentlemen have left the Government party. It was very hard for me to be, and very unwillingly convinced, that negotiations were going on continuously between some of these gentlemen, more particularly between the two Crown Ministers, whom I had to ask to vacate their seats, and Sir William Coaker and Sir Michael Cashin, both of whom were not in this House. Now Mr. Morine's name has been mentioned here this evening and I see no reason why other names should not be mentioned also. I say, sir, that a plot was absolutely hatched. For what object I do not know, except that it was for revenge on the part of some individuals or whether there was a particular desire to get hold of the public treasury to provide for some wanting friends. But I am perfectly convinced that it was not done with an idea of doing any good for this country, because if I

thought it meant the doing of anything good for the country I would be only too willing—and I feel sure that the gentlemen sitting behind me would be only too willing—to hand over to them the reins of government. We know that no better could be done than we have done, and we know that there could not be any more economy practised than has been practised by the present Government. I have nothing personal against the gentlemen who have moved their seats from this side of the House. I regret that they should have seen fit to become traitors to the party. I say traitors, because if they changed their minds and disapproved of the policy of the Government they should have come to me and said so. Surely that was their duty if they did disapprove of the policy of the Government. But to hold meetings, to be in conference with enemies who hold no seats here, through agents, directly or indirectly with those two gentlemen of whom I have been speaking, for the last fortnight or three weeks, then I say that we cannot trust them. I regret it. I have no personal feeling against these gentlemen. They have passed out and taken their stand on this matter. But I do regret that they should see fit to go about this change of position in such a peculiar manner. Mr. Little was my colleague in Bonavista Bay and if anyone would have asked me what man would not be guilty of treachery I should have said it was Lewis Little. He wrote me in 1925 asking for a sealing steamer and he got a sealing steamer. This Spring he wanted the Sagona to go to the ice and be master of her. We told him that the Government had made a mistake—we do not claim that the Government does not make mistakes —we told him that we made a mistake in sending the Sagona and Prospero to the sealfishery in 1925. The ships went to the sealfishery with promiscuous crews. Every member of the House thought that he should have as many berths as any other member, and the result was that the Prospero went to the ice with from ten to twenty men from each of the districts represented on this side of the House. It was a failure. Captain Randell told me it would be a failure. Captain Little had his crew from Bonavista, nearly all Bonavista men. The steamers were looked upon as a Government proposition—Government steamers. They went out to the ice and no doubt the captains did their best. We said, never again. If the Government wants the steamers to go to the ice and give labour, then we will charter them to one of the firms that sends steamers to the ice and let them find the captains and the crews. I suppose in the case of these two steamers going to the ice I made more enemies than I expect to make friends. I suppose that there was hardly a man who supported me but thought that he should be the master of one of these steamers. Mr. Little wanted one of these steamers to go out to the ice this Spring. I told Mr. Little that the Government had decided that a mistake had been made and that they could not repeat it. Mr. Little was very indignant about it. But I think that I have very good reason to know that Captain Little has been offered another steamer by some of the people that have been putting alluring prospects before him provided they got the Government.

Mr. Russell and Mr. Lake told us to-day that they did not want to break the Government. I know that their districts do not want the Government broken up. I am convinced of that. I know that telegrams have come from Burin district with three or four hundred signatures demanding that no steps be taken by the members to break the Government up. I know that Bay Roberts is very indignant at the action of their member. I have received a telegram from Mr.

Russell's committee itself; (reads telegram as follows:—)

"Russell's committee here congratulate you on action taken. We do not want a traitor as representative. Only regret you have not power to behead him."

(Sgd.) COMMITTEE.

That message was sent to me voluntarily. It is easy to see that the people of Bay Roberts are very indignant at the action of their member and are no party to it. However, these gentlemen have taken their seats on the other side of this House and if they had another member from this side of the House I have no hesitation in saying that they would move a vote of want of confidence in the Government. If this vote of want of confidence were moved I fail to see how the gentlemen who have moved their seats across the House could do other than vote for it, and if the vote were carried and the Government were defeated, it would mean that there would be another general election, and therefore I cannot understand their statements this afternoon that they want no election. I do not wish to say anything further this afternoon. With regard to Mr. Cashin's and the Leader of the Opposition's reference to the Budget it will be the proper time to express one's self on that particular point when we get back into Ways and Means. I hope now that these gentlemen on the other side of the House have at last an opportunity to express themselves freely and that they will exercise to the full the desires of their hearts.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—It is rather late, but with your permission I would like to say a few words.

I have, Mr. Speaker, very attentively listened to the explanation of the members from the Government ranks who have taken their seats on this side of the House, and after hearing their reasons there is really nothing else to do but to heartily congratulate them on the stand they have taken. The Prime Minister has said that there is a plot afoot. If there is I know nothing about it. I made no overtures to any members of the Government either to those now sitting in the Government's ranks or to those now sitting on this side of the House, I had no discussions with them in any way, and as far as I am concerned they crossed the House of their own free will after they have been for two years members of a Government whose policy they did not approve of. When the Prime Minister rose to his feet I expected that he would follow along the lines taken by those who have already spoken, that is those who have left his party. He has not however given the explanation to offset in any way what has been said. The member for Ferryland has made a charge that the Budget is incorrect and is padded to deceive the House and the Public. Mr. Bradley corroborated that statement. The statement states that if he as a member of the Executive were released from his promise and from his undertakings as a member of the Executive that he would reveal a harrowing tale to this House in connection with the Budget, which the Prime Minister and his party would not want to be known. I do not ask the Prime Minister to free him from his promises, as I know he can, but I do expect the Prime Minister to make some explanation to this House. I repeat again a charge was made this afternoon by the member for Ferryland that the Budget was an incorrect one. He referred to it as a padded budget, and following him we had the member for Port de Grave, Mr. Bradley, a member of the Executive who has gone so far as to confirm what has been said by the member for Ferryland, and I expected from the Prime Minister, when he rose to his feet, I was very glad to see him rise, as explanation as to

what was meant by the charge made by the member for Ferryland and by the inferences of the member for Port de Grave. As I said before, as far as I am concerned there has been no plot hatched by anyone, and I had nothing whatever to say until I listened to what the members who crossed the House had presented their case, and after listening to their explanations as to why they did cross the House I am sure that they were fully justified in what they have done. Whils't they sat in the Government ranks and heard us criticize the Government's policy and the actions of the Government they must have had in their own minds the same opinions that we had. The member for Burin tells us he had a hard pill to swallow last season over lines and twines. I know that Mr. Lake had a hard pill to swallow when there was an increase of duty of ten per cent. on lines and twines, and in- and other commodities, and I know that other members of the Government ranks had a hard pill to swallow when they were asked to vote for the increase of ten per cent. on lines and twines that the fishermen had to bolster up a fat and already overfed industry by increase in duties, making it harder for the fishermen to live. It was a hard pill for us to swallow on this side of the House. Here is a waning and declining fishery and still there are taxes placed upon the fishermen every year and they cannot pay. The people around Conception Bay are content to go to work on the Highroads and get away from the fishery. They cannot afford to catch fish. It is the duty of the Government to take some interest in the fishery and a fishery policy. There have been three sessions of the legislature since the Monroe administration came into power, and not once during these sessions have the Government brought in legislation to in any way improve the condition of the fishery. They brought in nothing that has helped the fishermen. Last year they came into this House and voted five hundred thousand dollars for the dock. It was estimated that the dock was going to cost a million one hundred thousand dollars. They gave out a contract cost plus basis. These people contracted to build the dock at cost plus seventy thousand dollars, which all the employees of the W. I. Bishop Co. paid out of the Government money. The Dock is not completed yet, and from figures given us by the Prime Minister we find that the dock is now estimated to cost $1,900,000. It will cost fully two and a half million by the time it is completed and some new machinery installed. The dock has been built like railways and other things during the war when a battle had to be won at all cost. Men have been working day and night, Sundays and week days since the work commenced. Where does the Lord's Day alliance come in, I call it a waste of money. The Highroads Policy has caused more waste. The Government estimated an expenditure of $500,000 for the season of 1925, and they have spent $1,025,000 on their Highroads and they have got nothing of any value for it. I agree with the member for Burin that he has got nothing for his district. He has told us that he cannot get a road of four miles repaired between the two largest settlements. If the Government were retrenching and reducing expenditure his task would not be so aggressive, but when he sees over one million dollars spent in a small portion of Conception Bay, in one season and nothing for his district he has a just right to kick and kick hard, and he is justified in abandoning a party like the present Government when one million dollars is spent in one season in one section and for the pleasure of sports who go fishing with a rod in the summer, and nothing for the Fishermen who toil

on the Grand Banks and risk their lives to bring enormous wealth into this country.

He tells us that there is a bridge in Grand Bank over which is hauled every year about fifty thousand quintals of fish. It is unsafe to go over and the Government will not find money to repair it or build a new one. Mr. Lake states that his district last year produced 141,000 quintals of codfish. The value of this at $9.00 per qtl. amounts to one ninth of the revenue the Minister of Finance and Customs estimates he will collect during the fiscal year. I say now again that Burin District should have at least $100,000 of the Highroad money to connect up the settlements. What do you expect Mr. Lake to do under these circumstances. I agree with him that his duty is to cross the floor of the House and sever his connection with such a party.

The Government's Policy has been one of waste and squandermania. Mr. Little has been promised money for his district which has never been allocated. Bonavista Town is a flourishing settlement of hardy honest fishermen, whom he states have no place to moore a boat in safety, and not even a place to haul up a boat except on private property. Mr. Little would be a traitor to the trust imposed in him by his people if he did not abandon such a Government as he was connected with. Mr. Bradley, Mr. Russell and Mr. Moore have also given good and substantial reasons for their actions.

The decision of these men is not made through any plotting, but lay in a continued consciousness of their communication with a bad and wasteful administration who have not attempted to carry out any of their promises.

The Government have done things that they should not have done. They without asking for the sanction of the House or bringing the matter before the legislature, gave away our security for ten million dollars, which we had when the industry started. The Government brought in a Bill to guarantee the sinking fund for the construction of a hotel, and told us what they wanted guaranteed was the sinking fund, no interest, and they came in again this session and asked for a guarantee as well of 6 p.c. on $450,000. Under the circumstances, considering what has happened, and after hearing the explanations of those members who have crossed the House, there is nothing else I can do but congratulate them on the manly stand they have taken.

MR. CASHIN—I feel that after the remarks of the Prime Minister, a few words by me in reference to remarks he has made are necessary. Firstly, I wish to congratulate the honourable members who have spoken just now, who have crossed the House. The main thing I rise for is this, that the Prime Minister made a statement that Sir Michael Cashin was in collusion with Mr. Bradley and Mr. Russell to break up this Government and take control of it, and he went on to say that Sir Michael Cashin and Sir William Coaker, I think he mentioned, were not fit, to a certain extent, to take charge of the revenue of the country. I have not been out of order very much during this session, but the Prime Minister this afternoon has overstepped himself in making that remark and he has got to take that back. That is a lie. Sir Michael Cashin did not know Mr. Bradley until Saturday. I don't know whether he ever met Mr. Russell, but I know that he was not in touch with either Mr. Bradley or Mr. Russell, and unless the Prime Minister can prove that, I am going to resort to an unusual procedure in this House and tell the Prime Minister that he is a liar.

HIS HONOR THE SPEAKER — I must draw the honourable member's

attention to the fact that his language is not parliamentary, I fear very much that steps for restraint will have to be taken.

MR. CASHIN—I think I have attempted to tell the truth at all times here. I have made charges here and at all times have told the truth, and I am telling the truth now. It may not be parliamentary and it may not be usual, but it is time for me to move out if by parliamentary procedure I have to prevaricate myself and my seat in this House is a joke. I will say then that what the Prime Minister has said is incorrect. It is untrue and I make that statement and mean it being as good a Britisher and a better Newfoundlander than the Prime Minister. I make that statement, and if he continues to make that statement or any untruth about my flesh and blood I will say that it is a lie. I am going to stand by what I said in my previous assertions. I am going to tell the Prime Minister that Sir Michael Cashin never met Mr. Bradley until Saturday and was no acquaintance of Mr. Russell's or in touch with him. My father was a member of this House for thirty years without ever being defeated. Is that a lie or is it not? I have nothing to take back. I am going to stand up while I have breath in me and defy the Prime Minister to tell me that I am telling an untruth.

HIS HONOR THE SPEAKER—Is the House ready for the question?

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker, I have asked the Prime Minister to take back that Sir Michael Cashin was in collusion with Mr. Bradley or Mr. Russell. I have said he was not, and the Prime Minister says he was. It is come to a showdown. I am prepared to bring Sir Michael Cashin to the bar of the House to-morrow afternoon with the permission of this House and we will see who is telling the truth. I want him to take that back right now unless he is able to prove it and he can't. Have I to come in here as a Member of the House of Assembly, as a Newfoundlander, as Cashin's son, and take that kind of stuff from the Prime Minister? It is a show down between the Prime Minister and me, and it has to come to a show down. Order has been called. I am not going to stand for order. I am not going to allow that statement of the Prime Minister or any untruth of that nature to go unchallenged. If it is thought better that I say it is an untruth I say so, and I am not going to allow any such against myself or members of my family.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I will say, merely, that I take back nothing that I have said. I am absolutely convinced, directly or indirectly, that those gentlemen were influenced by Sir Michael Cashin and Sir William Coaker. It may have been through a party called by name of Peter Cashin or anybody else, but it is the case. I acknowledge that I can't prove it, but I still say that I am convinced of it.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker . . .

HIS HON THE SPEAKER — The honourable gentleman has already spoken twice, if he wishes to pursue the matter further he may bring it up by substantive motion, at present he must be ruled out of order.

MR. RUSSELL—I have been living in the city the past two and a half years, and during that time I have exchanged no words with Sir Michael Cashin excepting a five minutes' conversation on Saturday last. The meeting then was not by appointment. Excepting that once I have not spoken with him during my period of residence in the city except to wish him good morning when passing in the street or something of that nature. I have never conversed with Sir Michael Cashin until I had that five minutes' conversation on Saturday afternoon. That conversation, as I say,

lasted about five minutes, and was not in connection with this move of ours. I don't know of any connection with Sir Michael Cashin, directly or indirectly.

MR. BRADLEY—It appears that it is charged that in connection with this matter that I with others was in collusion with Sir Michael Cashin. I want to say that I have never known Sir Michael Cashin, though I have been living in the city all my life, except as any man would know a man who had been in public life for a good many years. I was not in communication or collusion with him, and I deny that charge. I don't know what exactly the charge was or what the Prime Minister has said, possibly I was in the Opposition room when he spoke. I want to say, however, that I don't intend to lie under any charge. I am a free man and I am not led by any man, even as good a man as Sir Michael Cashin or anybody else. I do as I please and I ask no man's permission.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until Thursday afternoon, 27th inst., at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, May 27, 1926.

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

Petitions were presented by:

Mr. Hickman from Harbour Grace, re employment.

Mr. Cashin gave notice of question.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER —Mr. Chairman,—The wizard of Finance who has constituted himself as the leader of what I might now call the "main patch" on the other side of the House, put forward some statements the other day in which he claimed that the Budget had been padded. He intimated that it was intentionally misleading and, therefore, was deserving of condemnation. The speaker was inaccurately informed and his remarks were simply made with the desire to harm the Government without any consideration as to their consequent result upon the country. Mr. Bradley gave the House to understand that he could disclose revelations that would astonish the country as to what took place at that meeting on that famous Monday night, if he were relieved of the oath of office. Mr. Bradley knew that I could not relieve him of that oath of office and that I had nothing to do with any promise or any oath. I want to say that the Government have not in any way anything to be ashamed of as to what transpired at that meeting. The Government at that time in considering the Budget increased some of the estimates and justifiably so. I am not going to discuss the details of that matter now, because the Finance Minister is in charge of the Budget and more familiar with the facts and figures than I am; but I would like to state here that every member of the Government gave their acquiescence to it and there was not a single protest, not even from Mr. Bradley. One would imagine to hear Mr. Cashin talk, that somebody had stolen a million dollars. It is only the duty of every Finance Minister, as I understand it, to make his Budget as clear and encouraging as he can under the conditions that exist. Every Minister of Finance that ever came here did that, and that is all Sir John Crosbie has done, and when he explains

his Budget later on you will find that when you deduct from the expenditure the amount paid in connection with capital account, there is nothing more to the Budget than what the hon. member for Fortune Bay is prone to call "critically correct." The Minister of Finance shows that during the last two years he has spent twenty million of dollars; but if he spends thirty millions of dollars in three years, which is $50,000 more than the Minister expects, he can still balance his Budget for the three year term, provided extra expenditure is avoided. Mr. Lake persistently demanded and got thirty thousand dollars for the repairing of roads and bridges and fifty thousand dollars in connection with a dry dock. Representatives of other constituencies have made similar demands; and members on the other side of the House have been presenting petitions all the session requesting financial help towards improvements respecting public utilities in their constituencies. Mr. Little knows that forty thousand dollars was spent by a previous administration for making a hole in the ground at Bonavista Harbor so that the water would run out of the proposed harbour instead of running into it. The Government did allocate ten thousand dollars towards a breakwater but Mr. Little has never done anything towards making use of it. Now as regards expenditure in the Budget, this financial wizard that I have referred to claims that he can tell us how the matter can be straightened out. The wizard claims that by a saving of five hundred thousand dollars on the railway, by putting on the income tax again, and by putting on ten per cent. on goods that are now coming in free of duty, it would be a remedy for our financial ills. The tax was suggested by the Finance Minister and discussed in Council last year, but we found that it will be very hard to do anything with it. We have heard a lot about the Highroads and about the two million dollars that have been spent on them. We were justified in that expenditure, and I hope the income of tourists may show us means of developing the resources of the country. Although it will take some time before any tangible results still I am convinced that the expenditure in connection with the making of better roads than we have to-day will be amply justified. Speaking of the income tax, several members of the House wanted it put back again on the grounds that the income tax comes out of the rich man. But who is the rich man? As far as I know the rich man is supposed to be the fish merchant. Our firm paid out in 1924 an income tax of between six and seven thousand dollars and at the end of 1925, if the tax had been on and adjustable over two years, we would have got back that amount because we lost more than we made the year previous. That is the way the trade of this country runs. You have your ups and downs when you are supplying on credit for the fishery. You have to depend on fish being caught and you have your never ending anxiety as to where you are going to get off. The Government found that about thirteen hundred people were paying the income tax and virtually fifty per cent. of them were clerks, whose employers had to put in a statement of what salary they were getting. The contractor and the planter and many others around the country did not pay the tax. In fact they looked upon it as a joke. So I say the fair way for all concerned is to pay their taxes through the Custom House as the income tax cannot rightly be applied in this country. These are the charges made against us; these are the charges

mostly on which members have crossed the House. Some of them have given other reasons. One of the reasons stated by two members on the opposite side is that the country is faced with ruination because of the fact that Mr. Morine is in the executive of this Government. I think it was very unbecoming of any of those gentlemen who spoke yesterday to mention Mr. Morine's name. Mr. Morine has never done anything half so despicable as they did in leaving the party without due notice, and under the circumstances which they left it. That is something he never did, and I don't think ever would do. Mr. Moore used his position as whip in the Government party to get Mr. Lake and Mr. Little in here from their homes, telegraphing them that they were wanted for the Budget. Who wanted them for the Budget? Nobody ever said they were wanted for the Budget. When they came into town they were told exactly what they were wanted for by Mr. Moore. Mr. Moore got up at a dinner a few nights ago, and without being called upon to do so at all, said that there was no more loyal supporter of me than he was.

MR. MOORE.—Yes; up till Tuesday night last.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER. — Yes; up to Tuesday night, and on Wednesday morning it was all the other way. I say that it is an impertinence for any man who has done those things to get up and talk about the infamy of Mr. Morine. What we want in this country to-day, if the country is to go ahead and prosper, is new industries. We want more capital brought in to work those indutries, to give more employment, and for the benefit of the country in general. I see no future for the country if we are going to frighten away capital by income tax and disturb operations by the turmoil of a general election every six or eight months. If a party can come into power with a majority of 25 to 10 and a number can be bought over so that the whole position is changed in twenty-four hours, is that encouraging people to come in and develop the country? I say that such upsetting of affairs is the very worst thing for the country to-day, and that is what was attempted by those men I spoke of on Tuesday, who employed members of the House to do their dirty work. I say that the men who have done this have been the bitterest enemies you can find of this country to-day. If members are going to break the stability of Government for the gratification of their spleen and for personal aggrandisement, there is, in my opinion, no future for this country. I do not claim to be any great assistance to this party; I do not claim to be even a good leader. I am inexperienced, and to a large extent incapable, and nobody knows my shortcomings better than myself. I am anxious to get the best possible advice and assistance in the Council Chamber that is available, and I consider that, in this respect, Mr. Morine, as a member of the Cabinet, has been of great assistance to me. I went to a party meeting and said that I was dissatisfied and disheartened at the turn things had taken, and I said, perhaps, it was to a large extent because of Morine's associations with this party, and, if anybody was of that opinion, for him to say so. Mr. Morine and I could retire from the party at the end of the session and a new leader be elected. Was there a man on that side of the Hous today that got up from his seat to say that he was dissatisfied? There were two, Mr. Lake and Mr. Moore got up and said they did not like Mr. Morine, but nevertheless they were going to stay in the party, and they did stay

there; stayed to do their dirty work, and after that was done, they said they had to leave on account of Morine. As I said I am not going to talk Budget today. It does not require me to explain the Budget, as it would be a reflection on the Finance Minister, but I state, clearly and positively, that the Budget is critically correct, when you take out from the expenses the capital expenditure; that is all I have got to say on the subject this afternoon. Mr. Cashin is perfectly at liberty to have his own view and make his own statements, and the Minister of Finance is very well able to look after any charges that he makes. The whole executive takes the responsibility for that Budget, and if Mr. Bradley has nothing more to be ashamed of than his association with that, then he need not be ashamed of anything.

MR. CASHIN—In reference to the remarks which the Prime Minister has just been making and his reference to me as a wizard of finance I want to say that the "clean up, keep clean and a square deal to all" Prime Minister has as a matter of fact borne out the statements made by me the other day. He told us that the estimates of the Budget were increased. I said that the other day and I also said the other day that we will have a deficit on current account of a certain amount and I didn't include capital account. I said that you had lost on current account for the fiscal year—approximately . . . . on current account for the railway for nine months of the fiscal year 1925-26 over half a million dollars, and that is not capital account. If you want to count capital account your deficit at the end of the year 1925-26 will be, with the interest on 3 or 4 million dollars at 5 per cent. another $200,000. With capital account you can add on another four million dollars on the estimates and that will make five million. Capital account is made through the loans you raised the last two or three years of four and six million dollars. The statements I make I do so without fear of contradiction, and I have just as much interest in the country as the Prime Minister or any Member of his party, and I resent the insinuation of the Prime Minister that I have not got the interests of Newfoundland at heart as much as he has. I resent the fact that he should come in here as Prime Minister of Newfoundland and throw out insinuations of a personal nature that people outside of this House have not got the interests of the country at heart. I want to tell the Prime Minister now that some of those individuals whom he meant were his best supporters during the last general election. With reference to those men who came across the House the other day, I have stood up in this House during the last fourteen months and appealed to Members on the opposite side of the House to do the right thing, and I am not going to be of any party that brings in a wrong statement. The Prime Minister practically told us that the Budget is false and I thank him for that much. He said they had purposely made increases. He has spoken about Income and Business Profits Tax and spoke of the harm to industry and companys by an income tax.

Companies never paid Income tax, they paid Profits' Tax. Income tax was paid by private individuals, and the profits these private individuals receive from all sources from various companies. My proposition is this, that he should put an income tax on incomes of four thousand a year and over, and when you criticize my remarks you should criticize them fairly and say that I made that statement. That is the statement I made, and I say that any man getting four thousand a year and over should pay

an income tax. The Prime Minister has said that the fishermen would resent it. I want to ask the Prime Minister how many fishermen make four thousand a year. Ninety-nine per cent. of the fishermen don't make any more than five hundred dollars a year, and I challenge contradiction of that statement. It is ridiculous to talk about collecting money from fishermen on income tax. With regard to Mr. Morine being in the Government, he has nothing to do with me. He attempted to bully me while I was in the Government, and he ran across the wrong man. I am going to tell the story of that now. It is connected with the raising of a loan and last year's tariff. Two years ago when the Monroe Government came back in power, the Executive Government to a certain extent raised seven and a half million dollars. They wanted it to be ten millions originally, but brought the bill for seven and a half millions and didn't have the courtesy to call the party together and ask their opinions on it. I told my colleague, Mr. Moore, that if the Finance Minister presented the Bill, without first presenting it to the party that I was going to object. Mr. Moore went outside and met Mr. Morine and told him that Cashin was going to kick if the Loan Bill was brought up without coming before the party. Mr. Morine asked Moore for me to come out that he wanted me. I went out and in his autocratic, impertinent manner, while he may have had more political experience than I had, attempted to tell me that I had to do as the rest did and let things go as they said. I want to tell the House that no man in Newfoundland to-day can bully me, and I told Morine that, and I told him to move out quick, which he did. They had a party meeting to discuss a six million dollar loan. It went back then to six million since I had objected. At the party meeting I objected to two million dollars being devoted to the Highroads. I objected on the grounds that we went to the country pledged to do something for the fisheries, and I was overruled by every member of that party, and I was opposed to that highway policy. Next year we came back when the House opened, and last year's Budget came in. It took considerable figuring to find where we stood, and finally we discovered that extra taxation to the tune of twelve or fifteen per cent. was included in the Budget, and I objected again, and I went to the Prime Minister personally and told him straight that I considered that we should have a party meeting to discuss that Budget, and he told me that he did not think so. My opinion was shared by other Members of the Government, and the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, Mr. Walsh, got up a round robin addressed to the Prime Minister, signed by practically every common member of the party, demanding a party meeting, and we had a party meeting and the Minister of Agriculture and Mines did not turn up.

HON. THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—Will you tell why? If you have a story to tell, you might as well tell it.

MR. CASHIN—I can tell the story all right. I want to tell the House all about it if Mr. Walsh is anxious, but I don't think he is.

HON. THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—Go ahead, I am only too pleased. I can tell that story too.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Walsh went to my father's house that night and got drunk, and he told him he was fed up with taxation, and he felt like leaving the Government. I was there that night. He stayed away from the House and the debate on the Budget, where he should have been to raise his voice on behalf of the interests of

the people. I went there and raised my voice against the Budget and protested on behalf of the people. He had not courage enough to do that but stayed away and got inebriated. so that he didn't know the Budget from a bale of hay, and he came down here when the meeting was in its dying moments and stood up in this House and said, perhaps it would be alright to take it, that the ten per cent. on lines and twines only amounted to twenty-five hundred dollars, whereas it amounted to twenty-five thousand dollars, and that it only figured out about thirty cents a man for every man in Newfoundland, or something of that nature. I saw the hon. Member that night. and I don't think he knew much about the Budget. The next day there was another round robin and he came to me and asked me to sign it. It was contradicting the one the previous day. and when I was asked to sign it I said I would not. It looked to me rather silly that I should sign one thing one day, and another thing showing a very different opinion the next day, and I said I would not. The Prime Minister made a reference to bitter enemies of this country. I want to tell the Prime Minister that I am no bitter enemy of this country. and some others he referred to are no bitterer enemies of this country anymore than he is. He came in yesterday afternoon and made a statement that he could not prove, and he came in this afternoon and made a wheening speech on the Budget. I regret just as much as the Prime Minister that the financial condition of Newfoundland is not all that it should be, or that it is desired it should be. I regret it just as much as he does, but as a Member of this House standing alone I feel it my duty to state it is the duty of the Finance Minister and of the Prime Minister and of the Executive Government to bring in a true statement, and they didn't do it, and the Prime Minister's own words corroborate that. I say it is deliberately deceptive. I would sympathize with the Government if they had come in and said, "Gentlemen, we find ourselves in an awkward position financially and we want your assistance." That was their duty, but what did they do? They came in here with a padded budget, and the Prime Minister practically corroborated that statement this afternoon, and makes no explanation as to why that Budget is passed, and expects members on this side of the House. me at least, not to say anything at all about it. I am supposed to have no right to say anything about it to the Finance Minister or the Prime Minister. I would ask the Prime Minister that if he was a large shareholder in a company on Water Street, and the Managing Director of that Company made a padded report of the finances of that Company showing it to be in credit when it was absolutely in debt, what would he say to that managaing director? I am of the opinion that his job would be gone inside of twenty-four minutes. not to speak of twenty-four hours, and I consider that the Prime Minister would be doing right in such a case, and I say that the same thing applies to that Budget. I have been "drawn into a trap," what is the trap? I say that this country has been drawn into a trap and the meshes of that trap are rather unusually small. The people of this country have been drawn into a trap by false promises. They were been drawn into a trap whose mesh must be I think half an inch. I have gone to considerable trouble to figure out what I have in connection with this Budget. It took me a week and when I had done so I was surprised to find it was in such a financial condition. I am willing to assist this or

any other Government under such conditions I am willing to help at any time to put this country on the map whether its Government be Monroe or Hickman or Cashin or Coaker or Warren. I say that the policy of this Government since it came into power has been not so much to put this country on the map, or to do their best in the interests of the country, but to help out anything that suits their own selfish ideas.

Not so much in the interests of the country as in the interests of their own selfish ideas. They have displayed selfishness and viciousness in every shape and form. They have been trying to get after other people. They have been trying to put them to the mat. And now they find themselves in the ridiculous position of being put to the mat themselves. Now Mr. Chairman, I am not seeking a general election, not that I am afraid to face the people that I went with the Government three years ago at their own request and tell them the conditions of affairs in the country and ask for re-election, but I feel that the Prime Minister knows that if the Government had to do the same that they would have a very difficult job indeed. Probably just as difficult a job as the Prime Minister had this afternoon attempting to explain that budget. They would find it a very difficult task indeed to get me out of the House. I feel that whist I am on my feet, that I should draw the attention of the House to the fact, that I do not think that you sir, as Chairman, of this Committee should be allowed to come in here and act in a dual capacity. A sort of reporter for the Daily News as well as Chairman of this Committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN—I want to draw your attention to the fact that you cannot reflect on the Chair.

MR. CASHIN—I am not reflecting on the Chair, but on the person who is in it. I feel that I had to do that, and I feel that it was my duty to do it. I carried out my duty before you became a member of this House. And I want you to understand and every member in this House, that I have just as much interest in Newfoundland to-day as any member in this House. And it ill becomes any man to come in her and to tell me that I don't know my duty. When I was called upon to do it I did it to the best of my ability. And I did not need any political pull to do it either. I was alright when I was in your party Mr. Chairman. You were alright when you were associated with me. Now the boot is on the other foot. Now I want to tell this House that you brought this row on yourselves this afternoon. The storm began with the Prime Minister when he got up here and termed me a wizard of finance. I have got to term him a "Clean up and keep clean and a square deal for all Premier." Mr. Chairman, I want to tell you this. If we had the same courage right here now, as those who did their duty three or four or six years ago had, that budget would never pass this House. It is deceptive, it is iniquitous and it is not true. And every member on your side knows it. The Prime Minister himself said that it was not correct. Now to-morrow I will get a lot of free advertising. To-morrow I will get the only thing that I don't have to pay for. Now I want to go further and say that I was out $200 000 in my estimate the other day. There was another $200,000 for interest that I did not add on. No wonder we would be short in our revenues. You are going to come in here to-morrow or the next day and then it will be my duty to vote for the loan that you have got to get to pay for your squandering during the past two years. We were told in one of your articles yesterday that I said that I could build the dock for nothing. Now

I did not say anything of the sort. But I would have found out what it was going to cost first. Surely you are not going to tell me right here now, as an ordinary business man, that common care and provision was taken when the constructing firm gave their estimates, and they persisted in saying when the job was half completed that they were living up to their contract, and now we find that they have gone 100 per cent. over it. You don't mean to tell me that that is good business. I venture the opinion that if that happened in the Prime Minister's own business, there would be something doing. And you don't mean to tell me that the railway is being run right. The railway to-day is in a despicable condition. It was recommended by someone, members on this side of the House, that a member should be appointed from this House, to look after the interests of Newfoundland in connection with the railway. The Prime Minister agreed to consider that suggestion, and then he came back a few days afterwards, and said that his Government did not consider that it was necessary to have a Minister or Chief Commissioner of Railways. I claim right now sir, that if he had to put Mr. Sullivan in that position, that he would have done something to stop the squandering and the waste that has been going on up there. Now because he is politically opposed to me does not mean that I should get up here, and attempt to belittle any ability that he may have, and call him the ignominious names that were insinuated at me across the floors of this House. Now let us see what this legislature has done, after its three months in session. We passed a dog Bill. We passed what is commonly now known as the Granny Bill. We threw out the Besco Bill, because the Prime Minister's own party would not stand for it, in spite of the fact that it has passed through the hands of the Executive Government and was signed by them. What else did we pass. We have a bill before us to-day in connection with local affairs. It may not have very much effect one way or the other. But surely you are not going to tell me that in three or four years to come, you are going to establish a Mayor in Logy Bay, in Broad Cove, in Cape Broyle, in Argentia, while we are neglecting the main industry of the country, the fishery, which we are all talking about especially at election time, members on this side of the House and on that side. We went to our constituents during the last general election, and we told the fishermen and the common people of Newfoundland, what we would do for them if we were returned, everyone of us. And what have we done. We have increased their taxes and the duties on the main articles of life. During the past week developments have taken place in this country and to-day the Government finds itself in the position of being discredited in the eyes of the people of Newfoundland. They have trust the blame on several people, myself included. But they can't throw the blame on me because I have been discrediting them as hard as I can ever since I left them. And the result of it is here now. Now sir, the Minister of Finance has told us that there is no increase of taxation. I say that there is a lot in that budget to-day which is going further. They are putting a tax of one and a quarter cents on codoil. They are putting a duty of fifty cents on every cask of oil coming into this country. Why is that. Because of a corporation in this country called the Imperial Oil Company. All the oil imported now has to go to the Imperial Oil Company in globo. Whilst if other people were allowed to import oil, they would import it in casks as they did before, and the fishermen of this country would derive a benefit in a

two fold way. To begin with they would save one and a quarter cents on the oil and they would have the cask besides to put their codoil in. This would be thrown in with the kerosene oil. The putting on of the duty and the cutting out of the cask was an attempt to protect local industries such as the Imperial Oil Company, in which certain members of the Government are interested. A lovely state of affairs. Should not the fishermen of this country get their gasolene as cheaply as they can, and is it not your duty to try and help them all you can. And have you done so, no. you have not. I suppose that I will be told to-morrow that I am repeating myself again when I tell you that you increased the duties on everything pertaining to the fishermen and the producing class of Newfoundland and helped yourselves. Is that doing good for the common people of Newfoundland. We had a debate in the House the other day regarding the Humber, and the Hotel. Both of which projects I supported. And concerning one of which I was insulted by the Prime Minister when I did support it. We have three thousand at the Humber and other places where industries are in operation. A total of twelve thousand men and the main industry of the country is not being helped in any shape or form. A petition was presented here the other day by the Member for Port de Grave, and backed by every member in this House, regarding the exportation of Labrador fish in steamers off the Labrador. And I hope and trust that that petition will not find its way to the same place as all other petitions do, and that is the waste paper basket. We have had fishery regulations in Newfoundland. We had the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition the other day explain the fishery regulations, and what happened to them. Now I say that you have got to have regulation of shipments out of Newfoundland soon or you will not ship any fish from Newfoundland at all. Because to-day if the Minister of Finance should take the trouble to go down to his department, and look up the records he will find that during the month that has passed, hundreds of Newfoundland fishermen have gone to the United States or Canada to fish, and why. They have gone up to Boston and Gloucester and fished there. And here we are almost all fishermen and our own legislature has not even attempted to make any kind of legislation which would help to improve in any way the basic industry of the country. On the contrary they have gone out of their way, I almost would say, to destroy the main industry of the country. To-day attempts are being made in connection with the main industry of the country to have it controlled by one man to a great extent. That will be a very great mistake. And when that happens if ever it happens, which I hope it won't, the fishermen of Newfoundland will have to move out.

Now to-morrow or the next day you will close this House, and you will go out from it as if nothing had happened. As if no one had left your ranks. But you will leave this legislature a discredited party, and no one knows that better than yourselves. You have been discredited by yourselves. Because your domination was supreme. It is regrettable that in any party two or three autocrats can control it. Mr. Lake and Mr. Moore and Mr. Bradley, these gentlemen can speak for themselves. I don't intend to attempt to help them out.

They have their own grievances as I have mine. But I want to tell them right here now, that if they had to stand together the other day, Newfoundland would be in a better position now than it is. If I had been the advance guard in any way, of destroying a Government, formed by the

capitaists of Newfoundland I feel proud of it. If I have been the advance guard of helping in some small measure to exterminate from public life of Newfoundland people who have betrayed the common people of this country, I am proud to be here this evening. You will never have good Government in any country until each and every man gets together and thrashes out the affairs in a business-like manner. Consider the pro's and con's in every shape and form. Legislation is brought in here, and the members of the Government rank and file know just as little about it as the members on this side, when it comes in. It is rammed down the throats of the rank and file, and they are told to vote for it or get out. Is that good Government. Now to get back to the Budget. Mr. Bradley's statement the other day did not help as far as I was concerned, or assist me to arrive at these figures. The first day that the House opened this year, I asked several questions regarding the fishery conditions of Newfoundland. These answers I have kept together. And I have been able to check up the budget according to the answers that I have received from time to time. It was merely a simple sum in addition and subtraction. And when the Budget did arrive and when I heard it read by the Minister of Finance I knew that it was not correct. And I was supposed then in order to please the Prime Minister and the Executive Government to let the budget pass. But if I did allow a thing like that to pass, I would not get any credit for it, but the Administration would go out of this House and they would boast of how they had put it all over the Opposition. They would not take the will for the deed. They would not say that these men over there did that for the good of Newfoundland. On the contrary they would ridicule them. Before you can attempt to belittle my opinion or the opinion of any member in this House you will have to come forward with your figures one by one, and there is the truth. Unless you can do that, my opinion stands confirmed.

Now it has been said that the District of Burin gets a huge sum of money during the past year or two for its roads and bridges. Now I knew before I heard Mr. Lake speak the other day that Burin District was the largest fishing district in Newfoundland. And why? because Burin District sends the largest number of bankers of Newfoundland to the Grand Banks. And I was one of the Members of this House who supported a petition presented by Mr. Lake for a bait depot in Burin, and at the time I advocated a bait depot in Ferryland District. and why? Mr. Lake will bear out this statement, that vessels from the Banks come into Ferryland to replenish their supply of bait and sometimes they have to wait for weeks at a time for it, during squid time. It is not so bad during the caplin schools. Sometimes they have to go as far as Holyrood, in Harbor Main district, for bait. I am not a practical fishermen, but I have lived among them; I was born among them, and I hope that when I die they will bury me among them. I do not feel like coming in here and being insulted, and having my family insulted by the Prime Minister, because I dare to assert my independence. I say now that the present administration has taken the taxes off business men and increased it on the goods coming in for the common man—deliberately legislating for the wealthy people of the country. And that sort of thing has caused revolution in other countries—it has been like throwing a red rag to a bull, because it is discrimination of the worst kind between classes. And in any country to-day most of the leaders are representative of the

common people, the people who come from the masses. Capital is the child of labour. but according to the Government of Newfoundland Capital is no longer the child of Labour, but Labour is the slave of Capital. The Income Tax is the fairest tax that we can have if it is properly handled; an income tax on incomes of $2000 of a married man is a little stringent, but I say that an Income Tax on incomes from $4000.00 upwards is fair. and no man who had an income of that amount, if asked to do so, would kick at paying out a small portion of it to the Exchequer of the country. Why? Because that $4000.000 which they earn comes directly or indirectly from the masses of the country, who keep the business of the country going—the fishermen, the labourers, the miners, papermakers of the country—everything comes from them.

We are confronted here by the Budget Speech of the Finance Minister, delivered here the other day, and as I sat here listening to it I said. "Sir John Crosbie knows now that that Budget is incorrect," and any one else could have seen the same thing. It is a very difficult thing for any man to get up in this House and read a statement that is not absolutely correct—very difficult! And why? Because he knows that unless he is opposed by some idiotic fools that his statements are going to be questioned. And it is our duty to criticize. You have been criticized in your own ranks, and I am in favour of that form of Government. You should have meetings and discuss every detail with your party. I don't know—probably you have done this, but what you ought to have done after the Budget was made the law of the land the other day was to have called a party meeting together and say, "This is not all that it looks." Soon you will want a loan, and I hope you will get it; I feel that Newfoundland is worth it, and I also hope that part of it at any rate will be raised in this country, as you should have done with the Hotel bonds.

Now, sir. I must submit again to this House that gentlemen on either side should not make statements they are not able to prove, and if they are unable to prove them they should be men enough to take them back. I think that the greatest proof that my statements were critically correct was for any man inside or outside the Bar of this House to hear the Prime Minister explain the Budget, when he said the deficits I mentioned were on capital account. Surely the Prime Minister does not need to tell me that I am such an idiot altogether that I did not know the differece between capital account and current account. But the difference is not made up on Capital account, it is made up on the current revenues, and on the general revenue of the railway, and I did not include the two millions spent on the dock, nor the two millions spent or to be spent on the Highroads; I did not include the one million six hundred thousand deficit from the previous Government, or the one million spent on re-railing the railway, or the five hundred thousand which it took to build the "Caribou"—these were spent on Capital account. Now I say here that this Government has spent 30 millions during the past two years, or $29,100,000 to be critically correct. They have spent at the rate of one million a month since they came into power. and since the revenue is ten millions a year, they have had a deficit of two million dollars each year. I have asked a question this afternoon in connection with the balances to the credit of the country in each of the Banks of the country, and how much we owe and to whom it is owed. I know that if I get this statement accurately to-morrow New-

foundland will know its financial condition, and that we have gone over 3 millions in debt during the past two years. We owe $3,150.000 now.

Now, sir, as the debate on the Budget goes on I shall possibly have more to say. If the Government does not want to have me do so, as they evidently do not, I suggest that they call a meeting to-night, and have me thrown out; put it in the rules of the House that I am not allowed to speak; that I am not allowed to have an opinion, that I am merely an imbecile, as the Prime Minister evidently would like. Put it down that I am only a revolutionary and that I am not a decent citizen. Put it down that I am not to express an opinion, and you get to the final stage of autocracy in Newfoundland, because everything else has been attempted by the present administration. But, sir, I do not feel that the Government wants that —they should welcome the criticism of a constructive nature, which I have given, and which has been brought out by the Prime Minister this afternoon. I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that a rule be put in that would have the desired effect. That the gentlemen who are politically opposed to this administration would be court-martialled to-morrow and shot at dawn the following day, in order to satisfy the political autocrats of Newfoundland. I would suggest that you have us deported and sent to the Fiji Islands where we could interview the geologist of whom we have heard so much, and after you do that you will find that you are political Robinson Crusoes. But I know your man Friday, and fortunately he is not very much liked in this country, and if he remained behind the party with which he was associated it would not last long.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as certain old members have said before me with these few words and this little timely advice I shall close. The Prime Minister has stated that he is not an expert politician, and everyone will agree with him, and neither am I, but he has to live and I have to live, and I say "Live and let live," and do not attempt to weigh down this country by taxation on a people already overburdened.

MINISTER. OF. AGRICULTURE AND MINES.—When I came into the House this afternoon I had no desire and no intention to take any part in the debate. I was content to sit and listen to the criticism coming from the opposite side of the House. And, like the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, I like to listen to the gallant Major offering suggestions — I do not doubt but there is much information that he is able to give. I would not now take any part were it not for the fact that the member who last spoke has seen fit to make a nasty insinuation against me personally. I will refresh his mind—he stated that he had a story to tell of the Budget of a year ago when it was brought in by the Minister of Finance. He stated that a round robin was got up by the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, which contained a request to call a party meeting. That was signed by some 12 or 14 members, of whom he was one. He said that the Minister of Agriculture and Mines failed to turn up. Asked why, he said it was because I was drunk. That is the statement he made, and I deny absolutely the charge of being drunk. And I think it ill becomes the gallant Major, to whom I take off my hat as I did to all the men who went to the defence of our country and constitution, to conduct himself as he has. I do not think it reflects any credit on this House of Assembly to make such insinuations here to-day. I did get up a round robin which other members signed—it is quite correct that I, as

well as other members, hate to see any extra taxation put on the people of the country. Ever since I have held a seat in this House, for 14 years now, my voice has always been raised in the interests of the common people, of the people I represent. I came in here with the party led by Sir Edward Morris, in 1913, In 1914 the Great War commenced, and 1916 or 1917, I forget which now, an amalgamation of forces took place, when Sir William Coaker, and Mr. Lloyd, who was then leader of the Opposition, formed. an amalgamation with the Government.

The principal reason of this was to put into effect a proclamation which the people of this country were at the time absolutely opposed to. At the time I held a commission from the Government which brought me $1,000.00 a year—I was a poor man, as I am now, but I had no hesitation in throwing up that commission and taking my seat with the Opposition—I went into the wilderness, so to speak, and raised my voice against the Government. I remained there until the Government of Sir William Lloyd went out on a vote of want of confidence, and Sir Michael Cashin formed a Government in which I accepted the portfolio of Agriculture and Mines. Now, Mr. Chairman, I regret very much the fact that I have to make personal statements to the House and the country at this time, when the country is looking for something else. We are faced with as grave and serious a crisis as the country has had since responsible government, and it is not interested in the fact that Walsh was absent from a meeting because he was drunk or not. The country wants to know if the Monroe Government is going to remain in spite of the insidious and disreputable actions of people who ought to have known better. They want to know if there are enough gentlemen with sufficient interest in their country to say, "They shall not pass," and I must apologize to the House and to the visitors for having to make such a statement. I did go to Sir Michael Cashin's house,—that was over a year ago—and it is not I who am to blame for bringing the honourable member's father's name in here. Sir Michael Cashin and I have been friends for a long while except for two or three intervals—this is another and possibly it is the last. And we did talk over the revenues of the country, and taxation. I have been interested in the District of Placentia for years and any man knows that we must have money for the fishery to go on. Now, sir, on that occasion, one year ago, during my absence from the House, overtures were made to me for the purpose of disrupting the Monroe Government—that if I got out and vacated my seat in the Government I would not lose a dollar, that my salary would be paid monthly, half yearly or yearly, as I wished. I think it is a fair judgment of my capability of looking after my district when I took my seat here instead and defended the attitude of the Prime Minister and of the Finance Minister on the Budget. That is a serious statement to make, but I make it coldly and deliberately. It is common knowledge that recently tens of thousands of dollars have been ordered to men to walk across the floors of this House and break the Government to satisfy the personal spite of some men, and to enable them to come in and do what they have been doing in the past, and God knows we have had enough of that. In 1924 Walter S. Monroe got a body of men around him, and after two years we were just getting the country on an even keel when this contemptible plot was hatched to bring us down. And this is an occasion where

the country, north and south, east and west, has joined hands, but for a few heelers, out for personal gain—a few disgruntled ones because Mr. Monroe would not give them all they wanted, and we will find no decent people in the country to sanction the tactics of these men. Now, I had no desire to enter into this debate or to discuss the Budget, because the Hon. Prime Minister has said enough in a few words to satisfy anyone on it, and the Finance Minister will have an opportunity to defend every line of it. I wish and hope, that if any gentleman has any attack to make on me it will be in my public capacity; I do not think any man here wants to take up the public press and read such contemptible and insulting charges as have been made here to-day. At no time since I sat in this House have I been in an unfit condition to carry on my duties. When I sat there in Opposition I talked until the perspiration ran down into my boots, but I have never had any such dirty, contemptible insinuations directed to me as the hon. member has hurled at me this afternoon.

MR. LAKE—Mr. Chairman, the Hon. the Prime Minister saw fit to connect my name with that of the Hon. A. B. Morine again.

I think that I made it clear to this House a few days ago when I left the party and I do not want to do so again.

I was disgruntled, as I said, last year over the income tax. Why should I not be disgruntled over the income tax?

I have figures before me that show that forty-five thousand dollars only were the income tax collected on incomes from one thousand dollars to two. I say like the Hon. Member for Ferryland that there was very little of this money paid by the fishermen. Mr. Monroe knows and the country knows that very few fishermen can afford to pay or earns enough to pay income taxes.

Few fishermen make five hundred dollars let alone two thousand dollars.

I think that it was disgraceful for the Government not to keep on the income tax. $202,373 from incomes from six to eight thousand dollars. Why should not the men who earn from six to eight thousand dollars pay income taxes? 9,000 dollars between eight and ten thousand dollars. Over twenty-nine thousand dollars on incomes between ten and twenty thousand dollars. Fourteen thousand dollars between twenty and thirty thousand income. $4,900 between thirty and forty thousand. $8,990 between fifty and a hundred thousand.

I think that any man who has been a fisherman and represents fishermen should stand by them and protect them and try to reduce taxation instead of increasing the taxation on lines and twines and that class of goods.

I took up the Daily News this morning and saw that six children were left fatherless because their father was drowned, what has the country done to help these fishermen. The other day we were going to bring in an insurance bill. Insurance for whom? Not for that mother or six children, but for the men in the civil service with big fat salaries. These men were fishing out of Grand Bank, Newfoundland and I defy contradiction, in a schooner belonging to Mr. Wm. Forsey, Grand Bank, Newfoundland.

MR. BROWNE—Mr. Chairman, my information was what I read in the Daily News this morning, that these men were fishing out of Nova Scotia and belonged to Harbor Breton and if they came under the Nova Scotia law they would be looked after and I did not cast any personal reflection upon the hon. member himself and I do not think that it is right for the hon.

member to make the remark that he has made. I do not think that the hon. member should cast any such reflections across the floors of the House.

MR. LAKE—I am sorry if I have said anything to ruffle the feelings of my friend Mr. Browne. The two fishermen drowned off Nova Scotia in the schooner Christer and Elinor belonging to Mr. William Forsey, Grand Bank, Newfoundland.

They do not come under the Nova Scotia Act.

Then this insurance bill was brought in the other day to give insurance to those who are already getting big fat salaries, and I object that such a thing should be brought before this House and I am going to object as long as I can.

The Prime Minister connected my name with the Hon. A. B. Morine and I was the one man who had courage to tell Mr. Monroe that I did not wish to be in a party with which Mr. Morine was associated.

I stated that eighty-five per cent. of the party did not want Mr. Morine but no man stood up in his seat to support me. But when we left the meeting one man said to me that ninety-five per cent. of the party did not want Mr. Morine.

Maybe there is one. And if it were put to a vote I do not believe that there is one man in the party that would say that he wants to have Mr. Morine there.

I do not think that the Prime Minister was quite fair to us when we did not know that Mr. Morine was included within the ranks of the party. I have nothing to say about the Prime Minister. It would not become me to say anything about the Prime Minister. I never have.

The Prime Minister referred to the Burin dock as being given some of the money that was given to Burin District. Last year we begged the Government to help to lift the debt off the Burin dock and they loaned the Burin dock thirty-five thousand dollars. And in all sincerity why should they not loan the Burin dock thirty-five thousand dollars when they are spending about two millions of dollars on a dock in the West End of St. John's, also spending two millions of dollars on highroads when the West Coast has not as much as a road where you can drive a horse and carriage. We have no roads over which you can drive automobiles and then you are spending two millions on highroads and expect me to come in here and be satisfied. I am glad to hear the Prime Minister state that I have been demanding money ever since I have been in this House.

I am glad that he has said that because it will show the people of Burin that I have been trying to do what I promised them I would.

This morning the Daily News says that the third man left the ranks of the Government because of megalomania.

I am a fisherman and I had to go fishing to make a living and I want to say that I have an idea that I think the man who wrote that tried and could not be elected in Burin district. I do not pretend to be an educated gentleman and I do not know what that means, but if he is the man I think he is I will let him know what I think of him and why he did not get elected in the District of Burin.

I do not want him calling me any dirty names.

I want to tell the Prime Minister that I did not do any dirty work. I did not try to buy anyone and no one tried to buy me, because I have an independent spirit.

What we want in this country is to clean up and keep clean and give everybody a square deal.

I have not seen very much of the clean up but I must confess that the Hon. Minister of Finance's depart-

ment has been cleaned up but in the others there is little sign of it.

They are squandering money in every direction and the interest is now three million six hundred thousand dollars on the public debt and the people of the country and the fishermen of the country have to pay the debt, the people who go fishing from December to January and they do not come down here to work on the highroads or the hotel or the dock or anything else.

I told the Prime Minister that I did not like certain gentlemen and I do not see why I should take it back. I do not intend to take it back.

I stand for a square deal to all. But I do not want to see two million dollars spent on highroads when the district of Burin is neglected and the district of Fortune is neglected and the district of Burgeo is neglected, when these people catch a quarter of the shore catch of fish of the country. I did not intend to come to the House this evening to make a speech.

I made the explanation as to why I left the party and I think that was good enough and with these few remarks I will take my seat.

MR. MOORE—The Prime Minister was good enough to mention my name in connection with some dirty work while I was a member of his party. I made an explanation the other day with regard to my position when I crossed over and I do not think that it is necessary to go over the ground again. I was a strong supporter of Mr. Monroe's party and a loyal supporter, and I say that without contradiction until last Tuesday night. Five of us got together to discuss the Budget. I might say now that while we were at the meeting the budget was not altogether what occupied the time of the evening. We were swapping stories about what happened in the past in elections. I went home. I did not think anything more about it at the time. I heard that there were stories going around in connection with the Budget being falsified. I spoke to the Hon. Mr. Sullivan about it on the street. I said there is something wrong with the Budget and I expected better from you. He still denied it. After the meeting I went home. The next day I was called by Mr. Bradley over the phone to come to his office and he passed me a letter that he had received from the Prime Minister. Nothing at all happened in between that time as far as I am concerned. I called at Mr. Bradley's office and he showed me the letter. Mr. Lake happened to come in at the time. Mr. Lake said he thought it was a pretty high-handed action. I said "If that is the case as far as I am concerned I am going to stand by you." I telegraphed Mr. Little to come up that the Budget was going to be presented and he telegraphed back, "Owing to business affairs cannot possibly be at St. John's. Sorry!" Lewis Little. I telegraphed Mr. Lake and I made the statement in the room before five or six of the party that were in there playing cards that I had wired both of them. Sir John Crosbie said that it was unnecessary to wire Mr. Lake that he would be present Monday. Sir, I make the statement to show you and the House that I am sincere in what I say. I have no desire to keep the House open. I have no desire to embarrass the Government, on the contrary I am prepared to help the Government in every way.

MR. BRADLEY—I had thought that the dirty linen that it was necessary to air in this House was aired yesterday afternoon. I had thought that the assertions that you had to make against the members that had crossed the House you had made. I had little idea how much money was floating around the country for the

benefit of impoverished politicians until Mr. Walsh rose to his feet. He has informed us that on various occasions he has been approached and offered this amount and that amount and the other amount. Apparently he is very important. Much more important than I appeared to be myself because I have to admit that not on a single occasion has any one offered me one cent or anything else. The Prime Minister saw fit to refer to me again this afternoon. He referred to the statement that I made yesterday afternoon in connection with the Budget. First I want to repeat what I said yesterday afternoon that when Major Cashin gave these figures I had no idea that he was going to do it. I had no knowledge that these figures were in his possession. I had no communication whatever with Major Cashin and I had no communication with him whatever and I know nothing about the figures that his speech revealed. The Prime Minister comes in here and makes the statement and from what he said you would think that someone was going to steal a million dollars. Make it ten while we are at it. There is no need of the use of my statement now because your own statement pursuant to Major Cashin's statement is good enough for me and good enough for the people of the country. They understand the situation now. I want to state here again once and for all that I was not bought by anybody. I have not got a dollar from anybody or anything else. The Prime Minister also made the statement that I was satisfied with the Budget at the last Executive Council meeting. If the Prime Minister will carry his mind back he will know that I was not satisfied. He will know that I made the statement that there were certain matters that would recoil upon our own heads. He knows perfectly well that I left the Council meeting in a very bad frame of mind that night, and my hon. friend Mr. Sullivan knows that in speaking with him going down the stairs that night I said that I did not like the look of things. If the Prime Minister will carry his mind back a little further he will recall that I said that I was not satisfied that a new six million dollar loan should be raised on the credit of the colony unless the million dollars for the highroads were diverted from the course in which it is going to be spent now. The hon. the Prime Minister will remember that across the Executive Board one meeting I flung a challenge at him when I asked when an effort was going to be made to reduce the taxation in this country. I said that we had come to the parting of the ways and that we had to conduct the affairs of the country as the politicians had done in the past or that we had to run the colony on a business basis. I told him that I was satisfied to go to my own district and cut right and left even if it meant absolute defeat for me in the next general election. You talk about our actions here tending to make a general election in this country. There is nothing further from my mind than a general election at the present time, and I am satisfied that the gentlemen who have crossed the floors of the House do not want a general election any more than I do. I wish to refer to another matter. I want to draw the attention of this country to the position of the fishermen of the country to-day. I can speak perhaps more familiarly with the Labrador fishery because the associations of my constituents is all with the Labrador fishery. Personally I have very little knowledge of the fishery although I am the son of a fisherman but I have drawn my information from the men who have spent all their lives fishing. I want to tell you that

the fishermen who got a fair catch of Labrador fish and sold at five dollars could only about square his accounts. I am told this year by fish exporters that the price of Labrador is likely to be about four dollars. Mr. Chairman, will you tell me how in the name of goodness how a man can prosecute the Labrador fishery in this country. Yet there are millions spent on highroads and docks and not a cent for the staple industry of the country. That is my kick, sir. In conclusion, I want to say this: —I want to see this country governed as well as it possibly can be and I am prepared to do my best no matter what side of the House I am on to see that everybody gets fair play. and I state again that the fishermen of the country have not got fair play. They have demanded bread and you have given them a stone, and the only thing they can do is to read the pious platitudes that come from the Government newspapers who sit with hands folded placidly over capacious paunches and say they are better than other men.

MR. LITTLE,—Mr. Chairman, yesterday evening I thought that this was ended. I did not intend to throw anything to-day across the House. You remember what I said the other evening. I made no reflections on no one. I just gave the statement as to why I left the other side of the House. The Hon. Mr. Monroe got up and he accused me of having personal reasons. Now I did not like that. I think that I have a right to my grievance as well as any other man and I do not see why I should not have the right to defend myself. The Prime Minister referred to the steamship last spring. I am going to bare myself right bare. I am going to keep nothing in. I am living down in Bonavista and I do not know but that I am living in a little hell. You might say that I have not had a home for three years. I would like to know for what. I could not stand it any longer. I came up last year and said that they had to do something to help me out. I am not a man that can refuse a widow a handout. If I have a fifty cent bit I give it to her. I do not say this to praise myself. My home was a hotel. Finally I had to do something that I could make a few dollars at in my spare time and that would not be of any loss to the country. I did not ask for a job. I asked for that ship. I said that I had to have something or I would have to resign my seat. They gave me the Sagona. I went out and like a good many men who went out for the first time my first trip was a failure. But I did as well as anyone else with the young fat although it was said around town that I would not get the ship through the narrows. I got her out and I got her in. I got her out the same way as I got my seat in the House of Assembly through energy and pluck and an independent spirit, and that was why I was independent enough to take my seat from that side of the House and bring it over to this. This is a free country and I will use my own mind as I please without any interference. To get back to the steamer. Every one knows the kind of a spring that we had last year. We would have got the seals; I knew my position when we got a call from the Stella Maris and you know what happened. And I am sure that but for that thing I would have got a trip of seals. I consider that I did not have a fair deal. I came in here and the Government did not tell me that I could have that ship again this spring and I did not know until the time came for the steamers to go to the ice that I was not to have her. The people in the district were expecting berths. The Prime Minister said we

got the forty thousand dollars. But it was not since this Government came into power. There has not been one dollar spent there since then. You decided that there would have to be something done in Bonavista and there has not been a dollar spent there since. Do you expect me to go down to the district after four years and say to the people I asked for money to do something in Bonavista and I could not get it. I told the Prime Minister when we were going around the district that if I were not treated fair I would jump. Now he knows that is true and now for the interest of the House I will tell a little story that I used to tell. It is this: There was a ship that got becalmed close to the shore and one of the sailors went for a swim or a bath or whatever you might call it, and while he was in the water a crocodile got after him. The crocodile is one side of the Government. He swam and he dived and at last he got near the shore and there he found a tiger ready to receive him. He did not know what to do but at last he dived under the crocodile and left it to the tiger to fight it out with the crocodile. Mr. Chairman, that is what decided me to come out into politics one morning about three o'clock as I lay on my bed. I said that I would do like the man did with the crocodile. The two sides have come together and let them fight it out. Now we will come back to the hole in the pond. Ten thousand dollars was promised last spring. I do not know anything more about that ten thousand dollars than this gentleman here knows about it, and the only thing I know is that I was sent down to Bonavista to put men to work. But how could I do that without money to pay the men. I waited a week, three weeks, and I am waiting yet. Now that is not all. I am a fisherman and I am not ashamed because I am a fisherman to stand here on the floors of this House of Assembly although I cannot speak as gramatically as some of my friends. But I am not afraid of anyone. I have not lived out of the Government and I have paid thousands of dollars more into the revenue of this country than lots of others on the floors of this House to-day. Why should I be ashamed to stand here I would like to know. I am not going to say anything about the Prime Minister, not till I am driven to it. Now, supposing a man in any business was not treated rightly, supposing a bookkeeper had the foot put down on him would he stand for it. He would not be a man if he would. If the Government said to me last spring: "Little, we cannot give you the steamer this spring." But that was not done. I was not told the intention of the Government until I got a wire from Mr. Monroe about the first of March that it was not the intention of the Government to send out the ship this spring and then, sir, there was no intimation of any provision that was made for me. I did not have one friend on the other side of the House to speak in my behalf. If it was for the benefit of the people at large I was willing to suffer. If I had that ship this spring I would have a load of fat. And you expect me to stand for that. I am not going to stand for it. Now, I went down in Bonavista district in 1924 and I preached cutting down of expenditure and the waste of the past Governments. There was no reduction in expenditure and that shows that what I have done is the right thing. I was not asked to do what I have done. I did it of my own free will. Mr. Chairman, I know the conditions of the people. I know that they are suffering now and you expect me to come here on the floors of the House of Assembly and stand for that. Now I

would like to ask what has been done for the fishermen for the last three and a half years. Soon you will have to go out of Newfoundland to find a man who will know how to hoist a sail. There are thousands of dollars going in speculative enterprises and not a cent for the fishermen. Why did not the Government go to work and build schooners at 5 p.c. interest until they were paid for and send them to the fisheries, and then you would be able to get some revenue out of them. Now sir, I would like to ask you when you made the statement just now that some of the members left the party for personal reasons did you mean me? Now the Prime Minister has come across the House the second time. He does not care how he hurts my feelings. I gave a clear statement of why I crossed the floors of this House and the first time that the Prime Minister fell down in my estimation, and I am going to spare him now. See how lenient I am. There was the time that I came up here to get work for some of my men last year. I will spare you until I am forced to do it. I will be asked when I get back to Bonavista what good I am. They will say 'what did we put you on the floors of the House for?' Now because I am trying to do my duty someone is going back on me. I do not care if every man in the district is going back on me. I came to you about it. Your answer was that money did not grow on rose-bushes. Every man has his feelings. We are all made alike. Mr. Speaker, I have taken my stand here as an independent. No dollars or cents have been offered me directly or indirectly. But there was an offer made to me from the Government to give me the very thing that they took from me last spring.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I really thought that before any progress would be made in connection with the Budget that the Finance Minister would take up the challenge with regard to the charges made by the Independent members of this House, and I think that the matter should be cleared up before we proceed with any discussion on the Budget. I do not mean by that that the business of the House should be held up. On the contrary, charges have been made and they should be refuted or otherwise. The Prime Minister referred to those charges, but he thought he was not to blame and tried to disprove them by stating that this was the business of the Finance Minister. I think that now is the opportunity for the Finance Minister to disprove any insinuations that have been made with regard to the Budget. We were told that the deficit on the railway for 1924-25 would be wiped out by the earnings of 1925-26. But what do we find? We find that during that period the loss would be something like $650,000, at a conservative estimate. That alone will give the people of this country a correct estimate of the financial conditions of things. Is it desirable or profitable to have the only transportation service we have to spend that amount of money per year? Personally I would really like for the Finance Minister to make a statement different even from what we are led to believe with regard to the railway. During the last few days I understand that Water Street has been in a state of excitement over the propaganda that has been broadcasted and which might have a calamitous effect in connection with a general election. Having regard for the financial condition of the country is the reason why the people of th ecountry do not want a general election, not but they want a change of Government. The very attitude of the members who have left the Government ranks shows that they only express the opinion of the people of the country with regard to the present Government. The people who have left the Governmnt cannot

be looked upon as traitors. No, but by their actions they meant what they told the people who elected them. They told their constituents that they were going to carry out their policy of reduction of taxation and reduction of expenditure, but their actions by visionary schemes and squandermania have proved otherwise. We should cut our garment according to our cloth; and the fisheries of the country should be fostered and protected and if necessary a bonus on fish should be given, if the finances of the country warrant it. The Prime Minister and his colleagues were elected principally through spreading the propaganda that bonus would be given on fish. But nothing has been done in that direction; two millions of dollars has been expended on the Highroads. The spending of such a huge amount of money on the Highroads has caused the disintegration of the Government Party more than anything else by those men who did not approve of the policy of the Government. Mr. Chairman, the Government is defeated whether they resign or not. There are men on the Government side who would not sit one hour longer with the Government if they went by their own convictions. But they are afraid of the stigma of being called a traitor. Why? The Government themselves have broken every promise on which they were elected. As a matter of fact these men are traitors to their country while they remain where they are. By your actions, particularly by the tariff you put on last year, you are making this country unfit for men to live in and young men are consequently making their way out of this country every other day by train and steamer as quickly as they can.

A tremendous amount of money was spent in the country during the years 1924-1925, more than was for the three or four years previous to that, but what is the condition of the country to-day? Last year the Government kept itself going and relieved unemployment by spending millions of dollars on capital account. Two million dollars were spent on the dock; a million on the railway; and a hundred thousand on rerailing in connection with the street railway; and so in that way unemployment was kept away. More men were employed at the hotel. It would be hard to imagine a man in St. John's being out of work who was able and willing to work and quite a number of men from the outports got employment also. What is the situation facing you at the present time, however? The dock is finished, the hotel is finished and nothing more can be done to the railway unless we borrow a million dollars. You have a million to spend on the highroads but for goodness sake don't spend it like the rest has been spent on highroads. We will have to come in and vote another loan for the country. We will have to vote it whether we like it or not, to keep the country from starvation during the next twelve months When you have it, spend it where it will be of best assistance to the people Spend it on roads that will be used in a way that will help industries depending on them for transportation Spend it so as to encourage people to produce so that they will benefit themselves and the country at large Don't spend seven or eight thousand dollars a mile to make roads good for tourists. That is enough to make the angels weep. Can this country afford to spend seven thousand dollars on a mile of road where there is no engineering to be done? A number of men were employed by Mr. Cochius to watch tripods,—four or five sticks, so as to make the motor cars go a certain way and not make ruts. One would imagine from things like that that we had the revenue of Canada. That is altogether out of keeping with what should be in this country, and a whole

lot more than we can afford in a country where we have to get our wealth from the sea and the forest. This is not a country that should expend huge sums of money on a tourist policy, in the matter of making roads for tourists. In Canada it is possible to get tourists to come in their motor cars because of such inducements as liquor in Quebec, and because goods can be brought back across the border in motor car duty free some times. It is a different matter altogether here, where we are cut off from Canada and the United States, and if wealthy people want to come here with a motor car they have to ship it here. I don't think it is very likely that many people are anxious to come down here like that and bring their motor cars. You can go whistle for wealthy tourists. The class of people who are likely to come here are those who want a holiday, not very wealthy, who are just anxious to spend a holiday at the fishing pools. They come down and stay about a week or so. What is the good of the Hotel, which is supposed to become a great thing for tourists, to such as those? If you had a hotel built out somewhere near the fishing pools it would be more acceptable. We are told that we would not have this hotel if it were not for the tourist policy. Last year we guaranteed the capital on the hotel, and we have guaranteed interest on it. We have guaranteed capital and interest on $450,000. Anybody would build a hotel if capital and interest were guaranteed. What we want is for more independent men to take their seats from the Government side of the House and bring about a change in the policy under which Newfoundland is now being run. There is a great outcry about the undesirability of a general election, in the event of its coming to a change of Government. There is no need of a general election for a change of policy. I say that the Prime Minister has not the confidence of the country, and if I were over there in his party I would not say general election or no election. Does it follow that a general election would take place even if the Government was defeated? The Administrator would ask the Prime Minister whom he would recommend to carry on the Government. It would be no trouble for some man to form a Government that would change the highroads policy at a stroke of the pen, and do something for the fisheries too. I submit that I am disappointed in the Prime Minister, and he is a disappointment to his constituents and to the country. Has there ever been heard tell of such a thing in the annals of parliamentary history; his own colleague leaving him on principle. That is what Mr. Little has done to the Prime Minister. The steamer that has been referred to was not the chief reason. The principal reason was that he could not tell his constituents that the policy on which he was elected would be put into force. He saw a different policy of which he did not approve and he was helpless, and I sympathise with the honourable member at the life he would have to live among his constituents at Bonavista. The Prime Minister's Government is practically and morally defeated. It is immoral for a man to hold a position on behalf of the country that he knows the country does not want him to occupy. Such a man is a traitor to the country and not those who leave the ranks of such men. A man who practised bribery and corruption could be tried in the courts and he could be disqualified to hold a seat, but the Prime Minister can make promises of a policy and be elected on that policy, and when in office make no attempt to carry out that policy, but instead pursues a policy as far apart from it as the North from the South Pole. The people of the country are the jury in

connection with that and they know what was promised and they know what was performed, and they will decide accordingly, and will condemn such an action. You are defeated at the present time, and I wonder at the Prime Minister holding on in office, in spite of the fact that five Members of his party have left him in principle purely, because they could not go back to their constituents and say that the Monroe Party was carrying out the policy on which it was elected. Independent spirited men are being sacrified on principle and the Prime Minister is allowing it. Go to the Administrator and say "I am not wanted. The man on whom I relied chiefly for advice is not wanted. I cannot do so on the advice of the other members of the Executive. I cannot trust them. They are not qualified to advise me. I must have Morine and since they will all be leaving me if I keep Morine, I must resign." That is the proper attitude and the proper action for the Prime Minister to take, and I give him that advice gratuitously. I just want to make this point so that I will not be misunderstood. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Monroe practically told us that he was inexperienced and wanted someone to give him advice; that he was anxious to get the best possible advice, and that Mr. Morine was a great help to him. That confirms my opinion that Mr. Monroe must have Mr. Morine.

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.

when the House rises, it adjourn until to-morrow, Friday, afternoon at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

It was moved and seconded that

FRIDAY, May 28th, 1926.

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

Petitions were presented by

Mr. Brown from Grand Falls re road.

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. LAKE—Mr. Chairman, I wish to say a few words in reply to a few remarks that have been made. I have listened to the remarks that were made yesterday, and it seems it was gathered by some people that there was a lot of money flying around during the last few days, and that Major Cashin had struck the "main patch" and bought some of us over. I want to tell this House that as far as I am concerned I don't think I have yet struck the "main patch," for Cashin or no one else bought me over, and I want to make myself clear on that point. I am a free and independent citizen and a free and independent representative of the District of Burin, and I want to make myself clear before the House and the country that I am now in a position whereby I can vote any way I wish. I was not bought. I came over of my own free will and accord, and I want to make that statement very clearly. Two days ago I made a remark here that I did not want any general election, and I want to confirm that statement here now; not, that I am afraid of going back to the District of Burin,

for I feel sure of my election in that District when I do go back with whatever Party may consider me fit to go back with. Further, I may say that I think it is about time that this House got down to business so that some of us can get away to our business in the outports and do some work for our personal benefit, and to produce something to help the revenue of the country. That is all I have to say.

I merely wanted to make myself clear on my independent position here in this House. For a while this afternoon I almost thought I was going to be alone over here in this corner. I thought I was going to be deserted by the other independents. I am quite prepared to stand over here alone. I merely wanted to make myself clear on those points and on my independent position here.

MR. HICKMAN—Arising out of the remarks made by the Prime Minister yesterday, and before further explanation of the Budget, I want to say a few words to put myself clear with the House. No doubt the Minister of Finance will give us a full explanation this afternoon as to what happened in reference to the Budget. The honourable member for Ferryland has charged that the Budget is changed. His charges were substantiated by the member for Port de Grave, Mr. Bradley, and yesterday confirmed by the Prime Minister. If the Budget has been changed there is some purpose for changing it, and I think that the House should know the reason. Yesterday the Prime Minister made reference to a general election. I might tell the House that members on this side of the House don't want a general election this spring, and so that the House may get through and the members from the Outports may be able to get home and get down to business, we are quite prepared and quite satisfied for the Government to pass the Ways and Means, and are satisfied to arrange with the Government or the Prime Minister to put through such legislation as is necessary for the country to carry on. They are prepared to hear what the Government have to say, in connection with the matter of a loan and will give them all the assistance we can. We will not of course agree to the raising of any money for squandering like has been done in the past, but in connection with any reasonable amounts necessary for the carrying on of the country, we are in accord with them. There is some legislation on the Order Paper which is not necessary, and I think that could possibly be eliminated.

Now, I do not want to follow along the same lines that have been followed along by everybody even by the Prime Minister yesterday, in connection with the highroads policy, the dock and the tourist policy. That has all been covered many times, but I would like to make a few remarks in reply to the Prime Minister in reference to the Income Tax. He stated yesterday that I was not in favour of the Income Tax. My views were much the same as his on the injustice of the Income Tax. I consider that the Income Tax in the form it was in, was very unfair. It compelled employees and clerks to pay an income Tax, because the employer was forced to give the Assessor's Dept., a list of his employees and the salaries they received, and these people had to pay Income Tax according to that, and at the same time people in the outports, fishermen and others who could not be got at but who should under the Act have paid a Tax did not pay it, and I was for that one reason against the income tax. It is not that I have any objection to paying my Income Tax as I have always paid it. I have objected or have disagreed with the idea of income tax for that particular reason and in that particular manner, but it does not

follow that I am against the principle of income tax altogether. If an income tax could be imposed that would bear only on the shoulders of those well able to pay, I might have a different view altogether on the subject.

The Prime Minister said yesterday, at least I inferred from what he said that the present condition of things, I presume he meant financially, was due to this upheaval in the Government. I do not agree with the Prime Minister that such is the case, for he knows as a business man that it has been very difficult for men who come here to look for supplies to get these supplies. Many have refused to supply those whom they supplied before. I have one case in mind of a man who came here and raised money on a Life Insurance policy to get supplies for the spring.

I want to assure the House that we are not responsible for the House being in session at the present time. The House opeend three months ago and for some time the Government were not ready with its legislation. Considerable time was spent in discussing the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, but we discovered if we had not occupied the time of the House by that discussion the House would have had to adjourn as it did many times during the session. The public accounts are supposed to be placed on the Table of the House within ten days after opening. We insisted on having them placed on the Table of the House and sixteen days after opening they were tabled loose leaf, unbound. We had gone far into the session when we discovered that the Estimates were not printed and the Government had no legislation ready, and I think that the Government are to blame for the present state of affairs and the House being in session at this late date.

A charge has been made that members who have crossed the floors of the House to this side were induced to do so, were bought to come over. I do not think that is the case at all. I think that the members who have crossed the floors of the House did not make their decision in a day or in a week. They have been disgusted and dissatisfied with the policy of the Government for more than a year, and now at this stage it has come to a time when they have made a decision and crossed the floors of the House purely as a protest against the policy of the Government.

We are ready, as I have said, to meet the Prime Minister and discuss any legislation that is necessary and have the House close for this session, so that there be no general election sprung upon the public this spring to do anything damaging to the trade of the country, and I think that on this side of the House we are all of the same mind and are willing to cooperate to get through necessary legislation and have the House close as soon as possible.

MR. SCAMMELL—I feel that the Leader of the Opposition has thrown out to the Government a suggestion which the Government is not very well in a position to reasonably refuse. I submit that they ought to proceed to the transaction as appears to be needed for the general conduct of affairs for the coming year, with all dispatch and close the House for the present session in as short a time as possible. What is absolutely necessary only should be gone ahead with, and anything that does not fall within that class should be cancelled from the Order Paper and deferred with any other legislation not pressingly needed, for next session, so that we may look for prorogation within a short time. As the suggestion is a fair and reasonable one in view of the late date at which the House is now open I think both sides of the House will agree that this course should be pursued. As far as I am personally concerned it is not my intention to

delay the time of the House for any matter that I do not consider necessary, and that I am called upon in duty bound to comment upon, and I heartily agree with the suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition. I still feel that I have a duty to discharge in connection with the present Committee. I feel that I must give expression to some opinion as regards the Budget now before the House. I do not propose to be lengthy but intend saying a word or two on the subject. I have listened with great interest to the debate that has taken place on the Budget now before the House, and I have watched with some interest and thought the developments that have taken place in the political situation in the last ten days or so. I have watched, I say, with some interest and thought, and I may add with some amount of apprehension. We are here to do our best under all the circumstances in the interests of the country as a whole. Personally I am not an obstructionist and I don't think I shall go down in the political history of the colony as such. Personally I do not want to be regarded as one who would seek to undermine the confidence of man in his leader, or one of those who would seek to overthrow a Government merely for personal aggrandisement. I feel that the honourable members of the Government ranks who have come over to an independent position in this House have done so absolutely and entirely as independent men. Nobody regrets more than I do, nobody who takes serious cognisance of affairs can do otherwise but regret sincerely that a man should be obliged by force of his own convictions to take leave of the Government, with which he went to the country and with which he was returned to office. But I want to add that in my humble opinion it is going to be a sorry day for Newfoundland if it comes to a pass that chains of party allegiance are to be so strong that a man is to be prevented from acting according to what he considers his manifest duty to the country and to the Legislature. These honourable members felt that they could not longer remain, in view of the promises made to their constituents, and in view of the undertaking given their constituents they could no longer give their support to the Government. I see no other course for them than the step they have taken. The responsibility rests on their shoulders and they are the ones who will have to give an account of their stewardship. I am satisfied from what I have heard of their explanations that they have absolutely good and sufficient grounds for the step they have taken. I must proceed to unfold the situation and give some show of weight and truth to the contention I have just made. We are here now in Committee, discussing the Budget. The Budget is a document that must of necessity give to this country a statement of our financial position. Some few days ago in the House we were discussing Estimates. We had presented to us the amount of the Bill which we will be called upon to pay for the transaction of the ordinary business affairs of the country during the next twelve months. We are today discussing ways and means to pay that bill. It is pertinent and natural that we should be told what our position is today therefore. A charge has been made since the Budget came in and the Finance Minister presented it to the Committee, that the Budget now before this Committee does not give to this House and this Committee a true statement of affairs. It was charged that a true statement was not given with deliberate intention to deceive. What object the Finance Minister can have in deliberately intending to deceive I cannot say, and therefore I am forced to the conclusion that if the Budget now before the

House is a true statement of affairs he has not got control of the absolute facts of the situation, that his position demands that he should. I have read and listened carefully to the charge made that the Budget is not a correct statement of affairs and I want to be put on record that I am of the opinion that the Finance Minister has not told us the actual state of affairs of the country to-day. It would be far better for the Finance Minister, in consideration of his reputation as a public man to take more cognisance of the charge. Maybe he has taken no notice because of the source from which it emanated. Such a serious charge emanating from any responsible source should be taken cognisance of by the Finance Minister. In this connection it occurs to me that I read the other day of the Chancellor of the Exchequer delivering his Budget in the British House of Commons, and he did not mince matters but went straight to the British people and told them exactly what the position was, and one of the leading British journals in commenting on the clearness with which the Chancellor of the Exchequer had treated the statement of affairs of the country said that it was a matter for congratulation for him, and in commenting on it said that "he has not attempted to conceal the serious character of the situation, and he has not raised up hopes for the future that he knows to be fallacious." I submit that the Finance Minister whose position here corresponds to that of the Chancellor of the Exchequer in England in respect of this, would be in a more forceful position to-day if an independent and unbiased press in this country had come out and said that he "has not attempted to conceal the seriousness of the situation and has not raised up hopes which he knows to be false." I believe both of those charges can be made at present in our own case. I believe—and there has been a free expression of opinion outside by people in that connection—that the figures of the Budget given by the Finance Minister are not a correct statement of the situation as regards our financial position. I propose to examine and analyse the figures of this Budget, and in doing so I have to be guided by figures that were previously presented to this House by the Finance Minister. Last year the Finance Minister delivered his Budget on April 8th and he had then practically three months to go to finalize his accounts and discover the position in which he stood. In my perusal of the Budget speech of 1924-25 as well as that now before the Committee I contend that there are good and sufficient grounds for the assertion that the Finance Minister has not given a true and correct statement of the financial affairs of the country. I am not as well acquainted with "the man on the street" as some others, but I do not believe that the community generally places any confidence or reliance on the Finance Minister's statement in this year's Budget. His estimated revenue for 1924-25 was $9,453,000 and his estimated expenditure $9,177,000. This year we are in a position to see that his actual revenue for last year was $9,783,000, so that he was a quarter of a million dollars out in his estimate. That I submit is a large discrepancy between the statement of the Finance Minister last year, and the true position of conditions as they existed, and I submit that there is every ground for the charge made in connection with this year's Budget. The Minister made no allowance for or reference to the fact that he will have to come in here and ask for at least $150,000 for Supplemental Supply, which forms part of our expenditure for last year; so that taking into account your discrepancy on your estimate for last year and what you are likely to ask the House

to vote for Supplemental Supply for this year I submit that you were nearly a half million dollars out in your last year's financial statement. I have examined some of the figures contained in the two Budgets, and I think that the Finance Minister is quite capable of being out very considerably in some of his estimates, even though he may be a financial wizard. The Government has made public statements in the hope of persuading the country that they were reducing expenditure. You have attempted to throw dust in the eyes of the people of the country by telling them that you were reducing expenditure, but in attempting to do this in an official statement you are merely juggling with figures. The Minister of Finance in his Budget expresses a pious hope this year that the actual expenditure will not be as great as the estimates. He said taxation cannot be reduced unless expenses are curtailed. This we all know is obvious; but the Government is not even attempting to reduce expenditure, and, therefore, cannot expect to perform the herculean task of reducing taxation. You are trying here now to re-enact an extra tariff of fourteen per cent. that you put on last year. You have tried to place the blame of that new tariff on the shoulders of the late Government, and, Sir, I think it is high time that the truth of how this tariff came into effect was known. It is true that a Commission was appointed by the late Liberal Administration and that the Commission issued a report, but the present Government were not obliged to accept that report or any recommendations of that Commission. You succeeded the late administration before they had even time to consider that report. You, therefore, inherited that report and the late Government were relieved of all responsibility in the premises. My point, Sir, is that the present Government must take the onus, because the high tariff imposed last session is all your own and therefore you must take your censure from the people of the country for it. Still the Finance Minister has availed of every opportunity to tell the country that when the present Government assumed office there was a deficit of $1,600,000 that had to be liquidated. He failed, however, again to tell the whole truth and say that there were certain balances on the credit side from loans, aggregating $800,000 and through which half the $1,600,000 was wiped off. The charge has been made against the Finance Minister that the Budget now before the House is not a correct and true statement of our financial position. Now I have another charge to make against the Budget. I feel it my duty as a representative of the people who sent me here to do so, and it is this. The Minister congratulates himself that he is not increasing taxation. He was not sent here by his constituents to increase taxation. He was sent here to reduce taxation and it is not good enough for him to say that he can collect sufficient revenue to meet the tremendous expenditure that has been going on. His job is to reduce expenditure and reduce taxation, to make it possible for our young men to stay in Newfoundland and not be going out of the country as fast as the steamers which he talks of to bring tourists here can carry them out. With regard to the gentlemen who were independent enough to forsake the Government party, despite bribes, threats and cajoling, I ask who could sit unmoved by the story told by Mr. Lake of the manner in which his district has been treated by the Government, and his demands on behalf of his constituents ignored whilst millions of dollars are spent on highroads and other wild cat schemes. The House has already heard the plain story told by Mr. Lewis Little, one of the most intelli-

gent, industrious and honest fishermen of Bonavista Bay. The Prime Minister came in here and told us he was not a plausible politician, but a plain man of business. I fear, sir, that he very soon forgot the role of the plain man of business and became the plausible politician. The tragedy of this country at the present time is that the Prime Minister did not disassociate himself with professional politicians and bring to this House with him twentyfour men as honourable, honest, sincere and independent as Capt. Lewis Little. Mr. Chairman, I view the whole situation and general outlook of the country in a serious way, and there is no hope for Newfoundland while such mad and visionary policies such as spending two million dollars on highroads for tourists are continued, because we are essentially a fishing country, and I believe that the time is ripe now to give that encouragement to our fisheries which is so long needed. God be good to the old days when the fishing stages were kept up, flakes were boughed and kept in proper order and when our harbours were filled with canvas. But I say that you have lost faith in the fisheries of this country, and, if you remain till the end of your term, 1928, there is not one man in your aggregation to-day who is going to lift a finger to see one dollar spent in any way to improve the fisheries of this country outside of the $20,000 for fishery inspectors and towards collecting statistics. It is time to call a halt. That is the reason why to-day confidence in your Government has been shaken. These are the reasons why people are asking themselves where we are and whither tending, the very people who forsook the substance for the shadow and voted for you. To-day they have learned their lesson, and your Government have lost the confidence of the country and the confidence of the men who deserted you. You have broken your faith with the people, and you can't even show that you have even given serious consideration to making an attempt to reduce expenditure. The expenditure, I submit, sir, has got to be cut down $2,000,000, however, it is to be done. If you can't do it because of a party affiliation, if you are afraid to undertake the job because of political consequences there is still a means for you. The other year, in Great Britain, the Government was up against the same problem of reducing expenditure, but the Government themselves did not assume the responsibility for undertaking this task; they appointed a Commission instead. We have all heard of the Geddes Commission. Now, what attempt have you made? Even if you have to engage a commission, no doubt, you will find men today in this country who would be prepared to work on such a commission for a mere matter of expense; and in the event of this commission advising you how expenditure could be reduced; even then if certain proposals were put up to the Government, you are not bound to accept them. But, then, I say, you won't do anything to reduce expenditure by even the fraction of a dollar, and when the final survey comes around, it is found that you have increased it to the extent of millions. You stand charged to-day before the bar of public opinion with having broken faith with the people of this country. Your party has lost faith in you to a large extent, and the country has lost faith in you. I think that Mr. Halfyard gave you very sound advice during the course of his remarks yesterday afternoon.

In conclusion, I am going to say that such opinions as I have given expression to this afternoon are sincere. It will be the last time probably during this session that I shall have occasion to castigate you on your neglect of your duties, and I say now if you think it is not too late, if there

is still hope for you, I ask you to take heed of the Scriptural admonition, call a halt, stop this downward pace, "Go and sin no more."

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, the past few days have made history again for Newfoundland. We are always making political history and I presume we will do so for years to come. Apparently the excuse this time thrown across the floor of this House is the Department of which I am head. Naturally it would be, as it is the most responsible Department in the country, and it requires one to act with great deliberation and caution in these critical days, especially when discussing financial matters. Before making any explanation to the House of Assembly I would take this opportunity of congratulating the Hon. W. S. Monroe, the Prime Minister, and the loyal supporters behind him. He stands unique as a Prime Minister, with seventeen of the most loyal men that have ever been elected to the House of Assembly. No bribes or temptations in any way could disturb them from their posts, and I am proud to be one of their associates. I should not like to be for one moment in the position of my poor friends who crossed the floor. Their leaving the Monroe party and deserting their positions will go down in history against themselves, but the one thing I do want to refer to is the abuse of Hon. Alfred B. Morine. No one possibly in this House is in a better position than I am to criticise Mr. Morine if I so desired, or to have fought the Monroe Government on the continuation of Morine in his association with our party. But I would like to say here now that when a Crosbie signs articles for four years with his Captain he does so in the darkest hour. Mr. Morine at this particular time appears to be the bugaboo, but it is only drawing a red herring across the track. With just a little difference with Mr. Morine during the Premier's absence from this Colony while I was acting Prime Minister, I have found Mr. Morine fair and above board, and whatever that difference was it was immediately forgotten, and in view of the personal abuse which is being poured at him I feel that I would be no man, and I would not be able to justify my position in this House if I were to allow it to pass. Any true men or men worth while can have differences, and have many, but it takes real men to be able to forget, and I am thankful to say that I was able to dismiss that difference without further thought. Mr. Morine like many others of us in political life has made mistakes; if he had not he would not be human, but to the men to-day who rake up past slanders in this House I would only like to say "people who live in glass houses should not throw stones." The attitude that Mr. Morine has taken in this crisis has proved to me that he is a man worth while, and the party who is standing behind Mr. Monroe at this time are of the same opinion as I am. No man could be more vilified or blackguarded in political life than Mr. Morine, and he is a fairly good second to myself as I have very seldom escaped. In 1919 when I arrived from a foreign voyage I met Sir M. P. Cashin who invited me to be a member of his excecutive. He gave me the names at the time and amongst them was Mr. A. B. Morine, yet I raised no objection, and Sir Michael Cashin was the man who told me Mr. Morine was worth while. In 1923, just before the final crisis in the Squires Government, Sir M. P. Cashin called again at my home after a pleasure trip abroad, and after some discussion in connection with the political situation, he suggested that we see Mr. Morine the next day, and from the conversation which took place and events afterwards I was sure that Sir M. P. Cashin had not changed his

opinion in any way from 1919. We afterwards visited another gentleman together and Mr. Morine's name was brought up, in fact the gentleman is now at this house, and he told us there and then he would not have anything to do with it, and if necessary I will name that gentleman. My only reason for referring to Mr. Morine and quoting this incident is to prove conclusively that the thoughts of the honourable members who left this party were unfair and unjust, and his greatest villifiers to-day were men who only a few years ago would have been only too pleased to have gone arm in arm with him.

Now with regard to the famous Budget of 1925-26, the bugaboo which made Mr. Philip Moore cross the floor, the padded Budget, I could close him off with one remark. It is a lame excuse. Everyone knows of Mr. Moore during the past two years in St. John's; nothing more need be said. Mr. Lake and Mr. Russell, I am quite convinced, have no doubt whatever that the financial position of the Colony has been handled by the present Fiance Minister as well as they expected any man to do. With regard to Mr. Little, I won't be unkind to him; he knows why he crossed the floor of the House. I dismiss him with a passing thought. Mr. Bradley never crossed the floor of this House on the Budget, and Mr. Bradley knows and was as conversant with the Budget as any other man, and of the discussions that took place I am not ashamed as Finance Minister. I remember his remarks very well, "when it comes to taking care of the financial end Sir John knew how to do it." I say nothing more about Mr. Bradley; he must, himself, explain the position he has taken to his constituents and the public. Now let me deal with the real financial position. What is it? I am told that I padded the Budget, that I padded my Estimates, that is absolutely untrue. Take one of the charges made by the hon. member for Ferryland that the death duties were padded—he referred to people dying and that I must expect a lot to die. Gentlemen of this House of Assembly, my estimate of a hundred and fifty thousand dollars is so correct that it is at the present time within about four or five thousand dollars of that estimate.

Come to the 1925-26 Estimates. Take my Estimates of 1924-25 which year is passed. I estimated in 1924-25 my Customs Revenue then at $7,800,000.00 and at the close of that year the total revenue to the Customs is approximately $200,000 more than I estimated. Take my Customs Estimate now for 1925-26. Am I not justified in making an estimate for the close of June of $8,250,000.00? I am justified and will prove this to the country before 1926 closes that I am approximately right.

Take the next item estimated by me for the present year. For Postal revenue for the year 1924-25 we received $316,265.00. For the present year I estimate $317,000.00, about $700.00 in the difference. Surely no honourable member in this House can doubt that I am not justified with my figures. Take Telegraphs: The total revenue at the close of last year was $207,000 and I estimate the income at the close of June, 1926, $250,000.00 a difference of $43,000.00, which in view of the extension of new telegraphs and increase of business I feel is justified.

The Crown Lands revenue last year, I estimated $145,000.00 and we received $159,000.00. Now in the coming year I estimate $120,000 which is $39,000 less than we actually received last year, and I have every reason to believe that I will be correct. Inland revenue stamps I estimated last year at $45,000 and we received $42,000, and this year I estimate Inland revenue $45,000, and from

my personal knowledge I believe it will go over that.

Fines and forfeitures I estimated $6,000 and I received $5,952.00. This year I estimate $26,000, and I am in a position to say that it will go over that amount, as a considerable stock is on hand at the Custom House which is not included in this Budget. Liquor profits I estimated $100,000.00, and the exact returns to the end of the year gave us $76,000 over. This year I estimate $320,000, and I have no fear whatever in this regard as the amount in hand will prove that I am absolutely right. Income tax I estimated last year $360,000, we got $351,000, and I estimate arrears collected this year will give $165,000, and I have no doubt whatever that we will receive it and possibly a bit more.

Revenue from public institutions: I estimated the fees at $55,000 and we received $55,421.00, $421 over my estimate, and I am estimating $55,000 again this year. In the Broom Department I think there will be very little difference.

Guaranteed loans I estimated at $86,500, and we received $86,849.51. For this year I estimate them at $87,000. There can be no doubt about that whatever. There may be a difference of $1,000 one way or the other. I estimated estate duties last year as $45,000 and we actually received $47,000. This year I have estimated at $150,000, and there is not one item in the Budget or in my estimates that will be so true as that. The returns will be fully $150,000 and the people who talk differently talk about that of which they know nothing. I estimated Bank Tax at $197,000 last year and we received $223,857, and this year we are estimating $141,000 Bank Taxes, Cable taxes, etc. Miscellaneous revenue I estimated last year at $80,000, and we received $79,803, and this year we are estimating at $135,000, which I have every reason to believe we will receive.

It will be remembered in my Speech last year that I estimated a surplus of $275,497.00, and the actual result was $347,003.23 or $71,506.23 more than my estimate of last year. In all I estimated a revenue of $9,453,000 and we actually received $9,783,188.46.

These are the financial figures given by me for the years 1925 and 1926, and in spite of what anyone may say or attempt to contradict I have an idea my calculation will not be far out. The debatable question with me at the present moment is what ought to be charged to current account and capital expenditure, and after all I contend as Finance Minister of this Colony that the $100,000 spent by the Light House Department building new lights and other necessities for navigation should be charged to capital account. Again take roads and bridges; last year we voted in the estimates $150,000. In my opinion this is another capital account item and we voted a similar amount this year. All amounts of a constructive nature or for building purposes should not be placed on the present generation to pay, and when the Loan Bill comes in this House in a few days I shall feel justified in putting amounts of that nature in that loan.

Railway. The Railway had a deficit last year and unfortunately will have another this year, but nobody can find fault with that. The expenditure along certain lines has been very great and this has been charged to Maintenance. I am now fully convinced that this Railroad, with new industries starting in the country, will, in the very near future, under the management of Mr. Russell, become a paying asset. My colleagues on the railroad committee know where considerable savings can be made, and I hope in the next six months that we shall be able to give our time to bringing it about. I cannot agree

with the statement made by the Hon. member for Ferryland that with a stroke of the pen you could cut off $250,000 expenses especially in the way he mentioned in reducing salaries and men's pay. A man must have a living wage, whether he is a railroad man or any other kind of a man, and I for one could not be a party to reductions of that sort. There are other ways this amount can be saved and when the House meets again after this session I am fully convinced we can prove it. One moment you hear a request from the Opposition and from the members who crossed the floor to reduce expenditure, and in the next instant you hear of requests for money. Out of the 35 members in this House to-day I don't think there is one who is not looking for extra money. He may be justified in doing so, but he then should not criticise taxation. For the seven days before the Budget came it was said that we were going to put an increase of 10 per cent. all around before any discussion whatever had taken place with my colleagues. We decided at the meeting Monday night that our people were taxed heavily enough and that in the present outlook it would ill become us to place a burden on the people of the Colony to-day, and we decided that with close attention to expenditure in the coming year we would be able to make both ends meet. To the wise whisperers who went around telling about this increase of 10 per cent. may I now extend my heartiest thanks as it gave to the revenue the boost it required, and with all their criticisms and all the remarks about the financial matters it was the one good turn they did the Colony. I came into this House with this Budget not as a pessimist but as an optimist. I wanted to send a ray of hope to the people, and I wanted to send a ray of hope to those who invested their money in this Colony, and no part of that Budget in my judgment has been padded in any way that I cannot justify at the close of the year, and you will have the extreme pleasure at the next session of examining these accounts, and I think I can safely say that those who criticise now so severely will find that I knew what I was talking about.

It will be remembered that a few days ago, the honourable member for Ferryland said that a shipment of fish was made that would not bring ten cents a quintal—a beautiful thought to induce fishermen to go to the fishery. My opinion of fishing the coming year is that the price obtainable will be practically equivalent to the past summer, and to prove that, I have personally invested considerably more money in the fisheries of the country this year than in the past, and I feel quite confident of the result, although the pessimists going around have a contrary idea. I have listened to a lot of nonsense about this matter, and the men who have the most to say in this House about the fishery have not fifty cents invested in it, and wouldn't, because they think they would not see it again.

Now for the guidance of the House I propose to show what taxing free articles would mean if the suggestion of the honourable member for Ferryland was taken and how much it would embarrass the fishermen. Taking the items used by the fishermen out the net result to us by taxing free goods would be a mere bagatelle.

I was somewhat amused by a remark made by one member of the Opposition. He said now you have the Dock, you have the Hotel, what are you going to do next to employ the men? My answer to that is to repeat what Mr. Asquith said, "wait and see."

Now, in conclusion in replying to the honourable member for Ferryland. He informed me I could collect from the N. P. & P. Co. $1.00 a ton and twenty five cents per h.p. I

would suggest to him before making such erroneous statements to read the Act and see if he can convince me or any other intelligent man that I can collect this money under said Act. I advise him in future in making statements to be more careful and correct in a matter of that nature. I do not intend at the present juncture to make any remarks on the Dock, Railway and Hotel until my Loan Bill is in this House. I shall now conclude by giving Revenue and Expenditure figures from 1920 to 1924 which speak for themselves. I shall now also show th efigures during my tenure of office as Minister of Finance. The country can compare these statements, and if they are not convinced by these figures alone that the country has been better looked after during the past two years, then I naturally, will be disappointed.

CURRENT ACCOUNT

Former Administration:	**Revenue**	**Expenditure**	**Deficit**
1920-21	$8,438,839.86	$10,949,053.17	2,511,013.89
1921-22	8,269,680.92	9,127,542.79	857,861.87
1922-23	8,876,772.74	8,552,301.74	675,529.00
1923-24	8,401,669.09	10,022,137.45	1,620,468.36
Monroe Government:			**Surplus**
1924-25	9,783,188.46	9,436,185.23	347,003.23
Estimated:			
1925-26	10,069,000.00	10,007,447.61	61,552.39

NFLD. GOVT. RAILWAY
Expenses Maintenance of Way and Structure.

Year 1920-21	$836,461.64
" 1921-22	516,447.36
" 1922-23	544,611.90
" 1923-24	555,057.40
" 1924-25	708,679.86

Mr. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, I want to have a few words in reply to the Finance Minister; like him, I have no desire to hurt anyone in my criticisms. With reference to your surplus of 347,000 I just want to make my point, and it is this, that the surplus is from ordinary revenue coming into the Customs House, but we must not forget, as you told us this afternoon, that that surplus has been eaten up by the railway deficit. And I submit that in the Estimates the Railway should be shown, whether as a surplus or a deficit, and if it was charged in you would find that your surplus was wiped out, and a deficit incurred instead. That was my point, and I feel that the Minister of Finance realizes it as well as I do; that was why I said there was a deficit instead of a surplus.

Now I regret to hear that so many wealthy men have died, because Newfoundland has need of them at the present time. But coming to the Estimates of income and expenditure for 1925-26, I submit that he should have estimated the railway, and I brought forward figures for 9 months showing a deficit on its operations of five or six hundred thousand, and it is only natural to suppose that, leaving all other figures aside we will have a deficit for the year of about $750,000—you can't get away from it. I am not knocking the Budget, but I am pointing out that it is not an accurate statement of the financial affairs of this country. The Finance Minister knows, and the Prime Minister admitted yesterday as the Finance Minister admitted to-day, that the surplus shown by the Budget was eaten up by the Railway, and you are going to have the railway again this

year, as last year. Unfortunately your surplus won't go far towards paying a railway deficit of one million, and you can put in at that—with the amounts paid the railway by the Government yearly you can put it at one and a half millions.

Now as to capital account. The Finance Minister says the $150,000 spent on roads and bridges ought to be charged to Capital Account, as also ought the maintenance of lighthouses. Even if it were so, the money would have to be borrowed, and interest paid—we have no surplus from which to draw on. I feel that the Minister was perhaps playing a little politics this afternoon when he referred to my statement that I could cut down the cost of operation of the railway, and that he supposed I would do it on the salaries, but that he wouldn't. I attended meetings in St. John's West at which the Finance Minister spoke, and he very strongly urged that they be cut—it is amusing.

He also confirmed what I said to the effect that the Railway can be made to square its accounts, and I thank him for bearing out my statement. I have been very strongly attacked by members on the other side for making the statement that the railway could be made to pay or to square its accounts, and I have the Minister of Finance bearing it out when he comes in and says that if he and I went up there it could be done, and I agree with him that it ought to be done.

Now with reference to the free list—the Minister pointed out that with the exception of pork, beef and kerosene oil there was little else coming in on the free list. But if you put 10% on that it would just square your accounts for the year. I also pointed out that when he comes in here with his figures he should include the railway figures, showing a surplus or deficit; and I think he will agree with me that the figures I quoted were correct, for I got them from him. And I want to tell the Chairman, and the Daily News that I don't want anyone to put them together, either—I can do that myself very well.

I do not intend to make any personal references, but I do want to make some remarks about the statements of the Prime Minister yesterday, when he explained why Mr. Morine had been included in his Cabinet. The Prime Minister went on to explain that when he came into power he wanted a man there to advise him. Now I think, Mr. Chairman, that the Prime Minister showed little tact yesterday in making a statement of that sort, especially to the men associated with him in the Executive, because the inference was that he didn't trust any man for that purpose except Mr. Morine, and that was the reason he appointed him.

HON THE PRIME MINISTER—From where do you get that inference?

MR. CASHIN—If you will read the remarks in the Daily News you will find out. (Reads) I submit in all decency and sincerity that even if you had left Mr. Morine out, there were men in your party just as good as Mr. Morine—and they were men who fought for your party, and preached for your party. I took part in the making of your party, and please goodness I will take part in the unmaking of it, and the proof is that I have done considerable already.

Now Sir, I don't intend to engage the House further this afternoon, but I think my statements have been borne out by no less personages that the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance, that you have deficits for both years, beyond the shadow of a doubt. But my point was that I feel that every Finance Minister, whether it be Sir John Crosbie or anyone else, ought to come in her with a true

Budget, and take both sides of the House into consideration and tell them of the situation the same as any incorporated company. If the Minister of Finance had done that there would not have been the criticism of the Budget that there has been.

HON THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—I said that I thought that there was one year when we had a slight surplus. I have the list here. 1920-21 Deficit $836,461, 1921-22 $461,-447, 1922-23 $544,611, 1923-24 $555,-057.40.

MR. HALFYARD—There is something incomplete about this budget. The picture of the Finance Minister is not on it this year. I do not know why the ommission has been made because we like looking at a good looking man. The Minister of Finance said that there was a great difference between the estimates and the final results of the revenue collected. This confirms what I said about the budget of 1924. I do not wish to delay the House for any considerable time but just to show what caused the difference between the estimate and the realization at the end of the fiscal year. The Hon. Minister of Finance said:—

(Reads)

Certain reductions were made between the time that Minister Cave made his estimate and the end of the fiscal year and therefore there is good reason for being a deficit. It was thought that a high tariff was not in the best interest of Newfoundland. It was argued that if cheaper goods could be had then more would be bought. That was the propaganda that was circulated and as a result the Government of the day was influenced by it and thought that possibly it would encourage the trade of the country. That is all that I have to say about that, the difference went to the labouring class and the fishermen of the country.

MR. GRIMES—During the debate that has been taking place on this budget attention has been given to the place that taxes have in the collection of a revenue and there some remarks that were made the other day by the Prime Minister that I think ought to be answered. He said that if the income tax were introduced in this country capital would be driven away to some other place, and I would like to ask him what place in the British Empire of the whole world is there that the income tax is not imposed. The introduction of the income tax on salaries of over four thousand dollars would as I pointed out bring a revenue of about three hundred thousand dollars and I do not think that the trade of this country is in any way effected by having incomes of over four thousand dollars increase the revenue of this country by three hundred thousand dollars. Every industry in the past has been contributing towards the income tax. It would not have the slightest effect on the trade of the country any more than it has had in Great Britain and Canada and Australia where it is enforced to-day. I think that it is only fair and just that persons should pay according to their ability to pay. Anyone receiving an income of six or eight or ten or twelve thousand dollars should pay more to the revenue of the country than a man who is only earning eight or nine hundred dollars per year. No one can deny that successfully that revenue should not be collected solely on the necessities of life not on a persons income. If a man is earning ten thousand dollars he can put away four thousand dollars and if a man is only earning a thousand dollars he spends it all and about one third of it goes into the revenue of the country. You can collect three hundred thousand dollars on incomes and it will come back to

the poorer classes if it is applied to the necessities of life. Take for instance clothing. You collect seventy cents on the dollar for clothing in this country. If a suit of clothes cost ten dollars then seven dollars has to be paid into the revenue. The seven dollars has to be paid by the poorer classes because it is only the poor that buy the ready made clothes and the richer man goes to a tailor and gets his clothes made.

But there are no articles that are used by the wealthier classes on which they have to pay seventy per cent. There is another reason why if the three hundred thousand dollars were collected on the income tax that we would be able to reduce the duty on clothing. We would be able to take off the duty on the material that is used to make the ready made clothing. It would serve the purpose of cheapening the clothes by another couple of dollars and not only that it would provide more employment for the people of the country because the cheaper the local industry can produce the clothing the less chance there is for the imported article to compete against it. So in that way you can encourage home industry and give more employment to the people of the country. I do not think that there is anything unsound about that. We are talking at every session of the Legislature about encouraging Home industry and we have an opportunity to do this at every discussion of the tariff and there is nothing done but the duties are increased.

The other question is in connection with the railway. It has been pointed out that there has been a heavy dfiecit in connection with the railway. I am sorry that the Finance Minister is not here because I would like to ask him how he proposed in such a short time to do away with the deficit. It is certainly interesting information. I think that the House ought to ge informed as to how it is going to be done. Now that the Minister is coming into the House I will repeat what I said. I said that I thought that the House ought to be informed as to how you propose to wipe out the deficit in such a short time and what you mean by a short time. I would like to ask the Finance Minister that question. The Government considers certain ways of reducing expenditure and is going to take the matter up. It is very good news. We all live in hopes and I do not think that it would be a good thing for the country if we did not. Mr. Chairman what I want to understand from the Finance Minister is this: He says that in a short time he has the hope of wiping out the deficit on the railway. What does the Minister consider a reasonable time. You hope with the tourist and freight and passengers and express to wipe the deficit out on the railway.

You say about twelve months. That is very interesting. Everybody wishes that to take place for the sake of the country and for the sake of the principal involved. The Finance Minister said when he was in Halifax said last fall that he did not believe in the principal of the Government ownership of the railway. It is your duty as the member of the commission for the management of the railway to make the railway pay and if you can do that you will be doing something that has never been done before in this country and you will deserve all the credit that is coming to you for it. I will certainly give you a clap on the back for it. Mr. Chairman I have never seen the reason why a business man should not as successfully run the affairs of the country as he has done his own business. It is certainly what they are elected to the House of Assembly for. I am glad to get that information this

afternoon that possibly within twelve months the deficit can be wiped out on the railway. I hope that we will have a practical demonstration of what can be done by the Government through the commission running the railway which will be more of a credit to the country than it has been in the past. There is one other matter to which I wish to refer. That is I would like to know what we have a Department of Mines and Agriculture in this country for. I am sorry that the Minister is not in his chair. I am glad that the Minister has come in. You have employed a man by the name of Mr. Bayley down there and you have rightly and properly encouraged that gentleman to go around the different districts to interest the people in agriculture. And the basis of his remarks is that agriculture can be carried on on a much larger scale than it is at the present time and that it is a business that can be made pay and that a larger number of people can make a living at it by following the industry. The Minister will agree with me that they have done nothing whatever. I do not blame him. No doubt suggestions have been made by him and by the previoius Ministers to try and get the Government to interest themselves and encourage the people to follow the industry. But what is the use of employing a man to go around the country and give lectures and say that you are going to do this thing and that thing and the other thing and nothing whatever is being done in any direction. I know a number of young men who have gone out of this country. They are willing to work on a farm if they only get a little encouragement. I have heard these men say as they took the train to go away to Canada and the United States that if the Government of Newfoundland had been as generous as the Government of Canada and loaned then fifteen hundred or two thousand dollars they would have been able to buy machinery and give the machinery and their farms as guarantee for the money and in fifteen or twenty years they would be able to pay it off. I think that if we had done the same as Canada devoted a half million dollars instead of spending it on highroads and the encouragement of the industry of agriculture we would be better off and you would encourage young men to establish themselves on their farms and you would see most of them conducting successful farming business.

Only ten or twelve per cent of the number failed to make returns. And can't it be clearly seen that if we had done the sam thing in connection with the labouring man of this country, and encouraging him to go on farms we would have the same result in Newfoundland. I submit that Newfoundlanders are just as capable if they are given the chance as Canadians are. And why should they not be given the chance. It is at their door and not one knows better than the Member for St. George's. He will agree that there are men up there in that district, who if they had the chance would be on farms to-day in larger numbers than they are at present. There are sections of the country in nearly every district of the island, where there is good land where numbers of people could settle, and make a good living out of it. Now these are matters that I think that the Government would do well to consider. You are going to raise a loan I understand, and I trust that the Government will take a portion of it, and first put it into the outlying settlements that have been neglected for the past two years. Then to divide a portion of it to encourage a large number of those persons who would settle down in many parts of

the country if given the proper encouragement. That has not been done at the present time. Mr. Bailey goes around saying what I have not a doubt but that the Minister instructs him to say, that there are four million dollars worth or agricultural products brought in from the outside that could be raised in the country. Why does he tell the people that if he is not going to help the people to produce these things. I quite agree that propaganda is a good thing provided that the necessary help is given also. Now if you want to raise four million dollars worth of goods that are being imported from Canada and the States at the present time, you have got to carry out a different policy with regard to agriculture than you have at the present time. I submit that the Government should give that their careful consideration. Otherwise you are throwing money away sending a man around this country saying this, that and the other thing, and you are doing nothing to assist that policy.

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES—Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the hon. member for the very helpful suggestion, and for the criticism that he has made regarding the Minister and the Department of Agriculture. Now I would like to remind him that previous to 1924, when I assumed control of the Department, the vote in this Legislature for the encouragement of agriculture was $25,000. In addition to that there was another $20,000 vote for the model farm. And in addition to that there were in the Department three agricultural commissioners. Mr. Winsor who formerly represented the District of Bonavista, Mr. Calpin from Bay Roberts, and Mr. Legrow from Bay de Verde. Time went on and the Government decided that they should abolish the policy that we had regarding agriculture. I think they were wise in making that decision. There was an enormous amount of money spent over and above that voted in the estimates. About $75,000 a year was voted in Supplemental Supply, and I think all will agree with very little result. There was very little achieved by that expenditure. When I assumed control my vote was $5,000. There is a great difference between $75,000 and $5,000. In 1925 my vote was $20,000. Now I quite agree with the hon. member that on the face of it it looks extraordinary, that in this country we are not able to produce sufficient potatoes, turnips or hay to supply our local wants. First I endeavoured to find out, in what way we could assist greater production in agriculture. I made enquiries in Canada, and I had consultations with Dr. ———————— of the Agricultural College in Truro. I told him what I thought our wants were, and what Mr. Bayly who, no doubt, is a good practical man, had suggested. After some negotiations we purchased some machinery from a firm in Canada. We also got a lime crusher. We arranged with a local firm for the purchase of two hundred tons of raw material, to start with. It was brought to St. John's in schooners from Twillingate District. It was supposed to be the best lime stone when crushed. It contained a greater percentage of certain requirements. We had the crusher erected, and we crushed the lime stone at a cost to the Government of $12 or $13 a ton. Now lime for agricultural purposes costs $25 a ton. It cost us after purchasing the raw material, and crushing the lime stone twelve dollars. We sold it at six dollars a ton. Now, I think, that was some little encouragement to the farmers. But I was very much disappointed to find that we almost had to send out a commercial traveller, all around the island

to advertise that we had this crushed lime for sale. We were selling it to the farmers in St. John's East and West for six dollars. And we would put it in any section of the island for the very same price. Out of our small vote I intended to make up the loss so that we would be able to put all the farmers on the same footing. I am very sorry to have to say to the House that at the present moment we have forty tons of that two hundred tons that are not sold and there are no orders for any. We notified all the principle farmers. Mr. Bailey has gone around amongst them. They wanted it before but now we can't 'sell any. There are a great many difficulties to be overcome. But certainly I agree that we should be ashamed of ourselves, to have to go outside to spend this money to bring in an article that certainly can be produced at home. Now it happened that in Nova Scotia, which I suppose is one of the bigest agricultural Provinces in the Dominion, they had to import their potatoes largely from Prince Edward Island, that is for local use. They had to do the same with cabbage and turnips. One of the first things done by the present Premier was to create a new department for the development of natural resources. And the next thing he did was to create a commission to enquire into the cause of their having to import these agricultural products from Prince Edward Island. The Commission has been in session now about a month. The result is that there are now about ten commissioners appointed for the various sections of Nova Scotia, to try and improve the conditions of things there. So far as I am personaly concerned I feel that nothing more can be done than we are doing at the present time, with the amount of money at our disposal. But if the House is prepared to vote the amount of money that would be required to carry out the suggestions of the hon. member, I shall certainly do my best to have his hopes realised.

MR. LAKE,—Mr. Chairman, I am fully in accord with the principle that our fishermen should not be taxed further. But I really think that this concern should be protected. I know Dawe & Son and have seen their product, and I understand they make a barrel from the green stick to the finished product in 24 hours. I agree that they should be protected —it helps labor, and is a move in the right direction. While it may or may not affect the price, I think we should protect the industry as much as we can.

MR. MOORE,—Mr. Chairman, I would also like to support the protection of the barrel factory at Bay Roberts. But I would like to ask the Minister of Finance if he is able to give any guarantee with regard to the price of oil. The Imperial Oil Company, since they came to this city have had control of oil, and we have had the statement here now that they can't put up the price of oil. Mr. Oldfield is not the kind of man who would hestitate to put the price up, not one cent, but five, unless he was restrained.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE,—As I said, that was what I thought from talking to Oldfield. I can find out whether it is correct.

MR. DUFF,—Mr. Chairman, I quite agree that Dawe & Sons ought to have the protection, because I have seen their barrels, and they are of a very fine quality indeed. And they can not only hold kerosene but also gasolene. There is only one item that I wish to speak about regarding the tariff. I am very pleased that there has been no general increase in taxation. But outside of this there is a fact which bears hard on the people of Carbonear and Harbor

Grace, and it is on the matter of coal. We have to pay a duty of 50c. a ton on coal coming into Carbonear and Harbor Grace, in Carbonear the duty goes to the Water Company, which is quite satisfactory and proper. But they also have to pay a sales tax of 30c. a ton, and that brings the tax on soft coal to 80c. a ton, and on hard to $1.00 or $1.50. And it doesn't seem fair to have to pay that tax on coal when all other ports in the country go free. I hope the Minister of Finance will give us the reason for this, and if possible, if there is any way of remedying it, that he will do so.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—There is going to be some change in the Sales Tax, and that can come up then.

MR. ASHBOURNE. — Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the Minister of Finance at whose request this protection was given to Dawe & Sons?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.— The request came from the district of Harbour Grace, and I think we had a letter from Dawe & Sons about it, and informing us as to what they were doing, that these barrels were being manufactured and the labour given, and things of that sort. That is all I know—we are giving labour to our own people, and that is the whole issue.

MR. ASHBOURNE,— Now arguing from that premises, I would like to go on and state that I understand the Imperial Oil Company has been buying these barrels from Dawe & Sons for some time. And I do not think that Dawe & Sons are employing all their men solely in the making of oil barrels.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE.— Well, as I understand it, they have 70 men at Salmonier, and about 75 at Hodgewater. In addition they have from 40 to 50 operating in their own factory in Bay Roberts, and approximately a hundred in White Bay, and they are able to use the birch that previously was unused; it is not only the 40 or 50 men working in their place at Bay Roberts. It is a remarkable thing to see how they handle it financially. Likewise the railway gets an advantage in hauling, and we here in carting, and I think it is worth while.

MR. ASHBOURNE,— My point is whether or not these men would get this employment without any such protection. The fact that Newfoundland fishermen require thousands of barrels each year for seal oil and cod oil is a matter that affects more than three or four hundred men. Is the Sales Tax collected on barrels, if it is not on kerosene oil itself?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE,— No, there is no Sales Tax.

MR. ASHBOURNE, —In this connection, I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Finance to another matter.

I am told that the birch barrels are not as good for cod oil as the imported oak barels because it appears that the oak barrels do not dry up in the sun as much as the birch barrels do. I would like to bring this matter to the attention of the Minister of Finance.

MR. BROWNE,—Refering back to 306E. It has been brought to my attention by one of my constituents who does a large business as a commercial traveller that advertising matter such as catalogues are heavily taxed. These are distributed in the outports and form a large part of the literature of these people. They contain predictions of the weather that never come true and fortunes that sometimes come true. They cost very little. But the duty on these articles comes to more than the articles themselves. Mr. Doyle brought to my notice the matter of

Dr. Chase's almanac. It costs about 60 cents per hundred to be printed. If the duty is put on these booklets at fifteen cents per pound, the duty will be more than the value by several times. I wish that the Finance Minister would consider the increase on articles of this character.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed certain Resolutions with some amendments 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 Further to Amend the Revenue Act 1905,'" 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 Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to Newspapers and Books" 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 previsions.

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill to consolidate the Education Act.

The remaining orders of the day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until Monday afternoon next, 31st inst., at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, May 31, 1926.

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

Petitions were presented by:—

Hon. Mr. Long from Fortune re bridge.

Mr. Scammell gave notice of question.

Mr. Bradley gave notice of question.

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 relating to the raising of a certain sum of money on the credit of the Colony for public purposes.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill "An Act to Consolidate the Education Act" 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 Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 22, Consolidated Statutes, Third Series, entitled 'Of Customs.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr, Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

Committee of the Whole on Bill "An Act to Amend Chapter 22, Consolidated Statutes, Third Series, entitled "Of the Customs."

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Chairman, On the last day that this Bill was before the House all the matter contained therein was passed and approved of except that the hon. leader of the Opposition wanted to know what the current domestic value on goods meant. For the information of that gentleman and the House generally I might say that it reads simply this from the Customs Act.

(Reads Section one and two)

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Commit-

tee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and had passsd 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 to Amend Chapter 22, Consolidated Statutes, Third Series, entitled 'Of the Customs,'" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrosed, 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 for the Confirmation of an Agreement with the Commercial Cable Co."

day the Government have a contract

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE,—Mr. Chairman, I think I explained to the House when the Bill was in Second Reading that this Bill involves no more or less than the granting of permission to the Commercial Cable Company of landing extra cables in the country. Nothing has been done further than to permit sites for landing purposes up to fifty acres. There is to be no additional taxation on the Company, as they are already paying the maximum tax. The sections of the original agreement read as follows:

(Reads clauses).

The right under section 3 to grant free of charge through all Crown lands rights of way for trenches, and under 4 the right of pre-emption, of entry upon private lands to take subject to arbitration as provided for under section 5. There is nothing at all being given in the way of concessions to the Company, beyond the giving of sites for the erection of station houses and so on, not exceeding fifty acres.

What is provided for, apart from the actual landing place of the cables is for sites for buildings, erections by the Company for various purposes that may be necessary.

MR. BRADLEY,—Just what is meant by "terms, etc." in Section 1.

(Reads: "On terms and conditions as favourable as those, etc.")

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE,—It simply means this. To-day the Goernment have a contract with the Commercial Cable Company that they shall not pay to the Government in excess of on five cables. They say they ought to get the same benefit, that is where cables exceed five only five are paid for; they ask to be put in the same position. To-day the Commercial Cable Co. is paying taxes for five cables and asks the Government to agree to the right being given under terms and conditions as favourable as those that were before enjoyed. So far as the Goernment is concerned, as it is a question of there being no new revenue, under these circumstances it was thought that concessions ought not be given the same as when there was a question of the Government getting the benefit of new revenue. Under Agreement of the Government with the Western Union Co. the right is given of free entry of material. That was done previously and in making the agreement now it was thought that under these circumstances they ought not be given the right of free duty on material.

MR. RUSSELL—As far as I can remember, when the agrement was made with the Western Union Company the "free of duty" clause was put in on original installation. I know that it

continued some years. I don't know whether it has been cancelled yet. I quite agree that the Commercial Cable Company to-day should not be allowed to get anything in free of duty. I know that, as I said before, the Western Union got goods or apparatus free of duty, but that should be only on original installation on the same principle as saw mill machinery is allowed in free of duty for original installation.

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, with unanimous consent, the Bill entitled "An Act for the Confirmation of an Agreement with the Commercial Cable Co." 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 Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Revenue Act 1925" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon, with unanimous consent, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Revenue Act 1925."

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 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 to Amend the Revenue Act 1925" 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 PRIME MINISTER — Before we adjourn I want to give notice of some resolutions, and in doing so I merely wish to refer to the fact that we have had a good deal of discussion in the House about the fisheries and their interests, and I think possibly that the resolutions may meet with the approval of the members.

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow move the following Resolutions::

RESOLVED,—That a Joint Select Commission of both Houses of the Legislature should be appointed with power to sit out of Session to enquire as to the cure and cull of salt fish, its transportation and marketing and cognate matters concerning the Colony's salt fish trade.

RESOLVED,—That the Speaker be asked to name five members of the House to serve on such Commission.

RESOLVED,—That a message be sent to the Legislative Council requesting their concurrence and the appointment of a similar number of members to serve on the said Commission.

MR. LAKE—Mr. Speaker, before the House adjourns I would like to ask about that $20,000 that was granted the other day in connection

with the Old Age Pension Scheme. According to the Act now you cannot give it to old women except to the widows of old age pensioners. Now in our district we have a few old women, and as I understand it, some time ago when the Bill was brought up in the House the object of giving the extra $20,000 was for the widows of old age pensioners. I think that the Act should be changed to read that all old women over sixty-five should receive the old age pension. Under the present Act you can't give them anything. I ask that the Act be changed to include these cases.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Speaker, as it happened I brought up some letters to answer this afternoon, and the last one is from Seal Cove in my constituency. It relates to the very subject that we are on now. It points out what a hardship it is. These widows have been led to believe that they would receive the old age pension if their husband died. I know of one case where a very old friend of mine died. He was an old age pensioner. But he died three months before this Act came into effect, with the result that his widow, although over 75 years, is absolutely helpless. And we can't do anything because her husband did not live three months longer. Consequently this woman cannot get a pension. I don't know whether the Act should be amended to take in those few that are really eligible for the old age pension. Perhaps it could be amended so as to provide for those who are left widows within a year of the coming of the Act. I don't think that there would be many affected. But there are these extreme cases and I would ask the Government if they do not propose to amend the Act, so that the Minister of Finance might be given a little discretion with regard to these exceptional cases, where a woman is left a widow as old as seventy-five years of age, but because she does not technically comply with the provisions of the Act she fails to get a pension, while the woman next her, who may be sixty-five or sixty-seven, gets a pension because she comes within the terms of the Act. I appeal to the Government to give the Minister of Finance some discretion as I don't think that there would be many cases, and it would mean a great deal to those old women who really think that they are entitled to a pension.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word in reply to both the hon. members who have just spoken. But in the first place I would like to say that the grant that was put in was not intended to do more than meet the situation that had arisen, or so I understood. A considerable number of extra names had appeared and the old grant was insufficient to take care of the old age pensioners and the widows of old age pensioners who had died since the coming in of the Act. But there are three points raised by the previous speakers with which I entirely concur, namely, the hardship to the widows of old age pensioners who did not come within the purview of the Act. Secondly, the hardship to those widows whose husbands died previous to the passing of the Act. And I think there can be no disputing the fact that it is unfair, that where an old age pensioner had died his widow should be deprived of a pension because the enactment came into force at a certain period. It seems to me that the safest way would be to bring in a short amendment to the Act, to apply the benefit of the enactment to the widows of pensioners or any persons on the old age pension list. Therefore I take the liberty of saying that a measure will be introduced before this House goes out of session to cover that anomaly.

Hon. the Minister of Justice gave

notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Old Age Pension Act.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, June 1st, 1926.

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

Mr. Scammell gave notice of question.

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 for the raising of a sum of money on the credit of the Colony for certain Public purposes.

Mr Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

HON THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—In moving these Resolutions in connection with a loan on the credit of the Colony, the total required is five million dollars, and in explanation I might say that the rate of interest will be five per cent per annum, practically under the old conditions for other loans we have had free of taxation and so on. The first item is the completion of the dock, freight sheds, machine shops and wharves. That means a new machine shop, as the men in the machine shop can no longer work there. The Government has found that it is going to be necessary to build that shop as the place is absolutely deteriorated, and falling down, and when it rains the workmen are not able to remain inside. For that reason it was decided to rebuild the place and make a new machine shop. The next item is $1,945,000.00 for rolling stock re-railing, improvements to road-bed and in aid of operation of Nfld. Railway, $40,000 of this is for two new Steam Coaches which was not voted in this House. They have been in operation, one at Corner Brook, Bay of Islands, which has been very successful, and another from St. John's practically to Kelligrews. I understand they have been very successful and practically paid a greater proportion than we anticipated, in fact I think clear of expenses something like twenty-five to thirty per cent was netted. The next thing that the Government proposes under this $1,945,000.00 is the purchase of two new steam coaches, four new locomotives, two new baggage cars and several new bridges and stations. The estimated cost of these totalls to about $290,000.00, and $615,000 is for improvement to the road bed and operation of the railway for 1925-1926, practically covering the deficit of the road for the past year. The next item is a million dollars for re-railing the Bishop Falls Division. I don't think anyone will say that we are not justified in this. It is for re-railing what is called the Clarenville Division. The Division from St. John's to Clarenville has been done and that has been very successful and I think that those who have travelled over it will agree that it is much needed and an excellent improvement. When we took over the Railroad it was in a condition practically falling down, and all this money should have been spent years ago. Unfortunately to-day it falls upon the people of Newfoundland to pay the bill, and the Government after serious consideration decided that it would be best to re-rail at Clarenville and that division and, if possible, eventually to go on to Port-aux-Basques. While the Government continues to operate the Railroad, if there is a serious accident because of

the bad state of repair, the Government will be blamed. Everything possible must be done to keep the road in a safe condition, and I think the Opposition will agree that we are justified in this. The next iterm is $80,000.00 for a Public Building at Corner Brook with equipment. $80,000.00 will be the cost of the building fully equipped. Tenders were called for and the only tender was $95,000.00 without equipment. Equipment will mean about six or seven thousand dollars. By any other tender it would have cost the Government $20,000 more. The next is $13,000 for an addition to the building of the Liquor Controller's Department and that ought to go, you will agree to capital account. That has been done and consists of a new storey on top of the Liquor Controller's offices. The next is the new heating system of the Court House $12,000. It is estimated it will be a little more or less. We next come to a part of this program which is no fault whatever of the present Government, but has to be paid. It is an amount which is really hereditary, but it is pit prop account including the Rogers claim of $200,000. That is the balance owed to-day on this account at the Bank of Montreal. The Rogers claim is about $30,000 and $171,000 is owed the Bank of Montreal on pit prop account. A million dollars was borrowed last year to wipe this out, but it was not known at that time what the balance was. This is the balance due now, and it was decided that there was nothing else to do but get a loan and pay it up. The next item is $90,000 to liquidate the Militia Account. An amount was borrowed by the past Government to do certain things in connection with the Militia and a balance remained was never paid. This amount has to be paid and the Government decided that the money would have to be borrowed to pay up. Next comes an amount of $80,000 which is not our fault again. In connection with this we are the innocent victims of circumstances which we had no control over. $80,000 is owed the Imperial Government and they have demanded payment. It appeared that this was owed them in connection with three ships, the Lobelia, the Watchful and the Daisy. That is another matter that is no part of our work at all, but as has already stated was left to the Government to clean up and has got to be cleaned up. It has never been paid. We found it there and we have to pay it. The next thing we come to is the balance due to the Railway Purchase Loan, $58,210.00. This amount is appears is still due of an original two million dollars. The next item is $150,000 for new Lighthouses and Fog Alarms. I understand that the Department of the Marine and Fisheries have spent a considerable amount of money during the past year building new light and new fog alarms. The Minister will be able to give any further information or details that might be required. It will be agreed that that cannot be taken out of Current Account. It is proposed this year to spend another $50,000 in keeping these lights, etc., in repair. It is generally understood that the lighthouses all over the country are in a bad condition, and we have been trying to repair them. The next item on the Resolutions is $75,000 for the Labrador Boundary Expenses and the United States Pecuniary Claim. I understand from the Minister of Justice there are some petty bills coming in in connection with the Labrador Boundary that will have to be paid, and the case is coming on in October before the Privy Council and money will be required. The Government have decided that this is something that could hardly be taken out

of Current Account. If it was taken out of Current Account taxes would have to be increased. I think it should be looked upon as belonging to Capital Account, also as I feel convinced we will win this case. $25,-000 of this is for the United States Pecuniary Claim that we admitted. There is $50,000 for erection and alterations to Public Buildings. I understand that the Museum and a lot of the Public Buildings are in a very bad condition, and this is voted with the idea of repairing and fixing them up. The next item is $50,000 for an addition to the Sanitoriium. The Government realises that it is necessary to do something for the Sanitorium, for it is impossible to get a patient in, and it is thought also by putting an addition on congestion will be relieved at the General Hospital also, for there are a good many Tuberculosis cases down there and they are practically chronic cases and if this money can be spent in making an addition to the Sanitorium the General Hospital may be relieved of twenty-or thirty patients and that much more space will be left free for patients who require to come in to be attended to immediately. The next item is one hundred thousand dollars. I understand from the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs that a lot of lines had to be rebuilt, being in a falling down condition and this amount is required to be able to sustain a line through the country and the amount is very necessary.

The next matter that I propose to satisfy the House and the country with is the expenditure of $296,790.00 for investigating the Mineral, Agricultural and Fishing Resaurces of the Colony; developing and experimenting in connection therewith, and especially in promoting the interest of the Fisheries in respect to Bait Depots. I might say that the decision of the Government already is to bring a man here and enquire into our minerals and to investigate generally what our mineral resources are worth and to satisfy yourselves once and for all if our St. George's Coal Fields are worth while.

Then there is $1,000,000.00 for special public works and improvements, making a total of $5,000,000,-00. I do not think that any honourable member of the Opposition can object to that vote, particularly in view of the fact that so many bridges and roads all over the country need such extra attention. Now the Government have devoted two million dollars for highroads and I am in accord with having it carried out to a finish. I am proud to know that twenty-five motor cars arrived here yesterday and these are entitled to good roads and highroads. With regard to the railroad, I am no prophet, but, if it is economically run and economically handled, my personal opinion is that it can pay for itself. It is unfortunate that we have to ask for this loan but if the people of the country want their property taken care of there is no way that public expenditure can take care of that expenditure clear of a loan.

MR. HICKMAN,—Mr. Chairman, I contend that these Resolutions should not be proceeded with this afternoon becase the amount of the Loan asked for exceeds what we expected. We did not think that the Government would need any more than three million dollars and now we find the Government asking for five millions. Ever since this Government has been in power they have been talking about the $1,600,000.00 of a deficit left by their predecessors; still that amount is not made up in the additional Loan. Included in this Loan is $75,000.00 for Labrador Boundary Expenses and U. S. A. Pecuniary Claims. Why not make them a present of the Labrador Boundary; al-

though the press supporting the Government were wont to say what a wonderful victory we had achieved in this country. Now we find that the Government has got to come in here and ask for $75,000.00. I do not think that the Government should come in here and ask for authority to borrow money for every little thing like that. With regard to the proposed addition to the Sanitorium I have no objection, and with regard to the amount devoted for the development of the St. George's Coal Fields, I think that every member of the House is in accord with that. As to experimenting on the fisheries, I think it is due to us to know what the Government propose to do with regard to that proposition. Then there is $1,000,000.00 allowed for special public works and improvements. Having had no explanation of it, I think that this so called proposed expenditure of a million dollars for public works is a forecast of a General Election. During last session of the House we were given to understand that the $1,600,000.00 referred to covered all liabilities of the last Government. With reference to the steamers Lobelia, Watchful and Daisy, the Minister of Finance was in the Executive Government at the time that it was decided at a meeting at Government House that these small steamers were to be sent here instead of ten or a dozen aeroplanes and I also understood that these three ships were gifts and not to be paid for. I, therefore, would ask that the Committee rise so that members on this side of the House who are not present this afternoon, can consider the matter?

MR. HALFYARD,—Mr. Chairman, I am sure that if there is anything that will have a saddening effect not alone upon this House, but upon the country generally, will be to borrow another five million dollars to carry on the Government. During the short term of office of the present administration of less than two years they have borrowed six and a half millions and now they propose to borrow five millions more and we have nothing of a substantial nature or of a labour giving industry to show for that expenditure. With regard to the Budget I might say that we are budgeting nothing so far as our debts and our liabilities are concerned. The Budget contains nothing about the deficit on Railway, or Supplementary Supply, and the only part of the Budget that we are concerned about and that the country is concerned about is what has been left out of the Budget. I contend that our public utilities in the main, such as the repairing of roads and bridges, telegraph lines and lighthouses should be met out of current revenue, even without borrowing more money or "padding" or 'cooking" the Budget. Throughout every part of the British Empire the National Debt and Railways are Budgeted, particularly that of Government controlled Railways; but the Monore Government does not see fit to Budget concerning the financial standing of our Railway, despite the fact that the people, particularly the working classes, are responsible for the upkeep of the Newfoundland Railway. Personally, I do not know what we are heading for. Page 13 of the Budget delivered in April, 1925 by the Finance Minister says:

(Reads).

We had to assume the responsibility and we naturally thought that the outstanding liabilities were wiped out by last year's loan. With regard to the special vote for public works and improvements, Mr. Chairman, I would only vote for that for the relief of unemployment. That is the only reason why I would vote for it.

In every district in the island there are a certain number of unemployed, and it is just as well to have that vote to distribute to the different districts per capita. I would be better pleased, however, if the Finance Minister could give us more particular information, as to what purposes these special amounts are to be applied. I would ask the Finance Minister to raise the Committee and to come back to-morrow prepared to give full particulars as to how the money will be spent.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE,—Mr. Chairman, before the Committee rises I would like to bring a few points to the attention of members on both sides of this House. In the first place I certainly think that there is no doubt about the fact, that no one wants to be raising money. But we have got to pay our bills and that settles it. There is no particular pleasure to any member of this House to have a loan bill a dollar more than it ought to be. But so far as the present loan bill is concerned, it certainly has brought to some of us, surprises, with regard to the developing of things that we did not know that we were liable for at all. When the Railway Settlement Act was passed in 1923, the Reids got $2,000,000 and then we thought it was all over and done with. It was only when the Finance Minister was called upon the other day to provide this $58,000 that we discovered that section five of the Agreement that was passed at that time, rendered us liable for this amount.

(Reads Section 5)

I may say here that this $2,000,000 that was put down in the loan Bill was raised at that time for the finalising of the Railway Settlement the Government floated the loan and we are paying the difference now. It is the same with regard to these boats. It is perfectly true that they were gifts. But is like a person giving you a gift of a motor car. You have got to pay your license. You have got to get your registration fees through. And you have got to buy gasolene. And you also have to give her a lick of paint to get her down town. We were given the Lobelia, the Watchful and the Daisey. But there were certain alterations that had to be made. The Admiralty said that they would give us the boats but we had to pay for those improvements ourselves.

Mr. Chairman, I want also to avail of the opportunity to table now the report upon the Pecuniary Claims Commission, for the information of the House. Mr. Morine and Mr. Hunt were the Council employed. The report was made to the Governor in Council. And it is only fair to say here now, that the remark made by the Leader of the Opposition, though of course it was not intended to in any way to reflect on the report made, was found to be entirely unsound. The Colony had outstanding, claims by the American Government, amounting to $100,000. But the Colony admitted what they were going to pay, and in every respect the resistance of the remaining claims has been completely successful.

Secondly as regards the much disputed Labrador Boundary. I have a letter here, dated May the 17th, from Burn and Berridge in London. I will read it to prepare the House and the country for the fact, that when we come in here and ask for fees, we should know what is the cost. Anticipating that we would be called upon in October to pay some fees, to the Council engaged, I cabled them to know what the demands would be that we would have to meet in the near future. And I received this letter which is as follows:

(Reads letter)

Now I would like the House to perfectly understand that there is nothing haphazard or wild, when we ask for this vote here. We want to be in a position that when people ask for their money we will be able to pay them that is all. It must be remembered that so far as this Labrador Boundary is concerned, since this administration has come into power no additional counsel has been retained. Those gentlemen whose names I have mentioned, were retained by the previous administration.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, I don't intend to delay the Committee any longer, but I would just like to draw the attention of the Leader of the Opposition to the fact that I have just been looking at this loan bill here before me, and nowhere is the Lobelia or the Daisy mentioned. Now the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition will remember the incident of the aeroplanes. It happened that when we were offered those aeroplanes, we thought that we would prefer a wrecking tug or a big tug to go outside. If we got that we would appreciate it very much. We turned down the aeroplanes because we thought that they would be of no value. I don't think, however, that there was anyone in the Government at that time who thought that those steamers were going to cost anything like this. I never thought that we would have to pay $80,000 or $100,000 for them. That was a peculiar kind of present. There is one other matter that I want to refer to. That is that I thoroughly disagree with Mr. Halfyard, when he says that we borrowed $11,000,000, and we have got nothing to show for it. Have we not got the one hundred and thirty one miles of railroad to Clarenville. Have we not got two new steam coaches and new cars. Then there is the new dock. You are not going to turn around and say that the new dock is no good. We have something there for the money spent. And you are not going to condemn the freight sheds. You are only talking that way from a political point of view. And I want to point out to the hon. member that $2,250,000 has practically been paid out in meeting bills contracted by the last Government. Possibly you did a lot of good with that money also. But nevertheless we had to borrow the money to pay for it.

MR. HALFYARD—Would you itemise that.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Well, first of all there was $1,720,000 of a deficit for 1923 and 1924. Then there is the 428,000 and the interest that you are liable to be charged for this, which would bring the whole amount up to $2,250,000. Now I am not laying down a law. Probably you went through lots of trials and tribulations. But I would like to see some constructive work for the money which you spent, which we have not got. That is all. When we debate this matter in Committee to-morrow, perhaps I will be able to go over the details much better.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman, I quite agree with the member for Trinity that the amount of $5,000,000 is a very large amount, and far above what we were anticipating on this side of the House. I think that this shows a very sad state of things in this country, if one million dollars has to be provided for unemployment. Not only that one million, but also what has to be spent on the re-railing of the railroad on the freight sheds, and public buildings, which will total a large sum. What I would like to ask the Minister or any member of the Government is, whether they are satisfied that they have the fullest information as to what are the conditions that prevail in this country with regard to unemployment. Is there actually 5000 people out of employment in this country to-day.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I don't say that we are going to spend it all within the next two months. I hope that it will last for five years.

MR. GRIMES—I don't know how long it will last. You may spend it all this year. But I think that we ought to know what is actually going to be done with this money, and how long you are going to take to spend it, and also how many people there are unemployed. The Minister of Finance made a statement this afternoon that some districts are better off than other districts, and it would not be required to spend as much in one district as in another. If that be so then he has not given any reason to this House to show that this expenditure of one million dollars on public works is warranted. And I say that to-morrow when this matter comes up before the House again we ought to be given the fullest information in connection with unemployment in this country. And I think that we ought to investigate all the demands that might be made before voting away monies to the extent that we are doing to-day. One million dollars with the one hundred and fifty thousand already voted means 5,500 persons being cared for by Government expendiure in one way or another. I submit this is too serious a matter to deal with without better reasons given than those already stated to the House.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a word in reply to the member who has just sat down. I would like to understand how it is possible for us to know the conditions of unemployment in Newfoundland. Are you going to advertise for every man who is out of a job. We don't know and there is no way of knowing how many people there are out of employment. And I don't think it would be good policy to look for them. If we look for them, we certainly will be able to find a great many men unemployed, or who would call themselves unemployed, and who would be able to get along without Government assistance. I am particularly satisfied, that in spite of the fact that there has not been any development of a big industry like the Gander, and in spite of the agitation on the part of some politicians for the Government to provide for it, we have not had the demands up to the present that I thought we would have had. And I say that it is to the credit of the people of this country that it is so. I think that it would be a reflection on the people to ask them whether they are unemployed or not. The purpose of raising one million is not to find employment for the unemployed, or to give it away in poor relief. It is put there for the construction of permanent works and works that are necessary in this island, and which ought to be on capital account. We have been building bridges that have fallen down after a few years, or have to be repaired frequently. It is very necessary and very advisable now, that concrete bridges are being built, that we should continue that policy, and they can't be built out of current revenue. They cost ten times as much or five times as much, as the case may be, to build them out of concrete as to build them of wood. There are certain places certain permanent roads should be built, good roads, irrespective and outside of the particular tourist policy. These matters should have the consideration of the Government. And where we see that it is necessary, and possible in the future that people must be either paid or given work, we can use a certain portion of it for that. For that reason and that alone I can assure Mr. Grimes and every member on the other side that we are going to guard pretty carefully that one million. It is not going to be given out "Pro rata," and any work that is done is going to be done under

careful superintendence, and not by the ordinary road boards. I only rose to make that explanation because Mr. Grimes made the suggestion that we ought to be prepared to-morrow to come into this House, and give a list of the unemployed in Newfoundland.

MR. HALFYARD — Mr. Chairman, these pleasing platitudes that we hear from members of this House fall on deaf ears as far as I am concerned. You were going to spend half a million last year on roads, and you spent instead $1,121,000. If anyone will say that was properly spent, I fail to see what reason they possess, with this country saddled with debt as it is, and a small community of 250,000 people. Here we have a crowd of men called legislators, trying to make themselves believe that they can afford to spend one million dollars on a visionary scheme. It is a sad commentary on the intelligence of the people who occupy seats in this legislature, considering the conditions of things at the present time. No unemployment, why I could bring up a stack of letters from my own district written by people who think that I may have something to do with the allocation of grants. Nine out of ten of those letters are from people asking for something to do, and the other one tenth, for money to build roads and bridges. I am not talking politics. I throw that back. What I meant to say was that we are getting no returns for the money that has been spent, that could give tangible results from an industrial point of view. You have not created any new industry. You have only rebuilt public utilities such as the dock, and you spent too much on that.

MINISTER OF FINANCE—What did you do?

MR. HALFYARD—Never mind what I did. What are you doing now that is the question. Are you lessening expenditure, or is there any hope of lessening expenditure in the future. You say that you had to build the dock, and to re-rail the railroad, but are we any better off after doing that? The same thing applies to the freight sheds. Take for example the Furness Withy, a wealthy company. If they thought that concrete sheds were necessary they would have built them. Instead of that they have built sheds which cost half the money, while this Government is going on as if we were rolling in riches. We are spending money in all directions, and at the same time we can't meet our current liabilities, and we have to transfer them to capital account. That is the condition of the country. All the smooth sayings of anyone in this House or outside of it cannot alter the situation. I ask you what is going to happen to that one million as far as Trinity District is concerned. Are you going to do the same as last year. Roads and bridges falling down. Trinity District is being neglected and that money will be diverted somewhere else to build roads in other districts, and expend money that is uncalled for. The country cannot afford it; and it is contrary to the expectations of the people when they elected the Monroe Government to power, absolutely contrary to the expectations of the people of the country when the Monroe Government was elected to power, and it is continuing, I am inclined to believe, more so than ever before, because for my own part I don't take politics seriously as far as the party side of it is concerned; but I am inclined to believe that it is high time for this Government to vacate office. This resolution confirms me in that opinion.

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.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the following Resolution was adopted:

RESOLVED: That a Joint Commission of both Houses of the Legislature should be appointed with power to sit out of session to enquire as to the cure and cull of salt fish, its transportation and marketing and cognate matters concerning the Colony's salt fish trade;

RESOLVED: That the Speaker be asked to name five members of the House to serve as such Commission;

RESOLVED: That a message be sent to the Legislative Council requesting their concurrence and the appointment of a similar number of their members to serve on the said Commission.

Mr. Speaker appointed the five members of the Commission as follows: Hon. the Prime Minister, Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Mr. Hickman, Mr. Scammell.

Old Age Pension Bill

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, while the bills are being distributed I may say that the object of this Act is merely to enlarge the scope of the Act passed last year. Last year's Act, if you will remember, transferred pensions of men to the widows of men who had reached 65. The object is that where there is a widow of a person who has received the old age pension, who is 65, automatically after July 1st she receives a pension. If the House feels like making progress, I shall move the first reading now, and perhaps we can make further progress this afternoon.

MR. LAKE—Mr. Speaker, if I might be permitted to say so, this is not the point I wanted at all. I asked the House yesterday if the Act could not be amended to include any old women. I don't see why it should apply to widows of old age pensioners only.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, I take it the House is agreeable to the second reading of this Bill. As I understand it, an amount of $20,000 has been put in the Estimates this year for old age pensions, and I think the object is to provide grants for old men where they are at present insufficient and unsatisfactory—that is the primary object. That being so the second question was one following on that—it must have come to the knowledge of most members that there were many cases unprovided for in the Act of last year. There were many applications, and it was found that it only applied where the deaths were subsequent to March, 1925. The object of this is to remedy that, and we do so in these words: (Reads)

It doesn't propose to make a refund of any amounts not paid under the old scheme; beginning July 1st any old ladies whose husband was receiving a pension comes on the list when the husband dies, on application. It is not intended to extend the pension to all old ladies for this reason; if you do so you will have every old lady receiving the pension in the same way as the men, it will more than double the present vote. It is utterly absurd to put in such a provision without practically doubling the old age pensions vote.

MR. MOORE—Mr. Speaker, I was not as much interested in this bill yesterday as I am to-day. I can readily understand that it would be hard for the Minister of Justice or for the Government to come in and change the law every time as a member has a hard case to put before them. But I had a case to-day—an old lady whose husband died years ago came to me; she came to me some time ago and I promised her when this would come up that I would see what could be done, and that I would try to get her a pension. I forgot it until she came to me again to-day. She is cer-

tainly an object for sympathy and should if possible get a pension—her husband died years ago and was a pensioner fisherman.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—That is just the kind of case we are providing for.

MR. MOORE—Then that is quite satisfactory to me. That is all I want to know.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that the Minister of Justice has seen fit to introduce this Bill. While I do not object to the remarks of the member for Burin, Mr. Lake, I do not want to jeopardise the bill which is now before the House for the sake of attempting to get pensions for all old women at this time. That is a thing which may come later, and as the Attorney-General says will mean doubling the vote for this purpose, if not more than that. I would therefore like to say that I am squarely in accord with the Bill as it is—I deprecate the suggestion that it should go further at the present time. That can only happen if the Government is prepared to come in with an additional vote of $40,000. This amendment takes care of the cases which were before the House yesterday, and I support it. I think it will afford a great deal of relief to people who would otherwise be deprived of comfort that they were enjoying when their husbands were getting a pension.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Speaker, I rise to say that I am in accord with the terms of this Bill, and my regret is that it doesn't go further than it does. I hope the time will come when old people will not have to be 75 before they are pensioned, and that as time goes on it will be brought down to 65 or 70. I believe that as men get older it is the duty of the State to look after those who are not able to look after themselves. I think the Government is doing well, and I give this measure my hearty support.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Burin, Mr. Lake, has just made a statement that I think rather important, inasmuch as it reveals a condition of things regarding the old age pension scheme that we have lost sight of. Now the system that has been adopted is that the allocations are made pro ratio for each district, and Mr. Lake has just stated that he has vacancies in his district. I know districts that have long waiting lists and cannot get them filled, and I think the administration of the Act is not being properly carried out.

There is also another aspect of the matter that requires serious consideration, and that is regarding the qualifications of applicants. It doesn't follow that a man of 75 should get a pension merely because of that —there may be lots of men of 70 who need it much more than he, and the whole scheme is being badly administered in my opinion. Perhaps because a man has not much political pull, or doesn't see eye to eye with a political party, years and years may pass without his getting a pension, although he may be absolutely qualified to receive one; then he "passes in his checks", so to speak, and his widow, under this Act, has no claim—she is penalized because her husband was penalized, and I say it is an inefficient system.

I have no idea of the number of widows in the country who would come under this, but I do know that the Legislature has voted enough to pay every man of seventy-five years $50.00, irrespective of class or means. Two or three years ago I took up the census returns and divided the amount of money granted by 50 and found that there was enough to pay every man of 75 an old age pension. There must be something wrong somewhere—either people are getting the pension who

are not entitled to it, or there is something wrong with the census returns. And we are only going to aggravate a position that is unjustifiable. A man dies and leaves a widow—he may have been able to support his family and never have applied for the old age pension, although he may have been living from hand to mouth. He dies, leaving nothing, and although his widow may be 75 years of age, because he did not get anything she has no claim. The Act itself is alright but this is one of the anomalies of which I speak. I represent a district which has a long waiting list for pensions, and we are trying to give those on the list every possible consideration; other districts have amounts to their credit, and I think this requires grave consideration. I would give every possible assistance to the widow of a pensioner, as well as the aged men who were not pensioners, for these are the men who helped to build the country when they were younger, and their widows are entitled to consideration. I don't want to oppose this Bill but I do not think that it is comprehensive enough and hope that before the next session something will be done towards reorganisation.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, I would like to place myself on record as supporting this measure and I would be pleased if the Government could see its way clear to give the pension to old ladies as well as old men. As it has been pointed out by previous speakers this would mean practically doubling the grant if pensions were given to ladies of sixty-five. It has been said that the country cannot afford it, but I think that we can afford anything, and if we go on borrowing millions every year it is just as well to add another two or three hundred thousand to this and just add two or three words to amend this Bill and make it include ladies as well as men.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Speaker, I am in accord with what has already been said and I want to register my approval of the present amendment of the Old Age Pension Act. While the remarks of Mr. Bennett may be the case, I know there are one or two in the district of St. Barbe who have been recommended and had not reached the age of seventy-five, but there were extenuating circumstances. By providing a pension they were less a charge on the community and by giving them the pensions other forms of relief were obviated.

I don't see how we can depart from dealing with this on the per capita basis, although I believe some laxity ought to be permitted. I understand that where there are vacancies in some districts and a long list in another the amount has sometimes been transferred. I remember meeting Mr. Vinicombe when he was a member here and he told me that if I was short on old age pensions they had some over and could spare me some. That opened my eyes. Fortunately I have never had to avail myself of the offer, and most of the applicants in my district have received compensation. I am also inclined to agree with Mr. Halfyard when he says we should provide for old women, if we could see our way clear to do something. And speaking of money, I have never seen the House in such a jocular mood as they were to-day when we were talking of raising five million dollars. I agree that we should grant pensions for men who have been worn out in the service of their country, and the widows of the fishermen of this country have borne the heat and toil of the day and have done as much towards the building up as the men, and they ought to be put on the pension list. The widows and wives of the pen-

sioners have worked just as hard as the men in most cases, and I think it is only fair to grant them the small pension which is received by the men. I want to place myself on record as supporting this and trust that, as the Colonial Secretary says, any irregularities or anomalies will be provided for by the next session of the Legislature.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that, arising out of remarks of members opposite yesterday, I undertook to get this Bill prepared for to-day, and it is gratifying to find the support this has received.

We had an old ladies' bill in here a little while ago, but just what progress it is making in the Upper Chamber we have been unable to ascertain as yet. This is one case in which we are able to look after the ladies in our own way. This is a money bill and the decisions of this House will not be interfered with. The hon. member for St. Barbe quotes the instance in which Mr. Vinicombe told him that if he had not enough old age pensioners to look after he could give him some. It shows that Mr. Vinicombe appreciated the spirit of the Old Age Pension Act. It does not mean that there is any lack of applicants in St. John's East. It was never intended to be a district matter. It is rather interesting to remember that this country was the first of the British Dominions to adopt the old age pension scheme. It is only recently that Canada began to follow our example. This amount of fifty thousand dollars that was voted was for nothing more than for some assistance in distressed cases. It was intended to apply not only in the matter of age but specifically and definitely in the cases where persons had not sufficient means for their support. It was never intended that a person should come to the age of seventy-five before they should be able to receive the pension. There are many men in this country who are past the age of seventy-five and because of their own industry and good luck, perhaps, they are not in need of old age pensions, but the whole idea in the carrying out of the Act has been the question of the men's needs. I have always felt that it did seem funny to have to tell a man who had broken down at sixty-five or seventy that the pension age was seventy-five, and that he would have to live another five or ten years to get it. I subscribe to the idea that it ought not to be so much old age assistance as assistance for those who because of misfortune in some form or another are in need of help. The hon. member for Burin has mentioned the case where the father of the family has passed away and the family has been raised through the efforts of the widow, and as the years have gone and she is grown old the family has passed out of her life and left her alone. I do not think that there is anything more pathetic than cases of that kind. And I do not think that there are any two minds about finding some scheme to help her. The present scheme is only trying to do away with some of the hardship that has been experienced in the last few years, and I can do no more than say that so far as I am concerned I am at one with those who advocate and try to provide for cases where anyone, man or woman, having reached an advanced age, I do not say necessarily seventy-five, but where they have become dependent on charity, that it is the duty of the State to come forward to their support. I do not think that it is the duty of the State to pay half the attention to a man who has his health and try to look after his wants in the matter of employment, as it is their duty to

provide for the persons who because of advanced age or bad health have become dependent.

MR. LAKE—I am in full accord with what the Minister of Justice has just said. But it seeems to me that there is something wrong with the carrying out of the Act.. In regard to the district of Burin I do not handle old age pensioners unless they come from the magistrate or clergyman in the town in which they belong, and then I always get the proper statistics in connection with their age and their condition. I know of several old men of over seventy-five who never looked for a pension, and to my knowledge I only know of one man under seventy-five geting it. That man got smashed up about five years ago. His wife is older than he is. I took the matter up with the Minister of Finance and asked him to do the best he could about the case. I did not want to lie about it, I told him the exact condition.

Mr. Speaker, I think with the Minister of Justice that we should look after our old women as well as our old men. As Mr. Halfyard said just now, there is no reason why that grant should not be increased if possible. I hope that the present Government will see its way to do that because I would like to see the old woman over sixty-five get the pension.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY —The hon. member for Burin is likely to get himself into a funny position over this thing. He says that he has very few old age pensioners, and therefore he must have few old age widows of pensioners. I suppose that it is because your district is so wealthy, and the district produces so much, as we learned from your able address the other day, that they do not require the old age pension. Or, they do not live to be seventy-five. I am sorry to hear that. The good die young. Then you must have very few widows. What I was going to ask is supposing that there are not enough of pensioners to go around. A drop balance? I think that somebody should be given discretionary powers under this thing. I suggested yesterday that the Minister of Finance and Customs should have such powers under certain conditions. It would be unfortunate to have ten thousand dollars of a drop balance because we did not have sufficient widows to absorb the amount. In regard to this whole question I will tell the House of an extraordinary thing that happened yesterday in my office. The Superintendent of the Poor Asylum came down to me and he seriously asked me what he would do with the money of the people who had died in the Poor House. He has their bank books and they have left no issue. I think that this country is looking up. It must be a very prosperous sign. Mr. Miller was much exercised over the fact that he had the money in his possession. I told him that I did not know of any manner of disposing of it unless it went into Chancery. I sent him to the Minister of Justice. I merely mention that but I would like to see some provision made for any money that may be left over after the widows have been looked after. I had the honour to be one of those who voted for the first twenty thousand dollars in this House for this purpose, when a member of the Government of Sir Edward Morris. Now we are voting a hundred and twenty thousand dollars for the old age pensioners. But is there not something wrong? I think that it should not be according to districts because there are some districts that are worse off than others and are in need of more assistance in this respect while others that are more fortunate are not in need of it. However, there are some aspects that we cannot look at under

this bill, but I think some good has been accomplished for the old age pension scheme and I hope that when the member for Burin comes in here next year that he will be able to tell us that his district does not require any assistance in the matter of old age pensions.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the Bill entitled "An Act to Further 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 presently.

Whereupon, with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to Further Amend Chapter 74 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third 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 presently.

Whereupon, with unanimous consent, 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 Further Amend Chapter 74 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Old Age Pensions.'"

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 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, with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to Further 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.

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 Chapter 181 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Harbour Master and Harbour Regulations for the Port of St. John,'" "An Act to Amend the Act 15 and 16 Geo. V. Cap. 23 (1925) entitled 'An Act Respecting the Encqurage-ment of Shipbuilding and Rebuilding,'" "An Act to Amend Chapter 51 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Nuisances and Municipal Regulations,'" and "An Act to Amend 15 Geo. V. Cap. 8, entitled 'Of the House of Assembly,'" without amendment.

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. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MR. CRAMM—There are some things that I do not understand in connection with this, and I move that the committee rise and give us an opportunity of seeing into these votes.

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 to Consolidate the Education Act.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. introducer that the Second Reading be deferred so as to give members on this side of the House an opportunity of perusing and considering the Bill?

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER —Mr. Speaker, I would be very pleased to have the Second Reading deferred, as we have no desire to press the matter, but I would like, for the guidance of those, who are interested in Education, to make an explanation before the Bill comes up for discussion. The Bill contains eighty pages and I do not think that there are many members sufficiently interested to peruse all the sections of it. I want to explain to the House that Part (1) of the Bill is mainly a modification of the first (13) sections of the 1920 Amendment Act. It comprises a substitute for a Ministry of the Department. In its place it organizes a Bureau of Education representative of the different denominations with the Prime Minister as Honorary President and establishes a Commissioner as the Executive officer of the Bureau. The Superintendents recommend this change in the interest of educational progress and the church authorities not only assent to the change but prefer it. Apart from this fundamentel change, there is in this Part (1) no important change unless it be the power given to the Bureau to arrange educational facilities for very small settlements where no denomination does anything, as pointed out in Page (5) of the Bill. The legal recognition of the University College (see page 4) and the using of the C.H.E. as an Advisory Board to the Bureau instead of the complicated machinery for this laid down in the 1920 Act. Part (2) is part (1) of the 1916 Act embracing subsequent amendments. There is only one change of importance indicated on page (9), sub-section (i). It is thought that members of the Board of Education, speaking generally, do not take sufficient interest in their office and that they do not know the Education Act. It is enacted here that the sections of the Act indicating their duties, functions and privileges should be read aloud for information of the Annual Meeting of the Board in the hope that knowledge may stimulate interest. Part (3) of the Bill is part (2) of the 1916 Act embracing amendments made since 1916. There is no major change. Part (4) is Part (3) of the 1916 Act embracing subsequent amendments. There is no change except for the addition of the Commissioner, the President of the University College and the Principal of the Normal School to the Council. Part (5) begins at the foot of Page 17 in Part (4) of the 1916 Act with amendments made since—with a division of the University Jubilee Scholarship into two parts on the recommendation of the C.H.E. as a result of the establishment of the University College. Part (6) is Part (5) of the 1916 Act brought up to date. There is a University Grade Teachers' Certificate added. The requirements for all grades have been stiffened up and the University College and Normal School have been included in the institutions recognized for the training of teachers. Part (7) is part (6) of the 1916 Act brought up to date with minor amendments; there is no major change. Part (8) is sections 20 to 23 of the 1920 Act somewhat simplified and containing a few minor amendments. At present the section of the Act concerning the appointment of supervisors and inspectors is inoperative but it is hoped that with improved industrial conditions these important and useful offices

may be appointed. Part (9) is part (7) of the 1916 Act brought up to date. There is no major change. Certain sections pertaining to the small denominations which were deleted in the 1920 Act have been restored. The duties and functions of Superintendents have been transferred to Part (1) of the Act under administration. Part (10) deals with the Treaches' Pension Fund and is Part (8) of the 1916 Act with a few amendments of major importance. When this fund was established some 14 years ago the Government was assured that an annual grant of $1600.00 would be sufficient to enable the fund to meet the charges upon it. To-day it costs the Government $16,000.00. This change has been caused by several circumstances and events; (a) salaries have been almost doubled during the 14 years and therefore pensions have been increased greatly as they depend upon salary; (b) the last ten years of service have been changed into any three of the teachers' choice as a basis of calculating the pension; (c) the disability clause has proved more costly than was anticipated. It has therefore become necessary to increase the fixed premium paid by the teacher by a charge of one per centum of his salary (which will add some $7000 to the fund each year) to stiffen up the disability conditions and to appoint a Board of Trustees to care for the Fund. On this Board the Teachers will have representatives. In consideration of the cost of this fund to the Government—a cost that was never anticipated—the Teachers' Association has given these changes their approval. Part (11) is Part (9) of the 1916 Act and section (27) of the 1920 Act unchanged, except that the amounts are left to be voted by the Legislature each year. Part (12) is part (10) of the 1916 Act with minor changes. A new section may be needed to repeal the statute establishing a Department and Ministry of Education. Part (13) deals with the SCHEDULES, which have all been brought up to date. Schedule (k) Page 71 of the Bill contains a table with a major change. The old augmentation scale started some 36 years ago and has never been changed except by adding a certain rate per cent. to it. It has thus grown out of shape and out of keeping with the conditions of the day and contains anomalies against which the teachers have protested. A new scale has therefore been prepared and which provides annual increases instead of increments in five year periods and stimulates progress in the teachers. Its purpose is not an economical one, but under it progressive teachers can earn more; lazy teachers will earn less. The SCHEDULE of studies has been cut out and left to the Bureau to draw up from time to time to meet growing conditions. These are the main features of the Education Act.

I think that the establishment of the Memorial College has been a very good thing for this country and I think that it is going to prove a great benefit not only in preparing scholars for professions in the future but also in preparing them for the industry of the fisheries and of agricultural employments that may be theirs. I don't think that this country really thoroughly appreciates the benfit that we are getting for the ten thousand dollars which is all the Government is granting to that institution except that we paid the interest on the original cost of $400,000. I am one of those who went around the country on an electioneering campaign condemning the Government who put that building there, but I think that is the best four hundred thousand dollars possibly the former Government spent. We have in it a Government building that is a credit to the Government and there are mighty few buildings of which it can be said that they are a credit to

the Government. The Court House building is not a credit to the Government, and I don't know of any other that the Government owns of which it might be said that is, unless it is the one that we are in. The Normal School building is a credit to the country and although it cost more than it ought to have and although heating and ventilation plants of a rather extravagant nature were put in, we have really an asset in that building, and it is a pleasure to go into it and to attend the various meetings and lectures held in that building which are elevating.

In moving the second reading I want to say that there is nothing contentious about the act which is before you. It is rather lengthy, and I have no doubt that some of the members might like to take it home to go through it and compare it with the former acts.

Speaking with the Superintendents of Education in connection with this and when asking them about the act brought in by Dr. Barnes in 1920 they told me that Dr. Barnes had asked the Superintendents to offer suggestions with regard to the amendments he proposed and without paying any heed to their suggestions he put his bill in force. I think that if Dr. Barnes had taken the Superintendents, who had a larger knowledge of affairs of education in this country, into his counsel a great deal of necessary amending possibly could have been avoided.

I don't think that there is anything more that I need add. We will take the matter up in Committee. It is a long Bill, having some eighty pages and I don't think really that there are enough gentlemen in the House that take sufficient interest in it to have it read through. Any of the members who are sufficiently interested and who care to go through the Bill and compare it with former acts, will, I think satisfy themselves that there is nothing of a contentious nature. There was an original Education Act in 1916, and it was amended in 1920 with other amendments since and if we merely amended it again now, without consolidating the Acts, it would be almost as difficult to understand as our Sealing Bills at the present time. It has been thought advisable therefore to make a consolidation of our Education Acts, so that they can be put in book form and used in schools as the Education Acts Consolidated.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I beg to give notice that I will on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Act 8, Edward VII. (1908) Cap. 6, entitled "An Act with respect to Compensation to Workmen for injuries suffered in the course of their employment and Acts in amendment thereof."

I would like to say for the imformation of the hon. members that the object of this is to bring into effect at once merely a short amendment with regard to the matter of the amount of compensation of workmen. The Act with larger provisions completely remodelling the acts in connection with this, is going to take a good deal of time and this is now introduced to put into effect increased compensation immediately.

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, and the Act 15 Geo. V., Cap. 23 (1925).

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, June 2nd, 1926.

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

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER— Mr. Speaker, since this Houst last met I regret to say that the Legislature has been deprived by death of another of its prominent members and in the passing of the Hon. Philip Templeman, whose sudden demise we have just heard of, we are left without one of the most eminent Newfoundlanders of the Legislative Council. For a quarter of a century or more he has been a supplying merchant in the capital town of the district of Bonavista where he made himself wonderfully popular, liked and respected by those who had dealing with him. He was Chairman of many of my meetings there and I had an opportunity of seeing how he was regarded by these people. The country has lost a great man in Mr. Templeman. He was a man who took a deep interest in the fisheries and a man who took a great interest in the Colony's affairs and I beg to move the following Resolution of condolence:

"That this House places on record its deepest sympathy with the family of the late Hon. Philip Templeman, a member of the Legislative Council whose sudden passing has removed from our midst one of Newfoundland's most representative sons. Resolved, further that as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased this House do now adjourn."

MR. HICKMAN — Mr. Speaker, again it is my sad duty to second a motion of sympathy to the relatives of a member of the Legislative Council, a man whom we all know as a Newfoundlander who has made considerable progress in his line of business, and a man that this country can ill afford to lose because of the way he supplied for the fishery, especially for the Labrador fishery. Although he has not yet reached the allotted span, Mr. Templeman spent the whole of his life in the fishing business of the country and was ever ready to see towards the uplifting of that in-

again it is my sad duty to second a the motion proposed by the Prime Minister.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Speaker, I regret the sad circumstances which necessitates my supporting the motion before the Chair at the present time. I desire on behalf of those of us who, for a number of years, have been associated with Mr. Templeman, commercially and socially, to express a word of regret over his sudden passing. In the district of Bonavista and around that whole Peninsula of Bonavista it has been our pleasure and our privilege to know Mr. Templeman as a business man and as a friend, and, apart from political affiliations, we have always known him as a gentleman. His sudden passing comes as a shock; but I think that his career shows what a young man can do in Newfoundland when imbued with the desire to succeed. Not only the district of Bonavista, but the whole country will regret his passing, and I think that the Prime Minister has done well in moving the adjournment of the House out of respect to the memory of the deceased.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Speaker, In rising to support the Resolution proposed by the Prime Minister, I would like to associate myself with what has been said with regard to the late Mr. Templeman. Personally, I feel his demise keenly. I have known Mr. Templeman for many years and I am sure that he will be missed in Bonavista and elsewhere. He was what I would call one of Nature's noblemen. He always had an open home; he never turned anybody down. From the standpoint of business I never met anything better than Philip Templeman. I extend to his wife and family my sincerest sympathy and I join in the Prime Minister's motion for an

adjournment of this House on account of the loss of one of Newfoundland's best sons.

MR. MOORE—Mr. Speaker, Representing a fishing district, I desire to go on record as supporting the motion now before the Chair. I have known Mr. Templeman for quite a number of years. He was a personal friend of mine and I regret very much his sudden passing. Newfoundland has lost a great friend in Mr. Templeman, and I know that I am voicing the sentiments and feelings of the people of my district when I support the motion for an adjournment.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Speaker, Ordinarily a motion of this kind is spoken to by persons who wish to speak in more or less representative capacities. As the late Mr. Templeman's memory has been spoken to in the sense of an outport man, I think that I should join in the tribute paid as to how he was known in St. John's. He was a supplier for the fisheries for many years and as a business man I had ample opportunity of forming my estimate of the type of man that he was. I was in conversation with him, I might say, late last evening, and his sudden passing is certainly a lesson to us all how uncertain this life is and how much we ought be prepared to meet a sudden calling. He certainly was one whose life here made us look upon him as a type that was ever ready. His generous nature, his kindly disposition, his character as the head of a family and a citizen all combined to make us feel that he is now reaping the reward of a good life. I trust that his soul will have eternal rest and that the Lord will shine perpetual Light upon it.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, seconded by Mr. Hickman, the following Resolution was adopted:—

RESOLVED that this House place on record its deepest sympathy with the family of the late Hon. Philip Templeman, a member of the Legislative Council, whose sudden passing has removed from our midst one of Newfoundland's most representative sons.

RESOLVED FURTHER that as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased this House do now adjourn.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until Friday afternoon, 4th inst., at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, June 4th, 1926.

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

First Reading of Workmen's Compensation Act Bill

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Speaker: In this case permission has been granted to speak on the Bill on the motion for the first reading. I thought perhaps that it might save the time of the House and future explanation to give the purport of the present measure now at its introduction. It will be remembered that a resolution was passed by the House in the earlier part of the session with reference to the consideration of the Workmen's Compensation Act and the question of considering the extension of the operation of the Act, and generally both consolidation and amendment of the present law and the making of additions to it, and the matter was referred to a joint selection committee of both Houses. The matter of workmen's compensation in this country or the matter of the extension of the operations of the present law which has such ramifications, is something that would have to be given the fullest consideration before a measure was submitted to be voted on and the reason that course, as spoken of, was taken was because of that, and

also the purpose of sending it to be considered in advance in the form of having it investigated by a joint Select Committee was not alone for this but also to get as far as possible the opinions in the way of evidence of people personally concerned in industrial works in the community where the Act would be in operation. The introduction of the present measure was brought about largely because of the fact that in addition to the consideration that had been given to the matter recently by the Government in a general way, particular interest had been shown in the matter by Mr. Browne, the member for St. John's West, who had gone to the trouble personally to submit for the benefit and consideration of the Government an Act modelled largely on the lines of the Canadian Acts, particularly the Act as operating in Nova Scotia. We had prepared running side by side with this, to be considered a transcription of the present English Act and the position was that it should be considered which form was the more adaptable in this country.

The matter of the handling of awards for workmen's compensation by new means and the scope of each of these forms if adopted was to be the subject of consideration as it was felt that growing out of our lack of keeping pace with the times in the matter of workmen's compensation in the sense of the allowances that should be made there was a feeling that there was not sufficient provision made today under present conditions of the value of money, in the way of awards both for deaths and accidents. It was thought there was a want of sufficent provision as to the extension of the Act and it had to be considered how far the present law might be included and in what sense it might be amended. The introduction of a measure as required for a complete remodelling of our law on Workmen's Compensation would entail a great deal of controversy and it has been thought that the best way to meet the necessity at the present time is the introduction of this short amendment. I want to express my indebtedness to Mr. Browne for his interest and trouble in connection with this. The present amendment with regard to the scope of the present Act does not alter or take from it in any way except in respect of the measure of liability. The effect of this present amendment as will be seen when the hon. members will have had an opportunity of considering the Bill, simply is to increase for families or dependents in case of death the limitation on the amount of compensation from $1,500 to $3,000. At the present time if a workmen is killed in the course of his employment the liability of the employer is limited to fifteen hundred dollars. It is now proposed to change that and make it three thousand dollars. I would like to say that this is not an amount selected haphazard or rushed at, but an amount taken as in keeping with what is considered fair elsewhere. When the present law was made the limitation was selected as in keeping with the limit of compensation of £300 in the English Act of the period. To-day that has moved up to £600. So it is that the present substitution provides only what is provided under the law that our own law was to be compared with equally in that respect before, and as it has been considered necessary in Great Britain by reason of changing conditions to make the extension so also it is necessary here. As regards the weekly payments a man will get half his average weekly salary and the limitation clause is stricken out. The second last section provides that the Act shall come into force on the first of January next. The reason of that of course is to give an opportunity to persons affected to make arrange-

ments by way of insurance. We have learned that most of the concerns carrying insurance carry it to the year ending 31st of December and therefore of course this gives a reasonable period so that employers may have time to make arrangements to take on this new liability. I do not know that I can do more than to extend to the hon. member who has shown such interest in the matter my personal thanks and to ask the House to accept from me the assurance that the point of bringing in this present measure is so as not to disturb conditions under the present Act, but to meet a point on which I don't think there will be any diversity of opinion namely that the allowances in cases of death and accident ought to measure up to what is being done in other countries.

I beg to move the First Reading.

MR. LAKE—I am very sorry that this Bill was not brought before the House before as I am interested in the matter very much. I have discussed the matter on various occassions with Mr. Browne. I think that a Bill should include seamen and fishermen and provide for them also as is done under the Nova Scotia Act, and I sincerely trust that next session Mr. Browne may have an opportunity of bringing in that Bill and so provide that dependents of fishermen and seamen who may be lost in carrying on the trade of the country should be provided for. At present there is no such provision except what may be done by the Permanent Marine Disasters Fund. It is time for the country to awake to those facts and I hope as I have said that definite steps in this direction will be taken in the next session of this House.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend Chapter 212 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of Compensation to Workmen" 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 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 and the Act 15 Geo. V., Cap. 33 (1925).

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 Resolutions without amendment.

On motion this Report was received and adopted and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 15 George V., Cap. 33 (1925) 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 presently.

Whereupon with unanimous consent and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 15 George V., Cap. 33 (1925) entitled "An Act Respecting a Tax on Goods Imported into Newfoundland" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon with unanimous consent 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 the Act 15 George V., Cap. 33 (1925) entitled "An Act Respecting a Tax on Goods Imported into Newfoundland."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MR. GRIMES—Suppose I made purchases in the Southern States or elsewhere and had it shipped say to New York and the freight charges to there were $100 according to this Bill I will have to pay duty on the freight charges of $100. Multiply this by all other such freights it means increasing the price of the article concerned. There is no justifiable reason given for asking this to be done. The people of this country are already overburdened with taxes and we should cry halt to any further increases in the cost of living. This bill is going to cause trouble for importers and before further attention is given there ought to be proper investigation made and a report given the House.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, I have had some experience in this regard, although not much in recent years. I take it as a general principle that a price usually quoted is f.o.b. port of transportation. We purchase tea in England which may come from China or India and it is subject to all the charges of bringing it into England, and when we get a price f.o.b. Liverpool for instance, the cost of transportation to Liverpool is naturally added. That is a principle which will also be accepted as far as the United States is concerned. As far as the United States is concerned if we buy goods from Montreal or Boston quotation is f.o.b. that port.

Personally I am afraid that the effect of this Bill is going to jeopardize the trade of our own Railway, as far as transportation to North Sydney is concerned. Suppose we purchase goods f.o.b. Montreal, it usually goes aboard Montreal boats rather than to North Sydney, because the transportation charges from Montreal to North Sydney are considerable and this may have the effect of diverting traffic to opposing steamship lines. That is a phase which strikes me as being rather serious, as we all agree that it should be the policy of the Government who operates the Railway to get all freight possible for the Railway. The more it earns the better it is for the country, and any deficit it incurs has to be paid by the taxpayer, and that can only be adjusted by the earning power of the Railway, and we should be very careful not to jeopardize that earning power.

Apropos of that a very serious situation has arisen regarding the Railway. We have very serious competition in this country that is being very little thought of. We have steamships that operate to our coasts bringing down goods right along the West Coast. The Clark Steamship Company has inaugurated a steamship service in direct competition with the Railway. Not alone is that serious but there is a movement on foot to operate a line of steamships to the East Coast of Newfoundland, so that they will bring goods to the very doors of these people, and the Railway will be entirely cut out. I think that this is a very serious matter and one that ought to be taken up, and I know will be taken up by the Government. And today we may be putting further restrictions on the Railway and this aiding other competitors. If that is the effect I suggest that we should move more carefully.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, Following on what the Colonial Secretary has said, I quite agree there is a serious situation existing on goods coming into Newfoundland from the United States and Canada, and I think the Newfoundland Government is very lenient in allowing ships to come in here and trade without collecting

duties of any sort. They trade here without paying duty of any sort, except when they come to St. John's where they pay Port Dues. I think the Government ought to take this into consideration, because after all it is limiting the merchants who have their money invested in the country to allow people to come in from other countries and trade without any restrictions whatever. I think the Government can well take this into consideration or they will find that before long no goods whatever are transferred via the Railway. And I understand the Canadian Government has subsidized some boats trading on the West Coast.

MR. MOORE—Mr. Chairman, Before we rise from the Committee I would like to have one word. A few evenings ago we were in Committee on an item and a measure for the protection of oil barrels; I supported that and asked the hon. Minister of Finance and Customs at the time if he thought kerosene oil was going to be dearer because of that, and he said he did not think so. Now on March the 8th kerosene was 28½ cents a gallon and to-day it is 31½. Now I am interested in every fisherman on the Southern Shore who is using kerosene for the fishery, and that was the reason I asked that question. The price has gone up to 31½ cents and this is a thing that every member should take up and see that this Oil Company which has this monopoly here does not fleece the fishermen too much. I merely bring this to the attention of the House.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, I certainly agree with what the hon. member has said, and I will investigate this thing. I was given to understand that the measure would not affect the price, and did not know of this increase. I shall look into it.

Following along the line taken by the hon. the Colonial Secretary and the Leader of the Opposition, I am quite in accord with the feeling that these people are not paying any dues and that something should be put on. For the information of Mr. Grimes who asked if I consulted the trade, I might say that it is not much use to consult them, except as indiviiduals. The trade was consulted and I think a Committee was formed and that was the last I heard of it, and one member told me that they could not get together a meeting. That is what happened. They go in and use our wharves and it is a very hard job to get them to pay anything if they damage them, but if we damage a wharf in North Sydney we always have to pay a very large amount.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, before the Committee rises I would just like to refer to the remark of Mr. Moore. I wasn't in the House when the measure of the fifty cents protection on oil barrels was discussed, but I know something about it and the remark made by the honourable member that this increase was because of that is outrageous and incorrect—it cannot possibly have any bearing on this amount. What I want to point out is that this imposition of fifty cents protection has no effect whatever on the cost of oil. The only thing it does is to insure that the Imperial Oil Co. who were geting casks from Halifax they are now getting them from this country. Anyone can make the casks. Dawe is the only one making them to-day.

They ask for certain protection; they ask that fifty cents be put on each cask to give the local production that much protection, so that, instead of buying them from Halifax they would be bought here and used for cod oil the same as kerosene casks. Now the point I want to make

is this: If they increase the price of oil and formulate that as an excuse for so doing, they ought to be told where they get off.

MR. WARREN—I am afraid that I cannot agree with what the Colonial Secretary just said with regard to this. The position is now that the Imperial Oil Company will have practically the monopoly of the oil business when you place a duty of fifty cents on the casks, and I will tell you why. This information has been given me by a firm which has been in the habit of importing oil and which is going out of the business altogether. The Imperial Oil Company imports oil in oil tankers, and they barrel it here. They buy their casks from Dawes. The other firm on Water Street who imports gasolene and kerosene in casks have to pay the duty. They have no oil tankers or premises for barrelling oil like the Imperial Oil Company have on the South Side. They cannot further compete with the duty of fifty cents with the Imperial Oil Company who bring their oil here in tankers and then barrel it in local made barrels, and so are able to undersell the other firms by fifty cents a barrel. I don't know very much about it myself, but that has been pointed out to me by a member of the firm who used to import oil but is not going to import it any more now for that very reason.

HON. THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, I may say that I am in a position to state in the House this evening that there is no way whatever in connection with this fifty cents protection to raise the price of oil, because when I was in New York last January I was told by the oil people themselves that oil, at least by the first day of May, would be gone up three cents a gallon. They told me that if I wanted to buy oil for the Department of Lighthouses to buy it before that time. I did buy it. I also found that I could import oil as cheaply as I could buy it from the Imperial Oil Company here in town with one exception. I got the price in New York and I calculated that it would cost twenty-seven and three-quarter cents to land it in St. John's. The cartage, etc., would cost about another two and a half cents a gallon. I may say that the other day when this Bill went through I had no chance to make any remarks. Last year and the year before, when I went down in that department first, I took up the question with the Imperial Oil Company; they told me that there was no such thing as making barrels in this country to contain kerosene; that we had no wood for that purpose. I differed with them, and I held to the opinion that birch wood properly dried could make as good a cask or even better than we were getting from Halifax. The first year I made no impression on the Company, but last year I said that I would buy no oil at all from them unless they would give people in this country a chance to prove whether or not barrels could be made in this country as good as in Halifax. I did not keep up to my word. However, I only bought half the amount of oil, and I got the other half from the Texas Oil Company. It woke up the Imperial Oil Company. They gave Dawes & Sons a trial. They made five hundred barrels for them that year, and I may say that up to the present time they have turned out as good or even a better cask than we were importing from Halifax. Last year when we sent out these five hundred barrels to the different lighthouses we sent out letters asking the lighthouse keepers to let us know how these casks compared with the casks they were getting from the Imperial Oil Company. A

hundred per cent. of these people came in here and said that our casks were away ahead for tightness of any other casks since they had been operating the lighthouses. That goes to show that casks can be made in the country, and I do certainly think that if Dawes & Sons were to make casks in this country out of properly dried birch that they would have a far better chance than the others. I visited the lighthouses two years ago on the northeast part of the coast, and in every oil house that I went into you would almost want a pair of long boots to go in there. One-third of the oil was being lost and running away down through the floor. Last year we had excellent reports regarding these five hundred barrels. It was not the fifty cents a barrel import duty that was put on the casks that was the cause of the oil going up in price; what was the cause I do not know, but I may say that the Imperial Oil Company brought $50,000 worth of barrels into this country. If we could give that labour in this country I think it is only right that we should see that that amount of money is kept here, especially when we can turn out a barrel just as good as the barrels which were coming from Halifax.

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.

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 Respecting Railway and Shipping" without amendment.

Answer to Questions.

(1) MR. SCAMMELL asked Hon. the Colonial Secretary to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing how many persons, native born Newfoundlanders of the male sex, have left Newfoundland for Canada and the United States since March 1st, 1926.

In reference to No. 1.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—I may say for the information of the honourable member that the returns for May are not yet complete.

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.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, for the information of the Leader of the Opposition I may say that the items here under the Colonial Secretary's Department are for work I think that was done around the grounds at Government House. There was a new conservatory built and some other things done there. That is all that I have any knowledge about. As far as the other items are concerned I may say that there was never a sufficient vote to meet the requirements of the office. Of course there were other amounts in connection with vital statistics. There was a committee formed to enquire into the public institutions, the hospitals, medical services in the outports and public charities. Certain help had to be employed. Miss Tobin and two others were employed for several months collecting statistics. They made certain reports. These reports are all available now and the new Board of Health will take the whole matter up. That $5,000 was well

spent because we never before had information, especially with regard to outport charities. I think that it has been already intimated that when the Medical Conference meets this summer this subject is going to form a very important part of the discussion. With regard to the other amounts, Weights and Measures, these were not presented when the estimates were put through. If the hon. member wants any further information I will be only too glad to secure it.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Colonial Secretary if there was anything done with regard to the co-ordination of the various charity organisations.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the hon. member I may say that the only thing that was done in that connection was the Public Charities Bureau under Miss Crawford. We gave them a grant and of course Miss Crawford's position is rather misunderstood. Miss Crawford is partly an advisory secretary. She does not give relief. She is not put there to supersede the Commissioner of Public Charities. But the co-ordination of all the charity organisations is achieved through her, and consequently there is no overlapping. She has every case indexed in her office where charity is required or desirable. And if all the charity organisations before giving charity to those who apply for it, or to those whom they think are in need, if before doing that they would first apply to Miss Crawford, she will tell them what is the exact situation of those to whom they might intend giving relief, and what relief, if any, they are getting at present. It is a most useful organisation I think and will do away with a lot of imposition that has been practised on people of late by those seeking relief and not requiring it at all. I think this bureau will justify its existence as it goes along.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I notice in connection with the Public Charities that the fees this year are $20,000. Last year they were $10,080. They are doubled this year. We thought that when we had the public institutions enquiry, and a new Public Board of Health, medical attendance, etc., would be considerably reduced. But there is no reduction. In the outports last year the Public Health Contingencies was $500. This year it is $1,000. Evidently this is a clear case of poverty prevailing throughout the country. I notice that last year the total for this department was $101,000. This year it has been increased in spite of the efforts that the Government has apparently made to reduce the vote coming under Public Charities. It is a deplorable condition of affairs. But I suppose that we will only have to submit to it. We only have to sympathise with the Minister of Finance and the Government, in finding themselves in such a position, to have to find such a large sum of money for Supplementary Supply. I did not think that it would be so much. Last year it was $505,000, and this year it is $532,000. Instead of a decrease as we had expected there is an increase. And the Finance Minister has expressed a wish that we should live within the votes that are in the estimates. Now he finds that he cannot accomplish that and we are in a worse position than we were last year.

This large amount of over half a million dollars asked for as Supplementary Supply which the country has to finance on current account is very disappointing, and every one will find that this money has been already spent. Some people will be inclined to say that extravagance has

reigned supreme instead of the economy that the Government preached but did not practice. The Finance Minister knew, of course, monthly, if not oftener, of our financial conditions throughout the year and that there was no effort made to curtail expenditure is apparent from the Loan Resolutions now before the House. No attempt is being made to reduce expenditure or reduce taxation, and the country is getting into a deplorable state in view of the large amount of money that is being spent to carry on Government in this little country. If it was earlier in the session we may be inclined to ask for a full explanation of all these votes; but in justice to the entire House and fearing that there may be a misunderstanding I think we should be shown how this money has been spent, and I think that the Departmental Heads should be prepared to supply the accounts covering all these items. We cannot congratulate either the Finance Minister or the Government on the way they have managed the financial affairs of the country. They started out to do well, but eventually fell by the wayside as the enormous bills presented and which the country has to pay are disappointing and surprising. I trust that all the outstanding bills are included in this half million dollars asked for in Supplementary Supply, though I fear that it is only a part of our obligation, after all.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, With regard to the extra vote for Public Charities, I want to say that it is disappointing that we are not getting any better in relation to Hospital Fees. Over ten thousand dollars was voted in Supplemental Supply for Hospital Fees, and I was astounded the other day when I had an intimation from the Commissioner of Public Charities that he wanted a vote of twenty thousand dollars additional this year for Hospital fees. As the House is doubtless aware, the General Hospital is under control of a Board of Governors with a paid Secretary, and they are responsible for the collection of fees and it was generally understood by this House that paid fees would be on the increase and unpaid fees on the decrease after that Board was established. I am afraid that a great many of these people who do not pay are well able to pay. Still they enter the Hospital and represent themselves as pauper patients. There is one way to remedy it, similar to the way it was remedied in Halifax where they were up against the same difficulty regarding the payment of hospital fees as we are. Have the General Hospital in two parts, one for the paying patients and one for the non-paying. A few years ago they started a pavillion in Halifax and that pavillion to-day is not alone paying for itself but helps in paying for that part of the patients of the institution that cannot pay. Whilst it is true that a large number of our people are poor, still we should have more national pride. The General Hospital to-day is a Government institution, but it is not there for people who can afford to pay and who do not pay. I think it would be wise if a more careful enquiry was made with regard to people going in there for treatment. The Hospital is under an efficient Board of Governors with Mr. Rennie as Secretary, a first class man, but somehow or other they have fallen short of what they should have accomplished. However, as to the big addition in the vote, there has also been a big addition in the vote for the Customs Department and which no doubt can be explained by the Finance Minister.

MR. HICKMAN—Has the Hospital authorities to collect now all fees except the $20,000.00?

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—No. Every patient that comes in now has to pay and if he is unable to pay the Poor Commissioner will pay for him. It appears to me that the votes are put under somewhat different headings this year from what they were last year; but I can assure the House that anything that can be done by my department to cut down expenditure will be done, although it is a pretty hard job to do it when so many people want to get something for nothing.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman: I agree with the Colonial Secretary's remarks respecting hospital accommodation. There are a great many people prepared to pay for private rooms instead of going in public wards.

From the conversations I have had with some physicians some day an additional wing will have to be made to the Hospital to provide for these people. For instance, take a man who is dangerously ill. If the few private rooms there are occupied, he has to go in a public ward in that state. Besides it would be very creditable to our country to have a hospital of this kind. I do not mean to suggest that the Government should make an addition to the Loan Bill, but it looks as if it is necessary to have an addition made to the hospital to provide more private rooms for people who are very sick and who are only too willing to pay for the treatment they get.

THE HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman: Following on the suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition, I might say that it is the intention to increase the capacity of the Tuberculosis Sanitorium and take chronic cases of tuberculosis and where patients can get plenty of fresh air and expert treatment through Dr. Rendell. I think that will relieve the congestion considerably at the General Hospital so far as very sick people are concerned. I quite agree with the Leader of the Opposition that more accommodation should be available at the General Hospital for those who are prepared to pay for it. With regard to the Lunatic Asylum, the insituation, as now conducted, is a credit to Dr. Parsons, who is now sick through overwork and through his war disabilities, and abroad getting treatment. The Lunatic Asylum is too much for any one man to handle. The work of Dr. Parsons is being most creditable carried on by Dr. Grieve. There are 450 sick people there and these people require constant attention. Whatever happens, it is only a question of a short time when Dr. Parsons will have to be provided with an assistant, but the great difficulty will be, if Dr. Parsons is compelled to retire. It may be possible to get a man to put in the institution to act as a surgeon. Dr. Parsons has not been able to reach on the position to do surgical work though a lot of it is needed there. I believe that the more surgical work performed, more cures will be made. I feel that the best possible care and attention must be given all those sufferers in those institutions. Dr. Rendell has been doing magnificent work at the Sanitorium but as he is now well up in years and can hardly be expected to give that efficient service that a younger professional man could give and cope with the constantly increasing number of patients which will be added to in the future when the building is enlarged. I think, therefore, that before many months pass that a surgical assistant to serve both institutions will be appointed; if not, an assistant for both institutions will be appointed.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—Mr. Chairman, I would like to explain the various items in the vote for the Department of Agriculture

and Mines. The explanation for the first item of $761.00 is that prior to last year there was no assistant in the Museum building, but owing to the large number of visitors going there it was found absolutely necessary to have an assistant. The duties of the regular caretaker is not at all to take visitors around and show them the various exhibits, and I recommend to the Government to have an assistant appointed. The Government found that an official in the East End Post Office could be done without there and arranged to have that lady transferred to the Museum building. The next item of $250.00 is to cover a report made on a certain mining property, and for which application had been made by a certain mining Syndicate. We had nobody available in the department to make the report so had to engage an outside man to make it and the charge was $250.00. The next item of $3,000.00 is for supplies in connection with surveys. This is to cover the cost of surveys made by our men on new roads that are to be opened up and who were kept out last Fall at work longer than was anticipated. The next item is $600.00 for timber inspection. This amount was for travelling expenses, as one of our men were required to go to Notre Dame Bay last year and make a report on some property down there. The place in that territory had been surveyed and people from outside were cutting timber on the property, and we had protests about it from members of the House as well as from Sir William Coaker. We also had to send Mr. Thistle to Hermitage Bay in connection with a complaint lodged officially by Mr. Warren about some Crown land grants and Saw Mills there. These are the reasons why the account was $600.00 overdrawn. Contingencies of $1200.00 is for maps and group insurance premiums. The explanation of the vote for $5,000.00 is that we purchased last year a large amount of sheep and bulls and arranged for the purchase of other agricultural animals. The last item of $2,000.00 is to close off the account respecting forest insects. The total amount asked for in Supplementary Supply by our Department is $22,311.00.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman, the Government expends large sums of money on highroads and can't spend half a million on such a deserving thing as the encouragement of agriculture by advancing money to young men to go on the land, and they would pay the money back with interest in a certain period of years, and we would have these young men settled and working profitably, and we would be keeping money in the country that is going out of it to-day. I think that you would be showing yourselves in a light that would make you appear in some way justifying your existence as a Government if you made some attempt along the lines of encouraging agriculture in this way. At present you are voting only twenty thousand dollars for agricultural assistance, and I call it a joke for the good that it does. In every other dominion, in Canada, in New Zealand, in South Africa and in Australia large sums of money are spent in order to get people to go and settle on the land, and their experience has been that it has paid them well to carry on work of that kind. Some people may say that this is not a farming country. I understand from people with good knowledge of the land that there are sections of the country well able to take care of a larger number of people engaged in agriculture than at present. I think that the Minister of Agriculture ought to put it up to the Government that an attempt be made in this direction, that we may get down to a definite agricultural policy and a land settlement policy. We are spending money on highways and things of that kind that we have very little hope

of getting half the returns of the money that has been spent on them and returns from an agricultural policy would be far more certain. I have spoken of certain sections of the country that would be suitable, and I want to refer to Port de Grave, Twillingate, Bonavista, sections of Trinity and Placentia and principally on the West Coast that could be made the objects of a land settlement and agricultural policy and the money spent would be expended wisely and well. If you lent a half a million dollars in that way, inside of a year or two you would have the money back with the interest on it and you would have settlements dotted over the country that would be bringing in revenue to the country. I think that it is well worthy of the consideration of the Government to follow the example of other countries in this respect, and it surely would be money well spent.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—I want to thank the honourable member who has just spoken for his suggestions, and I agree with him that the matter he has mentioned is well worthy of the best consideration of every individual member of the House. It does not reflect any great credit on the Government or on the House, or on the people of Newfoundland that we import such a quantity of agricultural products that should be raised at home. Perhaps we are all deserving of a share of blame that this is the state of affairs. What I would like to see is that something be done here along the lines of what has been done in Nova Scotia. The situation here differs from that in Nova Scotia with regard to the Legislative Assembly. In Nova Scotia there are a large number of men who are practical farmers having seats in the House. So far as I know we have not one practical farmer in the House here. Personally I know little about farming, as I have never been engaged to any great extent in farming. We all want, however to take the matter up seriously. I was surprised the other day on taking up one of the newspapers to read an article by a prominent citizen who had entered one of the largest grocery stores on Water Street on Saturday afternoon, and while there he saw a half a dozen customers come in looking for vegetables. There were on display local cabbages and other vegetables, and they tripped over the local article to buy what was imported. The most important thing in order to have any sort of success with local farming is to overcome that sort of thing and get the people to insist on buying the local product. That sort of thing is poor encouragement for local farmers to exert themselves. I have often gone into stores and seen persons come in and buy Prince Edward Island potatoes and vegetables from Nova Scotia and different parts of Canada when our own article could be procured there, just as good, if not better. That is poor encouragement for our people to raise an extra amount of vegetables. I would like to see a committee or commission of a non-partisan, non-political nature appointed, who would be prepared to try and promote the development of the agricultural industry. It is too big a question to be handled in connection with politics and such a commission is the only hope that I see. I attempted last year to get such a commission together and could not manage to get enough men prepared to act on the commission. I think that we can now make a last determined effort and try to get some men from the Government and the Opposition to act on an agricultural commission with sufficient interest to take the matter in hand, and they can get from outside a few practical men who may also be willing to serve on the commission, and let the Government place at the disposal of the commission sufficient money to be

spent in a non-political way, and honestly and then I think that there may be some hope in the future that the condition of affairs may not exist that we must admit that there is imported into the country four million dollars worth of vegetables that should be raised in the country.

MR. GRIMES—I think that the Minister of Agriculture's suggestion of a commission is well worthy of the consideration of the Government. If we had such a commission, non-political in character and of practical men, I have no doubt but that good results would be the outcome. I trust that this will be done.

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.

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 certain Resolutions 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.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, I may say that the members on this side of the House were very much surprised when they were told that a loan would have to be raised; and there is a great deal of information that we should have before we go into this loan bill. Now there was a question on the Order Paper of May 28th asked by Mr. Cashin, I think, which has not been answered yet. It was asked I think for the purpose of getting some information which we should have before you can expect us to discuss this bill at all. We should know what your temporary loans at the Banks are, for the different departments, and also the different purposes for which you had these loans. We would also like to have other information that is not covered under that question. We would like to know if the balance of the $2,000,000 for the high roads is still intact. I have been informed that $1,250,000 had been spent last year on the high roads. We want to know if the Government are using the balance for that purpose, or if it is being used for other purposes. We would also like to know how much has been spent on the dock to date. We would also like to have a report on the railway that was laid down last year from St. John's to Clarenville. The general opinion in the country is that the rails are not suitable. I don't want to report from current gossip, but that is the opinion. It is said that the rails are so soft that a nail placed on the track sinks into the rail after the train has passed over it. We would like to have a proper report on this thing. It is no use for this country to go to the further expense of one million dollars for new rails, and then to find that they will not last as long as those that are there. We would also like to know when the demand was made upon the Government by the Reid Co., Ltd., for this $58,000. We heard nothing about this during the two previous sessions of the present Government. But now we find that in this loan bill, we hear it for the first time that about $58,000 is required to pay up the balance supposed to be due to the Reid Company. Now according to the act which we heard read a few days ago by the Attorney General, the Reid Company at the time that they sold the railroad to the Newfoundland Government, had the option of taking Newfoundland Bonds at par, or cash. Evidently they accepted the Newfoundland Bonds, and certainly no one expected that they would sell them for the Newfoundland Government. As we never heard of this request before, we would like to know when this request was made,

and why it was authorised to be paid. Now the Government have raised since they have been in office, two years, $6,500,000, and we would like to know how they disposed of it. What has been done with it? Now in the present loan, there is one million for works and improvements, and I think that we are entitled to know what are the special works and improvements to which this loan is to be applied. Although we do not want to delay the House, because the session has been already too prolonged, still we must have that information before we can intelligently go on and vote for an additional loan, and I think that the Finance Minister would be good enough to let us have that on Monday, and then we could proceed with the loan bill.

MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, before rising the Committee, I was asked for certain information in connection with certain matters, and I have much pleasure in handing over to Mr. Hickman, the report for the additional cost of the St. John's dock.

(Reads)

Now the next matter here is a very mysterious account. It is in connection with the Lobelia, the Watchful and the Daisy. This is the first time that I have seen it. What it means or how it got this way I don't know and no-one can tell.

(Reads)

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 Education."

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, on the last day I was asked to let the Second Reading stand over, and I would like to move the second reading of the Bill now.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, I was much obliged for the courtesy extended by the Prime Minister the other day in deferring the Second Reading of the Bill; but really I am not in any better position now to discuss the second reading intelligently any more than I was at the last sitting, and as the hour of the evening is now late I would ask the indulgence of the Prime Minister and the House to further defer the second reading?

It would not be any saving of time to begin the discussion of the Bill on the second reading now as I have not had time to compare the Bill with the old acts, and I am not any further prepared than yesterday when I asked to have the motion for the second reading deferred, and if the discussion was started now I would only have to put in time until the House would rise at half past six so as to get an opportunity to consider the Bill further so as to be able to speak on it. I want to ask again that the second reading be deferred.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I have no objection to giving any time the honourable member may wish for consideration of the Bill. We were hoping to have the House closed on Wednesday next, and I would not have brought this Act forward if I thought that there was anything contentious in it. It does not seem to me that there is anything possibly contentious with respect to it except as regards the appointments of Commissioners in connection with which I have had telegrams from all over Conception Bay urging that if a Commissioner be appointed that Dr. Barnes should be appointed. I replied that, while I have nothing against Dr. Barnes, if the suggestion was that we should throw Dr. Burke aside and put Barnes in his place that I could not consent to, and if the pro-

position was that we should find another job in the Education Department for Dr. Barnes, leaving Dr. Burke as under man, that I was equally adverse. That is the position to-day. Any messages I have received have been sent to me largely because of the interest of the people over there take in Dr. Barnes and what he has done for education. I want to save four thousand dollars a year for all time as the salary of the Minister of Education. I don't mind if it is suggested that "Commissioner of Education" is the wrong name. I am perfectly satisfied to call the officer Vice-president and the Prime Minister the President of the Education Department if that would suit better. It does not make a bit of difference if the name is president or vice-president, or commissioner. I do not desire that there should be any alteration in the present constitution. It has worked particularly well during the past two years. The three denominational heads have done all the work and have only come to me on an occasional matter on which they wanted a decision and for such matters as signing of cheques. The general work of that Department has been very excellent. I take this opportunity of presenting the annual report of the Education Department, and I am sorry that it did not come to hand earlier in the session. It is a very interesting and full report, and I commend it to the perusal of all members.

In compliance with Mr. Halfyard's request, I beg to move that the second reading be deferred.

Hon. the Prime Minister tabled Annual Report of Department of Education.

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would move that the Rules of the House, with respect to all matters now before the House, or to come before it, be suspended.

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 47 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Inspection of Foods.'"

Hon. the Minister of Justice gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the St. John's Municipal Act, 1921."

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill respecting the Management of the Harbour of St. John's.

MR. RANDELL—I would like to ask the Prime Minister if it is the intention of the Government to introduce any legislation with regard to the institution of a port authority for the Harbor of St. John's?

MR. HICKMAN—The harbour of St. John's at the present time is in a terrible condition. It is practically impossible for steamers that want to go west to get along, and there are no regulations whatever; schooners can drop anchor any place they wish and prevent other ships from passing. The Harbour Master has neither funds nor authority. If there is any way of giving authority to him and funds, and bringing about an enforcement of having schooners anchor in the middle of the harbor and allow a passage on both sides it would certainly be a good step. At present when a steamer has to go out from the west end of the harbor the pilot has to go out and make the schooners get out of the way. This is no time for bringing on new legislation, but I would suggest that instead of the legislation that has been referred to that something be done by way of giving authority to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries or the Harbor Master through the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, so that the harbour might be regulated for the present, as it is very necessary to make some improvement.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —As regards the authority of the

Harbor Master he has power and authority to make regulations as regards where ships shall anchor. I will look the matter up, but I am very clear that he has that authority.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I am very glad to hear opinions being expressed on the matter of bringing up legislation with regard to the harbour of St. John's, as I entirely agree with the sentiments that have been expressed. I know the necessity of the Harbor Bill, and as a matter of fact the Bill is printed and ready, and I will be very pleased to bring it before the House to consider it within the next two days. We had been rather inclined to shelve this legislation as we understood that Members of the Opposition were leaving town and we did not want to appear to be forcing through legislation at the last moment, but if it is desired to bring it forward and do what we can about it, we shall be only too pleased to do so, even if it should be necessary to drop it afterwards.

MR. MOORE—I would like to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if he has received a petition from the pilots, something in connection with the matter of their going to sea. They appear to have no place for when they are going to sea. They asked me to bring the matter up. The petition has not been presented, and I would like to ask the Minister when he comes in if he knows anything about the matter.'

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The present arrangement of having a Pilot Commission is extremely unsatisfactory. I was looking into the Pilot Act and I noticed that a commission of at least five have to be in charge of the pilots, and I find that there are only three commissioners in being, and whereas according to the Act they are to meet once a month, they meet only once a year. The Act is entirely obsolete and inoperative. Mr. George Shea is Chairman of the Pilot Commission. I don't know that he is a man particularly interested in matters of that sort. If we could get three active men to take hold, who would be interested in the affairs of the harbour,, I think that it would make for good. Capt. Stewart who has taken a great interest in this matter of the harbour tells me that Captains of foreign ships who have some little grievance, who have been overcharged at the Customs House or some such place, do not know where to go to get their difficulties and grievances settled, and if there was a Harbour Commission to which they could bring their grievances, he believes it would have a very good effect and would give an opportunity of having such captains leave here thoroughly satisfied, which would avoid the giving of a bad name to the harbour on account of grievances unsettled. For that reason as much as anything else I was anxious to have this Commission put in operation. Captain English is a very good harbour master, but he has not had any money at his disposal, and I think that he would welcome a Commission to exert its powers and influence to have things done. I think that it would be worth while to give notice of the Bill, as it is quite ready as I have said, and in the time that we have something might be done with it, even if we had to drop it if it was thought impossible to put it through in such a short time as is now left at our disposal.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Speaker, on the motion to adjourn I wish to call the attention of the Government to the conditions prevailing in the district of Twillingate at the present time. Supplies for the fishery are only about 50 p.c. of what they were last year; there are a large number of people in very poor circumstances. A large number were employed at Corner Brook and now are out of employment—on the north side of the Bay

there are about 100 families, and on the south side about 200 families, and I would ask the Government if they are prepared to grant allocations to relieve present conditions. I think it is a mistake for the Government to stand on technicalities, and the Government could very well give instructions to the Department of Public Works to allow some grants to go out there. I made application to the Department a couple of days ago and suggested that the couple of commissioners appointed some years ago could control the thing, but I was told they couldn't do anything until they received instructions from the Government—I suggest that that be done. It is an insult to ask these people to go to the Relieving Officer—the Government can relieve this and give work at the same time, and I trust they will see their way clear to do so.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I think I can assure the hon. member that an amount of $150,000 will be let go out immediately for that purpose. The Minister of Finance and Customs is not in the House now, but I understand that is being done. As regards the unemployment and the shortage of supplies in Twillingate District, I am aware that it is so, and it is very regrettable. But I do not think the Government can do anything by way of drastic action for this District any more than any other. If it were known that the Government were giving relief, some people would stop home from the fisheries in order to work on the roads. In Bay de Verde last year the men wouldn't go to the fisheries, but insisted on working on the roads—so much so that Mr. Cramm advised that the Government shut down road work until the fishing season commenced. I think there will be considerable work from the Grand Falls people in connection with building the dam, and also at Red Indian Lake—between these places I think four or five hundred men will be employed, and I hope this will relieve the situation in Green Bay to some extent. And we are hoping that there will be other things. I had a talk with Mr. Crowe, and it is likely they will need a good many men to peel wood at Hampden; he thinks that possibly they would have to employ a thousand men. He thought the Company might ask that some wood be exported without being peeled, and I told him I did not think this would be allowed, because they can get the labour for peeling in this country. I know at this time we ought not do anything to discourage the fisheries in any way, but I do not want the Government to do relief work. If individuals require relief, they should go to the Relieving Officer.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until Monday afternoon next, 7th inst., at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY June 7th, 1926.

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

The Clerk having informed the House of the absence of Mr. Speaker, through illness, Mr. Puddester took the Chair.

Mr. Scammell gave notice of question.

Mr. Hibbs gave notice of question.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Report of the Newfoundland Patriotic Fund for the year ending December 31st, 1925.

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 for the authorization of an agreement between the Govern-

ment and the Terra Nova Oil and Products Co. As the Session is drawing to a close, I regret to have to bring in a proposition of this kind at this late hour. However, it has been represented to us by the Honourable Member for Carbonear and by Mr. Powell that it is very important that an Act of this kind should be put through the House. We have been rather handicapped in discussing the situation with Mr. Powell, because before coming to an actual agreement with him, Mr. Powell had to go away to Montreal and we were unable to get in touch with him. The object of the Bill is laid down on definite lines, and these definite lines are depicted in the Bill. The Company when first approached on the matter wanted an absolute monopoly of this business and to be freed from taxation for fifty years: that is, they wanted free entry for all their goods during that period. Now we have come down to a proposition, and as can be explained when the Bill comes before the House for discussion that the Company is to be freed from taxation on their shares of Debenture Stock, etc., for twenty years. They got to pay an income tax that might be levied of general application and they got to pay a Municipal Tax of general application; that their machinery is to be admitted free of duty for twenty years, and that they are to employ nobody but Newfoundland workmen, except experts who are not obtainable in the country.

The Bill is very short and very easily understood, and what I have stated are the salient points of the Bill. I know that the honourable member for Carbonear looks upon the Bill as a very important one, and I think he is anxious to get it through at this Session of the Legislature, and probably he may be able to explain the matter more fully when it comes before the House for discussion. I thought I would explain the main features of the Bill before it comes up before the House to-morrow.

Notice of Motion

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—To move that the Rules of the House with respect to matters now before the House or to come before it, be suspended.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker, I would like to know why the Prime Minister intends to make that motion now, particularly in view of the Loan Resolutions being yet before the House, and I do not think they should be put through under suspended rules.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—We have no particular reason for moving the suspension of the rules. All we are doing is following out the ordinary custom. We will give ample opportunity for debate on the Loan Resolutions.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, the most important legislation presented this session is now brought in for consideration. There are items on the Order Paper to-day of paramount interest, and if this legislation is not considered, according to the ordinary rules of the House, we are only turning this legislature into a farce. I refer to the Loan Resolutions and the Education Act in particular. There is no need for suspension of the rules of the House. Business can be expedited just as quickly by the unanimous consent of the House. It looks bad to have those important measures that I have mentioned rushed through under suspended rules, and I hope that the Government will realise that the business of the House will be advanced just as quickly as it has been conducted the past few days, without suspending the rules.

MR. BRADLEY—Mr. Speaker, I, too, have to record my objection to the suspension of the rules of this House, under existing conditions. I have no intention whatever, I may say, of im-

peding the business of the House, and I am sure that no other member on this side of the House has any desire to prolong the session; but when we have to deal with a Measure that means the tacking on of an additional five million dollars on the already over-burdened taxpayers of this Colony, I think that the ordinary rules of this House should be complied with. If I can in any way facilitate the passing of legislation, the Government can take it for granted that I shall willingly do it; but I must object on principle, under existing conditions, to consider these Loan Resolutions. With the remarks of Mr. Halfyard, I also agree respecting the Education Bill. The present Bill, as I have seen it, is revolutionary in its character. It totally upsets the present methods of our educational institutions in this country and it tends to destroy a Minister of the Crown and put a Commissioner in his place. I have to take strong exception to the suspension of the rules of the House when these two most important measures are yet to be dealt with, although in conjunction with that statement it is not my intention now to in any way impede or unnecessarily delay the business of the House.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, now that we have a declaration from the other side of the House that business will not be impeded and that there is no desire to prolong the business of the House, I might say that it is not our intention to take any unfair advantage by the suspension of the rules, and I agree that the motion be postponed. I might say also that the Government decided this morning to postpone until next year the Education Act, as it might be thought that it was being dealt with too quickly, in view of its importance. I regret this as the Jubilee Scholarship cannot be divided, as provided in the Bill, and Dr. Paton cannot sit on the Council Bd. of Higher Education which many would like to see. However, it is the intention of the Government to let that matter drop this session and also to postpone the suspension of the rules until our money Bills are disposed of.

Second Reading of Inspection of Food Bill.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Speaker, when this Bill is distributed I think it will be readily seen that this is a Bill on which there can be no difference of opinion. If the House is agreeable I shall make a formal motion to explain it.

The Bill is brought in at the request of Dr. Brehm, Medical Public Health Officer and provides additions to Chapter 47 of the Inspection of Foods Act, chapter dealt generally with the creation of the Act, under which certain powers were had and certain regulations were put into force with regard to the inspection of cattle. Dr. Bishop was appointed to assist in this work and he was appointed with the authority of inspecting for what is known as the Tuberculin Test. Certain inspections have gone and the question has been raised as to the authority for the regulations under which he was appointed. The whole matter has been gone into fully with the result that it is now proposed to add to Chapter 47 of that Act an additional section. There are in the Act to-day 15 sections, and it is proposed to add to it section 16. So far as I am concerned, the Bill introduced is purely of a technical character, as we are asked to provide the necessary authority to make the position clear. There is also the second position with regard to this work. To-day we are one of the last countries to take proper precautions with respect to tuberculosis in cattle. There have been very stringent regulations applied, because of the importance of the life of the communities, in Canada and the United States; and there

can be no two opinions as to the absolute importance of having, at least, our milk supply in the country free from danger to the public health. I do not think that I need say more, and, if the House is agreeable, I will move the Second Reading of this Bill.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker, I agree with the honourable introducer of this Bill that there is a necessity for a law of this nature. I would like to ask if anything has been done with reference to the petition presented to the Minister of Agriculture and Mines by the farmers of St. John's respecting the destruction of diseased cattle.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—The petition was received by me and forwarded to the department of the Colonial Secretary.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Speaker, arising out of that petition, I might say that the Government at the present juncture has no power to pay any compensation for cattle destroyed and that point is covered by section (c) of the present Bill. This was brought in because it was felt that people might buy in perfect good faith and suddenly find that the cattle were diseased. For instance, take the case of the man Thomas, of the Cove Road, who had ten head of cattle slaughtered and destroyed as they were found to be tubercular, though they were imported as pedigree stock. This Bill gives the Government power to make recompense for cattle destroyed, which power the Government had not before.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, I take it that if cattle are diseased and are considered by an inspector necessary to be killed on account of tuberculosis that it is on the recommendation of an inspector to the Governor in Council that compensation is paid the people who lose the cattle. It seems to me that there ought to be some definite standard. I might have my cow killed and not be on very good terms with the inspector and get very little for it, and someone else in better standing with the inspector might get an excellent valuation put on a poor cow.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—The matter of valuation is entirely with the inspector. The Inspector makes a recommendation to the Governor in Council and compensation is paid to the extent of two thirds of that valuation of the animal.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—Mr. Chairman, I feel that I might say a few words at this juncture, as I think that I was in a way indirectly responsible for the legislature now before the House. The matter came to my attention when I read in the press that Mr. Thomas had lost ten head of cattle that had been condemned by the veterinary surgeon for tuberculosis, and that Mr. Thomas had imported them and knew nothing whatever of any defect or disease in them. I asked Mr. Bailey to get Mr. Thomas to call at the office that we might discuss the matter with him. The point that struck me was that possibly Dr. Bishop, the veterinary surgeon, might be mistaken. Such a large number of cattle having to be killed belonging to one man brought that thought to me, because without intending to cast any reflections whatever upon Dr. Bishop, who is a capable man, it sometimes happens that medical men have diagnosed wrongly in the case of human sicknesses and made mistakes and the same possibility might occur in the case of animals. I felt that before cattle were actually condemned we should be actually convinced that they were affected, I thought it would require an examination by a second veterinary surgeon. After talking the matter over with Mr. Thomas I found that the farmers generally had got together to call a meeting to deal with the matter. I called a meeting to take place in my office, and about the same time the farmers had thier meet-

ing in some hall in the city, and about a hundred and twenty farmers came down to my office and presented me with the resolutions passed at their meeting. I undertook to forward the resolutions to the Government, and as a result, I presume, this legislation is being discussed. I consider that compensation should be paid, as it would be a hardship otherwise especially to farmers who have gone to the expense of getting good cattle. I think, too, that if cattle are killed by the Government the period of time intervening between the killing and the payment of compensation should be as short as possible. It is a hardship on the farmers and causes loss to them to have an intervening period when they would be without their cattle. I think that compensation should be forthcoming as quickly as possible. I consider this legislation timely and that it should meet with the approval of every individual Member of the House, and be of great importance as all will agree that we are desirous of ensuring the best possible aid to the public in the way of securing purity of food.

MR. BROWNE—There are one or two things in connection with this question that I think ought to be considered. Subsection (d) says:

(Reads section)

I should like to point out that suppose for example Messrs. Campbell and McKay import a certain number of head of cattle, which are tested and found to be tubercular, they are under subsection (g) entitled to compensation. I don't think that they should be entitled to compensation. I think that they should see that they get good cattle, and that nothing but good cattle be put on the market. I think that section might be altered—"No milk or cream, etc."—and "no cattle and no meat" should also be put in. I think that this would make the regulations more effective and protect the public from any serious results that might ensue if such a loophole were left. I think that could very easily be done and is well worth considering.

MR. WARREN—I think that there is a good deal in what the honourable member for St. John's West has just said. While I think that we ought to have some sympathy for the farmer who keeps some head of cattle to supply the public with milk if he suddenly finds that his cattle are diseased, and perhaps he should be compensated for any loss he may sustain. It is different, however, in the case of a business where a hundred and fifty head of cattle are brought into the country from anywhere without any test or investigation to see whether they are healthy or diseased, and I don't see that the public should have to pay compensation of two-thirds of the value in such a case. It is not done in any other business, and I don't think it ought to be in that. It might be alright to give concessions in the case of a bona fide farmer, but if a hundred and fifty head of cattle are brought in wholesale from anywhere in the United States or Canada, and they are not all that they should be, I don't think that it should be given. I have heard it said that the people who sell cattle to be sent down here, send down the worst stuff that can be got hold of that they can't sell elsewhere. I don't see, in that case, why an importer should not be made to take his chance instead of having the public pay for that kind of thing. The importer or consignee should pay the loss just the same as an importer of fruit or anything else has to stand the loss if it is worthless on account of its bad condition.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—I was rather surprised to hear that there was inspection of that kind. I have had an assurance from Dr. Brehm that he inspects every head of cattle that comes into the country. I found out last year that there were

two cows imported on a farm in Corner Brook and they weren't in the country more than two months when they had to be slaughtered. These cows must have been tubercular when they were imported. It is not however the scroff but the high class cattle that seem to be most susceptible to T. B. Of the cattle on the Model Farm I think that three-quarters were found to be tubercular. I think that pure bred cattle are more likely to develop tuberculosis than the ordinary strong healthy cattle here. This is a very important question, having regard to the future health of the community. I have not had recently an opportunity of discussing this matter with Dr. Brehm, but I have had of doing so with Dr. Bishop, and I think that compensation should be given to people whose cattle are taken and slaughtered, but I don't see that this should go on continually; if a man should insist on importing such cattle, then I don't see that it is the duty of the Government to pay for them if they are slaughtered. Still it is a great hardship to impose on people to take away animals that so far as they knew were perfectly alright, and it would mean quite a loss. Mr. Thomas lost ten cows and Mount Cashel ten and the Church of England Orphanage three or four, and all in all I think that there were thirty or forty. Others have been altogether clear of it. Mr. Ross who has a very large herd of cattle in the East End did not have one cow that responded to the test. Evidently this disease is very contagious, and if one amongst a herd is affected the whole herd is likely to become affected also. I am informed that the cow is the most susceptible of all animals to tuberculosis, whether human or otherwise, therefore this is a very serious matter and I am glad that it has been brought up that some steps may be taken once and for all to do something to prevent the spread of the disease.

MR. DUFF—I agree with the inspection of cattle. I think all the cattle in the country should be inspected. I know that the people over in Carbonear would like to have cattle inspection, and I think that if people find they have cattle affected with tuberculosis, they are satisfied to have them killed and put up with the loss. I don't see why the farmers in St. John's, for I think that this Bill is intended particularly for St. John's, should be paid for their cattle out of the general funds of the Colony, while outport people will not get the same benefit. If this Bill goes through, I hope it won't go through so that people may be paid for cattle indefinitely at least. The fishermen suffer losses through no fault of their own and have to put up with them, and I don't see why a farmer with a tubercular cow should get paid for it.

MR. HIBBS—I am quite in accord with the idea of the inspection of cattle, and, if necessary, having them destroyed. I was rather surprised just now when the Minister of Agriculture and Mines mentioned the killing of those cows belonging to Mr. Thomas, to hear him say that he had no knowledge of this until after the cattle were dstroyed. I think in Sub-section C it should be provided that, if, when the cattle are inspected, they are found to be diseased, they should be segregated, but I think, before being destroyed, the Minister of Agriculture and Mines should have a report. I think that there is a danger if a whole herd of four or five or ten cattle were destroyed on the instructions of the veterinary surgeon without the Minister of Agriculture being given a report, a mistake might be made, and I think that a report should be made first so that an opportunity might be given to be certain, for another doctor might find that it was not tuberculosis. I think that it is a great

mistake and a hardship, in case an error should be made that an inspector should be given full power to condemn cattle, without giving the Minister of Agriculture and Mines a chance to have another veterinary surgeon give a second examination. Doing this would make the farmers better satisfied. Possibly a farmer might think that some of his cattle should not be destroyed, and a second examination would settle doubts. I agree with Mr. Duff's remarks that this Bill is for St. John's as veterinary surgeon and Public Health refer to St. John's. If it is a matter of protecting from disease, I think that the country outside should be protected as well as St. John's.

MR. BRADLEY—It appears that this is not a matter that may be dealt with as easily as one might at first imagine, for example we see that inspection of cattle does not mean only farmers' cattle. It is right that if cattle show sufficient evidence of the disease to warrant killing them, that they must be slaughtered. We come to the question of compensation, and I may say that I am not against a man's being given reasonable compensation through any loss he may incur because of any action that this Legislature may take and of which he has had no notice. If an Act is placed on the Statute Book and if his cattle are found to be tubercular and he had no knowledge of that before, and because of that Act they are killed it is reasonable to pay some compensation. That is not the position however. This killing of cattle has been going on and the farmers know that the law is in force, and they keep such cattle. Perhaps they don't know that they are keeping tubercular cattle, but they have failed to find out, then why should the burden be placed on the colony of paying compensation. Every individual in business must face some losses, and it is improper to keep tubercular cattle and to keep selling impure milk, and in that sense even, by those sales, such farmers have been making profits that they should have not made in fact. Why should we be called upon to pay compensation to people who have tubercular cattle two or three years after regulations have been enforced prohibiting them. I agree with the honourable member for Carbonear in his remarks on the losses suffered by the fishermen. I have been endeavouring to get something done for some of my constituents who have lost stages and other property at Labrador and have no means to rebuild them and resupply themselves, and so far nothing has been done for them. I asked a question the other day as to what was going to be done for them. I am not satisfied to vote for any legislation to give compensation to farmers for losses they incur perhaps through no fault of their own.

MR. HALFYARD—I would like to know from the Minister of Agriculture and Mines or some member of the Government whether cattle exported from Canada have to be inspected before being allowed to leave the country of exportation. I am sure that all meat must be inspected before leaving Canada, and I have an idea that the cattle must be inspected; if not, an embargo should be put on the importation of cattle from Canada without the proper inspection. We cannot ship a barrel of herring without sending with it a full inspection certificate, and for us to be taxing ourselves to pay for diseased cattle without an attempt being made to put the liability on the proper shoulders, I appreciate that we are not just to ourselves or to those engaged in the importation of cattle. That is a question I am sure that should receive the immediate attention of the Government. Now with regard to Sub-Section E of Section 16:

(Reads)

I trust that these regulations, if

this Bill is ratified, will provide a limited period for compensation, having in mind the point being made by the honourable member for Port de Grave. I also think that we should not import any cattle unless we know that they are properly inspected and unless a certificate to that effect comes with them.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, I want to take advantage of this opportunity to say that I know of no case of compensation being given for cattle that were recently imported. The only compensation I know of was given to those whose cattle were slaughtered on the farms surrounding St. John's and other places, but certainly there were no cattle compensated for that were diseased when taken from the wharf. I am sorry that the member for Port de Grave has gone out, because I wanted to say a word in reply to the remarks he made with regard to the fishermen on Labrador. I am quite as much interested as he is in that subject, and for the last week or more, I have endeavoured to see if anything could be done with regard to relieving a certain amount of the distress thrust on the fishermen that go to Labrador each year, and last December, you will remember, a tremendous gale swept the entire Labrador coast and some places suffered more than others. There was a great deal of damage done. Petitions were continuously coming in to the Government for some help and assistance for those who had been effected. The Government are very desirous of doing everything they possibly could to help the fishermen. The matter has been left in the capable hands of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and I understand that a steamer will be leaving to-morrow and sufficient material has been put on board to rebuild the stages that have been destroyed. The Government cannot go any further than that with regard to rebuilding traps and other fishing utensils, as we could not tell to what extent we might be compromising ourselves, but I thought that, if we could provide the necessary material to help the fishermen to reconstruct their stages that we would be doing something to assist them. I will do my best to get the Government to render further assistance when we know a little more how conditions are, but we have so little definite information that it is absolutely impossible to know just what is required.

MR. BRADLEY—I am not satisfied to vote for any measure to compensate a farmer for any losses sustained in his business, it may be through no fault of his own, and, on the contrary, his own fault, whilst my constituents, who have suffered losses through no fault of their own, are left without anything. It is not fair. Whilst I am always ready to agree that our Government should help anyone who has met with losses through no fault of his own, but I cannot, unless someone in this House convinces me agree that any losses that may hereafter be suffered by farmers in respect of diseased cattle should be made up to them. The law has been in force for two years, yet they kept these cattle, either knowing they were tubercular or not taking the trouble to find out. Why should these people receive compensation and my Labrador fishermen get no help at all?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, in the first place I trust that this House will understand that I don't begin to pose an agricultural expert, but, as I explained the other evening the reason that I am in charge of this Bill is because of endeavouring to explain why it is that this amendment is put in at all. Arising out of the discussion in which honourable members have taken part, I would suggest, in the first place, with regard to Sub-Section D that the

word "meat" be inserted.

With regard to the main point that has been mentioned, I don't think that there can be any possible divergence of opinion. What I would ask honourable members to consider is this that all that Sub-Section C seeks to do is to empower the Governor in Council upon the recommendation of the Medical Health Officer to make certain regulations with respect to compensation. As to the question of these regulations, as I intimated I cannot imagine for one moment these regulations attempting to provide compensation for cattle that are landed, say by dealers taking them on consignment to be sold in Newfoundland. It seems to me that they would be doing so at their own risk, and they would not get any compensation.

Now as regards the second point raised with regard to the application of this act, whilst it has been suggested that the general application, and activities of this act are confined to St. John's, still the medical health officer is the medical health officer for the whole island. Now what I would like the House to appreciate is that fact that the inspection of cattle act applys to the whole of the island, and therefore the activities of the medical health officer must apply to the whole island. Now, whilst so far as I am concerned, I am agreeable to any amendments that may be decided, still I can't imagine any danger in leaving things as they stand for this reason. There cannot be discrimination. Whatever regulations are arrived at must be based upon some standard.

The main point that I want to take advantage of making an observation on, before I have to speak again, is to ask members if they do not agree with the position, that if it is desired we can put in a clause to express, that no compensation will be paid on cattle landed here. But I can't imagine any danger at all. Take for argument's sake that a certain company imports cattle. These cattle will be strictly inspected by Dr. Brehm on the wharf, and if any of the cattle are found to be diseased their milk cannot be sold, or they cannot be killed and their meat sold. The further point that I want to make is that whether the cattle are inspected in Canada or not, there is this inspection here on the wharf.

MR. BRADLEY—Mr. Speaker, I did not hear the beginning of the Colonial Secretary's remarks, but I must say now that I am indeed pleased to hear that the Governmnt intends to do something for my people. I know that they are practically unable to continue the fisheries unless they get some assistance, and I am glad now to find myself in the position of being able to tell them that the Government intends to provide them with material for the purpose of re-constructing their stages, and that some further assistance will be given probably later on.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill "An Act to Amend Chapter 47 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Inspection of Foods" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time presently.

Whereupon with unanimous consent and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 47 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Inspection of Foods,'" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon, with unanimous consent, 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 47 of the Consoli-

dated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Inspection of Foods."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Cahill took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, there is just one other point that I want to stress, and that is this, that if cattle are inspected here, it does not take very long. A steamer arrives in the evening with fifty or sixty head of cattle. The auction is called for the following morning and they are all sold before noon. I do not know how much time it takes to inspect cattle, but it strikes me that if these are inspected before they are sold by auction it cannot take very long. There is then no reason why the whole herd in the neighbourhood of St. John's or Conception Bay should not be inspected once a year. It is unfair to the man that has a farm and has no inspection. Lots of farmers have their cattle inspected, and they are all free from tuberculosis. Then he advertises that he has a farm that is entirely free from diseased cattle, and he gets an additional number of milk customers on that account. But the other farmer who has good cattle and all free from disease, who has not had the inspection, is not able to advertise on account of that. These two things seem so much different that there must be something wrong somewhere. If forty head of cattle can be inspected in a few hours before they are sold at auction, we certainly can have inspection of all cattle once a year. I would like for the Minister to take that point into consideration. I think that there should be some time within which, after cattle have been purchased or imported, the owners should be compensated. Of course they may develop diseases by coming in contact with diseased cattle six or twelve months after they have been purchased. This thing is a very important measure. And I am very glad that it is before the House to-day, because it will help other measures of the same nature. There should be inspection of cattle all over the country. It is a grave matter for a man situated somewhere in the South or the West Coast, and who may own cattle that have tuberculosis, and these same cattle may be supplying milk and butter to his family, and the whole family may be wiped out by infection from the milk from those cattle. I have in my mind a family in one of the outports of this island. There were a good many children. They did not inherit diseases of any kind. But they kept a lot of cattle and every one of these children became infected with tuberculosis. That may have been done thru a diseased cow. I think that this is so important that it should be taken up with a great deal of caution by the Department and by the Government as a whole. I think it would be worth somebody's while to discover what kind of examination is made of these cattle that arrive here. A great many come here for sale, sent on consignment, because they are worthless. Newfoundland has always been the dumping ground for cattle, both horses and cows. I think that now that this matter has been brought up it should be given the greatest consideration by the Government.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, with regard to the point raised by the Leader of the Opposition I can't see that we can improve on that section. The Medical Health Officers got to make regulations, and these regulations have got to be approved of by the Governor in Council. It seems to me that it is just as well to go on as we are going.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and had pass-

ed 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, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 47 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Inspection of Foods'" 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.

First Reading of St. John's Municipal Act Bill.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, the St. John's Municipal Act of 1921, Section 95, provides:

(Reads Section)

Now for the purpose of enabling disputes to be settled, Section 96 which we are now asked to repeal reads:

(Now reads Section)

The Act was passed in 1921, but up to the present there has never been a Conciliation Board appointed. Within the past twelve months there has been a direct and genuine agitation because of certain disputes in the West End of St. John's, in which a certain legal man wished to avail himself of the machinery of this Act. He made a request to the Municipal Council to that effect, who referred him to the Government, who felt, as everyone will, that it was primarily a matter to be settled by the City Council, and we even went to the extent of having an amendment drafted to that effect, and asked the concurrence of the Council in it. They replied that they preferred it be left to other means of arbitration, and the bill now before the House is the outcome of all this, and the section by which we do it reads:

(Reads section)

I would like to say here that I regard it as an improvement over the present section. A man will have a right to nominate his own arbitrator, and that will be much more satisfactory. The very case I have in mind is that of Mr. J. O'N. Conroy, who has some dispute regarding some lease in the West End. A permanent Board would be most unsatisfactory on matters of disputes, which it has its place in business life. Where a man can appoint his own arbitrator he can pick a man thoroughly acquainted with the property under dispute. The Act has been on the books for five years and there has not been up to now a single application, not because there has not been a dispute, but because it was felt that the Government should not handle this, which is a matter for the City Council, if anyone—it has nothing to do with the affairs of the country at large. I think with these amendments it will be satisfactory, and hope the House is prepared to pass it.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the St. John's Municipal Act, 1921,'" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time presently.

Whereupon with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the St. John's Municipal Act 1921," was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred a Committee of the Whole Hous presently.

Whereupon, with unanimous consent, 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 St. John's Municipal Act 1921."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Cahill 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, with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the St. John's Municipal Act, 1921," 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.

The Chairman from the Committee of the Whole on Supply reported certain Resolutions, which were read a first time, as follows:

Additional Estimates ..$15,505.00
Supplementary Supply. 532,657.67

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 comply with the request made by the House of Assembly for the appointment of a number of members of the Legislative Council to serve as a Commission (with power to sit out of session) to enquire as to the Cure and Cull of Salt Fish, its transportation and marketing, and cognate matters concerning the Colony's Salt Fish Trade.

The members appointed by the Legislative Council to be the Honourables Messrs. Morine, Ryan, Alderdice and Bishop.

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 Respecting Newspapers and Books" with some amendments, in which they request the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the said amendments were read a first time.

With unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, 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 have been concurred in without amendment.

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 certain Resolutions respecting the Raising of a Sum of Money on the credit of the Colony for certain Public Purposes."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Cahill took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, while we were on this subject the other day we got into a debate on the matter of the $61,000, and I have asked the Attorney General to explain the legal position, as I am not a lawyer. As far as the Finance Department goes, I am not quite sure of my position, but one thing I do know that under the Railway Act we were authorized to raise a loan of $2,000,000, and the amount of the loan was $2,061,000. Now I do not know if there were any vouchers, or who signed it. For the information of the House I am going to read the Auditor General's letter to me.

(Reads.)

That is the position. I don't know who advised him—he only came home last Thursday. What he had in his mind was that he wanted some power to fix it in the public accounts. As Finance Minister the only thing I know is that £423,500 was raised which was the equivalent of $2,061,-000. It was sold in England, and sold to Lee Higging for 93, while I understand they afterwards sold for 96½. That is the position as I know it. I don't know if anyone is guilty of anything wrong, but as soon as the House closes I am going to investigate and find out just what was done and what it means.

MR. HICKMAN—I understand the bonds were raised in Newfoundland dollars.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—No, they were raised in sterling.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Finance has passed the buck to me and I am going to pass it along to my predecessor. It is not a question of explaining the legal position—someone who is accustomed to dealing with figures should be the one for this. The Railway Settlement Act says:

(Reads.)

Now apparently the position the Reid Company took is that they said "give us the bonds", but instead of giving us the two millions give us the equivalent in sterling at the prevailing rate of exchange. I am informed, without actual knowledge of the fact, that the Reids claim the rate was 4.72, and upon examination the difference between that and par makes up the $61,000—what that means I don't know, but it is a coincidence. Apparently the Colony is expected to pay the difference between the rates. As to the legal position, I am unable to explain it without consideration. Apparently the R. N. Co.'s position is that they were to be paid the difference between the rates, which makes up $61,000.

MR. BRADLEY—Is there any correspondence to be found?

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—None in my department.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, I was Attorney General at the time this transaction took place, but I don't know much about the financial end of it. But I do know this, that the agreement was to hand over to the Reid Nfld. Co. two millions in bonds, or that we would sell the bonds and turn over what we got for them. That in my opinion is the meaning of the whole thing, and I don't think any member in the Government or out ought to give an opinion or construction until the whole thing is cleared, because it might prejudice us in the future. We were to hand them over the two millions, but if we found that the Government could get more than they for the bonds we would sell them and hand over the proceeds. Now it is important to find whether the Reids exerted their option or not—I don't know; I for one don't think we are liable for that $61,-000. Now if you will look up Hansard you will find that the Prime Minister of that day was Sir Richard Squires, and that he made a statement in introducing the Railway Settlement Act categorically to the effect that this didn't cost the Colony a cent. He explained that all we had to do was hand over the bonds, and had to redeem them when due.

That statement is in Hansard, and in view of that I do not think that any member of the Government or of this House should countenance any further liability over two millions. I have a copy of Hansard here now and this is what Sir Richard Squires said in introducing that Bill:

(Reads from Hansard.)

We understood and were convinced at the time—as I am convinced now—

that the Reid Newfoundland Company could not exercise their option in sterling, as they were given Newfoundland bonds. I think that the matter is one for thorough investigation and I am glad that the Finance Minister is withdrawing that item from the Loan Bill at the present time.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, with reference to this item in the Loan Resolutions regarding Completion of Dock, Freight Sheds, Shops and Wharves, it certainly would be interesting to this House to know the reason why the cost of the dock was estimated at $1,100,000.00 last year, and now it is suddenly found that it is going to cost nearly two million dollars. An engineer from the Cranley Engineering Company, one of the largest of its kind in the world, came here first and made an estimate of the cost of the new dock and which was somewhere about the same cost as the Bishop Company's estimate, namely, $1,100,000.00.

The W. I. Bishop Engineering Company comes in and makes an estimate along the same lines, with the proviso that they would make the dock three or four feet deeper. As far as I remember that was the excuse put forward for giving the contract to Bishop & Co. However, it has been said that the Bishop Co. had been promised the contract before ever the Crandell Engineering Co. sent a man here.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — That is not correct.

MR. HICKMAN—I heard a man make a statement on the train before the contract was awarded to Bishop & Co. at all that he was going to St. John's to work for the W. I. Bishop Co. on our dock. Now later on there was another engineer brought down from Canada, and he somewhere confirmed the same estimates as those given by the others. Now the Bishop Company has to give some explanation to the public for exceeding their estimates so much. Now in the statement given to me by the Minister of Finance at the last session of this House, we find a great many reasons, and I think for the information of this House I should read a few of them. The reason why I am reading them is because there are some portions that I want the Minister to explain to the House.

(Reads.)

What are those Customs duties for?

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Of course under the contract all materials came in duty free, but they bought a lot of stuff in St. John's on which the duty was paid.

(Reads.)

MR. HICKMAN—Then there are the increased rates paid for labor. What does that mean?

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—For the information of the hon. member I may say that in the original contract it was stipulated that laborers would receive twenty-five cents an hour. I think the matter was debated by the Executive Government, and they decided that the laborers should be paid at the rate of $3.00 a day. That made an increase of five cents an hour, which would account for the increase in these estimates.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, it looks to me as if the original estimate made on this job was an incompetent estimate, or an incorrect estimate made for a purpose. It is one or the other, because when you go $600,000 out on a contract for the construction of a dock like we have got up there there is something wrong. Give them $1,100,000 which they estimated, and give them another $100,000 for the sheds, that would be $1,200,000. That leaves them $800,000 for the rest. There is something wrong about that. A contractor doing a job like that should be able to figure wthin $500.00 of the cost. Now this

is not very good information for this House to have. Of course, there is no doubt about it if the Bishop Company had contracted for the dock for a certain sum they could have done it for considerably less themselves, than with the Government paying the bills. No doubt a great many inefficient men get jobs down there because they were from certain districts, and the Government wanted to give them some support.

There is no doubt that a great many men were put up there because they were from some district, and because supporters were wanted to be got by giving them jobs up there, and through that great inefficiency resulted. Another big item that has caused high cost is the continual night work. I have often wondered why the Minister of Finance or the Prime Minister, practical men accustomed to employing labour, could allow that work to go on at the dock every night, sometimes with the thermometer below zero, with snow falling. Under such climatic conditions the men could not work properly, no matter how willing they might have been. The climatic conditions were against it. It looks very much as if the $800,000 which the Government is asking for to complete the dock and freight sheds will be required, while the estimate of one hundred thousand dollars for the sheds is no doubt the actual cost.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, I regret that I was unable to be in the House during the past couple of days that this and other matters have been discussed, especially when Supplementary Supply came up. It all goes to bear out my statement with regard to the Budget delivered by the Finance Minister a few days ago. We find in Supplyementary Supply $530,000.00, and additional estimates $15,500.

The first item is $800,000 for the dock, and that is not what I think will be sufficient to finish the dock, because the Loan Bill introduced here a couple of years ago distinctly stated, if I remember correctly, that the sum of six or eight hundred thousand dollars would go towards repairs for the dock. The dock has cost in the vicinity of two million dollars, and on top of that the firm of Bishop & Co. insults the working people of Newfoundland. With regard to their stating that politicians used considerable influence, and that people opposed to the Government used considerable influence with regard to getting people work on that dock, I went to that dock to get jobs for men, friends of mine, just as much entitled to get jobs as men from the Government, and I was told that they had strict instructions from the Government not to give any of my friends jobs on the dock.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—No such instructions were given to the dock.

MR. CASHIN—That was what I was told. If that report were broadcasted through the country to-day the W. I. Bishop Company would never finish the dock. They would be hove over. It is an insult to the members of the House and the common people of the country. If that report went to the country where there was an election campaign on it would be serious. That is a report in my opinion that should have been never written or for which Bishop & Company should be driven out. I want to thank the Government and I want to thank the Minister of Finance and Customs for corroborating the statement I made in connection with the Budget, in connection with two items, the Loan Bill and in Supplementary Supply. The item of $1,945,000 for use on the railway actually means a deficit of approximately a million and a half on the railway.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—The deficit on the railway to the 31st Dec. last year was $615,000.

MR. CASHIN—The figures presented by the railway give the deficit to the

31st of March as $550,000. I fail to see how you can make it $615,000 to the end of December.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—That is the statement here.

MR. CASHIN—I am afraid that does not include deficit 1924-25.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—That has been paid out of Surplus Trust.

MR. CASHIN—While we are on that question of the railway I would like to point out that I understand the Government intend to re-rail some section of the railway, and I submit that they should re-rail the western division, and I propose to point out why I suggest that and why they should in preference to the other two. I visited Corner Brook during the past week and I found out over there on investigation that during the past winter the Company practically have manufactured three hundred tons of paper a day, and had both their sheds filled, and in another month four machines will be manufacturing four hundred tons, and they have an idea of planning a shed next spring at Port aux Basques to store from five to ten thousand tons of paper, which means that they intend to haul to Port aux Basques their daily amount manufactured every day during the winter, and I submit that the Government shall possibly within a short period be in receipt of correspondence asking them what conveniences can be given to the Company for hauling four hundred tons of paper to Port aux Basques next winter, daily, for three months of the winter. They figure the freight at about $2.80 the ton, as that is about what the A. N. D. Company pays for hauling from Bishop's Falls to Heart's Content. I submit that if the road is going to be re-railed that that should be taken into consideration. I have raised the point because the Company will want thirty or forty cars that will be going every day and they will require two locomotives and the rotary to keep the road clear when necessary, and one train will be going in one direction and another back, and it will be very necessary to have the road in good condition. They figure that it will not be very difficult to keep the road clear from snow. They are figuring out how much it will cost to build a shed and dredge the harbor at Port aux Basques and make provision for the accommodation of four hundred tons. I merely point this out and submit that the Government should make enquiries in that direction, as the information I have is not absolutely official.

We have had a very short discussion on that $58,000 to-day which was included in this loan and which is now being taken out because it will not be due for eighteen or twenty years. If the bonds are redeemed at 4.86 the Government will have to pay an extra $61,000. I don't know who is responsible for it. The Act distinctly states that the Company (the Reid Newfoundland Company) had the option of floating the bonds in Newfoundland dollars or in pounds, and they took them across to England and sold them in pounds at 4.72, and got more pounds than if the exchange were at 4.86. Correspondingly at the end of the twenty years, if the exchange mounts to 4.86, we will have to pay a nextra $61,000, but if at the end of that time the exchange has gone the other way, it makes the difference that the people are really paying more interest to-day on that than we should. I think that the bonds are 5 per cent. Five per cent. on two millions makes a hundred thousand a year. The number of bonds at the present rate of exchange will amount to more beause exchange has gone up. I would like to ask the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs to tell me what is going to be done with this hundred thousand dollars in connection with the rebuild-

ing of branch telegraph lines. Are new telegraph lines going to be built or is it merely for repairs. I would also like to ask how much of this $296,790 is to be devoted towards the St. George's Coal Fields. I was one of the ardent supporters of that petition and I would like to hear something from the Government as to what they intend to do in that connection. As to the last amount of a million dollars, it is stupendous in my opinion. I agree that the public roads in various sections are in a most disgraceful condition and the public wharves in places are in a dilapidated condition, but I understand from what I have heard that this is to be devoted to districts other than districts being operated over by the Highroads Commission. Is that correct.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—That is not quite correct.

MR. CASHIN—If that is correct I am glad to hear it. There may be a district now in which there are marine works which would then be neglected, and I suppose half the grant now could go to marine works. I would like to hear all the details of this resolution explained and trust the Minister of Finance will explain it.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—I have already explained these items, when Major Cashin was absent from the House, but I will answer any items he wishes to know about briefly.

MR. CASHIN—I should like to ask the Minister of Finance how much of the loan he plans to raise in Newfoundland.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—We haven't decided—we haven't quite made up our minds about it. As you know, local loans are dangerous and difficult, but if anyone wants to buy I don't see any reason why they should not.

MR. CASHIN—I think the Minister said in his Budget Speech that there was twenty-three millions in the Savings Banks in this country. Now at 3 per cent. that is $690,000 in interest which the people are getting, and I suggest that we put say two millions on the local market, and even if we had to sell as low as 95 it would pay Newfoundland better in three or four years than if they sold in London at 100. The interest it would give people here would be about 6 per cent., and that on two millions is $120,000, while one the same amount in banks they would only get $60,000. If we sell in London the people's money is going out of the country, and if we sell here it remains here. The Government should give that consideration.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, it is naturally expected of the members of the Opposition of his Majesty's Government in this country, to make a few remarks when we have resolutions before the Chair for the taking up a loan for the colony. I shall endeavour as briefly as possible to perform that duty from the standpoint of honest criticism. Whether I am reported or not or whether my remarks may fall on deaf ears. The composition of the House at the present time is not inspirational for any one to exercise any great effort to set forth an opinion of the policy of the Government at the present time. Nevertheless I have endeavoured to perform my duty as a member of this House since I first had the honour of a seat in this Assembly, to the best of my ability although that may have been imperfect. We are presented with loan resolutions to the sum of five millions. Now this is a sad commentary on the financial condition of this country, when we of this House have to undertake the raising of another loan of five millions, for what? To carry on the ordinary business of this country, which the current revenue should make provision for. If we proposed under these resolutions to vote a large proportion

of this money for the establishment of a new industry, we should approach the resolutions in a different spirit. But looking through the resolutions we are inclined to ask the question "What are we voting for"? Shall the country benefit to any great extent by this extra five million added to her debt. I fear Mr. Chairman, that the answer with regard to the actual returns that this country will receive, will be in the negative. A great deal of this five million is to finish work that has been undertaken and to meet our outstanding obligations. Works have been undertaken in this country which are of a questionable nature as to the benefit that this country will derive, as to the earning power of the people, and as to making this country a better place to live in for the working man. Therefore it is not inspiring. On the contrary it is disappointing, that we have to find such a large amount of money at the present time. The members of the Government who are now listening to me will remember that during the years 1921-22 when they occupied seats on this side of the House complained of there being no public opinion in this city or this country. I feel quite sure that if these hon. gentlemen occupied seats on this side to-day, they would give voice to the same sentiments. And they would be justified in expressing these sentiments. A day or two ago resolutions were introduced in this House to provide in Supplementary Supply, for a big sum of over half a million. Seven-eights of the people of this country did not know a thing about it, and perhaps it would be equally true to state that 50 per cent. of the people of this city did not know a thing about it. We have no Public Press. We as a country and as a Government is in a very bad state because we have no Opposition Press. This Government is considered a disappointing failure by those who were acquainted with the facts that this House had to vote $532,000 for Supplementary Supply but the Government Press said nothing about it. The Telegram Newspaper on the orders of the day referred to the House of Assembly proceeding as follows:

(Reads)

Anyone who read that paper and wondered what Supplementary Supply was, got no further information than is contained in those four lines. They did not know whether it was one dollar or one million dollars. And still we are supposed to have an Independent press. Therefore I am convinced that public opinion in Newfoundland is dead, we have no press to enlighten the people and the affairs of this country as far as the public is concerned, are treated with silence, I might almost say with silent contempt.

The way the "Telegram" and "Daily News" have juggled with the facts concerning the votes for the different departments is misleading and contemptible. The true position of our financial position to-day is regrettable and disappointing and the least said about it the better, except that it is our duty to make ourselves cognizant of the situation with regard to the financial condition of the country. This new loan Bill is a purge that will tend to drive every able-bodied man out of this country. There is no hope for this country or for the future manhood of this country, under present conditions, and almost daily young men are taking advantage of every means of transportation and getting out as they cannot make a living in their own country. The Government is in a hopeless financial mess and the Prime Minister and the Finance Minister know it, whilst the country is in a financial fog and cannot be kept going without borrowing five millions of dollars although a considerable portion of that amount has already been spent on the Dry Dock and in other directions. The

sad part of it is that the Prime Minister, if he had the confidence of the Finance Minister, should have called a halt to some of those huge expenditures that were made within the past year, as he knew they could not be met out of current revenue. But no halt was called, money was spent like water and the Government kept on placating their friends and supporters at all calls. These Loan Resolutions are a sad commentary on the condition of the country when money has to be borrowed to carry on the public utilities of the country. There is $150,000 in the Loan Resolutions for New Lighthouses and Fog Alarms and $100,000 for repairing Telegraph Lines and a million dollars for roads and bridges. When we cannot find money to repair our roads and bridges, without taking a loan for it, I say the country is in a pretty bad shape financially. Further, I venture to say that two million dollars out of this five million dollar proposed loan is to give employment by the Government to substitute able-bodied relief and I am confirmed in that opinion by the report that was read to the House this afternoon by the Leader of the Opposition—a report made by the Bishop Company as to the work done at the Dry Dock within the past year. Bishop excuses himself for his over-expenditure of the estimate he made of the cost of that undertaking by stating that the workmen engaged did not give full services for the money they received and he blames the interference of members of the Government for the over-expenditure.

Lots of men employed up there did not give fifty cents value in work to the dollar. The dock has cost six hundred thousand dollars more than it should have cost. Men were piled up there and were expected to work no matter what weather conditions were; day and night work went on. As far as the finances of the country are concerned it would be just as well to have the money given out in pauper relief. The financial statement of 1924-25 may appear to be a very good showing until we analyse it and compare it with the statement for 1925-26. Mr. Chairman and Mr. Prime Minister the Government should have known what this country was facing and should have made an attempt to cut the garment according to the cloth, and have avoided coming into this House and asking for a further loan. There is no salvation for the country if we go on borrowing millions of dollars every year with no corresponding increase in the earnings of the people. We have to provide revenue to pay for the country's business. This must come to an end. We can't go on indefinitely borrowing money. It is a very serious situation and calls for most serious thought. The soul of the people seems to be dead. The material part may be here but the spiritual part is gone. The government is a corpse. The curtain will ring down in a few days time here upon what? Upon legislation that only burdens this country with extra taxation. The government at this moment shows facial expressions which may denote pleasure, but it is only skin deep. Down in the heart and soul of anyone who thinks, it must be realised that every word I am stating is the truth, and cannot be denied. What bit of legislation have we considered this year which has furthered the interests of the country to any extent. You came in and voted Estimates to cary on the government, and you increased the vote; you increased our expenditure vote. Then you came in and went into Committe on Ways and Means and cannot find ways and means to pay for the ordinary vote, and at the fag end of the session when everybody is sick and tired you bring in Loan

Resolutions and Supplementary Supply to meet our obligations and pay our debts, and then you want to put these through under suspended rules. Can the Government of the day take credit for doing anything out of these 11½ million dollars that will encourage people to live in the country. Take the staple industry. There is no encouragement given to anyone to continue at the fisheries by any legislation that we have considered or by any money that we have voted. If we go into the details of the bit of legislation considered in connection with the fisheries, we see that they are not to encourage but only to hamper. The few dollars that we voted for the encouragement of the fisheres have not been wisely spent, to say the least about it. Nobody can point to any gains received or expected to be received and yet we are supposed to be intelligent people and are supposed to be considering legislation for the advancement of the interests of the country and to conserve its interests and to maintain its independence. With regard to the independent part of it, and having our people live under a constitution such as men have fought for, we are getting nearer the end of that than ever we were before. Some people are seriously considering whether it would not be in the best interests of the country to take a holiday as far as party Government is concerned in this country. When the idea of Commission Government is first mentioned the idea and thought of it appalls us, but as we advance with the times and watch how things are shaping themselves, every thinking person will ask himself the question "What is going to be the end of it after all? Where are we coming out? Shall we ever get to a state in the government of this country so that we will be able to carry on without borrowing money." Mr. Chairman, unfortunately we have to agree to the borrowing of some money. If we have obligations we must meet them, but I strongly protest against this country borrowing five million dollars. I don't know whether it is the intention of the Leader of the Opposition to ask the Opposition to place itself on record in connection with the resolutions; perhaps it is futile and there is nothing to be gained by that, but I take this opportunity to record my protest against the borrowing of five million dollars, in consideration of the way money has been spent during the past year. We have about nine hundred thousand dollars left on loan account, according to the statement of the Finance Minister of the vote last year for the highroads. You have begun that policy and possibly you have seen the error of your ways, but you have gone so far that you must continue to some extent. If you do continue that policy of building highroads, I feel quite sure that you will instruct your Highroads Commission to try and get passable roads over which motor cars will travel, that will cost seven thousand dollars a mile. This country cannot afford it. I say that you should let the Highroads Commission finish the roads that they have begun. Give them about two or three hundred thousand to finish and take the other six or seven hundred thousand that you have voted for highroads and spend it through the country in the different districts, for different purposes, making passable roads, and bridges and wharves. That is one way you can reduce this loan. You cannot continue the mad policy of expenditure upon highroads. Your Government is practically defeated on that policy. I was hoping —every member of this House was hoping that the Finance Minister

would come down here with a hard, business like practical speech, bristling with facts and figures to show where the money was spent last year, giving the particulars and details, giving the accounts I have asked for, but all we get is a bald statement of the Dock, showing inefficiency and making the country and the workingmen of our country appear ridiculous to the outside world.

Mr. Chairman, I wish I could have given more time to preparing some remarks on these important resolutions, but at this season of the year it is impossible to give the attention to these duties that we should like to give. But during the past 48 hours I have given as close attention as possible to two items on the Order Paper —the Loan Resolutions and the mendment to the Education Act. I intended to show this House that some of us at least had some interest in education. I am glad the Prime Minister has had this Bill deleted or removed from the Order Paper. Mr. Chairman, as a result of my study of the Education Acts during the past 48 hours and comparing the Acts of 1916 and 1920 with the proposed Act, I happened to know more about the education Acts than ever before. It shows that we are all lax in matters that come bofre this Legislature, unless we have some particular interest in the bit of legislation. I am glad that it is not being considered; it was a retrograde movement—it was a bill made by the Superintendents of Education, and for the Superintendents of Education—it had Superintendents of Education written all over it. You could see selfishness in every section of it. If it was a bill for the improvement of education, or to give an impetus to education we could put it through under suspended rules, and stay here a week discussing it. It was a retrograde movement and I am glad that one man in the other Chamber took exception to having it put through in that way. But enough said about that—it is no credit to the Government to even introduce it. What that introduction will cost I don't know—I don't know whether the Superintendents will present their bill for compiling it, but the printers will be printing, and it will go into the waste-paper basket. It will never pass this House in its present form, if the House is of the same mind and attitude as myself. And in private conversation with the Prime Minister I could point out facts with which he would agree. The Prime Minister greatly assisted me by giving me marked copies showing what was deleted from the old acts, and what added, with comments, and such like, and it shows his sincerity of purpose in doing so, and I give him credit for it, and believe that when the defects in that bill are pointed out these sections will not be in the Bill that will be brought forward.

And where are we and whiter tending? But I forgot to say when I was speaking of the proposed Bill going to the waste paper basket—last year or the year before we had a Companies Act tabled, and I understand it cost $900.00 to print it, which went the same way. Why wasn't it put through. Nearly every bit of legislation that is put on that table is unconsidered; it is drawn up by people who are not responsible, and is usually thrown out altogether. It is no credit to the Government and it is not praiseworthy—it is blameworthy, but it is only in keeping with nearly every transaction of the present administration; it is "Come day, go day" with them, and borrow as they go. The sins of omission and commission as far as the Government are concerned are very great. What do we find since the Government took office: Take the Estimates of 1924-25, that were prepared by the incoming Government in June of 1924, and compare them with

those of 1926-27 passed the other day and what do we find? An increase in the Finance Dept. of $362,712.92, mostly for interest on new loans. The Justice Dept. has an increase of $300,538.76, Education an increase of $56,626.50; Public Charities $86,899.40; Marine and Fisheries $97,402.90; Agriculture and Mines $30,970.66; Public Works Dept. $56,941.38; Posts and Telegraphs $66,173.51; Customs $13,235.75; the Assessor's Dept. $280.00! Accountant of Contingencies $32,375.00—making an increase of $834,156.80 in the Estimates of 1926-27 over those of 1924-25. Two Departments show a decrease—the Colonial Secretary's Dept. of $5,422.00, and the Pensions Board Commission of $33,216—a net increase of $795,518.80. Now then, leaving out Supplementary Supply, because that is something every Government gets more or less, the interest on our new loan, at 5 per cent. will be another $250,000.00, and it is too much to hope that we will not have to pay interest on $450,000.00 for the New Hotel, which will be $27,000.00 more. And these increases will have to be provided for in this fiscal year 1926. That is where we stand after two years of the Monroe Government as far as expenditure goes. We are voting now $795,518.80 more than in 1924, and are further obligated for $252,700.00 more, making $1,072,518.80 more. And what about the revenue producing power of the country at the present as compared with 1924-25? We had a fictitious revenue in 1924-25, partially through the work at the Humber. And to-day we are getting a revenue from that great industry. But we are not getting as much actual revenue because the people are not earning as much in other lines, and there was less earned this year—the fisheries were more remunerative in past years than at present; the outlook is not good. The Minister of Finance may say that the Estimates may be increased but the revenue is also increased. well according to the statement of the Finance Minister that is correct. The revenue for 1923-1924 was $8,401,689.09. The revenue for 1924-25 was $9,783,188.46, showing an increase of one million three hundred and eighty-one thousand five hundred and nineteen dollars and seven cents. The estimated revenue for 1925-26 which ends to-morrow or the next day is estimated at $10,069,000.00. If that revenue is produced the difference between that revenue and the revenue for 1923-24-25-26 is $1,667,331.91. That is right. That would show according to the estimates a surplus. But we have not got that surplus. We had to take Supplementary Supply for over half a million. Therefore we are spending every cent of our revenue, and we had to increase taxation to get it. These are facts that cannot be disputed. Can the working people afford to live in this country under the present system of taxation. We are told that the cost of supplying for the fishery is so high that no returns can be expected, sufficnent to meet expenses. Therefore a great many people are being discouraged and are giving it up. The Government has lost all hope of ever being able to make it possible for the ordinary man to continue at his avocations, and to be able to provide himself and his family and those depending on him in comfort. The taxes of this Government are bearing upon the people like a heavy load. The Prohibition Act was repealed principally to get revenue. And we are getting the revenue. We have people coming in here from the outside to perform a most important piece of work, and they tell us in unmistakable language the effect of our Liquor Law. We would rather not hear it, but it is true all the same. Under the Prohibition law, one twentieth of the

liquor consumed by the employees of the dock would not have been consumed. Thousands of dollars have been lost to this country by the employees of that dock being able to go to the liquor stores and get their bottle a day. And as a consequence we get a black eye. I may not have the opportunity to remind the Monroe Administration after this House closes, of their duties to the body politic. But if it is not too late now I would ask them to consider the error of their ways, and to institute a different policy. Try to conform to some sane, reasonable administration that will in some way compensate the public for the political sins the Government have committed. It does not take a person of any great financial ability to spend money. If I were disposed to borrow money there are people foolish enough to lend it to me. And the same applies to a government. But you can only go so far and no further. This country after it gets to the end of its thether, with regard to borrowing money, then nothing but bankruptcy stares us in the face. Mr. Chairman, the Budget of 1925-26 was a prodigal budget. The Budget of 1926-27 is a prodigal budget. It is an extravagant budget. We are asked to vote one million dollars for special works and improvements. Now is it good government for those resolutions to pass without a word of comment. Is it good government for the fishery conditions of this country to be so misrepresented that we do not know the true conditions of the fishery. The truth is withheld from the people by the newspapers of this country. I would if I could broadcast to this country and every individual of this country the true financial conditions of this country, for the interests of every individual in that they could well understand what this country is up against. But the Government is not trying to let the people of this country know the true financial conditions of Newfoundland. And do you think that under those circumstances you can get the support of the intelligent people of this country. People should not be encouraged in their demands for assistance from the Government in view of the absolute need for econemy. Members who have spoken from this side of the House have told how they are approached continually by their constituents, who demand money to repair roads and bridges in their distrcts, particularly because of the two million dollars that the Government is spending on highroads. Demands have been made upon myself. The country is not in the state that we wish it to be in and there is nothing being done by the present administration to cause them to think differently. The million dollars that we are asked to vote in the Resolutions for "Special Public Works and Improvements" will be regarded by a great many of the electorate as a good will fund, a fund to placate the importune politician. I do not think that there is much to be gained by my continuing further my remarks, suffice it to say that I have tried to present my opinion to the House on the financial condition of the country. The public debt on June 30th, 1924, was sixty-two million dollars and in two short years it has been increased by over eleven and a half million dollars, despite the fact that thirty million dollars revenue was collected.

(Reads figures)

That sum for necessary maintenance work on the railway should have gone to current account. And then "other railway purposes" whatever that is for. It only goes to corroborate the statement made by the Member for Ferryland that if everything in connection with the

manner of operation of the railway was charged up to the proper account the deficit would be nearly a million dollars. The estimated deficit for 1925-26 is $615,000.00. Very likely that would be three-quarters of a million when we consider what is spent out of loan account for maintenance 1924-25. I protest against the amount of several of the items mentioned in these Resolutions. They should be considerably reduced. With regard to that vote for rebuilding Branch Telegraph lines I would like the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs to be here to explain how he intends to spend that hundred thousand dollars. When the Minister of Posts was asked about this when the Resolutions were introduced he said that the lines were in a state of disrepair. That should not go on loan account, it should go on current account. The Public Building at Corner Brook and equipment $80,000. That is only in keeping with the expenditure on the plant in that town. I feel quite sure that a building could be constructed and equipped to meet all requirements of that town for very much less money than that. That cost of $296,790 should be particularised. That should not be allowed to pass this House without being itemised as to how the Government intends to spend it. That vote for Special Public Works should be cut in two. It should be cut in two and five or six hundred thousand taken from the loan of last year and have devoted to public works and improvements throughout the country. I am glad to see the Minister of Posts now in his seat. I was referring to the vote for the rebuilding of branch lines. I presume that the Construction Department of Posts and Telegraphs Department have given you an itemised statement of how this money is to be spent next year. I would like to have this amount explained and know if the Department requires the money for the building of new lines or for repairing only.

HON. THE MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—I am not exactly aware of the particulars of what they intend doing with regard to that money. I trust that I will be able to get an account from them that will be satisfactory. Most of it I understand is for general repairs and rebuilding of branch lines and is very necessary. I shall be only too pleased to supply that itemised account to the hon. member, and a statement that will satisfy every member of the Opposition and on this side of the House. I think that of all the Departments not one is run more economically than the Post Office, not because I am Minister but I am sure that everything up there is run most economically. I will vouch for it that not a dollar goes astray and if the hon. gentleman wants a statement as to how that vote is expended I shall only be too delighted to supply the information. I have great faith and confidence in my staff and know the necessity of this money.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman, I think that the member for Trinity has given a pretty good analysis of the conditions with which this country is faced to-day largely on account of the increased expenditure that has been going on the last two years. That it is bearing heavily upon the taxpayer and upon the people is apparent when we see the condition in which some of us find ourselves to-day. In considering the comparison between the state of this country and the earning-power of the people when Sir Robert Bond went out of power in 1908 and what we find it to-day, in my opinion every member of this House must feel that we must face the situation and ask ourselves "Where are we and whither tending"?

(Reads)

In 1908 the Public Debt was $33,-

000,000 and in 1926 it is $70,000,000, practically an increase of three hundred per cent.

The average person in 1908 paid about $70 a year out of his income and in 1925 it requires on an average about $200 in order to pay one's share for the upkeep of the Government to-day. One can understand why it is to-day that the conditions of the people are anything but good. Everybody knows the average fisherman's income is not any more than two or three hundred dollars. Speaking of shoremen and those who go on wages, cannot as everybody will admit live on the earning power of two or three months that is all they have for the fishery, and make enough for the whole twelve months. They have got to earn pretty constantly through the year in order to be able to make both ends meet. Why are the fishermen not able to make both ends meet to-day and why is it to-day that we find that quite a lot of people have to go and look for employment from the Government on public works? The cause is unmistakable. The cost of the Government is a hundred and thirty dollars more per capita than it was in 1908, and they have not had a corresponding increase in earning power to enable them to pay that hundred and thirty dollars. That earning power that will enable them to pay $130,- over 1913 out of their earnings to the expenses of Government. The reason we haven't a greater income is because it is not sufficient to pay the cost of living. The outcome is that with increased expenses we are coming to a condition which necessitates that the Government must borrow from year to year to provide employment, or supply the Relieving Officer. And we can't go on indefinitely; we are going to be up against bankruptcy and ruin unless our industries are developed.

Now I figure that there is about 15,- 000 men engaged in the fishery to-day, and probaly there are a thousand more in St. John's who have to depend on casual employment, and who do not get steady employment—men who go to work on the waterfront as 'longshoremen and such like. According to the leaders of the unions the average employment of these men is seven months in the year, and that seven months they have to earn enough to pay them through the twelve months. Seven months is the average for the casual labourer, and there is not enough to keep them employed, consequently he has to go to his member and the Government has to provide public work to enable him to keep his family. And what are we going to do about it? Can we do it by cutting down expenditure. While I admit, Mr. Chairman, that it seems a pretty hopeless proposition to try to do so—we have gone so far; we have a debt of seventy millions and have to face the interest charges that have to be met, and what we can save on public departments or public works can only be done by effort on the part of everyone in the country. But the unfortunate thing is to have this condition of things where the Government have to provide employment for men to get a livelihood. But who pays the piper? It is the man who gets steady employment — the man who earns from $800.00 to $1000.00 a year; he has to contribute to taxation for the unemployed. And do we wonder if our men leave our shores from month to month. They leave because the fishery is not enough to keep them, but we think they will come back again, and that they go to Canada and the United States and send money back to their families. But for every hundred who leave there are at least fifteen who stay away, and we show that by the fact that our population is stationary and does not increase. And why not? Simply because Newfoundland is not able to provide sufficient employ-

ment to keep them on our shores, and the Government has never developed an industry sufficiently large to keep these men from leaving.

Now I have already referred to agriculture, and in my opinion what I would like to see the Government develop is a land scheme. The Minister of Posts and Telegraphs will agree that in the District of Harbor Main there are large tracts of land where if the people got proper encouragement they would settle down. And that is true of Port de Grave, Twillingate, St. George's and around the Codroy. I have been speaking with men who have surveyed that section, and they are men who have been living in Canada, and they have told me that the soil on the West Coast is capable of producing equally with Canada. Well, I say this, that if the Government is going to spend this money they ought to take a half million of it, and advance a loan of say $2000.00 to any young man who have a reputation for honesty and who are not afraid of hard work (and there are numbers of such to be found) that if this was done we would have these men stay in the country, and in 20 years the Government would get the money back, and have development of the country.

Now another aspect of this increased expenditure is the effect it is going to have on the fishery. One reason why we do not find supplies advancing so much as in former years is that the cost of supplying is so great—in former years merchants were able to supply a large number of men—but that is prohibitive to-day, and there is not much hope. We must reduce the cost of producing our fish, and we will lessen the cost of everything in the country.

We must get down to hard facts. I submit that if we went out to our Districts and told every Tom, Dick and Harry who wants a Post Office and other things, "If you get this you will have to pay for it—you may gain a temporary advantage, but in 15 years time you will be damning the Government and the member who granted it because of the increased expense." If we had put things before the people properly we should not have been saddled with such expenditure. I say these things are not taken seriously, but when men find that we can't make both ends meet some will put on their thinking caps, and if that is done we would find less demands on the Government. There will be times of necessity and depression—they have happened and will happen again—we will have our cycles of prosperity and our lean years as well. But we should be prepared for such—we should have something in the Treasury and not spend every dollar we get as we get it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have to protest against the expenditure on the Dock. It has gone far above what the Estimated Cost was to have been, and I think the position of the Opposition at that time was the correct one—that we should have entered into a contract with some concern to do the thing for a definite price, and bind them to that; we should have saved much expense by doing so. Not only that but we have been talking about giving Newfoundlanders a chance where a chance was provided.

Now you take in connection with the instalation of the electric light and power there. There was very little opportunity given to the local man to tender for that. A tender was called for on March 12th and closed about a week from that date. This gave no opportunity to the local man to be able to cable to the different firms. For it is well known that no one firm can supply all the material that is required for instalations of that kind. But strange to say the Canadian firms were able to put in their tender within that time. They

were able to tender and the local man was not. There must be a nigger in the woodpile somewhere, that we have not been told about in this House. That is why I think and believe that there was discrimination somewhere. I don't say on the part of the Government, but it is peculiar that the Government have not seen that the local man was given some opportunity to tender as well as outsiders, for that contract of installing electricity at the dock. Then we have been told that there was inefficiency on the part of some of the employees on account of drunkenness, and other reasons. Well, that did not surprise me at all, when you consider that you have men going up there and the liquor right before them. And then it is only natural to think that when a man does occasionally take a drink and is forced to buy a bottle or nothing, he will often take more than he should. The best answer as to the value of prohibition is in a comparison of what I saw at the main dam, and the conditions in the city. There was a distinctly better grade of work provided by the men at the main dam than by those employed in the city. Not that I think that the men there were better than the men in St. John's, but there was no rum there as there was in St. John's. That was the reason, and if you remove this evil in St. John's you will not longer have any complaint about the inefficiency of labour. Of course our words here may not have much effect, but at least there is sufficient warrant in that report, to suggest to the Government that before this session closes to have the Department of Control instructed to cut out the selling of whiskey or rum. Now, Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is not present because I would like to know what happened to the $50,000 last year, and the $150,000 to be spent?

What fog alarms are going this year? Where is it going to be to be provided, and what light houses? Now, I don't think that sum is required. I think that that could easily be put at half of what it is for this year. I believe as much as any man that we should provide all the safety appliances for the men who are going about in schooners, and steamers around the coasts of Labrador. But they have been able to do without them for a long time. The $150,000 in addition to the $50,000 of last year, is a tremendous amount of money. A larger amount than was ever spent in this Department before, in the history of the country. Now I would like to ask the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs if it is the intention in connection with $100,000 provided for the rebuilding of branch telephones, to include in that the telephones already in course of construction or partly completed.

THE MINISTER OF POSTS.— I don't think that it has anything to do with telephones. There is the vote for the maintenance of telephones.

MR. GRIMES.—Then I would like to say to the Minister that at least he ought to put telephones into the offices and connect them with the line. The telephone is a valuable asset to those people who live a long way from a doctor. Now, I would like to ask the Prime Minister if a portion of that money is to be set aside for the purpose of the development of the coal areas of St. George's.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.— Mr. Chairman, in reply to the Hon. Member, I may say that we have been giving consideration to the St. George's coal fields, and the general feeling is that we should assist. But we want to know just a little bit more about what we are assisting. And we want some pro-

position that would appeal to the Government. I saw a letter from one of the firms who are financially interested in that proposition, and they suggested that this company was prepared to put up $15,000 towards the development of that mine, but first they want to see if the people here are also interested in having that mine developed. And I told the member for St. George's that if the company was prepared to put up $30,000 for the development of that mine with the proper engineers behind them that the Government would be justified in spending another $30,000. But I considered that we would not be justified in giving $30,000 to Mr. Freeman to explore that mine without the proper supervision.

MR. GRIMES.—Mr. Chairman, I quite agree that the money should not be spent without the proper supervision but I also want to say that the proper supervision can be found. Now, I think that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries should be in the House to give us an explanation as to what should be done with regard to the development of the fishery resources of the country. Mr. Chairman, I think that one million dollars is a very extravagant amount to have down here, in connection with the special public works and improvements, when $150,000 has been already voted. I trust that the Government will deal fairly with the people in our section of the country, as these people derived no benefit out of the expenditure on highroads that has been going on the past two years. I would like to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries what is going to be done in connection with investigating the fishing resources of the Colony, as mentioned in the Loan Resolutions?

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—That will be considered when the Board meets.

MR. GRIMES—I think that the Minister ought to know something now of what is going to be done. That is certainly a peculiar position for the Government to be in. I think the House ought to be given the information as to how that money is proposed to be spent. Now, with regard to the expenditure of a million dollars on special public works, I want to state that the needs of Twillingate district got very littte attention from the Government within he past two years. I presented a petition some time ago signed by 500 residents on the north side of Green Bay. Now with fishery supplies these men would go and prosecute the fishery, if they got the chance, instead of working on the roads. Those who were in the lumber woods had their small earnings exhausted practically by the time they got from the woods to their homes. The Prime Minister stated the other day that he had been told by Mr. Crowe that the industry at Hampden could take care of a thousand men, but on enquiry I was informed that there was only room for half that number and most of the men engaged will be from White Bay where the men are close at hand. What I want to point out to the Government is the necessity for building a trail from Springdale to Hampden which would cost about $8,000, to enable the people to get to and from Hampden. This, I think, would relieve the conditions that prevail at present on that side of the Bay. On the south side of the Bay conditions are almost as bad. There is a road at Point Leamington that was partly constructed three years ago. about ten miles of it is unfinished and if that was completed it would materially assist the people as well as be a help to the tourist traffic. I would also urge upon the Government that

they give serious consideration to the building of the bridge at Twillingate when the moneys in connection with public improvements are being allocated.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER —The matter of the bridge has already been favorably considered by the Government.

MR. GRIMES—In connection with encouragement of agriculture I may say that the people of Little Bay Islands are taking a great interest in that industry and they ask for one thousand dollars for the making of a road across the island in order that they may be able to put more land under cultivation and thereby be able to raise all their own produce instead of having to buy it elsewhere. I think that the people in the districts on the Avalon Peninsula have had their share of the expenditure of public moneys during the past two years through the highroad policy and I think that it is time that other districts had a chance now.

MR. RANDALL—Mr. Chairman, in connection with this legislation before us, I would like to make myself clear to the House, to the country and to my constituents whom I have the honour to represent. I think that all right thinking men are very much concerned to-day as to the country's financial condition.

There is food for thought from various points of view. I do not consider it a good policy, if it can possibly be avoided. You as a country are borrowing more than you can ever hope to pay back, in my opinion, and I think that it would be better for us if we never considered any borrowing in this country and tried to work along without having to go and look for money to finance us. I have heard speakers deprecated and spoken of disparagingly because in the past they have said things that would be damaging to this country's credit. I may be considered a radical but I feel that it would be better in this country if our credit had been finished thirty years ago. If we could not have borrowed a cent it would be much better. I am not in accord with the borrowing of any money. We should worry along in some kind of way without doing it. It might be said to me that I was a member of a party that held the reins of office when some money was borrowed for this country and that I at least acquiesced in that policy. That is true to a certain extent. However a private member of a Government in this country has very little to say in the policy adopted by the Government. He often may hear for the first time on the street what is being done by his party and he is blamed for whatever policy the Government has adopted. If he stands up and airs his views contrary to the party policy he is very likely to be considered an outcast, or a bad party man to say the least, or else looked upon as a man who is a liability to the party. A man may in that way disagree with the policy that has been adopted and realise that he is in a position where he cannot take a line of his own. He is elected to represent a district with the best intentions perhaps in the world. He is looked upon by a great many people as merely out for profit. That may be true in some cases, but I am reminded of the statement of an eminent divine I once heard preaching in the pulpit that a man becomes as soon as elected a target for criticism; his name is treated with caustic criticism and ribald contempt. If then he faces criticism and states himself averse to the party policy he is very often looked down upon and considered an unsafe factor in the party. So perhaps, while being young in politics of this country, when I sat on the other side of the House, I acquesced in the borrowing of money, but as I am here a little longer and learn more, I begin to see the condition that the country is like-

ly sooner or later to come to, and I come now to the conclusion that it would be much better for me to voice my opinion in this way, and that is to make myself very clear with regard to the question of our country's looking for more money and more loans, and continuing to increase our debt. I have often thought that a country, as I have said before, is much like an individual, and as was said by Mr. Halfyard here to-night, it is bad policy to borrow, no matter whether it is a country, or an institution or an individual, and that is more especially true when you can't see your way clear to pay back. As far as this country is concerned, the outlook, I think every man within sound of my voice will agree with me is not promising when we consider what we are handing down to future generations. What a legacy we are leaving behind us! A day will come when people will denounce the politicians of this country for the unsavory position that they have put this country into. With regard to expenditure, I want to say that, in my opinion, this Government is not giving proper consideration to the spending of public monies, because in the first instance they have, in my opinion, spent them when they had no right to. They are somewhat similar to a man who is not able to pay his bills, who is just able to struggle along, and who goes out one day and buys himself a Rolls Royce, gets it on credit, and gets himself in deeper; like a householder just able to meet his debts who starts out to buy a palace and show some grandeur and finds himself in deeper when he is finished. In respect to the Re-distribution Bill that was passed last year, that increased the Membership of this House of Assembly to forty members. If the Government had an eye to economy I do not see why the membership of this House should not have been reduced. If our membership is increased to forty it does not look as if we were trying to economise. It is alright to embark on a policy wherein you want to spend money or to go into a speculative venture if you can afford it. If you have the money to spare, by all means go and buy a Rolls Royce, but if you have not got the money to spare it is a mistake to enter on any speculative policy. This expenditure of such a large amount of money on highroads with the hope of getting tourists to come into this country is a policy that no business man would adopt. No man of the business world worth two million dollars is going to say "I am going to put this up on the odd chance of returns coming in." There might be somewhat more excuse if the money had been sent on repairing outport roads where repairs are badly needed, but you have started in on a tourist policy in which it is very unlikely you will ever get returns, and I think that a mistake. Before I take my seat I would like to say a few words with regard to the codfishery and the situation, which every thinking man who knows anything at all about the business of the country takes the greatest interest in, as to how the fisherman is placed to-day with regard to his outfit and outlook for the coming summer. We all know that prices are not good ,and some of us who are conversant with fishery affairs know that even if a schooner man gets a good fare, eight or nine hundred quintals of fish, he is not likely to come out square. Some will, some won't. Some people came up last year, got good fairs and were just barely able to pay their way. This year the outlook is not nearly as good. How can as many continue to carry on? That is how the country is placed to-day, more and more can't get outfits. A fisherman is not anxious to give up the fisheries, but he feels he has to do something. I hate to stand up in this House and strike a note that is likely to be discouraging to either the Government or the fisher-

men, but these are facts that we cannot shelve and must look them in the face. Our expenditure is considerable more than our income and still we are borrowing and placing ourselves in a worse position than we were. I notice in the Loan Resolutions that we have $1,000,000 to be spent on special public works and improvements. Now then there is at least one suggestion that I would like to make with regard to expenditure on public works. I really think that the District of Trinity during the past year or so has not had its fair share of public monies. That is my opinion, and I want to bring to the notice of the Government one instance in particular where the people of Trinity District have been looking for help from the Government for a long time and nothing has been done to help them. I refer to the town of Trinity itself; the people have been looking for a small amount of money for the repair of a drain that runs through the centre of the town, which has been in a condition during the last two summers that is a danger to the health of the community. I personally interviewed the Minister of Public Works, and wrote several letters to that Department, and I know that public meetings have been held in Trinity town, but so far nothing has been done. People have written me and told me that the overflow from this sewer runs into the streets and even into people's houses, and they are deeply concerned as to what is going to happen to the health of the community during this summer. A matter like this should be brought to the attention of the proper authorities, and not be shelved—the health of the people is one of the first considerations of the State, and instead of spending money for the purpose of giving outsiders a good time we should look out for our own people first and give them ordinary facilities that will at least help to maintain the public health.

I do not want to delay the House any longer, but I do want to express my opinion as to borrowing. I don't envy the Minister of Finance or anybody in the Government, nor do I want to take their positions, because I feel that most positions occupied by members on that side are by no means sinecures. The Minister of Finance is perhaps putting up a good fight, as good a fight as he can, and I daresay that if I were there I wouldn't do any better, and perhaps not as well, so I don't envy him, occupying our seats here as we do. All of us are spoken of more or less disparagingly. Although none of us occupy thrones, still fierce is the light that beats on public men, no matter on what side of the House they may be, and I want to say to the people of the country that we are all very much alike. Before I take my seat I would like for the people of this country to understand that I am not in accord with borrowing. I know it is hard to see a clear way—of course I understand the conditions of the country, and they are such that drastic measures are necessary, but still I think we ought to worry along some way or another without doing this. We as a country in my opinion are aping others too much—we are doing things on too large a scale; we are buying a Rolls Royce when we have no money to spare. There are some items in those resolutions that I cannot understand—I can't understand such an item as this amount for settling the Railway Loan, that was supposed to have been cleared up years ago. There is another item that looks strange to me, and I wonder why it wasn't attended to before; that is the $80,000 for the Lobelia, Watchful and Daisy. These are items that would set ordinary people wondering how they have dragged along for such a time, and why such matters are allowed to stand over indefinitely. I hope that the large amounts that are being paid out for investigat-

ing the mineral, agricultural and fishing industries of the country will be put to good use, and I trust the fishing industry will not be forgotten—it is our staple industry, and it seems to me that some means should be adopted and some scheme devised whereby the fisherman is enabled to keep going, because just as sure as we are in this House the coming season is going to be a trying one, and more especially if the fishery is not a good one. In any case, even if we do have a big fishery, the prices are likely to tumble.

Before I take my seat, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I hope that, above all other things the Government does, it will help our fisheries, and give the fishermen a chance to come back and square up accounts—the outlook now is very discouraging to suppliers as well as fishermen—it is by no means good.

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.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill "An Act Respecting Education" was stricken from the Order Paper.

Second Reading of Workman's Compensation Act Bill.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, even though the hour is late, might I be permitted to move the second reading of this Bill. I don't think there is likely to be much difference of opinion about this. Sec. 1 of the Act provides for the substitution of the words "One thousand dollars" for the words "Five hundred dollars"—the effect of that is that where a workman has a claim the amount is increased to $1000.00. Sec-2 provides that compensation in case of death is increased for the family of a man from $1500.00 to $3000.00. In sub-section 2 of section 2 providing for a weekly income not to exceed $5.00 now becomes that the employee is entitled to half his average salary. Subsection 3 is new and is not in the old Act, and this is about the only difference that is being made in the scope of the Act. It provides:

(Reads)

That is a standard provision of Workmen's Compensation Acts of other countries of the last few years.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, does this act apply to all employees, or only those who came under this law under the present act? Of course the present act only applies to a certain class of workmen, it does not apply to those who have to work in mines or what is usually termed industrial works. I think that it was explained at the time that the matter was being introduced that one of the things that was in contemplation in proceeding with the Workman's Compensation Act was that there would be a material alteration in the extent to which people would be affected by the act. Here is the definition to which the Chapter applies.

(Reads)

Now I think that one of the anomalies of the act to-day is this that say a member of the crew of the Silvia happens to be injured, he gets no compensation while a man working on the wharf comes under the Act. That is one of the things that ought to be considered. To what extent is the act to be extended?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, I would like to explain that shortly. Subsection 2 reads at the present time:

(Reads)

Now the words that are to be stricken out are:—

(Reads)

I would also like to say that if the workman's average weekly wage is thirty dollars he gets fifteen. As regards the other point raised by the Leader of the Opposition, he himself will be the first to agree that it is only a matter of legislating in accordance with the changed value of money at the present time. When the act was passed twenty years ago fifteen thousand dollars was fixed as the approximate compensation. Since that time conditions have moved up. And whilst I quite agree with the fact that it is going to be an extra charge on industry, yet I would like the House to understand that as far as these amendments are concerned, we have done nothing at all more than to put ourselves on a par with the accepted principles in the world to-day.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend Chapter 212 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Compensation to Workmen'" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon, with unanimous consent 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 Chapter 212 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Compensation to Workmen.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Cahill 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, with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend Chapter 212 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Compensation to Workmen'" 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 Finance and Customs gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act Respecting certain Retiring Allowances."

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, in moving the adjournment of the House until three o'clock to-morrow I may say that I hope to complete all the legislation before the House on to-morrow, with the exception of money bills. There is no new business to come before the House only the proposition regarding the Terra Nova Oil Products, Ltd..

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Speaker, May I ask if the Government or the Prime Minister has received any invitation from the Imperial Conference?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Yes, from the President of the Conference. It will begin in October next.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, June 8th, 1926.

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

The Clerk having informed the House of the absence of Mr. Speaker, through illness, Mr. Puddester took the Chair.

Mr. Halfyard 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 Bills sent up entitled respectively "An Act to Amend Chapter 22 Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Customs,'" "An Act for the Confirmation of a Contract with the Commercial Cable Company," "An Act to Amend the Revenue Act 1925," and "An Act to Further Amend Chapter 74 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Old Age Pensions,'" without amendment.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the Rules of the House with respect to all matters now before the House, or to come before it, were suspended.

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 Authorization of an Agreement between the Government and the Terra Nova Oil Products Company, Ltd.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Cahill took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — Mr. Chairman, I think I explained the main features of this proposition yesterday. The Company proposes to establish a plant at Carbonear in which they propose to treat a great deal of fish oils electro chemically. The plant is estimated to cost something like one and a half million dollars. The Company claims that it will double the value of our oil products to be manufactured there. The promoters had asked for a monopoly for fifty years at first, claiming that their output would have to be large to make the business pay and pointing out that they would not be injuring any other company. The Government refused to grant this monopoly. Mr. Powell and Mr. R. G. Rendell, the organizers of the Company, forewent their claim for a monopoly and then the proposition came down to granting the Company free entry of machinery and raw materials for twenty years. We agreed to twenty years in order to get this industry going. The Company is given privileges like the Gander and Humber propositions, but not freedom from income tax, if such is ever imposed again. The Company for twenty years from the date of the agreement will be exempt from all taxation of every kind whatsoever unless levied under the general laws of the Colony, but not from Municipal taxation not exceptionally imposed.

MR. R. DUFF—I wish to make some reference to the Terra Nova Oil and Products Co. resolutions brought forward by the Prime Minister, and also to explain that the delay in bringing these before the Assembly is in no way attributable to the promoter of the above Company. As a matter of fact the Government has had this matter before them for consideration for the past two months, and my regular attendance to this House has been, in a great degree, caused by my interest in this Company and my desire to see it get the support it deserves.

The Company did ask for certain considerations, but not any greater than those conceded to other great industries which I shall mention. I certainly believe that the Government might very easily have given this Company an exclusive right for say ten years, to give them an opportunity to get established, and my reason for this is the history of our whale fishery. This industry was most profitable for a number of years, but eventually was abandoned because it was overdone ,and many people who invested in this industry lost their life's savings.

Regarding the concession we were asking for the same as the Gander Power Co., and other Company Acts that has come before the House during my term, and not so much as has

been allowed to others, for instance Nfld. Power and Paper gets a guarantee of £2,000,000 (two million pounds). Take for instance the Nfld. Milling Co. Act that we wasted considerable time over; they obtained exclusive rights for 20 years, duty free material for 20 years and protection to the extent of 25c. per barrel. There is the Avalon Telephone Co. monopoly for 30 years, St. John's Street Railway concessions, and last but not least the Mooney and Crowe Acts.

When I received a wire from Mr. Powell to withdraw this Bill unless it went through on its second draft, I felt that it would be in the nature of a disaster to my district, and my chief reason for attending the House this week was to show the seriousness of the position. It would be in the nature of a disaster not only to Carbonear, but to the whole country. This is the first important effort that has been made to improve conditions in connection with our waning fishery. This company will introduce scientific methods in this enterprise. There will be two or perhaps three leading chemists attached to this plant, and the labour will be very welcome and be a means of keeping our people in this country. Our Brazil fish carriers will have an opportunity of obtaining returning freights of cotton seed from Brazil instead of returning in ballast as heretofore.

This plant will hydriginate all fish oils into a pure tasteless form of lard that is used for various purposes, and butter factories will obtain their requirements in this country. The barrels and containers will be made of Newfoundland material by Newfoundland artisans. The refuse will be made into fish meal, and it is not necessary to inform this House of the value of vitamines in our oils, which is well established, but will be better known when this factory gets working. This is a new enterprise in this country, but not new in Norway. The Trade will have the same foreign markets open to them as they have now for their oil products, but in this instance they will have another competitor to purchase their wares, and one that has for its object to get every item of value right here in our own country instead of shipping to other countries to be manufactured.

Our bays at certain seasons are teeming with herring for which there is not a sufficient market. There will now be a market right here for all these surplus fish. These can be brought to the plant in bulk in vessel loads, the oil will be extracted and the residue will form a fish meal which makes a valuable cattle feed, and instead of importing some of the rubbishy cheap cattle foods we shall furnish a superior article. Mr. E. S. Archibald of an Experimental Farm writes to the effect that "European and American investigators report fish meal to have great milk and fat producing properties and is in superiority over cotton and linseed oil meal. Cattle increased milk and butter production on a ration of fish meal, and reduced very perceptibly when placed on regular diet."

A ration of 110 lbs. fish meal
" " " 42 lbs. Bran
" " " 22 lbs. Oats

174 lbs. eq. 215 lbs. Gluten

As an example of cash value:

Bran	$35.00
Gluten	60.00
Oats	70.00
Fish Meal	89.00

Fish Meal contains 60 per cent. protein, 15 per cent. phosphate of lime.

I believe this House will give their united support to this measure before them which means so much to this country, and will in this way show their appreciation of the founder, who loves his country and is first and foremost desirous of its welfare.

MR. HICKMAN—I think that Mr. Duff has made his case very well in

reference to this Bill. He has put forward very good arguments in favour of these resolutions and the only thing left that we might add is that since the promoters seem to be undecided as to where the plant is to be established, I would suggest that they decide on Harbor Grace. If as Mr. Duff has told us that an industry is to be started in which fish offal and herring and other kinds of fish that can be gathered around the country can be used, I think that in itself is sufficient reason to give the resolutions our hearty support. I don't see any great concessions that are being given and as far as we are concerned, we have no objection to the resolutions.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I might explain with regard to these Resolutions that we are only taking authority to make an agreement, because we have nothing definite from the promoters that these terms will be acceptable to them. We are only outlining the terms that the Government feel that they will accede to. Unfortunately Mr. Powell was obliged to go away and we have not been able to get in touch with him or the people behind him to know if these conditions will be satisfactory.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the agreement as an agreement, nor to the terms of the agreement, but I have strong objections to this form of legislation, of giving the Government authority to make an agreement, on general, loose terms such as this, which afterwards will not come before the House. Such agreements are generally pigeon-holed after being made and not seen by anybody. I refer particularly to the Telephone Company Agreement that was made under the same sort of legislation as this, that the Governor in Council should have power to make an agreement on certain lines, and it was not until the people found some terms rather onerous, and discussion arose and they had not seen the agreement, that eventually the agreement was published in the newspapers. I have drafted an addition to the Resolutions under discussion and I would suggest that this be added to Section 8:

(Reads)

That gives everybody a chance to see the Agreement. While it does not mean that it can be cancelled, it gives an opportunity to the House and the Members to see what the Agreement is like, after having given a sort of blank power of attorney. As I suppose a Bill will be introduced we will want another section to that effect too. I think that section should be added so we can have a record of the agreement that is afterwards made under the Resolutions.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—There is no objection whatever to adding that section.

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 recommended that a Bill be introduced to give effect to the same.

On motion this Report was received and adopted and the Bill entitled "An Act to Authorize an Agreement between the Government and the Terra Nova Oil Products Company, 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 Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act to Authorize an Agreement between the Government and the Terra Nova Oil Products Company, 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 Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act

to Authorize an Agreement between the Government and the Terra Nova Oil Products Company, Limited."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Cahill 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 Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act to Authorize an Agreement between the Government and the Terra Nova Oil Products Company, 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.

Retiring Allowance Bill

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—This Bill only confirms the pensions that have been passed as it is customary to do. All this is in the Estimates.

MR. HICKMAN—I would like to ask the Colonial Secretary to explain to the House the services of Mr. and Mrs. Winslow; what they have done in the past.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. and Mrs. Winslow were the keepers of the old small-pox hospital on Signal Hall and when that was dismantled, they were out of a job—they were kept on, on full pay, for two or three years. This gives me an opportunity to state the understanding we have with the Winslows which unfortunately the fever hospital and public health officials generally have not availed themselves of. They are pensioned at two thirds their salary, but if required by the Government for any special purpose, for example if there should be an epidemic or an outbreak of smallpox they will be available. We had to do something. We could not keep them on, on full pay. An attempt was made to work them into the fever hospital but Dr. Brehm did not seem to be able to fit them in and the Government decided to put them on the pension list, and if required we can make use of their services.

MR. HICKMAN—How long were they employed?

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Practically all their lives. They were twenty or twenty five years at the small pox hospital. I think the father, Sergeant Winslow, had the job before them and it has been in the family for the last half century.

MR. HICKMAN—In the event of these people being called upon to take charge of any hospital they will go back to their original pay?

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Yes, and the pension will be suspended. The case is this that these two people were in charge of that hospital for a great many years and it is not considered right to put them on the street without some compensation.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Referring to pension of Mr. and Mrs. Winslow, it is not a very easy matter to get anyone to take charge of a hospital which treats cases of small pox. I quite understand that there have been times when those in charge of the hospital could not get servants or nurses of any kind, and they had to perform all the duties themselves. They have had cases of small pox down there where the patients could not be handled except with a sheet. They have done noble work. As a rule I do not agree with increasing the pension where it is not necessary, but I certainly think that these people should be given due con-

sideration by the Government for the services they have performed.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Retiring Allowances," 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 the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Retiring Allowances" 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 Respecting Retiring Allowances."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Cahill 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 the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting 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 and on motion of Honourable the Colonial 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 presently.

Whereupon 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 presently.

Whereupon 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. Cahill 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 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 Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions respecting the Raising of a Sum of Money on the credit of the Colony for certain Public Purposes.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Cahill took the Chair of Committee.

MR. MOORE—Mr. Chairman, the first item in these resolutions is $800,000 for the completion of the dock. Now I don't rise this evening to delay this committee, but I want to bring to the attention of the Government the state of affairs that I saw there

this morning. When I went to the dock this morning to view the Wisteria which had just arrived, I found a state of excitement down near the lower end in connection with the boiler workers, and the engineers. I went to find what the trouble was and they told me that the ship was only going to be temporarily repaired, and that it was going out of the dock again, and they refused to work on it. I told them not to get excited, that possibly there was some explanation. The explanation was that her fore hold was full of grain and they could not take it out. I contend now that the grain should be removed from her fore hold and that the ship should be repaired in Newfoundland. If you build a dock as large as any on this side, we should not allow that ship to come off the dock without permanent repairs. Major Sullivan was there at the time, perhaps he can throw some light on the matter.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Mr. Chairman, with reference to the remarks made by the honourable member for Ferryland, Mr. Moore, he was standing up on the South side of the Dock, and I imagine saw me in conversation with some of the Boiler-makers. The delegates had just come back from Mr. Russell and we discussed the matter of permanently repairing as well as temporary repairing ships, the Delegates thought that the "Westlake" should have permanent repairs made. The explanation given to me previous to my conversation with the Delegates was that they could not make permanent repairs unless they could get some place to store the grain cargo, which would have to be taken out if permanent repairs were to be made. The Captain of the ship informed me previous to my conversation with the Delegates, that they had considerable difficulty in getting storage space for 670 tons of grain which they had to store before temporary repairs could be made. It had been suggested to get the "Edmund Donald" to store the grain, but it was found that this ship was leaking in the top side, so would not be suitable for storing grain. The boiler-makers were not inclined to make temporary repairs, they thought that they were entitled to get double time for temporary repairs and four hours for one hour at night time. I pointed out to them that this was a very poor time to raise a question like this, the country had gone to considerable expense to provide an up-to-date dock, and that when the first steamer came in; even if it was only for temporary repairs; that if charges were excessive it would give a black eye to the Dock. I said it was only by the men co-operating with the Management that we could hope to make the Dock a success. For myself, I am perfectly satisfied that the men could do the work as well as any men anywhere else, provided they had modern equipment. I furthermore stated that I was prepared to see that they got as good pay as men engaged in similar jobs in Canada, the States and in England, but then when they receive similar pay we would expect that they would give us just as good results as those men are doing. We cannot compel ship owners to make permanent repairs, if they are satisfied with temporary repairs. A private individual might refuse to take a ship on Dock to make temporary repairs if he owned the Dock, but I think it would be very poor policy for any Government to try to dictate to any ship owners whether they shall make temporary or permanent repairs.

In the past the impression has been that the charges for repair work done in St. John's had been extremely high; how far this is true or not I cannot say, but it is up to us now to try and remove any bad impression there might have been, and to show by our efforts and by our work that we can do the job as economically as any-

where else; this can only be done by united co-operation, which is most essential. Unfortunately, we are handicapped here in Newfoundland as to rapidity with which we can do the job, this is only a small place and we have only a certain number of skilled labour. In Quebec, St. John, New York, Newcastle, Liverpool or any other large centre, when a ship is in and it is needed to make repairs in the quickest possible time, plenty of help is obtainable and eight hour shifts can be arranged to work for twenty four hours. Here we cannot do this, sometimes it is of importance to ship owners to get their ships repaired and in Commission as soon as possible. This might be one of the reasons why they do not care to have permanent repairs made in Newfoundland, still, I think if our men make up their minds that they can rush the job and do as good work as they can anywhere else, it would be a great pity if they did not co-operate and use their utmost endeavour to make this new Dock a success; it will be to their own interest as well as to the interest of the country as a whole.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, I want to make a few short remarks in connection with the Loan Resolutions now before the Chair, more as a matter of duty than because I feel that anything I might say at this juncture would have any influence in deterring the Government from what appears to be a determined and settled course of conduct. The position really is that at present we have no course left open to us but to acquiesce in these resolutions. The whole fact of the matter is that the Government has got the country into such a state of financial chaos that the raising of this Loan appears to be imperative, and the Resolutions have been left to such a late hour in the session that we have scant opportunity to thrash the financial position of the country out as thoroughly as we ought to and would like to. There can be no doubt, sir, but that the whole country will be one in the opinion that this new Loan of five million dollars will be the last straw to break the camel's back. It does indeed seem difficult to realise that so much money has been spent, in the short space of two years by a Government pledged to the hilt to conduct the affairs of the country along economical lines. It may be true that when you took office you inherited certain obligations from your predecessors in office—every government does—but I feel none the less that you have garbled the situation in order to bolster up your own weakness and hide your own shortcomings.

Now there is one incident, just here, that I should like to refer to. Speaking on the Budget here the other day, I ventured the opinion that when we came to Supplemental Supply we would be called upon to vote at least $150,000 for that account. I felt safe when I ventured that opinion that the total was going to be considerably in excess of that, but I was studying the Finance Minister's face at the time to see if he would evidence any sign that my calculation was awry. He never moved a muscle or blinked an eyelid. I have heard since that he was amused. He must have been if he thought my opinion was all that I believed. But as I have stated sir, I believed more and our worst fears were justified when the Supplemental Supply was brought in here for the staggering sum of over $500,000.00. And talking of being amused let me say that thinking people see nothing to be amused at over the financial mess the country is in to-day. It is high time to stop playing politics with it and dealing with hundreds of thousands and millions of borrowed dollars in so loose a fashion as the Government has been guilty of. "Where are we and whither tending," is a question that has perhaps been hackneyed by over use, but it seems to me

there never was a time in the history of the country when the question might be asked and is being asked with greater seriousness. I have again to reiterate what I have said many times during the session that if the Prime Minister and his Government had remembered their contract with the people of this country, and seriously and conscientiously applied themselves to the task of reducing expenditure they could have done it. There are men in the Government ranks to-day who believe it could be done. There are men on this side of the House who know it can be done. Had the Government at any time during the past two years shown that they had made some effort to grapple with the ever increasing burden of expenditure and even if they had failed, they might be excused for coming in here and telling us that nothing could be done. But there is no proof that a pencil was ever taken in hand or a minute ever spent in dealing with the problem. I say, sir, no effort has been made to reduce expenditure but that on the contrary money is no objection and that spend, spend, spend is your slogan as long as you can tax and borrow and then tax again. No attempt has been made to cry "Halt." Now the Prime Minister argues that the people themselves don't want expenditure reduced when from every district comes the cry for money for public improvements. Very well, but who is to blame for putting the people in the position of demanding so much? Is it not because of the extravagant pace you have set yourselves that the people are making demands on you? If you were not squandering money on a Dock, a Hotel and on Highroads and other schemes, if you had not squandered money on these things and on a bye-election in Bonavista, the people of the outport districts would not be demanding money of you. They see all this money being squandered around here and with their own public needs pressing they go after you for a share of the borrowed millions which they have to be taxed to find interest charges for. That is why you have so many demands on you and under the circumstances you can't blame the people for demanding money for roads, bridges, wharves, etc., in their own communities. They are right and their reasoning is sound.

How much longer is the farce of squandering millions on Highroads to continue? How much longer is the country going to stand for the spectacle of public men pledged to economy, to reduce expenditure and to reduce taxation, disregarding their pledges in the flagrant manner you have? The Supplemental Supply Bill referred to just now throws the searchlight on your conduct on expenditure last year on current account. On current account alone you over expended by $500,000.00 And now there are these resolutions calling for another loan of five millions. Your argument that the country is holding its own, even if you are not reducing expenditure is absolutely refuted by the facts. It is ridiculous and farcical for the Finance Minister to stand up here, as he has done on each of the three Budgets he has introduced, and state that he has reasonable hopes that expenditure will be kept within the limits of his estimates. And in the same breath he asks for Supplemental Supply for half a million dollars over expended on current account last year alone. But why dwell on the tragedy any longer? You say you are satisfied to accept the responsibility. I say, sir, the people of this country are the ones who have to accept the responsibility and shoulder the burden of your extravagance and God knows that burden is heavy enough. And by this five million dollar loan you are making it heavier still. And yet, although they bear the burden you are not prepared to do the square thing

by them. Last year I charged here that St. Barbe district had been denied or robbed, because that is what it amounts to, robbery, of thousands of dollars that rightly belonged to it. The charge has not been refuted. I say you are not giving the fishing districts a square deal. How can you expect the fishermen of St. Barbe, of Fogo, of Burin, of Bonavista and the other large fishing districts, to prosecute the fisheries with enthusiasm or hope, if you take the money needed to develop their districts and spend it on your mad Tourist policy? And they must toil and be taxed to pay for it all. They go about their work with their local roads knee deep in mud, their bridges down or unsafe for man or beast, without wharves, without harbour protection, without any communication with the outside world in a good many cases. And you expect them to catch fish to pay the taxes for your Hotel, your Dock, your Highroads and other schemes. Is it any wonder they are antagonistic? Is it any wonder they demand money from you. St. Barbe District has been scandalously treated. Everywhere public improvements are needed from Trout River to LaScie. I cannot get from you a square deal for the District, I cannot get from you the courtesy of being permitted to deal with my district affairs. Such money as has been sent there has been wasted. You are permitting my twice defeated opponent to do as he likes over my head and nothing but confusion and detriment to the district's welfare results. Is this a square deal? If you think St. Barbe regards this as a square deal I tell you, you are mistaken. They have not sent me to this House from three elections to be treated in this way. The people have confidence in me, and I am going to ask you now to do the square thing, the manly thing and ask you in future to act on my recommendation as regards grants and other public matters in the District of St. Barbe and not on those of my twice defeated opponent. In this connection I appeal to Messrs. Higgins, Sullivan and Walsh, and to any other fair minded man on the other side. Compare the treatment I am getting in connection with my district affairs to the treatment we gave them when they were in opposition over here, to the Squires regime of which I was a member. We spent considerable money on relief, on the fishery, on pitprops as relief, on public works and in every case we gave the Opposition members of that day the right to do as they pleased with their own district's share. They knew most about their own districts and we let them have the say. I expect them now to be men and deal as squarely with us on this side as we dealt with them.

Now turning to the Loan again. I agree with everything that Mr. Halfyard said last night, that a greater effort should have been made to reduce the loan to the absolute last dollar really needed to pay off your pressing commitments. I doubt the advisability and disagree with the suggestion that you ought to be given a blank cheque for a million dollars to do as you please with. The Loan Resolutions are like the Budget, padded. The country is amazed at our present position, and no one knows that better than the Finance Minister himself, and no one askshimself the question more often as to where we are going to ultimately get off. You are padding this Loan by capitalizing your expenditure on current account. I say its wrong, its unsound and unfair. We ought, I feel, to stay here till August if need be and fight for more information and fight to reduce this Loan. But why tarry? The usual thing has been done again and the matters most vitally affecting the country's interests, left till the dying hours of the session to be debated, and then of course, hurriedly dealt

with. This method of doing things looks to me to be deliberate on the Prime Minister's part and is certainly not fair to the House or to the country. If this continues the rules will have to be amended so that all legislation for any session will be laid on the table of the House within 30 days at least after the opening, so that the most important pieces of legislation will not be left to be so carelessly and hurriedly dealt with at the wind up. Now I take it sir, that when this loan is put on the market every precaution will be taken to advertise it as widely as possible. Your conduct in raising this loan will be as carefully watched and questioned, I assure you, as your conduct in spending it. In conclusion I ask for St. Barbe District a square deal and every dollar of that million that justly belongs to it.

MR. GODDEN—Mr. Chairman, I have a few remarks to make. In the first place I regard it as unfortunate that the Government finds itself in the position where it must again raise a loan. The more we borrow, the more annual liabilities attach to the people of the country. I am not one of those who believe that Newfoundland is bankrupt—I feel that we have sufficient security to offer and satisfy anyone. But the hard part is that we have not sufficient people in this country to pay the taxes; have such a small population (of less than a quarter of a million) that we are likely to find ourselves in the position of being over-taxed if we go on borrowing very much more.

However the five million now under discussion has been allocated to various works, and I wish to make reference to two only. First, the eighty thousand dollars for the public building at Corner Brok, and Secondly the one million devoted to special public works. I refer to the first because of a petition presented by Mr. Halfyard, my colleague, last year from the people of Heart's Content, asking for a public building. Now Corner Brook has its public building; I have seen it, and it is well worth while—but I do not think it fair to grant that and leave Heart's Content out altogether. Corner Brook building has its marble walls and plate glass windows—it is a palace, and I think if only $50,000 had been spent on that and say $10,000 allocated to Heart's Content it would have been more satisfactory to all. Heart's Content doesn't want a palace, but they do urgently need a public building; I venture to say that if 3 ordinary persons want to get in the present building at the same time they can't do so. When I asked the Prime Minister if any consideration had been given that petition he answered "No, no consideration had been given." I hope that when this million is being shared up it will be distributed as fairly as possible, between the different districts and that Heart's Content will at least get their public building which they so badly need.

Reference was also made yesterday by Captain Randell to the town of Trinity, where the drainage system is a public menace. The drain runs through the centre of the town and has been in a state of disrepair for a number of years; funds should be provided to make this more sanitary and effective than at present. I hope that when arranging for other matters the Government will do something material in this regard.

Now it may seem inconsistent for any member to get up here and decry borrowing, and then ask for money for this or that thing. But my position is that since the million is being allocated some of it ought to go to Trinity. Perhaps the $58,000 voted by mistake in the Estimates can find a resting place in Trinity District for the benefit of all.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, I have a few short questions to ask. Does

the Government intend to place this loan on the market at once?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Well, we want to be careful and get the best results. If we find that we can arrange a portion satisfactorily it will probably go on the market.

MR. CASHIN—No doubt the Finance Minister will have to show his Budget, as presented to the House a few weeks ago, when making this loan. I wonder if it is his intention to show Supplementary Supply also—also the Railway Estimates showing a deficit, which would have brought a total deficit of one million for last year. I do not wish to criticize these resolutions to any great extent; I was one of those who went to a district for the Monroe Government and made certain promises, and I have done what I could for the public works of that district. I do say that I believe considerable expenditure could have been obviated if the Government had taken the proper course; I do say that certain allocations of amounts under these resolutions, such as the lighthouses grant, will never reach their purposes, and I predict that because I believe the revenue will not be sufficient to meet expenditure, and they will find it necessary to divert amounts such as those voted for lighthouses, and possible the Postal Department to square their balances. I would also draw attention of the Government to the fact that the Speech from the Throne pointed out (and made a great hurrah over it, that a delegation went to Washington on the Pecuniary Claims and won out. But I notice that you have an amount of $75,000 for the Pecuniary Claims as well as the Labrador Boundary. The claims which you won were claims that had already been paid the Exchequer of Newfoundland some years ago; but you lost money and I could almost name the vessels you lost on, vessels that went into ports and could not get repair, and on which their Government sued you. I contend that the Speech from the Throne suggests to the public that we won everything—the ordinary man would take that view of it.

Now I want to corroborate the view taken by Mr. Scammell regarding the million dollar amount, and at the same time I would like to ask the Minister or the Prime Minister when the other special grants are to be placed to the credit of the various districts. I was in Opposition at the time Mr. Scammell mentioned, and the members of both sides were allowed to allocate the money for their districts, and I must say that up to the present I have had no trouble. But people are looking at the one million and saying it is a general election slush fund, and I want to know right here and now, as a member representing a fishing district, whether I am going to be supplanted by some individual who may be a prospective candidate for election, who will be given the power to spend the money I ought to spend, as member. I propose to get an answer of "Yes" or "No," and then don't intend to say very much more. But I do want an answer, and if you say "Yes" I shall perhaps be as much satisfied as if you said "No". These are but short words, and I take it the Government ought to be in a position to answer that question. We could then get the bill through by six o'clock.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, before the curtain falls on this loan I would like to add a few observations. The last time a loan bill was introduced here by the present administration I suggested to the Finance Minister and I almost insisted—that loans should be advertised in the financial papers abroad, bids asked for and this country could get the benefit of the most acceptable bid. Every loan that is put on the market in Canada is advertised in the "Financial Post" and the "Financial Times." I have on

my desk here a copy of a financial paper in which Belleville bonds are advertised and bids are asked for from all the big financial Houses in Canada, including the Banks. The same applies to our proposed loan. After the loan is sold or underwritten all the offers received should be advertised with the names of the bidders in the financial papers as well as in our local press, so that we can see what price the loan fetched in the market. Furthermore, there is nothing like putting the loan on the market and making competition. I think that is the proper thing to do, if the Government are looking to get the best terms. I would suggest to the Finance Minister that this proposed loan be raised in the same way as the Provinces of Canada raise their loans. The present Government have been in power less than two years and during that time you have given yourselves authority to borrow over half a million dollars per month, that is your record, eleven and a half million dollars in less than twenty three months. No previous Government ever had in this country such a record, I hope that it will not be duplicated. With the present loan, most of which is already spent, the Monroe Government will have borrowed eleven and a half million dollars. You ought to be ashamed of your record. Our national debt is gone up to eighty five and a half million dollars, through mismanagement and incapacity of the present administration. Some of you have done well out of the barrowings and the revenue of this poor country. I heard some members of the Government state that Newfoundland is good for a hundred millions, so that after borrowing fifteen million dollars more no more can be had. There are a good many items of expenditure in the Budget charged to capital account, that should not have been thus charged, with the result that a surplus budget will be presented to this House and to this country. It is no trouble to find a surplus when money is barrowed to pay current expenses. It is a fictitious surplus. Take for instance the expenditure in connection with the public building at Corner Brook costing $80,000. The Finance Minister tells us that this is built of concrete and faced with marble. Just fancy the Government of Newfoundland borrowing money to build a marble Court House in a place like Corner Brook. A poverty stricken country with everybody overburdened with taxes and the Government goes and borrows money to put in marble. The Government now can scarcely call themselves a Government. If we had our full force here you would be practically defeated, but we are not so anxious as you may think. The right thing for you to do is to open the East End and test your strength. I would certainly like to see that done, but you are too cowardly to open the East End. If you got your man elected that would substantiate your Government. If you did not you would lose the Government, and that would be right because you have not got the confidence of the country or even of your party. You have been twice defeated during this session, and the right thing for the Prime Minister to have done was to resign. The Government is so unpopular at the present time that your own crew are deserting from the ship, actually jumping overboard to get rid of you. The excuse that they give is not the real reason. It is not because Morine or anybody else is in the party but because they continually realise that you are so unpopular that they have to part company from the ship or sink, at the next election. When the Budget came in the Member for Ferryland stated that it was padded and the Member for Port de Grave

said that if his lips were unsealed he could tell a harrowing tale in connection with it. We have not been able to get that tale. The Prime Minister stood up with the pretense of explaining this padded Budget and the Minister of Finance went over it with an effort at explanations, at some length, but we did not hear them say where it is padded and there was no explanation given as to why the Budget was padded. If this has been done, it has been done for some purpose. If the Finance Minister and the Execuive Government prepared a Budget and then changed that Budget to bring it in incorrectly it is treason, and there is some reason for doing it. Was it to deceive the people whom you expect to purchase your loan. We have never been told that the Budget was not padded and have never been given an explanation as to why it was padded. With regard to the account of the railway, the House of Commons at Ottawa brings in the Railway Budget of Canada, and there is just as much discussion on the railway as on the Financial Budget of the Finance Minister, but here this House does not get that information. This House has to be satisfied with anything the Members of the Government like to give it. It is unfair. The accounts of the railway should be brought down and a full explanation given of everything, to this House of Assembly, every year. I now ask the Finance Minister to tell me whether it is true that the rails laid to Clarenville, bought last year, are unsatisfactory. Are they as good as the rails which were taken up? It is the general opinion that these rails are soft and if the Government is going to re-rail another section of the railway they are certainly not going to buy rails from the same people from whom they got the rails last year. Did not you have a freight rate to St. John's and then have to pay four or five shillings more to take them to Clarenville?

MR. SULLIVAN—I don't think there was anything of the kind. I understood they were bought C. I. F.

MR. HICKMAN—C. I. F. St. John's?

MR. SULLIVAN—No, C. I. F. any port.

MR. HICKMAN—That is the information I wanted to get. I would also like to ask why the Knitting Mills is drawing five thousand dollars a year from the revenue of this country on account of a guarantee on interest. Surely there is no arrangement whereby we have to pay a dead industry a subsidy. An industry is subsidised when it is going to keep people employed. Surely we are not subsidising a dead industry, that may be keeping one man in charge paying him a thousand a year, and perhaps the Company getting the balance of profits out of the Government.

This Government have made more pensioners I suppose than any other Government ever did during their term of office. Last year a vote was passed to confirm thirty eight pensions and now we are voting for eighteen more. Fifty-six pensions made since you came into office two years ago.

The cost of the dock was underestimated six hundred thousand dollars, and the people doing the work say that the reason of it is through political interference, at least is due to inefficiency through political interference and inefficiency through drunkenness. They estimate a loss of $160,000 in inefficiency through drunkenness of the employees.

The Prime Minister and his Government are responsible for this as you changed the prohibition law and allowed liquors to be sold, and I charge you with the cause of the inefficiency. If there is inefficiency in the employees on the Dock there must also be inefficiency in every industry in St. John's, Nfld. Your bottle a day

is ruining the health of our young people, and on you falls the curse. I would not stand in the shoes of your Prime Minister for anything; I have no doubt that had W. I. Bishop Company taken a contract to construct the Dock for the amount that they estimated it would cost, that they would have constructed it for that sum, but for political interference the Government have had to pay an additional $600,000.00.

The last item on the Loan Resolutions is a million dollars. The Prime Minister said that they did not intend to use it right away. It would possibly last a couple of years; I venture to say that it won't last six months, unless there is an election next spring when it may be held over to use prior to a general election to buy the electorate. I hope that it will be voted per capita and not spent in districts where the money of the Highroads Commission was spent last year. I would like to know where we stand in connection with it. We have a great many people over in Harbour Grace to take care of, and I want to know if I can not have something to say with regard to the spending of this money. There are a lot of people over in my District who need employment for example in Upper Island Cove they are badly in need of work. They are in the position that they cannot get work. They would work rather than receive relief money. If they could go to work three days a week they would rather work than get something for nothing.

Lots of the items in these loan resolutions are not explanatory enough. There are two hundred thousand dollars to be spent in connection with the fisheries. While two hundred thousand could be properly spent, it also could be wasted, and this House should get some idea of what the Government have in mind with regard to that.

I hope that the Prime Minister will be able to give me an explanation of these few things, that I have asked, in particular just now with regard to the Knitting Mill receiving $5,000 when the Mills are not open.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—In reply to the Leader of the Opposition, I may say that we are not responsible for that five thousand dollars to the Knitting Mills. I think that it was under the Morris administration that the Bill was passed, and no provision was made in the Bill that they should get the money only provided that they operated continuously and on account of that, as long as the Knitting Mills were in existence they could have gone on getting five thousand dollars without operating or doing anything. Fortunately the Company is now winding up and I don't think we should have to continue paying after that. We were legally liable and until the Company went out of existence the liability was there and there was nothing else to do but pay. So that I feel that we are relieved of that particular liability. But that all goes to show the necessity for the careful preparation of every Bill that comes before this House. As far as I am concerned we are not liable in this case, because if they were legally entitled to the five thousand dollars, which apparently they were, we would have to pay that is all.

Now we are drawing to the close of the session, and there has been some remarks made about the one million dollars to be spent on Public Utilities. I want to say that I feel that the Government will be with me in trying to treat every district fairly and squarely as far as the expenditure of any portion of that money is concerned. But the members must not get it into their heads that we have got one million which we are going to divide up and hand out to the district representatives to spend just as they think proper. We will have to weigh very carefully the claims from the

various districts. I think that I may safely say that we will give every due consideration to the Opposition districts just as well as to the Government districts. I know that a great many members on this side have been very much touched by the appeals made by Mr. Halfyard during this session of the legislature. He certainly worked hard for his district and I am not going to forget it. But Mr. Halfyard and every other member of the Opposition must remember that because we have borrowed money or because we propose to borrow money does not mean that we are going to throw it away. We only take the right to borrow it where we find it necessary, and I hope that it will be expended in a most judicious and careful manner. I don't say that we are going to expend it all during our term of office either. Certainly we will not if it is not necessary. We propose to have a commission selected from among ourselves, to go very carefully into the question of the expenditure of that money, and see if we can not cut down expenditure in many cases. I hope that we may be able to have a tariff commission to enquire into the tariff in another year, and thoroughly revise it. But I want to assure the House that because we are borrowing money, or propose to borrow money does not mean that we are going to be extravagant. We intend to economise the resources of the country just as much as any member of the Opposition, and we are going to do the best that we can in the interests of all concerned. I want to thank the members on the other side of the House for the way in which they have dealt with the many matters we have considered and for the way in which they have let a great many bills go through. And I think that in the majority of cases their criticisms were very fair. But from the very beginning there was unnecessary debate over subjects that had not been introduced into this House. There were speeches made on the Besco loan, before the Besco Resolutions were brought in at all. There were various other irrelevant subjects discussed, unnecessarily and at great length and when they arose officially they did not arouse the same discussion that they provoked in the Address in Reply. The Leader of the Opposition has made the suggestion that we were defeated on the Besco Resolutions before we got to them. But we did not bring in these resolutions. I told the House before, and I want to tell the House again, that there were many points raised at the party meetings, as it was only right that there should be, and we naturally endeavoured to make certain alterations to suit the party. But not a single member ever said "If you don't do this, I am going to break your Government." When we discuss these matters in the party meetings, and when we find what the general views of the party are, and when any member raises an objection, I want to take the position, that we try to improve conditions, and I hope we will continue to do so as long as we are a party. I regret that there are some bills that we have not got through this session. I am sorry that we have not put through the Local Affairs Bill, because there are many districts would be helped if put in force immediately. I am also sorry that we have not put through the Harbour Resolutions, because I think and believe that a good committee behind the Harbour Master would be productive of a great amount of good. I hope that we will get that Commission appointed next year. I am sorry also that the Education Act has not gone through. I think that the Hon. Member for Trinity, though he studied that bill the other day, was like a great many others. He did not thoroughly read it. The Head Master of Bishop Feild College, who is also President of the

Teachers' Association, wrote a letter to the "Telegram" condemning that Bill. And then after reading it he found that he did not understand it. He had not read two or three clauses that followed after, and explained other clauses. That letter was never published by the "Telegram." I suppose that this matter is of a private nature, and should not be made public, but Mr. Wood told me that he had no objection to my stating the fact, that although he had read that bill, he had not really understood it. Now he is a man who has studied the Education Act pretty thoroughly, and it only goes to show that even with the knowledge of the Education Act that Mr. Halfyard may have, possibly he did not understand the Bill either, when he made the statement the other day that the Bill would never pass this House. I believe that when we bring in this Bill here next year Mr. Halfyard himself will say that it is one of the finest bills that has ever been brought before this House.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the remarks made by the Hon. the Prime Minister in his reference to my agitation for monies to be spent in Trinity District. Now it is just as well for us to depart from this Legislature good friends, and I have tried to promote that friendship, because after making a statement we are just as good friends personally; but you ask our opinion and we try to express an honest opinion of the conditions of the country financially. Now I am sure that the Prime Minister without having heard any remarks made by me as to what has been done for Trinity District, during the last couple of years, must have realised that Trinity District has not got a square deal. That is in connection with steam transport and the spending of monies in the district. I shall refer to one concrete case. I spoke of it at some length and with some heat sometimes in the session. That is in connection with the taking of four thousand dollars from the special grant of Trinity District and giving it to the High Roads Commission to help to build a road from Shoal Harbour to Clarenville. Everyone who heard me speak realised that that was a cause for complaint. And I trust that the good intentions of the Prime Minister will be supported by every member of the Executive Government, as far as the spending of monies not only in Trinity District but also in every other district in the island. I am surprised to hear from the Leader of the Opposition that the road around Upper Island Cove is not in a good condition. That is a scandal. After all the money has been given that community for able bodied poor relief.

Now there is another point that I want to mention, and that is in connection with the Assessor's Department. The vote for 1925 was $14,840, and now it is $280 more. I was wondering if that vote could not be reduced or cut out entirely. What has the Assessor's Department got to do now?

Now perhaps it is just as well to make a few passing remarks in connection with the Education Act, the amendments to which were tabled the other day. I stated then that there were certain amendments to the Education Act, that I did not believe that this House would agree to. I said that Superintendents were written all over the Act. Now I don't know that I have the good will of the Superintendents for the statements that I made, but I am prepared to stand by anything that I may say in this House.

In the 1916 Act the salaries of the Superintendents were stated as "not less than $3162.00"; when a Department was formed, and a Minister took it over, when he was preparing his Estimates he asked one of the Superintendants what his salary was and he said it was $3332.00; the others

were receiving something about the same. "Well," he said "I don't agree with that wording that the salaries shall he "not less than," so a section was put in the 1920 Act to the effect that the salaries "shall be $3332.00— and you will notice in the proposed amendment they have gone back to the 1916 wording. And why so? They have powers invested in them under the new Act to use any drop balances they may think fit. And where do these drop balances come from? From sparsely populated districts. And grants for other denominations. And they are given the power to increase their salaries as they like. In the 1920 Act there was a provise that a superintendent could be asked to examine another school "without pay," and in this Act they have gone back to the 1916 Act, and so they can get paid for it. It has "Superintendents" written all over it.

And there are conflicting statements there. Mr. Chairman, in one section powers are given the Superitendents to see that proper text books and a proper curriculum are provided, and in another section the school boards are given the power to do so. Farcical? It is the most farcical that could be imagined. I have in mind a school Board, that existed some years ago, some of the members could neither read nor write. They were paid $1.00 for attending a meeting, and the chief concern of such members were, "When are we going to have another meeting of the school Board"? And such men are to tell the teacher what books to use. Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Prime Minister, the arrangement of a curriculum is the most scientific question that occupies the minds of educationalists to-day—the old order has changed. I feel almost like appealing to Deity for forgiveness for the crimes I unwittingly committed while teaching. I taught for 20 years, and was regarded as a success, and for 10 years I treated the little tots as if they were material objects—the pschyology of the child mind was not known then. The greatest step we have ever taken in education is the creation of the Normal School within the past few years. Let us not send out school teachers with no idea of teaching—it is a fundamental necessity. Our boys and girls are the greatest asset we have, and what our schools are doing to-day is an index of what the men and women will be in fifteen or sixteen years hence. I could make a speech along that line but will not— I have just made these points to show that the Education Act should get our closest attention, and with all due respect to the Superintendents, this Act should not pass without due deliberation. We have had experience enough in that regard. The Midwives Bill of this session, was prepared by the Doctors, and we didn't take the trouble to read it, but the Upper House found something lacking in it, and would not pass it—instances like that teach us that we should be very careful to consider all legislation that comes before us. I don't intend to say any more regarding the principle embodied, but when the commissioner is appointed, I should like to mention the name of Dr. Barnes. Perhaps he won't thank me for doing so, but I do so because the Prime Minister mentioned him, and said that he had received communications from Conception Bay asking that he be appointed. I think it would be a loss to Education in this country if the services of Dr. Barnes were not retained—that Normal School would not be there to-day were it not for his appointment to the Department of Education. I don't believe another man would have stuck to his principles as he did—he went into politics on one consideration, that something be done for education. He is one of the greatest educationalists we have on this side of the water; his

fault is that he is too conservative, and his abilities are not known—he could be Prime Minister of this country if he were of a different make-up. He had foresight when he advocated the building of the Normal School. We know, and the Superintendents know, that our greatest lack is in properly trained teachers, and that was the reason for that school. The Junior College is of second importance, and the two combined are a good impetus to education.

I wish to thank you, Mr. Chairman, and the House for allowing me to make these few remarks, and I trust that if the Education Act is brought forward, it will be with these defects eliminated, and we shall all be unanimous in considering it, so that the interest of the Colony and Education, and not those of a few individuals, will be furthered.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—I don't think that Mr. Halfyard said anything that it is necessary for me to repudiate. Now as far as the dock expenditure goes, that I think will justify itself. There may have been a little money lost on it. But I do say that the labouring people got the advantage. I don't think that anybody will deny that. At least one million and a quarter dollars was spent for labour in St. John's alone and that meant a great deal to the city. Now as far as the railway goes, we bought the place absolutely falling down, and the track out of order. Something had to be done. We were told that the rails were soft. The Leader of the Opposition raised the same question. Now I was out along the line Sunday evening, and at one place I got a large nail and laid it on the track, and I got a freight train and an engine to run over it. The result was that you could not see a mark on the rail, but the nail was flattened out completely. I asked the engineer what he thought about it and he said that it was a very good rail. There is just one word more that I want to say, and that is not to imagine that the budget was padded. I estimated as near as I possibly could Many a man before me, estimated the budget and fell down on it. Now we want to see the country square its accounts, if it can possibly be done, and if we intend, as I said before in this House to curtail expenditure, we cannot do it without the help of the Opposition. That is the remedy. We have had a long and tedious session and I have got many hard shots, but they have not affected me very much. I am a good deal like the duck the water falls off very fast. But I want the members to understand that I wish to be on friendly terms with everybody. I want to thank Capt. Rendall for the remarks he made last night on the part that I played as Finance Minister. Now with regards to the officials that I have under me down in the Custom House, I want to say that everything goes along very satisfactorily. I want to make special mention of the Auditor General. Now I want to say to this House and I want the Government to understand that the Auditor General has no picnic. But after all he is only a man and the best of men can make mistakes sometimes. But I found Mr. Berteau ready to assist me in any way possible. But I only speak of men as I find them, and I don't care what a man in my Department is, or what his politics are. And if I could find one to-morrow capable of filling one or two positions, I don't care where he comes from. I want to find a man in connection with the Appraiser's Dept., and I would be very glad to find someone to assume the responsibility of that Department. I don't think that anything more need be said to add or to take away from this budget. But I hope to be able to come into this House next year and

show where these accounts have balanced.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Cair.

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 on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs the Bill entitled "An Act for the Raising of a Sum of Money on the Credit of the Colony for certain Public Purposes," 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 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 and Customs, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill 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. Cahill 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 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. 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 entitled respectively: "An Act to Authorise an Agreement between the Government and the Terra Nova Oil Products Company, Limited," and "An Act Respecting Certain Retiring Allowances."

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 entitled Respectively: An Act to amend Chapter 47 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of the Inspection of Foods," "An Act to amend the St. John's Municipal Act 1921," and "An Act Further to amend Chapter 212 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of Compensation to Workmen."

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 entitled "An Act to amend The War Pensions Act 1922."

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 Good imported into Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker left the Cair.

Mr. Cahill took the Chair of Committee.

MR. GODDEN—Mr. Chairman. If you pass this Bill, it is going to cause confusion in the Long Room. We import Tea from Ceylon for instance and

get a through freight rate to St. John's via Liverpool or New York. No mention is made on the invoices to show the proportion of freight charges from transhipping points. The real intention of this Bill is to definitely fix the meaning of T.O.B. and we should now rule that Sales Tax should be paid on the value of goods T.O.B. rail or steamer shipping point at the country of origin of the goods. If you pass this Bill in its present form you are making a mistake.

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 a Tax on Good 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 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, 1926 and the 30th day of June, 1927, 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 Sums of Money for defraying Certain Expenses of the Public Service for the Financial years ending respectively the 30th day of June, 1926, and the 30th day of June, 1927, and for purposes relating to the Public Services," 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, 1926 and the 30th day of June, 1927, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Cahill 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 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, 1926, and the 30th day of June, 1927, 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.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—

His Excellency the Administrator will be coming down to close the House at three o'clock to-morrow, and as there are some questions on the Order Paper to be answered, I beg to move that the House now rising to adjourn until to-morrow at two-thirty.

MR. RUSSELL—On the motion for adjournment, I would like to have a word to say in reference to a matter mentioned by the Prime Minister on Tuesday last. It may be a small matter, but fair play is fair play, and I feel that I have the right to make myself clear and state my case in connection with it. After we moved our seats the Prime Minister in speaking mentioned that he had received a message from "Russell's Bay Roberts Committee." I have no Bay Robert's Committee. There is the Liberal-Conservative Committee that is Bennett's and Simmon's as much as mine. That message turned out to be a faked message so far as that Committee was concerned. It was sent by Dr. Pritchard on his own responsibility without reference to anybody anywhere on my Committee or the Liberal-Conservative or anyone else's Committee. I asked the Prime Minister when he read that message if any names were signed and there were none because none were authorised. Some correspondence passed between the Prime Minister and myself in reference to it, and I have asked the Prime Minister to make a statement in the House with regard to it. I have been to Bay Roberts and made investigations and it seems that Dr. Pritchard sent the message without any signatures and afterwards when the message appeared in the press, he apparently went around and got certain men to consent to having their names sent in. I asked one man if he had given his name and he said he didn't. I know of another man who was a member of Hickman's Committee, and I have written proof that another man told me that neither did he send in his name or did he know anything about it and his name is one of the names sent in. I think as some publicity has been given this matter by bringing it up in the House before, it is only fair play as that was a faked message that I should take the opportunity of making this statement. I may add that Dr. Pritchard should be the last man in the world to make statements about C. E. Russell. A busybody over in Bay Roberts who undertook to send in a message of that nature. The Chairman there implicitly denied having any knowledge of it or giving authority to send any message and I think that it is only fair to me that a statement be made now by the Prime Minister. No doubt he used the message in good faith, but now that attention has been called to the matter by correspondence and from my seat I think he will do me the justice to explain the true situation.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — I dont know that I have very much to explain. In the course of debate it came out, (it would not have otherwise), that I had received a message signed "Russell's Committee, Bay Robert's" in which it said that they commended my attitude with regard to the dismissal of Mr. Russell. I told him it was signed by the Committee. I didn't know who the Committee were. I thought possibly he might know. I received a further message from Bay Roberts and I telephoned Bay Roberts to the gentleman Mr. Russell referred to and said that I was not going to accept any more messages from a Committee and if anyone wanted to send a message they should have their names signed. I got a message back saying that the men who authorised signatures were so and so. I wrote Mr. Russell giving him the names of the gentlemen on that telegram. I thought it would interest him. It certainly would not interest

this House. I received a similar telegram from the "Spaniard's Bay Committee" which was certainly not inspired by Dr. Pritchard. I don't know that I owe any apology. I think I stated that I got a message signed "Russell's Committee" and I afterwards got a telegram with names signed and I sent a copy to Mr. Russell.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, June 9th, 1926.

The House met at half past 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 Bills sent up 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, 1926, and the 30th day of June, 1927, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service," and "An Act to amend the Act 15, George V., Cap. 33 (1925) entitled "An Act Respecting a Tax on Goods Imported into Newfoundland," without amendment.

Replies to the following questions were tabled:

(1) MR. HALFYARD asked Hon. the Colonial Secretary to lay on the Table of the House a copy of the Agreement between the Government and "Besco" for the operation of the Mines at Bell Island for the year 1926.

(2) MR. HALFYARD asked Hon. the Prime Minister if his department or any department of the Government has given any consideration to a petition presented to the Legislature this session from the electors of Britannia and vicinity, asking for the extension of the Ferry Service from Snook's Harbour to Britannia; if any decision has been reached re same to make statement accordingly; further to ask the Prime Minister if his Government have given any consideration to the need for either steam or motor service on Trinity Bay for the Summer and Autumn of this year, 1926; if no steamer service is to be given Trinity District, why not, considering the proposal to borrow one million dollars for public services.

(3) MR. HALFYARD asked Hon. the Colonial Secretary if the Government is purchasing direct from the lumber dealers and stores, the material that is being shipped to Labrador by the S.S. Ranger or any othey way, for to help distressed Labrador Shore Fishermen; if not purchasing direct, why not; and to state the names of the persons or agents employed by the Government or to whom the Government have given authority to place orders for building material, etc.

(4) MR. HALFYARD asked Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Minister of Public Works, to lay on the Table of the House a statement of any Special moneys sent to Winterton, Trinity District, from the Public Works Department from June, 1924 to date, June 8th, 1926, giving the names of party or parties to whom money was sent, amounts, and to state if returns have been made to the department for same.

(5) MR. HALFYARD asked Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing the names of the parties who supplied coal to the Postal Telegraph Offices or Post Offices for all offices for that section of Trinity District from New Harbour to New Melbourne, both inclusive; the number of tons delivered to each office and the price of each ton delivered.

(6) MR. HALFYARD asked Hon. the

Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the Table of the House a statement of all moneys sent by his department to Winterton, Trinity District, from June, 1924, to June 8th, 1926; give names of parties and amounts in each case; the purpose of such allocations, and to state if returns have been made to the department for same.

In reference to No. 1:

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—In reply to the hon. member I may say that no agreement was made between the Besco Company and the Government for this year outside of the Minute of Council passed May 10th which contains all the provisions of the agreement made for this year's operations. I beg to table a copy.

In reference to No. 2:

MR. HALFYARD—Arising out of the reply given by the Prime Minister to my question No. 2, I can appreciate that the reply may be quite correct as far as it refers to the service from Snook's Harbour to Trinity. The extension would be from Snook's Harbour to Britannia which is really a new service. I value the opinion of Magistrate Somerton but I think really he must have in mind the old service and not the new. I trust the Government will give consideration to the matter and I hope that they may be able to agree to the request made by these people.

In reference to No. 3:

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—I am sorry that that question was not addressed to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries as I think he would be able to give a fuller reply. The Government have had very strong representations made to them, because of the tremendous devastations on the Labrador coast last December. It was decided earlier in the session to send a boat down to ascertain the losses, but the wisdom of that step was questioned and it was decided otherwise. They thought better use could be made of the money to be expended by finding materials to help the fishermen to rebuild their flakes. The Government gave instructions to send the necessary stuff down by the first boat to Labrador. Captain Winsor got in touch with several dealers and their prices were found to be in excess of what was thought should be paid. He thought material could be got, quite suitable and cheaper from the outports. I told him he was well able to know what was required and gave him instructions to get the necessary material and personally I understood he was looking after this directly, and also the Purser of the Meigle was going to look after this material and was going to bring an assistant to help to distribute it. As regards the question of agents being appointed to purchase this stuff, I have no knowledge of it whatever. I don't know of any other person engaged outside of what the Minister has done. I thought he would be here. I have made some inquiries at his office and I think some felt and nails were purchased.

MR. DUFF—Mr. Speaker. With reference to the strike at the Dry Dock I would be very glad to hear what has been done in that matter. Our workmen are paid too much for their labour. These men in charge of ships and our own countrymen go to extremes sometimes. I would like to hear if the matter has been settled satisfactorily.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER —Mr. Speaker. As we understand the situation the Dock laborers and boilermakers struck for double pay day and night on the ground that the ship was getting temporary repairs instead of permanent repairs. It is a most unfortunate thing. There is one ship on dock there and the owners have a perfect right to decide repairs for themselves. It is not for the Govt. or any workmen in this country to decide re-

pairs for them. The vessel can be temporary repaired by the pouring in of some concrete in the hull and if the men do not return to work the ship will have to come off the stocks again and it will give the dock and the country a bad name.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, seconded by Mr. Hickman, Mr. E. F. Sinnott, member for the District of Placentia and St. Mary's, was appointed to represent this House at the Australian Conference of Empire Association Delegates, during the present year. Mr. Sinnott was requested to convey the cordial greetings of this Legislature to Australian and other representatives of the Empire Parliamentary Association.

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 Administrator, 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 addresseed 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, 1926, and the 30th day of June, 1927, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service."

"An Act respecting Certain Retiring Allowances."

"An Act for the Raising of a Sum of Money on the Credit of the Colony for Certain Public Purposes."

"An Act to Amend the Act 15 Geo. V., Cap. 33 (1925) entitled 'An Act Respecting a Tax on Goods Imported into Newfoundland.'"

"An Act to Amend the St. John's Municipal Act, 1921."

"An Act Respecting Newspapers and Books."

"An Act to Amend Chapter 47 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Inspection of Foods.'"

"An Act Further to Amend Chapter 212 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Compensation to Workmen.'"

"An Act Respecting Immigration."

"An Act to Amend Chapter 181 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Harbour Master and Harbour Regulations for the Port of St. John's.'"

"An Act to Amend 15 Geo. V., Cap. 8 entitled 'Of the House of Assembly.'"

"An Act to Amend the Act 15 and 16 George V., Cap. 23 (1925) entitled 'An Act respecting the Encouragement of Shipbuilding and Re-building.'"

"An Act Respecting Railway and Shipping."

"An Act to Amend Section 4 of Cap. 1 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Promulgation and Construction of Statutes.'"

"An Act to Amend Chapter 51 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Nuisances and Municipal Regulations.'"

"An Act to Amend the War Pensions Act, 1922."

"An Act to authorize an Agreement between the Government and the Terra Nova Oil Products Company, Limited."

"An Act for the Confirmation of a Contract with the Commercial Cable Company."

"An Act to Amend Chapter 22 Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Customs.'"

"An Act to Amend the Revenue Act, 1925."

"An Act to Further Amend Chapter 74 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Old Age Pensions.'"

His Excellency the Administrator 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:

You will be pleased to be relieved of your duties as Legislators, to engage actively in the other avocations which demand your attention.

A large amount of useful legislation has received your consideration, and your labours in this respect have been for the public benefit. The Civil Service Act establishes clearly and firmly the basis upon which public officials shall be pensioned, a matter concerning which practice has been unsettled and unsatisfactory. The Newspaper Act grapples with a condition long discreditable to our Colony. The Railway Commission Act gives legality to an operation of the Newfoundland Railway which has hitherto been conducted without statutory authority.

The Act amending the contract made in 1923 for exportation of pulp wood from areas in White Bay has resulted in a sale of the Hampden Areas to the International Paper Company, which has already commenced its operations connected therewith, and increased employment will be given there.

The Dry Dock at St. John's has been completed, though the construction of storage and other facilities in conjunction with it will continue for some time. A large foreign ship is even now being repaired in this new Dock.

The Hotel in this City, in relation to which a guarantee has been given by the Colony, is not yet wholly completed, but will open for the reception of guests this month, early enough to offer a welcome to the Tourists who will soon be coming to our shores. In this connection it is pleasant to note that three fine new passenger steamers have been provided to meet the Colony's growing traffic.

Gratification is felt at the manner in which the Highways constructed last year by the Highroads Commission withstood the trying winter season, illustrating the fact that work well done is after all the most economical. The roads commenced last year will be completed at an early date, and new work undertaken in due course. The loan authorized this year will permit certain pioneer roads to be undertaken in localities which do not at present need motor roads, but will repay development, and call for increased facilities.

Comfort, convenience and economical operation have all been served by the partial re-railing of the Railway which took place last year. The additional re-railing this year for which you have provided will give increased beneficial results.

Our people can best be helped by increased wage earning facilities. It is, therefore, gratifying to note indications of increased development of natural resources, such as mining and manufacturing offer. The great works of the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company, Limited on the Humber are satisfactorily operating; The Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company, Limited are extending their operations. Certain mining operations are soon to be undertaken by the latter Company, and there are hopes for important pronouncements in connection with the fisheries.

The Joint Committee of both Houses appointed recently to enquire into fishery matters, will be appointed a Commission under the Public Enquir-

ies Act, to enable it to carry on its work out of Session.

This is a most important matter, and that its deliberations will be attended by great good I do not doubt.

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

The liberal supplies you have voted will be used for the public benefit.

A Commission will be appointed during the recess to study and report upon the expenditure of the Colony, with a view to reduction where possible, and upon the Colony's sources of revenue, with a view to more equitable and satisfactory imposition.

Mr. President and Honourable Gentlemen of the Legislative Council:

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

The successful result of the Seal Fishery is a source of much satisfaction not alone for the employment it afforded those engaged in its prosecution but also for the stimulating effect it will undoubtedly have upon other industries of the country.

In relieving you from your Legislative duties I join with you in the confident hope that the objects aimed at by your Honourable Houses in your endeavour for the public welfare may be achieved and I now take leave to wish you severally prosperity and happiness during the recess.

After which the Honourable the President of the Legislative Council, by command of His Excellency the Administrator, said;

GENTLEMEN:—It is His Excellency the Administrator's will and pleasure that this General Assembly be now prorogued until Wednesday the twenty first day of July next, then and here to be holden, and this General Assembly stands prorogued accordingly.

INDEX

INDEX

INDEX

A

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Motion for, 30.
Committee for, 31.
Report on, 31.

ADDRESS TO GOVERNOR, 97.

AMENDMENTS

To Address in Reply, 149.

ADDRESS OF THANKS, 300.

AGRICULTURE AND MINES, MINISTER OF

On Civil Service Protection, 363, 389.
Supply, 494, 614, 715, 737, 744, 774, 776, 778, 996, 998.
Shipbuilding, 570.
Besco Resolutions, 650.
Railway and Shipping, 768.
Ways and Means, 935, 962.
Inspection of Foods, 1006.

ASHBOURNE, MR.

On Address in Reply, 109, 120, 249.
Sealfishery Bill, 320, 401, 406.
Civil Service Protection, 330, 388.
Midwives' Bill, 477.
Shipbuilding, 573.
Hotel Facilities, 577, 580.
Supply, 682, 686, 729, 778, 811.
Power and P. Co. Bonds, 816, 850.
Railway and Shipping, 833.
Local Affairs, 900.
Old Age Pensions, 978.

B

BILLS INTRODUCED

Promulgation of Statutes, 69.
Postal and Telegraph Service, 69.
Encouragement of Shipbuilding, 245.
Sealfishery, 284.
Fees and Charges upon Mailable Matter, 339.
Crowe Timber Bill, 348.
Midwives' Bill, 377.
Of Trustees, 377.
Periodical Payments, 377.
Keeping of Dogs, 377.
Civil Service Protection, 394.
Marconi Wireless, 426.
Railway and Shipping, 481.
Immigration, 484.
Newspapers and Books, 496.
Nfld. Hotel Facilities, 600.
Harbour Master, etc., 637.
Light Dues, 637.
Board of Health, etc., 637.
Water Rates, etc., 639.
Shipbuilding, 651.
United Church, 653.
Cold Storage, 661.
Of the Customs, 820.
Railway and Shipping, 837.
Of the House of Assembly, 837.
Of Nuisances, 838.
H. J. Crowe Amendment Bill, 838.
Commercial Cable Co., 873.
Local Affairs, 873.
Public Roads, 873.
Revenue Act, 965.
Education Act, 965.
Old Age Pensions, 982.
Workmen's Comp. Act, 989.
Tax on Goods, 989.
Inspection of Foods, 1011.
Municipal Bill, 1013.
Terra Nova Oil Products, 1038.

Retiring Allowance, 1040.
War Pensions Act, 1040.
Loan Bill, 1054.
Public Service Bill, 1055.

BILLS, SECOND READING

Promulgation of Statutes, 150.
Postal and Telegraph Service, 151.
Taxation of State Enterprises, 151.
Shipbuilding Bill, 290.
Sealfishery Bill, 323.
Crowe Timber Bill, 376.
Postal and Telegraph Bills (2), 376.
Civil Service Act, 409.
Of Trustees, 409.
Periodical Payments, 410.
Keeping of Dogs, 411.
Midwives' Bill, 446.
Marconi Wireless Bill, 448.
Immigration, 651.
Nfld. Hotel Facilities, 651.
Harbour Master and Harbour Regulations, 669.
Of Light Dues, 669.
Board of Health, 669.
Water Rates, 669.
Encouragement of Shipbuilding, 670.
United Church Bill, 771.
Cold Storage, 772.
H. J. Crowe Amendment Bill, 838.
Railway and Shipping, 853.
Newspaper and Books Bill, 872.
Of the House of Assembly, 872.
Of Nuisances, 872.
Customs' Bill, 892.
Commercial Cable Co. Bill, 897.
Revenue Act, 967.
Old Age Pensions, 982.
Tax on Goods, 989.
Inspection of Foods, 1011.
Municipal Bill, 1013.
Workmen's Comp. Act, 1035.
Terra Nova Oil Products, 1038.

Retiring Allowance, 1040.
War Pensions Act, 1040.
Loan Bill, 1054.
Public Service Bill, 1055.

BILLS, THIRD READING

Promulgation of Statutes, 284.
Taxation and Immunity from Taxation of State Enterprises, 285.
Crowe Timber Bill, 396.
Postal & Telegraph Bill, 398.
Sealfishery Bill, 427.
Civil Service Protection, 437.
Of Trustees, 437.
Periodical Payments, 437.
Keeping of Dogs, 454.
Marconi Wireless, 457.
Hotel Facilities, 673.
United Church, 772.
Cold Storage, 772.
Immigration, 780.
Harbour Master, etc., 780.
Light Dues, 780.
Board of Health, 781.
Water Rates, 781.
H. J. Crowe Amendment Bill, 838.
Shipbuilding, 889.
Railway and Shipping, 889.
Of the House of Assembly, 889.
Of Nuisances, 890.
Newspapers and Books, 965.
Of the Customs, 966.
Commercial Cable Co., 967.
Revenue Act, 967.
Old Age Pensions, 982.
Inspection of Foods, 1013.
Municipal Bill, 1014.
Workmen's Comp. Act, 1035.
Terra Nova Oil Products, 1039.
Retiring Allowances, 1040.
War Pensions, 1040.
Loan Bill, 1054.

Tax on Goods Bill, 1055.
Public Service Bill, 1055.

BILLS ASSENTED TO, 493, 852, 893, 1059.

BROWNE, MR.

On Motion for Address in Reply, 16.
Sealfishery Bill, 322.
Civil Service Protection, 349, 353.
Supply, 557, 676, 777.
Motion to Adjourn, 746.
Immigration, 750.
Newspapers and Books Bill, 868
Ways and Means, 964
Inspection of Foods, 1007

BRADLEY, MR.

On Motion to Adjourn, 907, 924.
Ways and Means, 939.
Suspension of Rules, 1004.
Inspection of Foods, 1009, 1010, 1011

BROWN, MR. K. M.

On Address in Reply, 185.
Motion to Adjourn, 450.
Midwives' Bill, 473, 474.
Supply, 493, 778, 782, 792, 801, 805.
Railway and Shipping, 765, 834.

C

COMMITTEE OF WHOLE ON BILLS

Promulgation of Statutes, 279.
Postal and Telegraph Service, 279.
Taxation and Immunity from Taxation of State Enterprises, 280.
Postal and Telegraph Bills, 394.
Harry J. Crowe Bill, 394.
Sealfishery Bill, 398.
Civil Service Act, 427.
Of Trustees, 429.

Periodical Payments, 430
Keeping of Dogs, 437
Marconi Wireless, 454
Midwives' Bill, 457, 466
Hotel Facilities, 669.
Immigration, 747.
Harbor Master, etc., 770.
Of Light Dues, 770.
Board of Health, 770.
Water Rates, 770.
United Church, 771.
Cold Storage, 772.
H. J. Crowe Amendment Bill, 838.
Shipbuilding Bill, 852, 860.
Railway and Shipping, 860.
Of the House of Assembly, 889.
Of Nuisances, 889.
Of the Customs, 894, 965.
Newspapers and Books Bill, 895.
Commercial Cable Co., 966.
Public Service Bill, 1055.
Retiring Allowances, 1040.
Tax on Goods, 989, 1054.
Revenue Act, 967.
Old Age Pensions, 982.
Inspection of Foods, 1011.
Municipal Bill, 1013.
Workmen's Comp. Act, 1035.
Terra Nova Oil Products, 1038.
War Pensions, 1040.
Loan Bill, 1054.

COMMITTEE OF WHOLE

On Discussion of Power and Paper Co. Bonds, 628, 816, 838.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE ON RESOLUTIONS

Taxation and Immunity from Taxation of State Enterprises, 80.
Besco, 293, 313, 328.
Civil Service Protection, 306, 328, 349, 359, 381.
Fees and Charges upon Mailable Matter, 339.

Crowe Timber Resolutions, 340.
Marconi Wireless Resolutions, 411.
Supply, 480, 486, 496, 534, 601, 673, 713, 772, 781, 810, 821, 982, 993.
Nfld. Hotel Facilities, 574, 576.
Encouragement of Shipbuilding, 563, 650.
Harbour Master for St. John's, 637.
Light Dues, 637.
Board of Health, etc., 637.
Water Rates, etc., 638.
Nfld. Fresh Fish Corp., 653, 654.
Railway and Shipping, 661, 753, 833.
Ways and Means, 873, 902, 924, 946.
Loan, 969, 999, 1014, 1040.
Tax on Goods, 989.
Terra Nova Oil Products, 1036

COLONIAL SECRETARY

On Employment at Corner Brook, 119.
Savings Bank Deposits, 290.
Sealfishery Bill, 322, 407.
Civil Service Protection, 336, 350, 359, 371, 390.
Marconi Wireless, 411, 421, 425, 446, 447, 455, 457.
Keeping of Dogs Bill, 439.
Midwives' Bill, 471, 472, 473, 474.
Hotel Facilities, 515, 518, 528, 576, 587.
Supply, 608, 609, 675, 677, 715, 793, 794, 813, 993, 995, 996.
Power and Paper Co. Bonds, 628, 841, 849.
Immigration, 748, 750, 752.
Old Age Pensions, 978, 981.
Tax on Goods, 990, 991.
Inspection of Foods, 1007, 1010.

CASHIN, MR.

On Motion for Address in Reply, 25.
Speaker's Ruling, 72.
Notice of Address to Governor, 96.
Address in Reply, 155, 175.
Sealfishery Bill, 299, 402.
Civil Service Protection, 311, 351, 428.
Besco Resolutions, 315, 645.

Crowe Resolutions and Bill, 343, 347, 394.
Privilege, 377, 436, 448.
Penitentiary, 379.
Midwives' Bill, 468, 475.
Motion to Adjourn, 478, 670, 922.
Supply, 480, 489, 497, 512, 538, 559, 607, 615, 688, 693, 705, 740, 782, 785, 795, 802, 813, 827.
Hotel Facilities, 525, 591.
Power and Paper Co. Bonds, 633, 848.
Cold Storage, 658.
Railway and Shipping, 667, 755, 763, 764.
Ways and Means, 902, 927, 957.
Loan Resolutions, 1017, 1045.

COMMITTEES, SELECT

On Address in Reply, 31.
Internal Economy, 79.
Shipbuilding Bill, 290.
Crowe Timber Resolutions, 306.
Workman's Compensation, 348.
Atlantic Fisheries' Bill, 479.
Hotel Facilities, 480.
United Church, 628.
Of Keeping Dogs, 672.
Midwives' Bill, 672.
Commercial Cable Co., 859.
Fisheries, 977.

CAHILL, MR.

On Address in Reply, 202.
Civil Service Protection, 383, 385.

CHAMBERS, MR.

On Supply, 687.

D

DIVISIONS, 278, 600, 871.

DUFF, MR.

On Address in Reply, 100, 252.
Civil Service Protection, 329, 336, 428.

Crowe Resolutions, 342.
Keeping of Dogs Bill, 441.
Motion to Adjourn, 461.
Midwives' Bill, 472.
Hotel Facilities, 526.
Shipbuilding, 569.
Immigration, 749.
Local Affairs Bill, 900.
Ways and Means, 963.
Inspection of Foods, 1008.
Terra Nova Oil Products, 1036.

F

FINANCE AND CUSTOMS, MINISTER

On "Globe" Editorial, 355.
Privilege, 433.
Supply, 480, 488, 534, 704, 789, 812, 824.
United Church Bill, 771.
Customs Bill, 890, 891, 892.
Ways and Means, 873, 953.
Loan Resolutions, 969, 974, 1014, 1053.
Tax on Goods, 990.

G

GRIMES, MR.

On Address in Reply, 123, 248, 261.
Civil Service Protection, 384.
Supply, 496, 555, 681, 734, 997.
Hotel Facilities, 585.
Customs Bill, 891.
Local Affairs Bill, 898.
Loan Resolutions, 974, 1026.
Tax on Goods, 990.

GODDEN, MR.

On Address in Reply, 31.
Hotel Facilities, 521.
Loan Resolutions, 1045.

H

HICKMAN, MR.

On Motion for Address in Reply, 19.
Speaker's Ruling, 72.
Salvage of S.S. Kentucky, 133.
Address in Reply, 136.
Herring Fishery, 246.
Sealfishery Bill, 297.
Civil Service Protection, 311, 336, 366, 370.
Crowe Bill, 344.
Marconi Wireless, 415.
Hotel Facilities, 517, 519, 526, 579, 597.
Shipbuilding, 570.
Supply, 608, 611, 717.
Nfld. Power and Paper Co. Bonds, 630, 819.
Besco Resolutions, 649.
Railway and Shipping, 666, 755, 759.
United Church Bill, 771.
Newspapers and Books Bill, 871.
Ways and Means, 907, 947.
Motion to Adjourn, 920.
Loan Resolutions, 971, 999, 1016, 1049.
Tax on Goods, 990.
Inspection of Foods, 1012.
Workmen's Comp. Act, 1034.
Terra Nova Oil Products, 1037.

HALFYARD, MR.

On Speaker's Ruling, 74.
Address in Reply, 85, 234.
Civil Service Protection, 312, 427.
Crowe Timber Bill, 395.
Sealfishery Bill, 400, 406.
Marconi Wireless, 423, 456, 460, 461.
Midwives' Bill, 476.
Hotel Facilities, 529, 580, 590.
Supply, 558, 603, 605, 613, 673, 674, 730, 789, 791, 794, 805, 808, 811, 812, 994.
Shipbuilding, 569, 573.
Besco Resolutions, 647.
Railway and Shipping, 667, 757.

Ways and Means, 943, 959.
Loan Resolutions, 972, 976.
Old Age Pensions, 979.
Education Act, 1000.
Suspension of Rules, 1004.
Inspection of Foods, 1009.
Loan Resolutions, 1019, 1051.

HIBBS, MR.

On Address in Reply, 42, 269.
Crowe Resolutions and Bill, 345.
Civil Service Protection, 375.
Supply, 791, 799.
Inspection of Foods, 1008.

J

JUSTICE, MINISTER OF

On Resolutions respecting Taxation and Immunition from Taxation of State Enterprises, 80.
Sealfishery Bill, 299, 403.
Civil Service Protection, 308, 330, 360, 362, 365, 368, 375.
Besco Resolutions, 316.
Crowe Resolutions and Bill, 342.
Penitentiary, 378.
Marconi Wireless, 423.
Keeping of Dogs, 437, 442.
Midwives' Bill, 444, 457, 458, 460, 461, 467, 469, 472, 477.
Supply, 486, 487, 553, 612, 615.
Hotel Facilities, 522, 596.
Nfld. Power and Paper Co. Bonds, 631, 847, 851.
Cold Storage Resolutions, 654, 657.
Immigration, 747, 751.
Railway and Shipping, 761, 768, 835, 836.
United Church Bill, 771.
Newspaper and Books Bill, 866.
Commercial Cable Co., 966.
Old Age Pensions, 968, 977, 980.
Loan Resolutions, 973, 1015.

Workmen's Compensation Act, 987, 1034.
Inspection of Foods, 1005.
Municipal Bill, 1013.

L

LAKE, MR.

On Address in Reply, 209.
Midwives' Bill, 459.
Shipbuilding, 566, 567.
Motion to Adjourn, 909.
Ways and Means, 937, 963.
Old Age Pensions, 967, 981.
Workmen's Compensation Act, 989.

LITTLE, MR.

On Address in Reply, 218.
Motion to Adjourn, 917.
Ways and Means, 941, 946.

M

MARINE AND FISHERIES, MINISTER OF

On Seal Fishery Bill, 399, 401, 404.
Marconi Wireless, 425.
S.S. Seal Inquiry, 453.
Motion to Adjourn, 462.
Shipbuilding, 563, 566, 571.
Cold Storage, 660.
Supply, 683, 706, 714, 725, 729, 733, 804.
Tax on Goods, 992.

MOORE, MR.

On Midwives' Bill, 458.
Supply, 607, 616, 716, 792.
Motion to Adjourn, 917.
Ways and Means, 939, 963.
Old Age Pensions, 977.
Tax on Goods, 991.
Loan Resolutions, 1040.

P

PETITIONS PRESENTED BY

Mr. K. M. Brown, 31, 946.
Hon. Mr. Bennett, 837.
Mr. Cashin, 31, 244.
Mr. Hickman, 323, 924.
Mr. Ashbourne, 31, 133, 152, 195, 265, 397, 431, 495, 514.
Mr. W. J. Browne, 31.
Hon. Mr. Long, 116, 965.
Hon. Mr. Bradley, 853.
Mr. Warren, 133, 195, 282, 301.
Hon. Mr. Woodford, 152, 480, 819.
Mr. Scammell, 173, 465, 495.
Mr. Duff, 893.
Mr. Halfyard, 244, 301, 397.
Mr. Hibbs, 244, 282, 397.
Mr. Godden, 265.
Hon. Mr. Sullivan, 265, 431, 453.
Mr. Power, 265, 617, 637.
Mr. Puddester, 265, 600.
Mr. Little, 265, 397.
Mr. Grimes, 282, 672.
Mr. Walsh 290, 431.
Mr. Lake, 301, 397, 453, 600.
Mr. Moore, 301.
Hon. Mr. Higgins, 301, 323, 377.
Hon. Mr. Cramm, 377.
Mr. Winsor, 397, 465, 484, 808.
Mr. Chambers, 600.
Mr. Sinnott, 637.
Mr. Cahill, 713, 809.

PUDDESTER, MR.

On Motion for Address in Reply, 8.
Address in Reply, 60.
Privilege, 465.
Supply, 814.
Newspapers and Books Bill, 863.

PRIME MINISTER, HON.

On Motion for Address in Reply, 27.
Speaker's Ruling, 73.
Motion to Adjourn, 79, 95, 151, 919, 1056.
Salvage of S.S. Kentucky, 131.
Address in Reply, 223.
Herring Fishery, 247.
Sealfishery Bill, 296, 321, 398, 401, 406.
Civil Service Protection, 312, 329, 350, 351, 381, 393, 427, 428.
Besco Resolutions, 313, 640.
Crowe Timber Bill, 340, 394.
Midwives' Bill, 475.
Supply, 488, 511, 552, 601, 674, 692, 775.
Hotel Facilities, 518.
Shipbuilding, 565, 568.
Railway and Shipping, 635, 665, 762, 753, 759, 760, 833, 834.
Newspapers and Books, 651, 871.
Power and P. Co. Bonds, 840.
Local Affairs Bill, 897, 899.
Ways and Means, 924.
Loan Resolutions, 975, 1049.
Education Act, 983, 1000.
Terra Nova Oil Products, 1003, 1036.

PUBLIC WORKS, MINISTER OF

On Civil Service Protection, 361.
Marconi Wireless, 425.
Keeping of Dogs Bill, 442.
Immigration, 751.
Supply, 784, 790, 804.

POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS, MINISTER OF

On Civil Service Protection, 362.
Motion to Adjourn, 452.
Supply, 727, 734, 776, 795, 796 801, 803.
Loan Resolutions, 1026.

R

RESOLUTIONS OF SYMPATHY.

Hon. J. D. Ryan, 7.
Mr. A. W. Piccott, 151.

Hon. W. J. Ellis, 464.
Hon. P. Templeman, 986.

RULING

Mr. Speaker, 69.

RANDELL, MR.

On Address in Reply, 105, 231.
Sealfishery Bill, 319, 404.
Marconi Wireless, 420.
Shipbuilding, 572.
Hotel Facilities, 579.
Supply, 711.
Power and P. Co. Bonds, 842.
Loan Resolutions, 1031.

RUSSELL, MR.

On Motion to Adjourn, 915, 923, 1056

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Crowe Timber Petition, 325
Hotel Facilities, 495
Encouragement of Shipbuilding, 533.
Atlantic Fisheries, 653.
United Church, 653.
Commercial Cable Co, 873.

S

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Opening, 3.
Closing, 1060.

SCAMMELL, MR.

On Address in Reply, 35, 254.
Speaker's Ruling, 73.
Sealfishery Bill, 298.
Civil Service Protection, 328, 361, 363, 368, 373.
Keeping of Dogs Bill, 443.
Marconi Wireless Bill, 447.
Midwives' Bill, 468.
Shipbuilding, 564, 570.
Hotel Facilities, 578.

Supply, 604, 674, 694, 710, 787, 811.
Besco Resolutions 646.
Cold Storage Resolutions 659.
Railway and Shipping, 834, 835.
Power and Paper Co Bonds, 838, 841
Newspapers and Books Bill, 861.
Local Affairs Bill, 899.
Ways and Means, 949.
Old Age Pensions, 979.
Loan Resolutions, 1042.

SULLIVAN, HON. MR.

On Crowe Resolutions and Bill, 347.
Shipbuilding, 565.
Power and Paper Co. Bonds, 844.
Loan Resolutions, 1041.

W

WARREN, MR.

On Motion for Address in Reply, 22.
Speaker's Ruling, 71, 74.
Taxation and Immunity from Taxation of State Enterprises, 81.
Address in Reply, 189, 197.
Sealfishery Bill, 299 318, 399.
Civil Service Protection 309 330, 388.
Marconi Wireless, 417, 454.
Midwives' Bill, 446.
Supply, 486, 487, 609, 611, 612, 614, 679, 680, 713, 716, 772, 797, 821, 826.
Hotel Facilities, 518, 597, 599.
Shipbuilding, 565, 568.
Besco Resolutions, 643.
Cold Storage, 656, 658.
Railway and Shipping, 661, 760, 765, 769.
Newspapers and Books, 867.
Customs Bill, 891.
Old Age Pensions, 968, 978.
Tax on Goods, 992.
Inspection of Foods, 1007.
Loan Resolutions, 1015.
Terra Nova Oil Products, 1038.